

European Agenda for Culture

Open Method of Coordination

***Working Group on developing synergies with education,
especially arts education***

Intermediate report - English version, August 2009

Editor: Jean-Marc Lauret

European agenda for culture
Working Group on developing synergies with education, especially arts
education

Intermediate report - English version, August 2009

Contents

1. GENERAL PRESENTATION	3
2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
3. GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	7
THE AIMS OF EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS	7
APTITUDES AND SKILLS DEVELOPED BY EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS.....	7
THE THREE COMPLEMENTARY APPROACHES OF EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS.....	8
4. CONTENT TO BE GIVEN TO EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS.....	10
TRANSDISCIPLINARITY.....	10
HERITAGE EDUCATION	14
5. ROLE OF CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS AND OF ARTISTS (FORMAL AND NON-FORMAL EDUCATION).....	18
6. EVALUATION AND TEACHERS TRAINING	20
ANNEXES	23
ANNEXE 1 MINUTES MEETING 22 SEPTEMBER 2008.....	23
ANNEXE 2 ADDRESS BY JEAN MARC LAURET, CHAIR OF THE CULTURE MINISTRIES' GROUP	
"SYNERGIES WITH EDUCATION, ESPECIALLY ARTS EDUCATION", BRUSSELS, 22 SEPTEMBER 2008 ..	24
ANNEXE 3 MINUTES MEETING 2 FEBRUARY 2009	28
ANNEXE 4 MINUTES MEETING 11 MARCH 2009.....	29
ANNEXE 5 MINUTES MEETING 17 JUNE 2009.....	30

1. General presentation

In order to implement the European Agenda for culture, the European Union's Council of Ministers of Culture decided to establish in May 2008, 5 expert groups, one of them with a mission to develop synergies between education and culture, notably through arts education.

Identifying, sharing and validating best practice will enable it to make recommendations for specific measures and their implementation in each Member State, to propose initiatives for cooperation between Member States and at the European level, to provide methodological tools for evaluating progress, and to formulate policy recommendations.

The working group consists of experts appointed by 26 EU countries (Slovakia decided not to participate).

We have been given two deadlines:

- an intermediate report to be delivered in July 2009,
- the final report to be delivered in December 2010.

The opening session of the working group took place in Brussels on 22 September 2008. At this occasion, a representative of the French Ministry of Culture was designated as Chair.

Four main sets of questions emerged from the discussions at the 22 September session¹:

1. **The content to be given to the notion of education in culture and the arts**

- transdisciplinarity (the development of synergies between education and culture cannot be reduced to a reinforcement of the place of arts teaching, but seeks to include a dimension of arts and culture into all teaching);
- new forms of cultural expression and artistic practice: how can these be included in a way that overcomes the division between "established" culture and the cultural and artistic practices of young people?
- the role of media and the cultural industries as vectors of cultural production and diffusion. How can this role be recognized in policies which have so far been confined to encouraging visits to cultural institutions and introducing people to artistic practices?
- heritage education. How can heritage education policy be reformulated within multicultural societies?

2. **The role of cultural institutions and artists in education in culture and the arts; the role of civil society; the balance between formal and non-formal education;**

3. **The training of teachers, providers of non-formal education, artists and culture professionals in methods of education in culture and the arts;**

4. **Evaluation and assessment: the (formal or non-formal) assessment of skills acquired by children and young people and the evaluation of the impact of policies and action in education in culture and the arts.**

Member States' representatives were invited to make a presentation on the policies implemented in their own country (by the state and local authorities) in each of these areas, illustrated by examples of "best practice"

¹ The detailed proposals of each will be found in annexe (Jean-Marc Lauret's concluding address).

and concluding with a set of proposals transferable throughout the Union. The experts were also invited to address each of these subjects at a European level.

For the period leading up to the intermediate report it was decided to concentrate on only some of the themes from the first two sets of questions:

1. The content to be given to the notion of education in culture and the arts

- transdisciplinarity;
- heritage education.

2. The role of cultural institutions in education in culture and the arts, partnerships between cultural institutions and schools

By contrast, it was judged feasible to consider all the themes of question sets 3 and 4 in the intermediate report.

Four subgroups were established on these themes. Subgroups 3 and 4 merged at their first meeting. The following volunteered as subgroup leaders:

- Subgroup 1 on content: Barbara Neundlinger (Austria)
- Subgroup 2 on partnerships: Jan–Jaap Knol (Netherlands)
- Subgroup 3 on evaluation: Paul Collard (United Kingdom)

It was agreed that documents could be exchanged in the virtual collaborative workspace CIRCA (<http://circa.europa.eu>)³. The Chairman notes with regret that this shared workspace has not been well used so far and would like it to be better used in the future in order to facilitate exchange among participants.

Since the opening session of 22 September, the working group has met three times, on 2 February 11 March 2009, first in subgroups and then in plenary session and on 17 June in plenary session in order to examine this intermediate report. Appended are the minutes of the three meetings drawn up by Leonor Wiesner, the European Commission official responsible for relations with the group, whom your reporter would like to thank for her availability and skill. A last meeting has taken place in Göteborg on 30 July during the conference « Promoting a Creative Generation » organised by the EU's Swedish presidency. At this occasion it was decided to insert in the report a summary of recommendations, to harmonize the presentation of the three sub-groups reports and to shorten the part devoted to describing the content of cultural and arts education.

This report is not an exhaustive account of the discussions held over four days of work, but presents the recommendations arising out of the activities of the three subgroups. The general introduction seeks to establish a common language for the members of the group on the aims of education in culture and the arts, the aptitudes and skills such education develops, and the three complementary approaches of its practical implementation.

² Each country has a folder with three sub-folders corresponding to each subgroup. It was also agreed that the members of the "Access to culture" platform would have access to the documents uploaded to CIRCA and vice versa.

³ Each country has a folder with three sub-folders corresponding to each subgroup. It was also agreed that the members of the "Access to culture" platform would have access to the documents uploaded to CIRCA and vice versa.

2. Summary of recommendations

The reinforcement of synergies between education and culture is justified by the acknowledgement of the impact that quality artistic and cultural education might have on the key competences for lifelong learning as described in the reference framework adopted on 18 December 2006. It also allows for the development of specific competences on which the continuity between the aesthetical experience and the other relationships to the world is based. Its implementation –depends on a reinforcement of the status of artistic and cultural education in formal, informal and non-formal education and the recognition of the right to lifelong artistic and cultural education.

- The reinforcement of synergies between education, culture and also youth leads to putting the emphasis on a transdisciplinary approach to artistic and cultural education. The recommendations addressed to the Member States establish the conditions necessary to the implementation of a transdisciplinary artistic and cultural education:
 - Integration of transdisciplinarity in school curricula (Recommendation 1);
 - Project-based pedagogy as a corollary of a school curriculum based on transdisciplinarity (Recommendation 2);
 - Work in pluridisciplinary teams, both in schools and cultural institutions (Recommendation 3);
 - Partnership between schools, cultural institutions and local education and culture players (Recommendation 4);
 - Recognition of coordination functions within administrative, educational and cultural structures at the European, national and local levels (Recommendation 5);
 - Complementary consequent training of teachers (Recommendation 6)

The Group also invites the European Union to include artistic and cultural education in a transversal manner in all its programmes and initiatives, especially those addressed to young people for whom cultural offer is less accessible (Recommendation 7).

- Heritage education allows the identification of one's individual story in the collective history. The recommendations addressed to the Member States concern the contents of the notion of heritage education and its objectives:
 - Allow each child and the population of each Member State to know its heritage (Recommendation 1);
 - Make young people aware of sustainable development issues(Recommendation 2);
 - Promote openness to the heritage of others (Recommendation 3);
 - Strengthen the sense among European citizens of sharing a European identity (Recommendation 4).

The recommendations also concern the means to attain these objectives:

- Establishment of a partnership between the different Culture, Education and Environment authorities involved (Recommendation 5);
- Introduction of heritage education in school curricula (Recommendation 6);
- Establishment by national heritage protection laws of an obligation to set up an education service in heritage sites benefiting from public funding (Recommendation 7);
- Implementation of a transdisciplinary approach (Recommendation 8);
- Training of teachers and development of adequate pedagogical tools (Recommendation 9);
- Cooperation between schools and heritage institutions and corresponding professionals (Recommendation 10);

- Training of heritage professionals in approaches to heritage education and education in architectural culture (Recommendation 11);
- Support for local initiatives by organisations and establishment of a network of these organisations (Recommendation 12);
- Encourage the presence of contemporary artists in heritage sites (Recommendation 13).

It is also highly desirable that the European Union supports the inclusion in the Culture programme and in the European Heritage Label of support for mechanisms aimed at facilitating contacts between young Europeans at the most iconic heritage sites, the development of teaching tools with a multilateral dimension and the networking of different players in heritage education (Recommendation 14).

- Cultural and artistic educations correspond to a joint responsibility from the education and culture worlds.

Several recommendations are addressed to the Member States: to embed cooperation between schools and cultural organisations in a long term strategy, promote its sustainability, invite both parties to actively participate in this cooperation and submit it to a periodic evaluation (Recommendation 1). To promote the reinforcement and sustainability of the cooperation it is necessary to make an inventory at the national level of the pre-requisites, the possibilities and the obstacles for cooperation and create networks between schools and cultural institutions (Recommendation 3). It also implies the improvement of artists training and the exchange of good practices between Member States (Recommendation 4). Finally, it also depends on the recruitment of teachers open to transdisciplinarity and the appointment of cultural coordinators in schools.

The European Union is invited to promote the exchange of information and knowledge on cooperation between the education and cultural sectors by facilitating EU-wide networks and the realization of an EU-wide glossary and portal on cultural education (Recommendation 2). The EU could also promote cooperation actions between schools and cultural organisations from different countries throughout the EU (Recommendation 6).

- Evaluation is an important dimension of artistic and cultural education policies, not least since it allows checking the divergence between declared intentions and their real implementation. The inclusion of evaluation programmes in the national policies is therefore strongly recommended (Recommendation 1). At the European level (Recommendation 2), it appears indispensable to integrate the evaluation thematic in community programmes dedicated to teachers training and in the creation of multilateral pedagogical tools. The Union could also support the creation of a common EU-wide working and exchange space (Recommendation 3).

3. General Introduction

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS

The development of synergies between education and culture primarily affects children and young people of school age, raising the question of whether education in culture and the arts should be regarded as a tool for improving academic results, a means of reinforcing pupils' capacity to see projects through, to cooperate and to follow a project's development and results, or rather in terms of the specificity of artistic approaches, as a means of preparing children to "inhabit the earth poetically" in Hölderlin's phrase, to transform their relationship to the world and to themselves, to discover "the infinite faces of life" and to learn to mobilize within themselves "that part of human beings that resists calculated projects", to borrow the words of René Char. The answer is perhaps all these things at once, but it is clear that the ambition is not the same in each case. Beyond individuals as pupils, the effects of education in culture and the arts extend to the whole person at every stage of life.

DEVELOPING SYNERGIES BETWEEN EDUCATION AND CULTURE: EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS AT SCHOOL

The debate on the aims of education in culture and the arts at school is often posed in terms of "learning through the arts" or "learning in the arts". This tension between the two poles of education in culture in the arts reflects the way that its potential effects are divided into "extrinsic" and "intrinsic" effects. Depending on whether teaching is explicitly intended to improve academic results in non-arts subjects or to introduce pupils to knowledge and practice in the arts, either the "extrinsic" or "intrinsic" effects will be emphasized. While recognizing the impact that education in culture and the arts can have on key skills for lifelong education and training, as set out in the frame of reference adopted as a recommendation by the European Parliament and Council on 18 December 2006 (and notably on the ability to communicate in first and foreign languages, skills in mathematics, basic skills in science and technology, and numeracy), it is crucial to stress that education in culture and the arts develops specific aptitudes and skills that bring about "the continuity of aesthetic experience with normal processes of living", as John Dewey puts it, and other relations with the world.

APTITUDES AND SKILLS DEVELOPED BY EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS

- the capacity for shared exploration of all the possibilities of a given situation. Pupils asked to do school exercises are used to looking for a single right answer, which the teacher already knows, and rejecting all other answers, regarded as wrong. On the contrary, involvement in an art project has more in common with research and exploration than with an algorithmic procedure whose stages are marked out in advance. It teaches that there are many right answers possible to the questions we face in seeing the project through. It also teaches us that the result is never known in advance and must always be constructed. Each of us can attest that in almost all the different fields of human experience, be they individual or collective, we very rarely come across questions to which there is only one right answer, particularly one known in advance by some political, moral or religious authority.
- the capacity to imagine that which one cannot directly observe, and thus to plan and to anticipate. The development of these capacities is closely linked to self-confidence and the capacity to express oneself.
- the capacity to demonstrate originality, to develop one's own answer, to begin to construct a singular, personal view of the world. This is crucial to the construction of personality and plays a part in building self-esteem.
- the capacity to maintain and develop the innate creative and communicative skills of children and to encourage them to be co-creators.
- the ability to cope with the tension generated by dealing with situations that cannot be managed by

rational processes alone. This leaves a choice between running away from problems and persevering, learning to manage the tension inherent in waiting, and to seek out the sudden realization that generates solutions beyond anything reason could have provided.

- the understanding that an artistic practice requires effort and concentration, above and beyond the freedom of expression that it permits. Work on forms of expression is an essential stage in self-expression, enabling individuals to enrich their expression and render it communicable. While insistence on spontaneity for its own sake imprisons individuals in themselves, involvement in an artistic project enables them to open up to others and to communicate their personal experience.
- the ability to locate one's work in the world, to subject it to the eyes of others. This introduces children to the relationship of their own creations to those of their peers, and also to professional practices. Such an introduction must take place over time and be reinforced by new experiences. It fosters critical thinking – first and foremost in relation to oneself. It is of course dependent on a sufficient level of self-esteem and enables individuals to avoid turning self-esteem into self-importance. This ability to submit one's own output to the eyes of others is encouraged by encounters with works of art and by seeing these works in the context of the history of the arts and of societies. It helps to forge a sense of being part of a shared culture and encourages a respect for cultural differences.

The acquisition of these abilities makes it possible to highlight the link between the acquisition of the key skill of cultural sensitivity and expression and the other seven key skills, in particular “learning to learn”, “social and civic skills” and “a spirit of initiative and enterprise”.

Finally, we can assert that the acquisition of these skills constitutes a relevant factor for strengthening the social cohesion in European societies.

THE THREE COMPLEMENTARY APPROACHES OF EDUCATION IN CULTURE AND THE ARTS

Learning about aesthetic codes and an awareness of the relationships between the works and styles of which art history is formed enable us to understand works of the human artistic and cultural heritage, to construct a faculty of aesthetic judgement and to be receptive to new forms of artistic expression. These things are also fostered by personal involvement in artistic practice which, when overseen by artists, constitutes an introduction to the methods of artistic creation.

Beyond the transmission of knowledge, education in culture and the arts seeks to foster a personal view of the world in children and young people. To this end, it draws on their sensibilities and requires mechanisms to be developed in which children and young people take an active position, enabling them to discover for themselves the multiplicity of ways in which artists have looked at the world, to compare their different imaginative approaches and subject them to critical appraisal.

Education in culture and the arts is organized in terms of three complementary approaches:

- a direct relationship with works of art (through performances, concerts, exhibitions, reading and so on), both contemporary pieces and those that are part of heritage;
- an analytical, cognitive approach to works of art (such as studying the history of art or relating the understanding of art works to the other fields of knowledge) which constitutes the cultural dimension;
- introduction to artistic practices in a studio context.

Experiencing art works, the cultural approach, and artistic practice all feed into one another. A direct relationship with works of art (watching a performance, listening to a concert or a piece of recorded music, looking at a painting, reading a work of literature, etc.) and the aesthetic experience which results from it are not passive attitudes but must be understood as active processes involving both cognitive and emotional responses. It is important to use appropriate means to develop such active responses in children and young

people (as well as adults), combining observation and practice through the development of transdisciplinary approaches. Engagement in an artistic practice as an introduction to the processes by which artworks are made plays an irreplaceable part in learning the languages of art. But practice unrelated to existing artworks would be confined to learning about the techniques of expression, just as experience of artworks that was not part of a dialogue with personal practice would bypass an essential dimension of artistic creativity. The cultural approach unrelated to artistic practice and without experience of artworks would lack the poetic dimension of sensibility supplied by multidimensional education in culture and the arts. On the other hand, the cultural approach makes it possible to place individual works and personal practice in a social and historical context and is thus part of the construction of a personal cultural identity.

DEVELOPMENT OF SYNERGIES BETWEEN EDUCATION AND CULTURE THROUGHOUT LIFE

When policy for education in culture and the arts seeks to recognize the three complementary approaches described above, these aims and the importance of training in these abilities for individual and collective development should be recognized and reflected across all Member States of the Union by:

- the reinforcement of the role of education in culture and the arts in the education and training of children and young people, as part of the overall set of knowledge and skills that pupils should have acquired by the end of compulsory schooling through the inclusion of a dimension of culture and the arts in all subjects ;
- the reinforcement of artistic and cultural content in activities offered to children in the context of non-formal and informal education;
- reinforcement of the role of culture and the arts in universities and in the initial and in-service training of teachers

Lastly, given that – as advocated by the Council of the European Union – support for the development of the education and training systems of Member States that seek to ensure

- a) the personal, social and professional fulfilment of all citizens;
- b) sustainable economic prosperity and employability, while promoting democratic values, social cohesion, active citizenship and intercultural dialogue,

must take account of lifelong education and training in all formal, non-formal and informal educational contexts, it would seem desirable to extend Member States' policies in the field of education in culture and the arts to include adult populations and to recognize the right of every adult not only to lifelong professional training, but also to cultural education throughout life. The recognition of this right will bring about a full recognition of the role of parents and of adults in general as full partners of the education community, alongside teachers, artists and culture professionals.

Bringing arts and education together at this very moment is all the more relevant looking at the enormous amount of inspiring examples in various parts of Europe and considering that new strategies for culture and education in Europe will soon be formulated.

4. Content to be given to education in culture and the arts

If strengthening synergies between culture, education and youth is a main objective of policies in the field of cultural and arts education, it is because arts and cultural education must be conceived as transdisciplinary. It is this transdisciplinary dimension which will allow us to overcome separations between administrative authorities of these three fields at every level: community (EU) national, regional, local, and to include mediators in cultural, educational and youth institutions so that these worlds, too often separate, come together.

TRANSDISCIPLINARITY

Young people are used to working, playing and learning in a transdisciplinary way outside school. We favour transdisciplinary working in arts and other subjects because it not only fosters education in the arts but also provides attractive lessons for children. In addition, culture is not a specific type of knowledge but rather an element which links different fields of knowledge. Meanwhile arts education feeds and transforms the relationships we have with ourselves, others and the world. Arts education must enter into dialogue with all the subjects taught in the education system. One aim of education in culture and the arts is to escape compartmentalization in disciplines, including those that structure the teaching of the arts, and to encourage transdisciplinary approaches.

1. Transdisciplinarity: what does it mean? what are its aims?

First of all, it is important to distinguish between transdisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity, and indeed pluridisciplinarity.

Pluridisciplinarity (or multidisciplinary) involves looking at an object of study from different points of view, juxtaposing different specialist approaches. This involves the (conscious or unconscious) coexistence of several disciplines simultaneously focusing on the same object of study.

Interdisciplinarity assumes dialogue and exchange of knowledge, analyses and methods between two or more disciplines. It implies interactions between several specialists and their mutual enrichment.

Transdisciplinarity is an intellectual position whose aim is to understand complexity; it seeks to connect different methods and bodies of knowledge in order to foster a holistic approach to thinking and problem-solving. Transdisciplinarity differs from interdisciplinarity in that it goes beyond disciplines. It is not a “meta-science”, its aim does not relate to the logic of disciplines. In other words, transdisciplinarity does not involve the mastery of several disciplines, but the opening of all disciplines to themes which pass through and beyond them.

Transdisciplinarity is supported by pluridisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity, but goes beyond them to encourage an integrated view of a subject, leaving discipline-based approaches behind.

The first recommendation is to raise awareness of these definitions in order to avoid the frequent confusion between the different terms and to clarify the aims we should like to pursue.

2. Transdisciplinarity and education in culture and the arts

Transdisciplinarity teaches us to think contextually and globally and to express ourselves in concrete terms. Going beyond structured forms of knowledge (disciplines), transdisciplinary education re-evaluates the role of intuition, imagination, sensibility and the body in the transmission of knowledge. Education in culture and the arts is particularly well suited to transdisciplinarity.

- a) Beyond arts teaching which, in most European countries, focuses on the visual arts and music, education in culture and the arts aims to **introduce a dimension of culture and the arts into all teaching**.

Some examples help to better understand what it is about.

The inclusion of a dimension of culture and the arts in the teaching of literature is now widely recognized as a real enhancement. Complementing the reading of a work of literature with a theatrical adaptation (arts dimension) or contextualizing and cross-fertilizing literary analysis with other fields of knowledge (cultural dimension) are now major elements in the teaching of literature. The presence of a choreographer working with teachers of physical education and opening up their training to the world of dance makes it possible to enrich approaches to movement with an aesthetic dimension. In a more general sense, education in culture and the arts can be a backup to teach other subjects (for example, the analysis of works of art can be a backup to teach history, theatre and music lessons for training languages, dance or music lessons to teach mathematical notions).

There is a long way to go before the contributions of cultural and arts-based approaches are acknowledged across all disciplines, particularly in the sciences, where comparison of the approaches of artistic creation and scientific research and the cultural contextualization of science are concerns that remain too marginalized. To change this situation, a complete overhaul of curricula and teaching methods is required⁴.

- b) ***Relating the history of each art to the other artistic domains, and the history of the arts to other fields of knowledge.***

The teaching of the history of the arts can be seen as the first vector for introducing a cultural dimension into all teaching. The transdisciplinary approach must make it possible to construct a history of the arts that does more than simply linking the histories of the different domains of art, structured in terms of the major currents that have made the history of art: Romanesque, Gothic, Baroque, etc.

The transdisciplinary approach to the history of art will also make it possible to relate the history of art to the other fields of knowledge: language and literature, history and geography, citizenship, modern and ancient languages, philosophy, the sciences, economics, sociology, technology and sport.

- c) ***Updating our approach to the notion of aesthetic experience by cross-fertilizing the viewpoints of artists with different disciplinary fields.***

How can one “enter into the picture”, to borrow the phrase used by Diderot in his *Salons*, moving from what we feel on first encountering the work to the construction of a cognitive and affective relationship to it? This issue of how works of art are received of course applies to all artistic fields and all works of art.

Intersecting views and making connections between the different approaches of the visual arts, choreography, theatre and music are part of the answer to this question. The cooperation between the major national institutions under the aegis of the French Ministry of Culture led to several projects which follow this approach⁵.

⁴ We can name as an example of good practice, the Aurora schools project presented by Finland: “Instruction in music, visual arts, crafts, and physical education is integrated into every school subject and all education, and the aim of this kind of ‘instilling’ is to develop the operational culture of school. This kind of ‘instilling’ calls for the strengthening of arts education, too” (www.aurorankoulu.net)

⁵ We shall mention only one example here: “Chaillot nomade au Louvre” is a scheme born out of a partnership between the Théâtre national de Chaillot and the Musée du Louvre. A choreographer is invited to devise a tour through the artworks (paintings or sculptures) on display in the Louvre that resonates with the performance he is presenting at Chaillot. An expert on the history of art from the national museums acts as guide on the tour, which may involve groups of pupils, students, Members of the Théâtre

All these projects confirm our view that, in the field of education in culture and the arts at least, *transmission* is not a vertical process from the one who knows to the one who does not, but a space of circulation and exchange, where invention is as important as learning.

3. How can transdisciplinarity be developed?

Recommendation n°1 to Member States: Integration into school curricula is the main vector for developing transdisciplinarity.

Recommendation n°2 to Member States: Project-based teaching is the corollary of a school curriculum based on interdisciplinarity and also extra-curricular activities outside school.

Recommendation n°3 to Member States: Work in pluridisciplinary teams is indispensable to the implementation of transdisciplinarity. In the first place, this concerns the implementation of teaching, notably in secondary schools (the versatility of primary school teachers facilitates the transdisciplinary approach) and should have concrete consequences for pupils' timetables. This is also true for cultural institutions when they relate to different artistic fields.

Recommendation n°4 to Member States: Partnerships between schools and cultural institutions and, beyond these, local policy makers for education and culture also facilitate transdisciplinarity. Partnerships facilitate reciprocal learning for both sides, help to launch a process of change within institutions and foster the understanding and recognition of new target groups in schemes aimed at particular sections of society.

Recommendation n°5 to Member States: More generally, in this perspective and in order to facilitate transverse cooperation, the function of the coordination of education in culture and the arts should be recognized within administrative authorities at the local, national and European level as well as in cultural and educational institutions.

Recommendation n°6 to Member States: Transdisciplinarity requires support in the form of **teacher training**; training provided by universities remains too specialized.

National de Chaillot, or simply visitors to the museum. The aim is to set up an exchange between the artist's way of seeing the works and that of the guide. The comparison of visual works from the national collections and dialogue with the guide enable the choreographer and dancers to experiment with new ways of touching the audience's emotions, a new type of dialectic between representation and reception. The guide speaks in counterpoint to the artist and describes how his own view of works he knows well has been transformed. This unexpected encounter between artist and expert, with its circulation of references to different worlds, touches the audience's emotions and enriches and expands their way of seeing both the dances performed in front of the paintings – visual transpositions in the proprioceptive mode – and the paintings or sculptures on display, which both artist and expert each see from different viewpoints. *In this approach of plurality and homage to diversity*, the aim, to borrow the terms used by Dominique Hervieu, choreographer and Director of the Théâtre National de Chaillot who instigated this project, is to “suggest that the audience ‘look at the world with the greatest possible number of eyes’ (Nietzsche)”.

Other projects constructed on the same principle of intersecting viewpoints have been implemented by the national establishments of the French Ministry of Culture. These include the partnership between the Musée d'Orsay and Théâtre de l'Europe – Théâtre national de l'Odéon, the Musée du Louvre and the Conservatoire National Supérieur de Musique et de Danse de Paris, the Théâtre national de Chaillot and the Cité de l'Architecture et du Patrimoine, and the Centre Pompidou and IRCAM (Institut de Recherche et Coordination Acoustique/Musique).

Recommendation n°7 to European Union : Education in culture and the arts, notably for young people whom the cultural offer reaches less, should be included in all the programmes and initiatives of the European Union, and particularly the programmes “Culture”, “Media 2007”, “Lifelong Learning”, “Youth”, the European Capital of Culture, the European Heritage Label and so on.

HERITAGE EDUCATION

Heritage education is an essential component in the formation of personality; it enables each individual's history to be integrated into a collective history. It is a factor in the acquisition of the key skills needed by every European citizen.

The recommendations concern the content of the notion of heritage education, its goals and underlying philosophy and are based on a wide approach to heritage education. They also concern the means that must be put in place to attain these goals.

The goals

Recommendation n°1 to the Member States: The first goal of heritage education must be to provide every child and the populations of every Member State with knowledge of their own heritage.

This heritage is not only tangible heritage; it is also intangible heritage. And it is not only heritage shown by major professional institutions (monuments, museums...) but also heritage of local value.

In this sense heritage education helps build a feeling of belonging to a national (whether or not this is associated with a nation state) and European community. Heritage has to be considered not simply in terms of traces of the past, but also as carrying meaning for present and future generations⁶.

Recommendation n°2 to the Member States: Heritage is also what each society decides to pass on to future generations. Thus it also includes architecture, the art of space that affects our daily lives and relates to the future. More broadly, thinking about the urban environment and its spaces makes it possible to introduce young people to questions of **sustainable development** and also creates the conditions for a culture open to both heritage and contemporary design. **Respect for heritage needs an awareness of the rules for protecting it, and to have volunteers work on heritage protection sites, under professional supervision⁷.**

Recommendation n°3 to the Member States: Coinciding with the conclusions of the European year of intercultural dialogue, the idea of national identity is always seen as a dynamic notion, open to external exchanges. **The goal of heritage education is thus also to be open to the heritage of others⁸.**

⁶ All Member States could adopt the philosophy of the programme launched in Greece in 2006 with the title "Cultural heritage as an inspiration for modern artistic creation". In the light of this goal, Italy notes the innovative event held to mark the construction in Rome of the new National Museum of 21st Century Arts known as MAXXI. Its relevant feature was permitting visitors' participation during the work in progress, i.e besides the construction site of the new museum, through temporary exhibitions, performances, workshops and meetings with Italian and foreign artists, architects, town-planners.

⁷The link with the issue of sustainable development is noted in several contributions, associating the protection of monumental heritage with environmental protection (cf the national association "Heritage culture" in Bulgaria) and sustainable development (the Oak of Finland programme involving the Finnish National Board of Education, Finnish Board of Antiquities and Finnish Ministry of Environment. Or the Tree of Life Through Four Seasons in Greece).

⁸ Here, we can in particular refer to the preamble of Poland's Education System Act of 7 September 1991, which seeks to "instil in young people a sense of responsibility, love of fatherland and respect for Polish cultural heritage while promoting openness towards other cultures in Europe and in the world".

As the Bulgarian contribution notes, heritage education is a vector for building intercultural links in multicultural societies. Greece adopted the same approach with the project "Culture as a means of social integration: an intercultural approach: The notion of time (the program focused on a versatile approach to the meaning of time and emphasized its multicultural dimension throughout the ages)". The exploration of our heritage is also an opportunity to explore the multiple influences that have shaped it. The Spanish contribution rightly notes that "The existence of nationalist conceptions does not facilitate interculturality. It even makes it hard to recognize Arab culture as part of our culture". The French contribution presents the example of a project run by the local authorities

Heritage is not so much the fruit of inheritance as a process of adoption⁹ The structuring of individual cultural identity is not so much a matter of understanding a cultural legacy in which a large section of the population can find no place for themselves, as a process of adopting a heritage comprising the successive creations of the people and societies that have gone before us in the geographical area we live in today, though by no means all were our own ancestors. This conception is thought to facilitate intercultural dialogue, as individual cultural identities are built through exchanges with different cultures and successive adoptions that may be scattered through the life of each individual. “Adopting one’s heritage thus also means facilitating openness to the heritage of others, not in order to appropriate it or to imprison it in exoticism, but to engage in a dialogue that recognizes that cultures have equal worth. The adoption of the other’s heritage in an act of mutual recognition makes it possible to give that heritage a universal dimension, without this implying an uniformization of cultures”.

In addition to its role as a vector for intercultural dialogue, the involvement of young people in **promoting heritage should also be understood as a tool for fostering contact with others**. The promotion of heritage and its potential is also a way for promoting tourism¹⁰ Beyond the possible economic consequences of implementing such a programme, the aim is also to make tourism policy into a vector for contacts between peoples.

Recommendation n°4 to the Member States: There is a fourth goal for heritage education, which is to strengthen the sense among European citizens that they have a shared European identity.

The European dimension and the transnational nature of our heritage should be promoted in order to transmit a sense of belonging to a shared European cultural space. Our culture and heritage are the fruit of movement back and forth, a transnational transfer and exchange between the artists and intellectual movements that have forged European history, making them the ideal domain for the transmission of a shared identity based on cultural diversity, nurtured by cultural exchanges within Europe and with non-Member States. Seen in this light, heritage education is part of the process of building a European identity, while avoiding confrontation with others and rejection of all that is foreign that are often seen as inherent in the process of building collective cultural identities¹¹.

The recommendations also concern the means for attaining these goals

Recommendations to the Member States

Recommendation n°5: The four main goals of heritage education can only be implemented in the context of a **partnership between the different Culture, Education and Environment authorities involved at the national and local levels**.

Recommendation n°6: The second recommendation is methodological in nature and concerns the need to **introduce the knowledge of heritage into school curricula**.

in Le Lamentin, Guadeloupe, which uses an exploration of the Caribbean musical heritage and its different aesthetics to highlight the many sources, both African and European, that have produced this music.

⁹ The “Adopting our heritage” programme launched by the French ministers of culture and education in 2002 was based on the “Adopt a monument” programme established in Italy and also developed by the Centre for Educational Services.

¹⁰ Particularly emphasized by the Bulgarian contribution, “Tourism in the hands of young people”, in the context of the programme “My town/village in a united Europe”, which seeks to train high school pupils to act as volunteer guides at tourist sites.

¹¹ Thus, in Finland, school syllabuses (basic education) incorporate the cross-curricular theme “Cultural Identity and Internationalism” (the goal of this theme being to help pupils understand the essence of the Finnish and European cultural identities, discover their own cultural identity, and develop capacities for cross-cultural interaction and internationalism).

In societies with national minorities or facing the issue of integrating populations of immigrant origins, the teaching of the mother tongue and cultural heritage of the different components of society are factors in the struggle against failure at school. Learning about the different elements of heritage also involves setting them in their historical context. Teaching in history and the arts has a contribution to make here.

Recommendation n°7: When heritage education is seen as an underlying element of heritage protection policy, **it is crucial that national laws on heritage protection should oblige heritage sites benefitting from public funding to contribute to this education and to set up an education department in order to do so.** A comparison of the practices of professionals working in these education departments seems desirable.

Recommendation n°8: Heritage education implies a **transdisciplinary approach, involving archaeology, history, geography, literature, philosophy, music and the visual arts.**

Heritage classes enabling primary or secondary school pupils to spend a week in a heritage site are one example of a scheme suited to a transdisciplinary approach.

Recommendation n°9 : The introduction of knowledge of heritage into curricula and the promotion of a transdisciplinary approach must be accompanied by its integration into university curricula, the implementation of a **teacher training programme¹²**, and the **development of appropriate teaching tools¹³**, in which a **bilateral or multilateral dimension could be encouraged.**

Recommendation n°10: Heritage education cannot be reduced to a theoretical approach relying on teachers alone. It requires **cooperation between schools and heritage institutions and between teachers and heritage conservation professionals** such as archaeologists, archivists, museum curators and architects.

Recommendation n°11: The involvement of heritage institutions also requires the **training of heritage professionals in approaches to heritage education and education in architectural culture.**

Recommendation n°12 : **Support for local initiatives by independent organizations and clubs** during school hours (secondary school clubs) and outside school hours (non-formal education) and the **establishment of a network of these organizations** (exchanging experiences, training the managers of the organizations) also form one axis of the strategies to be established in developing heritage education.

Recommendation n°13: Bringing heritage to life and building links between heritage and creativity also means encouraging the **presence of contemporary artists in heritage sites by funding residencies and hosting contemporary arts events.**

¹² Along the lines of the Oak of Finland programme.

¹³ For example the website (www.hereduc.net) and the training manual for teachers produced by the HEREDUC project and launched as part of the Comenius program in 2002, by Community Education Flanders, with the partnership of other European Member States (France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy).

Recommendation to the European Union

Lastly, the promotion of heritage education as a vector for the construction of a European identity requires that mechanisms for cooperation be established at the European level.

Recommendation n°14: It is desirable to insert in the European Union's "Culture" programme and the European Heritage Label (currently in development) support for:

- **mechanisms facilitating contacts between young people of different nationalities at the most iconic heritage sites for Europe as a multinational entity open to exchanges with the rest of the world (for example those who have been awarded the European Heritage Label), along the lines of European heritage classes.**
- teaching tools with a multilateral dimension (books, websites)¹⁴.
- the formation of networks of the different players in heritage education.

¹⁴ As was noted by Sweden, teaching tools must not call into question the principle of teachers' pedagogical freedom. By developing such tools in cooperation by several Member States, the aim is to offer teachers pedagogical contents without imposing anything.

5. The role of cultural institutions and of artists (formal and non-formal education)

All EU-countries give arts and cultural education a place within their regular school curriculum, since they all consider these subjects an essential part of education. Cultural education stimulates creativity and offers pupils ways to express themselves artistically. It widens their views and deepens their knowledge and understanding of the world. In other words, it contributes to their cultural awareness, one of the eight key competences identified in the Lisbon strategy.

Learning about and learning through culture and the arts can take place *within* and *outside* the classroom, during visits to museums, monuments or performances. Furthermore many young people in the Member States participate actively in music, dancing, literature, theatre, visual arts etc outside school hours. Cultural education therefore takes place through both *formal* and *non-formal* learning.

There is general agreement that cultural education benefits very much from a close and sustainable partnership between schools and cultural organizations. A basic and fundamental assumption is that cultural education should be seen as a *joint responsibility* of the educational and the cultural side. Both worlds need each other. Cultural education will not flourish when education sees it as a peripheral phenomenon or as something that can simply be left to the cultural side. But cultural education will also fail when cultural institutes lose sight of the educational mission of the school or ignore the practical possibilities within the school program. Contacts between schools and cultural organizations should therefore not be occasional occurrences. And although projects can be a rich source of innovation and inspiration, for a really successful cooperation more has to be done. A joint responsibility implies mutual commitment and a joint policy, strategy and structure for partnership at all relevant levels.

Since the responsibilities for education and culture are organized in very different ways in Member States, the actual interpretation of this concept of joint responsibility can be and must be very different. But a starting point could be that the responsible authorities sign up to an intention to cooperate. A next step would be for authorities to initiate or support a process leading to agreements for cooperation between education and culture. Research, conferences and the development and sharing of good practices can help to broaden the support for cooperation¹⁵. Cultural education benefits strongly when it is recognized as a joint responsibility for education and culture at all the relevant levels. Therefore it is advisable for the policy on cultural education to be explicitly formulated in documents and for these documents to be supported by the responsible authorities for education and culture.

Recommendation n° 1 to the Member States: to embed cooperation between schools and cultural organizations in a long-term policy strategy and structure in which both sides participate actively and which is monitored and periodically evaluated. By doing so, cooperation will become more sustainable and not remain purely project-based.

Recommendation n°2 to the EU: to support the further exchange of information and knowledge between Member States on the cooperation between the educational and cultural sectors by facilitating EU-wide networks and the realization of a EU-wide glossary and portal on cultural education.

The preconditions for a successful cooperation between the worlds of school and culture depend on:

- *Acquisition of skills:* for a successful synergy between education and culture, both sides have to learn to work together.

¹⁵ For example the Slovenian national programme for Culture 2008 – 2011, the Netherlands Culture and School program and the protocols for cooperation between the French ministries of culture and education signed since 1983.

- *Facilitating networks and partnerships*: these offer the best means to bring together the worlds of education and culture in practice.
- *Taking account formal and non-formal learning*: cultural education takes place during and after school time. And just as a firm place for cultural education in the core curriculum is needed, the potential of cultural education in non-formal learning should be explored.
- *Considering financing*. Cultural activities do cost money: transport, time, materials, tickets and educational staff. Schools and cultural institutions rarely depend on the same source of financing. All kinds of models for financing are possible, but it is clear that a lack of clarity or even a simple lack of finance will frustrate cooperation before it can start.

The results of the recent conference on Cultural Education (CICY, 11-13th March 2009, organized by the Flemish and Dutch authorities) also confirm the need to fulfil these preconditions.

Recommendation n° 3 to the Member States: to promote the cooperation between schools and cultural organizations by making an inventory at the national level, under the joint responsibility of educational and cultural authorities, of the pre-requisites, the possibilities and the obstacles for cooperation and by facilitating networks between schools and cultural organizations.

For good cooperation between parties it is firstly necessary to know each other's starting point and the circumstances that lead each partner to engage in cooperation. Secondly, it is important to agree on the joint objectives. Thirdly, it is indispensable to respect each other's position and interests. Fourthly, cooperation should be based on a positive attitude, aimed at solving problems instead of creating them.

These general points are applicable to cooperation in cultural education. Too often, and despite the good intentions, parties lack knowledge of each other's position. It often happens that a school thinks that the cultural organization can fulfil all its wishes. At the same time, a cultural organization may develop its educational programme without taking into account the demands of the school¹⁶. An untrained artist in the classroom can lead to disappointment on both sides, just as teachers who leave their class alone during museum visits should not be surprised when the class does not take the visit too seriously.

Recommendation n° 4 to the Member States: to improve the training of artists in order to give them the pedagogical and organizational tools to work with and within schools. Schools and cultural organizations can benefit from an exchange of best practice between Member States.

Recommendation n° 5 to the Member States: to encourage schools to increase their experience and expertise in working with artists and cultural organizations. This can be made possible by using teachers who are able to work in an inter- and transdisciplinary way or by appointing cultural coordinators in schools.

Recommendation n° 6 to the EU: to promote cooperation between partnerships of schools and cultural organizations from different countries throughout the EU.

Conclusion

Cooperation between schools and artists or cultural organizations can lead to a great reinforcement of the impact and quality of cultural education. It benefits when responsibility is shared by both parties and when there is a long-term strategy and policy in place. A sustainable and intensive cooperation between education and culture will not only create synergies. More importantly, it will help increase access to culture and the creativity of generations to come.

¹⁶ In various Member States like Denmark - the Art Council's In House Artist Scheme - and the Netherlands - artists in the class - and also in France and Flanders there are programmes for training artists in cultural education.

6. Evaluation and Teachers Training

Introduction

There is much convincing evidence of good practices in all participating Member States. However, some Member States have collected a more comprehensive evidence base and begun to marshal significant arguments in favour of allowing young people to have a wide experience of the arts and culture throughout their formative years. While all education policies across the world, in particular in Europe, give a place to the arts, there is a significant gulf between statements of intent and their implementation. If the issue of the evaluation of education in culture and the arts is now being raised with such intensity, it is to provide arguments that might contribute to the bridging of this gap.

The survey summarised the evidence currently available to Dr. Bamford¹⁷.

Instead of adopting EU wide standards or performance norms, the focus should be on establishing appropriate standards locally. The process should be based on a dialogue with stakeholders and participants, in particular between those in the education sector and those in the cultural sector. A variety of different approaches and methods should be used, including portfolio approaches in which a number of different methods are used to triangulate the evidence.

In addition, the Group considered evidence on teacher training submitted by participating Member States. Aware that Eurydice is conducting a much more extensive study of the same topic, the group agreed to consider the Eurydice recommendations when they emerge and to confine their own recommendations to providing teachers with the capacity to effectively evaluate programmes.

¹⁷ A distinction is made between **assessment** (the set of means and resources used to determine student learning), **appraisal** (where you make judgements on the basis of a range of existing evidence) and **evaluation** (the set of means and resources used to determine more broadly the outcome of a programme, teaching strategies, policy and so on). While the group understands that these words did not necessarily translate individually into other European languages, the differences were understood and could be communicated by giving a broader context or explanation to the word being used.

Recommendations

Recommendation n°1 to the Member States: include evaluation programmes in national policies.

With this in mind the group agreed:

1. That evaluation is the key to developing and sustaining good work and should be undertaken regularly to contribute to informed decision making and improved action in arts education. With this in mind it is proposed:
 - That all projects and programmes should allocate funds from their budgets for evaluation.
 - That the evaluation programme is initiated from the start of the project or programme with proper benchmarking.
 - That more emphasis be given to the evaluation of policies and national programmes as there is a growing body of good evidence on the impact of individual projects¹⁸.
2. That evaluation in its etymological sense means questioning the values embodied in a policy, a programme or concrete action in the field and revealing, where appropriate, the gaps between these values and those expressed in the language that precedes and accompanies the action or policy implemented.
3. That evaluation is an overall judgement of the project as a whole used to determine more broadly the success of a programme, teaching strategies or policies. Evaluation in this sense means a systematic documentation of activities and a critical review of the performed activity/programme and its effects in relation to the explicit objectives.
4. That internal impact evaluation in arts education concerning pupils' achievement should select from among the following to report on:
 - Acquisition of arts skills
 - Capacity for trying new creative and/or cultural experiences
 - Increased confidence and self-esteem
 - Changed or challenged attitudes
 - Development of creativity, cultural awareness, communication
 - Capacity to transfer the skills acquired to areas within and outside of the school context
 - Increased collaboration

¹⁸ Qualitative studies of small groups can certainly enable detailed analysis of the specific effects that can be attributed to different teaching methods. The proliferation of case studies and the similarity of their results moreover constitute an interesting array of indications in relation to the teaching methods and approaches that can give the best results. But we should not confuse this accumulation of case studies with what is revealed by the evaluation of policy.

There are several differences between the two:

- the difference between an action carried out as an innovative experiment whose effects are generally positive and one conducted without any kind of observation. The experimental dimension of studies, in other words the fact of placing a group under observations, cannot fail to produce effects, notably on the behaviour of teachers and contributors. But what happens in groups that do not benefit from such observation?
- the difference between an innovative action over a limited period and long-term, reproducible action, in which a degree of weariness and routine may emerge.
- a difference of scale in space and time. Large-scale empirical research on the subject has never been done. Furthermore, most studies have been conducted over short periods when longer, longitudinal studies are indispensable.

Too often, evaluations of public policy settle for examples of "good practice", supposed to be the pieces of a puzzle which, once completed, will provide a complete image of reality. But in reality no such complete image exists. The reference to good practice may perhaps be part of a defensive strategy whose aim is to mask the limitations of public policy in relation to education in culture and the arts.

- Contribution to the formation of identity.
5. That programmes and policies should include measurements of, and nearly always demonstrate improvements in, **all** of the following to prove whether successful:
- Explore the limits/ (to work out of the box)
 - Partnership working between school and cultural institutions, artists, creative professionals, and cultural industries
 - Flexibility in organisational structures
 - Permeability of personal and organisational boundaries
 - Sharing and collaborative planning
 - Reflective and evaluative practice
 - Accessibility
 - Utilization of local contexts
 - Opportunities for presentation/publication
 - Professional development.

Recommendation n°2 to the European Union: to contribute to supporting teacher and cultural professional *training* in evaluation approaches, to offer them tools for carrying out these evaluations.

That in order to assist the adoption of the approaches outlined above:

- In-service training for teachers and creative professionals working on culture/education programmes should be provided. A short curriculum could be developed at a European level to assist Member States.
- An evaluation toolkit should be developed which provides project, programme and policy makers with the options for effective evaluation.

Recommendation n°3 to the European Union: an observatory (or at least a working space for sharing information between researchers in the field of evaluation) should be established at a European level. This should have the capacity to collect good evaluation from Member States to be made available to others and to commission comparative benchmarking studies and other studies in arts and education to improve the quality of information available to Member States.

ANNEXES

ANNEXE 1 Minutes meeting 22 September 2008

SUMMARY

First meeting of the working group "synergies with education, including arts education", which was set up to implement the Council work plan on culture 2008-2010. Twenty-three Member States present, with representatives from both culture and education ministries.

The EU Presidency opened the meeting with a presentation of the European agenda for culture and the Council work plan 2008-2010. It also explained the main principles of the open method of coordination (OMC) and the context in which this working group was established. The Commission explained that the group should aim to identify and share best practice as well as suggest recommendations for concrete actions at national or European levels. The Commission also said that it would deliver facilities (meeting room and translation, secretariat of the group) and pay travel expenses (two experts per participating country) for three meetings a year.

The WG nominated FR to chair the group. J-M Lauret, the elected Chair, was previously Chair of the ACE-net, a network dedicated to educational and cultural issues which has been active since 2005; many participants were also members of the ACE-net.

During a first exchange on the substance, the experts gave a brief presentation of the views on issues at stake within education, in particular arts education in their countries. Even though members generally shared the same objectives of further integrating arts education as normal part of school curricula, it was apparent that the points of departure and the conditioning circumstances of each country were rather different, although the way in which they would like to approach the work ahead seemed to be rather similar.

The topics mentioned by the experts as potential areas of work for the group included the new forms of cultural expression and artistic practice, the role of media and cultural industries in arts education, cultural institutions, artists and the civil society, education to heritage, training of teachers, artists and other culture professionals and the question of evaluation and certification.

In light of this discussion, the Chair will circulate a proposal in writing, also inviting experts to express their interest in leading work on a thematic area or a specific topic. With regard to its working methods, the group decided that priorities needed to be set and that a limited number of specific topics should be discussed in small groups, who would present the results of their work for discussion during next meeting, scheduled for the end of January/early February 2009. Two more meetings are planned for 2009, probably in March and May, the first to coincide with the International Conference on Creativity, Innovation and Arts Education, organised by the NL and B Education ministries and to be held in Brussels on 12 and 13 March 2009.

ANNEXE 2 Address by Jean Marc Lauret, Chair of the Culture Ministries' group "Synergies with education, especially arts education", Brussels, 22 September 2008

Contextual elements, the mandate of the Culture Ministries' group and themes considered by the delegations.

Reminder of the context of our mission

Implementing the Lisbon strategy, promoting the knowledge-based society, recognizing human capital as the primary factor in wealth, whose potential must be developed.

The development of synergies between culture and education meets this aim to the extent that it seeks to increase individual creativity and enhance skills in intercultural dialogue and the key skill of "sensitivity and cultural expression".

General aims

- The aim is not to work towards a transfer of competences from Member States to EU institutions.
- The Culture Ministries' group seeks to identify convergences through an exchange of best practice.
- It should also propose initiatives to the Commission with the aim of adding value to national policies.

A brief word on the ACEnet network

The network pursues the tasks it has set itself, notably the establishment of the *European Community of Knowledge on Arts and Cultural Education* portal, and the glossary, which will enable us to clearly identify the concepts of education in culture and the arts.

Aims of the group "Synergies with education, especially arts education"

- to introduce a dimension of culture and the arts into all teaching and not only to reinforce the role of arts education within curricula. Non-formal education is also included.
- to include an educational dimension in the artistic and cultural projects of all state-supported arts and culture organizations.

In schools, this means breaking down the barriers between disciplines, placing the training of the critical faculty at the heart of the education system by relating the different fields of knowledge to each other and combining approaches based on sensibility with those based on rationality.

In our cultural institutions, it also means placing the question of the way that creators and heritage preservation professionals relate to the wider population at the heart of the artistic and cultural projects of institutions. Creation is not an isolated act but a social practice. Heritage education is the basis for policies of heritage preservation.

So promoting synergies between education and the arts means affirming a twofold aim whose ambition is as great as the distance separating it from reality.

I should like to provide a broad outline of the context in which we are working within our countries.

- As stressed by the delegations from **Estonia** and **Portugal**, the place of education in culture and the arts remains marginal within the education system and we constantly have to justify its contribution to the education of children and young people.

How can research programmes be established, notably to evaluate the impact of education in culture and the arts on children and young people and to evaluate the impact of policies seeking to create synergies between education and culture on economic development and social cohesion? The **Swedish** delegation emphasized that this question must receive specific attention from our group.

I would add, concurring with the delegations of **Austria** and **Belgium** (Flemish community), that to “evaluation” we should also add “assessment”, leading us to consider research into methods of certifying key skills (cultural expression and sensitivity, intercultural competence).

- Access to cultural practices and resources outside school remains profoundly unequal.

University campuses are still often cultural deserts. Despite speeches asserting the desire to promote lifelong learning, there is a long way to go before the right of every adult to benefit from cultural education is recognized in the same way as the right to continuing professional training.

Where cultural institutions are concerned, state support for the cultural offer has certainly not produced the hoped-for effects of democratization. Without giving way to populism, we have to recognize that for professionals the issue of relations with audiences is still seen as secondary or indeed of marginal importance, compared to that of renewing artistic forms and languages.

In relation to heritage, despite promotional efforts reflected in heritage days, education still has a long way to go. The recognition granted to mediators is far below the prestige associated with the conservation professions.

Our discussions this morning have enabled us to identify some themes for concrete work and exchange of best practice that should permit the development of recommendations that are valid for all states countries.

- Beyond the strengthening of arts teaching, what do we understand by the inclusion of a dimension of arts and culture in all teaching? This question was posed by the **Slovene** delegation and, as the **Austrian** delegation also reminded us, teaching in vocational secondary schools is included here. The promotion of transdisciplinarity will make it possible to turn high schools into centres of cultural life that are open to their surroundings, as recalled by our colleague from **Luxembourg**. This is an important issue, particularly in rural areas where schools are often the only cultural institutions.
- What heritage education policies are implemented or should be implemented in multicultural and, in some countries, multinational societies, in other words in societies where a large element of the population cannot recognize heritage as having been left to them by previous generations? These issues were emphasized by our colleagues from **Malta** and **Greece**.
- What is the best practice to adopt in education in the image and in media? Several delegations mentioned this issue as a priority, notably the delegations from **Finland**, the **Netherlands** and **Austria**.

In schools, images tend to be confined to the role of simple illustrations to theoretical teaching. In the media, the place given to broadcasts dealing with critical readings of images is marginal, not to say inexistent.

The critical apparatus that needs to accompany the development of the web is confined to warnings about paedophiles and xenophobes.

In addition to the semiological dimension of education in images and to ethical considerations of the right to images, education in images should also have a cultural and an aesthetic dimension.

- Schools and non-formal education providers, the cultural institutions and the commercial cultural industries remain three separate worlds.

Education in culture and the arts is fundamentally based on visits to cultural institutions and introduction to artistic practices, while the cultural industries are the main vector for the production and diffusion of culture. What is the role of these cultural industries in policies seeking to promote synergies between education and culture? The importance of this question was stressed by **Finland**, the **Netherlands** and **Slovenia**.

- How can we recognize emerging artistic practices, as we call them in France, and urban cultures in our policies for education in culture, and how can we overcome the division between “cultivated, legitimate culture” and these new forms of expression that are very popular among young people? The **German** delegation posed these questions, which are clearly important if we take the view that education in culture and the arts cannot be reduced to a “top down” process, where pupils are seen only as receivers.
- Our colleagues from **Lithuania**, the **Netherlands**, and **Slovenia** invite us to consider the issue of the training of teachers and educators on the one hand and of artists and culture professionals on the other.

What skills must teachers acquire if the introduction of a dimension of culture and the arts into all teaching is to become more than just a pious hope?

And what do we expect from the artists and culture professionals who are asked to contribute to education in culture and the arts? That they should fill the gaps left in teacher training? That they should bring specific skills as artists or professionals? This would surely imply that a consideration of the methods of transmission, which cannot be reduced to pedagogy alone, should be included in their initial training and continuing professional development.

- Formal and non-formal education

We have long known that we cannot reinforce the role of education in culture and the arts in children’s education by increasing the hours devoted to it in already overloaded timetables.

There are two possible solutions for overcoming this obstacle. One is to modify school rhythms to make them more consistent with the rhythms of children’s lives, their rhythms of learning and their biological rhythms. The other is to take the responsibility for dispensing education in culture and the arts out of school time and make it a matter for non-formal education, at the risk of increasing inequalities of access to culture and the gap between the teaching of so-called core subjects and artistic and cultural practices.

The issue of the balance to be found between formal and non-formal education and the respective roles played by schools and civil society in education in culture and the arts is crucial, as noted by the delegations from the Flemish community of **Belgium**, from **Finland** and **the Czech Republic**.

- Universities. The **Slovene** delegation reminded us of the role of universities. Twenty-five years ago, an academic report describing the state of French campuses was entitled “A cultural desert”.

Beyond the development of professional training in the arts and culture, it is important to introduce a dimension of culture and the arts into all university education and to turn campuses into centres of cultural life.

In this area we can also exchange best practice.

- As the **Slovene** delegation also recalled, we need to explore the educational practices of cultural institutions in the sectors of artistic creation and heritage.
 - The practices of institutions and creative teams that place the relationship to the wider population at the centre of creative processes, and not just a secondary stage following the initial creation.
 - The practices of heritage institutions that fully integrate the issue of mediation and heritage education into their work of preservation, protection and promotion.
- The mandate we have been given should also encourage us to suggest what value could be added by EU institutions in the field of policies that remain national.

How can we extend the work of the EYID and ensure that the issues of otherness and openness to others remain at the heart of policies for education in culture and the arts? The **Bulgarian** and **Hungarian** delegations stressed the importance of this question.

How can we ensure that the work done in the field of education in culture and the arts also provides opportunities for exchanges between young Europeans, as proposed by our colleague from **Malta**, and between young Europeans and the rest of the world?

How can we ensure that the cultural and artistic exchanges that should be encouraged by measures to make artists more mobile - a subject another Culture Ministries group is working on - are extended in the field of education?

How, while respecting national programmes, can we encourage the creation of transnational teaching tools such as the Franco-German history textbook or the transnational training programmes for teachers and culture professionals?

These are some areas where EU institutions could make useful contributions.

I hope that this summary has provided a complete synthesis. We now need to reorganize these questions and to establish priorities and debate our working methods in order to move forward together.

Thank you.

ANNEXE 3 Minutes meeting 2 February 2009

SUMMARY

Second plenary meeting of the Expert Group. Twenty-two Member States present.

The Presidency started at the "Plenary" level by recalling the priority themes to be discussed, the deliverables to be presented and the agreed timetable for their presentation. Subgroups then started work. Plenary met again at the end of the day to listen to the results of the work of subgroups, draw conclusions on this work and recall general information. The subgroups composition was as follows:

- **Subgroup "Content"** - Chair: AT. Participants: BE, BG, FI, FR, DE, EL, IT, MT, PL, PT, ES and NL.
- **Sub-group "Civil society"**- Chair: NL. Participants: BE, DK, EE, FI, FR, IE, LU and SI.
- **Subgroups "Teachers training" and "Evaluation" (merged)** - Chair: UK. Participants: BE, FR, CY, CZ, HU, RO and SE.
- The Expert Group was reminded that its goal was twofold: 1) to learn by discussing the group's issues, aiming at producing a coherent and workable vision on them, and bring back home some good practices from other countries, and 2) try and extract from their work recommendations with a general bearing that could be addressed either to national, transnational or Community level.
- Subgroups have until next Plenary meeting (11 March) to produce an initial set of recommendations for each of their priority issues, for wider circulation/validation among the whole Expert Group.

The next plenary meetings of the Group are planned for 11 March and June 2009. A third plenary meeting of the Group will be organized towards the end of 2009, after the Cultural Forum, due to take place in September 2009.

ANNEXE 4 Minutes meeting 11 March 2009

SUMMARY

Third plenary meeting of the Expert Group. Twenty-two Member States present. The group met in subgroups in the morning and at the plenary level in the afternoon.

Presidency started the plenary by recalling the priority themes to be discussed, the deliverables to be presented and the agreed timetable for their presentation. A special focus was put on the contribution of the group to the Culture Forum, to be held on 29-30 September 2009.

Eurydice presented the Working Document containing the first part of its study on "Arts and Cultural Education at School in Europe". This study contains a "state of play" concerning the legislation on the teaching of arts education in European States schools.

Ilona Kish, representative of the "Access to culture" platform, presented some of the work and recommendations of the platform, underlining the need to associate closely the work of the OMC group and the platforms.

The result of the subgroups discussion was then presented individually by each animator:

- **Subgroup "Content"** - Chair: AT (Barbara Neundlinger)

"Content" is a very broad subject and the group is very large, this is why the group decided to start working on "key elements" for the content of artistic education. The key elements presently being analysed and discussed are interdisciplinary and heritage education. No recommendations have been yet drafted.

- **Subgroup "Civil society"**- Chair: NL (Jan Jaap Knol)

"Lines" of what could be future recommendations were presented. These include the need to share responsibilities at the different levels and involving different stakeholders, as well as the need to promote synergies between culture and education at the European level.

- **Subgroup "Evaluation and Teachers training"** - Chair: UK (Paul Collard)

This group is for the time being the most advanced. Some recommendations were already presented, following the external study on evaluation put together upon request of the Chair.

Subgroups will now dedicate themselves to the analysis of the abundant documentation made available by the members, in order to prepare a report presenting some recommendations at the next meeting.

The next plenary meeting of the Group is planned for 17 June (TBC). A preparatory meeting with the presence of the animators of the different groups is scheduled for 15 May in Brussels.

ANNEXE 5 Minutes meeting 17 June 2009

SUMMARY

Fourth plenary meeting of the Expert Group. Twenty-two Member States present (absent: HU, LT, PT, RO; Pm, SK is not a Member of the WG).

The Presidency started by recalling the purpose of the meeting:

1. Forming a consensus around the draft intermediate report (Annex II);
2. Agree on the deliverables to be presented and the timetable for their presentation;
3. Plan ahead the work of the Group for the period after the September Cultural Forum and until 2010.

Tapio Saavala (DG EAC-Unit B2 School Education, Comenius) presented briefly the latest developments within the Education "part" of the Directorate-General. Martin Prchal described the progress within the Platform "Access to Culture".

A complete overview of the draft intermediate report was made, and a general consensus was reached with only a few modifications. The President summed up the next steps to be followed:

1. Presentation of amendments by the Members of the group:
 - In English
 - With an identification of the paragraph in which they should be introduced
 - At the latest by Monday 22 June
 - To be sent to himself, Jean-Marc Lauret.
2. Circulation of a revised text by the President to the Members of the Group as soon as possible (ideally already by the end of June);
3. On 30 July in Gothenburg, introduction of editorial modifications by the Members of the Group present at the Conference (BE, DE, ES, FR, NL and SE). AT is still to be confirmed.

The Swedish Members of the group took the occasion to briefly present the conference "Promoting a Creative Generation" that will be held in July in Gothenburg, and to which all the Members of the WG are invited (please find enclosed in Annex III the draft programme of the conference).

The President also presented a proposal for future work of the group, that is, after the September Cultural Forum and until the end of the mandate of the Group (Final Report in 2010). The sub-group structure can be kept as it is (although Members will be asked around September if they wish to change their subgroup) and the themes proposed are the following:

- *How to take into account emerging digital practices among young people when defining education and culture policies. More broadly, media education, including audiovisual media.*
- *Partnerships with civil society (which balance between school and non-school learning activities?)*
- *Training: of teaching staff, but also of artists and culture professionals working with education institutions*

The last plenary meeting of the Group of this year will be organized towards the end of 2009, after the Cultural Forum (29 and 30 September 2009).