

CREATIVE ALLIANCES *for* EUROPE



Photo: Siv Kolås, Creative Partnerships Oppland

A report prepared by BKJ (Germany) and CCE (England)
and funded by Stiftung Mercator

CONTENTS

<i>Executive Summary</i>	3
1. Introduction	6
2. Do we need a new Creative and Cultural Education Strategy for Europe?	9
3. What can we know about Creative and Cultural Education in Europe?	11
4. What values and meanings does Europe embody?	15
5. What should be the role of creative and cultural education in Europe?	19
6. What structures would be able to support and extend the reach and impact of creative and cultural education in Europe?	20
7. Programmes, Projects and Activities	31
<i>Appendix 1 – List of those consulted</i>	36



Bundesvereinigung
Kulturelle Kinder- und Jugendbildung e. V.



STIFTUNG
MERCATOR

Executive Summary

This report was prepared by the German Federation for Arts Education and Cultural Learning (BKJ) and the international foundation Creativity Culture and Education (CCE) and was supported by the German Foundation Stiftung Mercator. It explores how the reach and impact of creative and cultural education in Europe can be improved, how creative and cultural education can strengthen our understanding of the value of Europe and how we can improve capacity in Europe for working collaboratively.

The research included reviewing relevant literature, interviewing a wide range of individuals, a programme of round tables and a concluding conference, Polylogue III.

The report studied a range of international strategies for creative and cultural education. The most significant are:

- Article 31 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
- The Seoul Agenda, adopted at the UNESCO summit on Arts Education held in 2010
- Culture 21 adopted at the first Culture Summit of the international organization United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) in 2015

These documents, to which almost all the world's countries and regions are signatories, put the case effectively for the need and benefits of creative and cultural education. The report concludes that further restatements of the arguments are not necessary, that most policy makers are convinced of the need and benefits, and the problem lies not in having strategies, but in why they are not implemented.

Specific challenges emerged:

- As so many different actors, both public and private, are involved in the funding, design and delivery of creative and cultural education it is impossible to assess whether the volume is increasing or decreasing.
- There are huge differences in investment and quality between different parts of Europe which means the needs of different parts of Europe differ widely and cannot be addressed by generalised approaches.

- The socio-economic background of children and young people determines the extent to which they have access to creative and cultural education – with the poorest having the least. It means that existing approaches, which have been supply led, have not succeeded and will require a new approach which addresses failure of demand.
- Those who access the most activities want the most more.

It was also clear that most activity was funded, designed and delivered locally, and that the decision making processes which supported such activity were generally local, internalised and opaque. There are few structures which are able to connect these decision making processes with the most important international strategies, the finest international research and the best practice.

In the case of Europe, the report argues that to improve our understanding of Europe, we have to have a definition of Europe we can share. It is unsurprising that a shared definition of Europe was hard to identify, but perhaps more surprising that such great differences were identified among those who were great supporters of Europe. The debate around what Europe represents is indeed centuries old. The report argues therefore, that it is the nature and content of that debate that may define Europe, rather than any commonly held set of beliefs, and that many of the ideals aspired to by Europeans are in themselves contradictory and will always be.

For this reason, the report concludes that to be active and constructive citizens of Europe, Europeans need to develop the skills necessary to navigate these complexities. It is precisely these skills that high quality creative and cultural education can develop. So, in addition to having the wealth of European culture made available to them, young people benefitting from a creative and cultural education would:

- develop the capacity to solve problems without violence
- develop the creativity and resilience to imagine and realise a better world
- encourage young people to dare to be different and to value diversity
- develop the skills necessary to collaborate effectively with people from different sections of society – including their own

None of this is new, but the report argues that how these competencies are nurtured in the classroom is now better understood and capable of being replicated.

The report concludes that to support local decision making and implementation and to connect it with best practice, experience and research across Europe, a web of local alliances, acting locally but internationally connected is required. Many of these local alliances already exist and others can be nurtured, but investment in the connection between them is necessary. To succeed, it is argued, the local alliances should consist of:

- Funders
- Programme managers and designers
- Practitioners from the formal and non-formal sectors
- Academics and researchers
- Private and public sector

And the connections between them on European level would be strengthened by investment in:

- Translation
- Youth Mobility
- Staff Exchange
- Peer Review and Mentoring
- Professional Development
- Internships
- Measuring progression
- Awards

Finally, to build the capacity of creative and cultural education to act as a sector which can contribute to strengthening Europe's cohesion and ability to act, the activities and experiences of the local alliances should regularly be connected to the European network of culture and education officials, ACEnet and the group of European researchers within ENO. This could be achieved by organising biannual conferences or polylogues on creative and cultural education with all relevant stakeholder groups.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 2014, the German foundation Stiftung Mercator agreed to support a proposal from the German Federation for Arts Education and Cultural Learning (BKJ) and the international foundation Creativity, Culture and Education (CCE) to develop recommendations designed to strengthen the reach and impact of creative and cultural education in Europe.

Two out of the four strands of the Stiftung Mercator's programmes are designed to strengthen Europe and to firmly anchor cultural education in schools. The Stiftung Mercator therefore felt it was important to explore how capacity in Europe to act effectively in the field of creative and cultural education could be strengthened. This report contains the findings and final recommendations of that process.

The starting point of this research was the assumption that the recent pressure on public finances in Europe was, in many places, leading to a reduction in the quality and quantity of creative and cultural opportunities for children and young people. In addition, the European Union, a key co-ordinator of many policy arenas across Europe, appeared to have stepped back from playing any significant role in the development of creative and cultural education. There is no reference to this topic in the EU's Europe 2020 strategy.

Simultaneously, however, the very concept of Europe appears to be in crisis. There seems to be a breakdown in understanding and support for Europe itself, a crisis which is also a cultural one. This can be seen most clearly in the European Parliament where one third of MEPs now represent parties openly hostile to the EU. It is hard to imagine any other democratic institution in the world where such a high percentage of members are opposed to the very institution they sit in. This reflects a huge level of public dissatisfaction with European institutions which, however ill-informed, has become a powerful force in national politics in many European countries. Another question for the research was therefore to explore whether creative and cultural education has the capacity to play a role in developing our understanding of the value of Europe and in the ongoing European integration process.

What was already clear was that to improve the reach and quality of creative and cultural education in Europe in these circumstances and to strengthen European identity by these means, new alliances and partnerships are needed. Thus the initiative “New Alliances for Europe” (NAE) was conceived with the purpose of considering the following questions in a joint process of research and exchange:

- What form of strategic interventions could improve the reach and quality of creative and cultural education?
- What interventions would strengthen Europe and lead towards a stronger shared identity?
- Could the evidence and knowledge of the benefits of creative and cultural education be made available more effectively to support those wishing to develop new programmes and approaches?
- What additional evidence is required?
- How can we persuade national, regional and local governments to invest in and nurture this vital area of work?
- How can this strengthen the development of young people’s identity within Europe?
- How could existing resources best be directed?

To help answer these questions, BKJ and CCE spent several months consulting with representatives of policy makers, civil society organisations, practitioners, researchers, and major European private foundations. The focus was on identifying practical measures rather than engaging in further theoretical debate. A list of the conversation partners is attached in Appendix 1.

The project culminated in a conference held in Wildbad Kreuth from 17 to 20 May 2015. Entitled, “New Alliances for Europe – Polylogue III on Arts Education”, it brought together:

- Members of ACEnet – ACEnet is the EU-wide network of policy makers working in the fields of arts and cultural education (30 representatives from 18 countries).
- Members of INRAE (International Network for Research in Arts Education) – an informal network of academic researchers from across the world (24 representatives from 17 countries).
- Members of a variety of other networks active in the field of cultural and creative education (25 representatives from 13 countries).

The initial conclusions of this report were presented at the conference where they were debated and new ideas and approaches generated. These have been incorporated in this final version of the report.

It should be noted that the term creative and cultural education is used in this report to cover a wide variety of practice, including but not limited to arts education, creative education, cultural education, creative or cultural learning, as well as activity which takes place in the formal, non-formal and informal sectors. It is also important to remember that these terms do not always easily translate into other European languages, and frequently change their meaning when they do. What is important is that the use of the term creative and cultural education in this report is intended to be as inclusive as possible.

However, we have also concluded that some areas of creative and cultural education require more urgent attention. We feel that the greatest return on investment would be achieved by improving access for those who currently don't participate instead of offering more and better programs or projects to those who already participate more or less frequently. In particular, we have prioritised strategies of cooperation and coproduction between the formal sector (pre-school, schools, training institutions, universities) and the non-formal sector (arts institutions and organisations, artists, arts educators, arts education institutions and organisations) for reaching children and young people in schools. The reasons for this are, that:

- making changes in the engagement and personal development of children and young people will have the greatest long term impact,

- school is where all children and young people can be reached
- co-operation between different stakeholders in the design and delivery of creative and cultural education programs and projects is an effective way to improve quality.

Finally, it is important to stress, that while in the course of this project we were able to talk to many experienced and knowledgeable practitioners, policy makers, and foundations across many countries, our conclusions are not based on having established a coherent and comprehensive picture of the state of creative and cultural education in Europe. The scale of research necessary to do so would have been impossible within the terms of this project. As a result this study is inevitably largely impressionistic and if it leaps to conclusions which are at odds with the knowledge and understanding of the reader, we apologise.

2. DO WE NEED A NEW A CREATIVE AND CULTURAL EDUCATION STRATEGY FOR EUROPE?

As part of this project, we considered the possibility of creating a new and overarching set of goals and priorities for the development of creative and cultural education in Europe. What became clear however is that a variety of such documents already exist, although none of them have been created specifically to be adopted at the European level. The main documents that have already been internationally recognised are:

2.1 Article 31 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child¹

Article 31 recognizes the right of every child to participate fully and freely in cultural and artistic life and requires signatory states to encourage the provision of appropriate and equal opportunities for cultural and artistic activity. It has been ratified by all 197 countries of the United Nations.

2.2 The Seoul Agenda²

¹ The full text of the UN Convention on the rights of the child is available at <http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>

The Seoul Agenda was agreed at UNESCO's Second World Conference on Arts Education held in Seoul, Korea in 2010. This was intended to build on the UNESCO Road Map for Arts Education which was the major outcome of the UNESCO's First World Conference on Arts Education held in Lisbon, Portugal in 2006. The Seoul Agenda provides a concrete plan of action that integrates the substance of the Road Map with a structure of three broad goals, each accompanied by a number of practical strategies and specific action points. The three main goals are:

- To ensure that arts education is accessible as a fundamental and sustainable component of a high quality renewal of education
- To assure that arts education activities and programmes are of a high quality in conception and delivery and to stimulate exchange between research and practice in arts education
- To apply arts education principles and practices to resolving the social and cultural challenges facing today's world by supporting and enhancing the role of arts education in the promotion of social responsibility, social cohesion, cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue.

2.3 Culture 21³

Culture 21 was adopted at the first Culture Summit of the international organization United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG). The summit was held in March 2015 and brought together municipal and local government representatives from across the world. Culture 21 has been designed as an international guide that is applicable all over the world; a tool that promotes knowledge, facilitates the exchange of good practices, and strengthens a global network of effective and innovative cities and local governments around creative and cultural education.

² The full text of the Seoul Agenda is available at <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/creativity/arts-education/official-texts/development-goals/>

³ The full text of Culture 21 can be found at http://www.agenda21culture.net/images/a21c/nueva-A21C/C21A/C21_015_en.pdf

What all these documents make clear is that national, regional and local governments all over the world have, through their active participation in a variety of international bodies, already publically agreed to implement a set of ideas and practical actions which would greatly improve the reach and impact of creative and cultural education. There is also a shared understanding that the outcomes for children and young people that such actions would bring about were:

- A realisation of the rights of children and young people
- Improved personal development and social realisation
- The enhancement of local, national and international citizenship and identity building
- A route to addressing other of humanity's pressing concerns.

We believe that if we were collectively to achieve these outcomes, we would build a stronger, more effective and more inclusive Europe.

The question which arises as a consequence is not **what** should national, regional and local governments in Europe do, but **why** aren't they implementing the policies that they have already agreed.

We decided therefore that we should focus on how we might encourage national, regional and local Governments to implement the strategies already adopted rather than attempting to draft a new European strategy for creative and cultural education. This report therefore summarises the practical steps that could support the further implementation of these international policies and plans.

3. WHAT CAN WE KNOW ABOUT CREATIVE AND CULTURAL EDUCATION IN EUROPE?

As explained earlier, this report could never have been a rigorous and exhaustive account of creative and cultural education in Europe. However some general conclusions can be drawn from the interviews conducted and publications studied.

- The extent of creative and cultural activity for and by children and young people across Europe is enormous. There is education in the arts (learning about the arts), education for the arts (developing the skills, knowledge and techniques necessary to be an artist) and education through the arts (using the capacity of the arts to develop one's potential and understand the world).
- It takes place in and out of school, in formal, non-formal and informal settings.
- The absence of any generally accepted definitions which, in the case of children and young people, would distinguish between arts and cultural **activity** on the one hand, and arts and cultural **learning** on the other, increases the scale of activity which falls within the definition of cultural education. When does watching a film, going to a concert, reading a book or learning to dance stop being entertainment and become learning?
- There are huge differences across Europe in the concept, quality and quantity of creative and cultural education opportunities available for children and young people. These differences are sometimes political. The Welsh Government, for instance, have recently announced a massive investment in cultural education to allow all schools in Wales to improve their offer to children and young people, while the Government in England have completely marginalised the arts in formal education over the same period. These are next door countries, but moving in fundamentally opposite directions. These differences are sometimes the result of regional traditions. The Nordic, Baltic and Eastern European countries have a long history of well supported after school cultural centres for children and young people. These provide a rich offering of cultural opportunity and training for young people of all ages, being at the same time under huge financial pressure.
- But many of the differences cannot be accounted for by differences in politics or local traditions, in other words by political or cultural diversity. Inspired local leadership can bring about little miracles of cultural opportunity for children and young people, while other nearby towns, cities and rural locations with similar politics and traditions offer little.

- In many countries the private sector and civic society provide a wide range of cultural opportunities, supported or unsupported by Government.
- What is consistent across Europe is that socio-economic and educational factors dramatically affect rates of participation by children and young people in culture and the arts.⁴ While both the relative affluence of parents and their levels of educational attainment significantly increase the likelihood of their child engaging in cultural activity, low levels of educational attainment and poverty among parents reduce participation rates by children and young people substantially. Given that social and economic inequality is now growing across Europe, these disparities in the levels of cultural engagement by children and young people are likely to become even more pronounced.

While many might regard these conclusions as simplistic, they do point to an important principle for the development of creative and cultural education in Europe. Documents such as the Seoul Agenda paint an ideal picture. However, the fragmented and patchy nature of provision across Europe means that planning, support and advice must be local and specific to the operational footprint of the commissioning authority. In other words, improving the reach and impact of creative and cultural education requires an understanding of the geographic reach and areas of competence of the organisation or tier of government wishing to improve their offer. It requires an understanding of the existing cultural infrastructure within the geographic reach and area of competence. It also requires an understanding of the particular social challenges.

The importance for particularised local advice and guidance begins to explain the gap between the rhetoric of the international strategies and the low levels of local implementation in Europe. In the course of this research we found many high quality creative and cultural education programmes, all of which had been devised and were being operated at the local or regional level. These included the schools programmes of the Botin and Cariplo Foundations, those of cities like Düsseldorf,

⁴ See Joseph Rowntree Foundation report *Poorer Children's Educational Attainment* <http://www.jrf.org.uk/system/files/poorer-children-education-full.pdf> and OECD *Equity and Quality in Education* <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/49620025.pdf>

Stockholm and Rotterdam, those of such regions as Hamburg or Oppland, and those of small countries such as Lithuania, Hungary and Wales. None of these were brought about as a result of international strategies, and indeed most of those responsible for these programmes confessed to being unaware of the existence of documents such as the Seoul Agenda.

There seem to be two reasons for this:

- Many of the national Governments who have signed up to the international strategies have no or little authority in culture and education within their own countries. The Federal Government in Germany has very little responsibility for culture and education – these are the responsibilities of the Länder, or regional governments that make up Federal Germany.
- For reasons which seem harder to understand small countries and regions appear to display much more support for a more holistic approach to the education of children and young people than those of the governments of larger countries. The latter are more obsessed with a much narrower range of educational indicators, such as those assessed by PISA. This can be seen in a comparison of the arid and flawed approach to education currently being implemented in England, compared with the rich and inspiring approach to education currently being rolled out in Scotland and Wales.

Another characteristic of the decision making processes at the local or regional level is that they are often invisible or opaque. In the case of private foundations, their decision making processes are indeed private and are driven by internal agendas and priorities. While the conclusions of the decision making processes are well publicised, the range of options considered and the advice taken is rarely drawn externally. In the case of regional and local governments, the decisions about how to implement creative and cultural education are more likely to be influenced by local political agendas rather than international aspirations or best practice. Indeed, rare is the tier of government that looks outside its immediate expertise for advice on how to proceed and when that advice is given, it needs to take account of the local political context.

The most effective way of improving the reach and impact of creative and cultural education must be to influence the decisions of those with the funding, competence and interest to invest in improving it. The conclusion of the observations recorded above are that these are to be found locally and regionally, and therefore an effective strategy will have to address how to connect the aspirations and vision of international initiatives such as the Seoul Agenda as well as international research and best practice on the European level with local and regional decision makers both within the private and public sector. In Section 5, this report will suggest how this might be done.

4. WHAT VALUES AND MEANINGS DOES EUROPE EMBODY?

The second strand in this project is an exploration of ways in which creative and cultural education might contribute to the democratic process of European integration, help young people develop their own identity and lead to a shared critical understanding of Europe. This proved to be a complex task.

Most respondents, when initially asked, expressed the view that Europe was important and of value. In particular people stressed the idea that the 'European Project' was an important mechanism for managing nationalist rivalries within Europe which had led to many centuries of bloodshed and warfare. There was also general sense that Europe should be understood as more than an economic mechanism as it had important cultural dimensions.

However, these cultural dimensions proved hard to define, not because the individuals concerned did not have clearly articulated definitions, but because each definition of a 'cultural or values driven Europe' appeared to depend more on what each individual **wanted** Europe to represent, rather than a commonly held set of beliefs.

- Eastern European contributors to this report emphasised the important role that European ideas and knowledge had played in their own countries as they had rebuilt their institutions and societies following the Soviet occupation. In these cases, Europe was seen to represent freedom and the right to self-determination.

- Many saw the immediate value of European Union as a mechanism for redistributing resources in Europe from the wealthier western or urban areas to the eastern member states and to rural communities. In these cases, Europe represented the values of social justice
- Many believed that the European Union was the champion of diversity within Europe, defending the rights and identities of the rich assortment of minority nations, peoples, cultures and languages that existed within its borders. Indeed, Europe is most highly treasured by the smaller nations and peoples who see it as a defence against the problems or complexities that exist within their own countries. This seems to be clearly true for example, in Belgium, in some of the Spanish regions, among minority communities in Eastern Europe and in Scotland and Wales.
- Some argued eloquently that Europe was based on a Western tradition which prioritised the rule of reason and rationality.
- Many saw specific artists, artistic traditions and artefacts to be 'European'.

But every one of these positions or beliefs is as problematic and partial as they are seductive.

- The self-determination and freedom of choice gained by eastern European countries has in many cases seen the emergence into positions of power political parties whose politics have nothing to do with the democratic values that Europe would claim to represent.
- The democratic discourse in many of the same countries has included the adoption of militaristic narratives which pits these countries against Russia, returning to nationalist rhetoric's which pre-dated and are contrary to the idea of 'Europe as a guarantee of peace'.

- The redistribution of resources across Europe is increasingly contentious. Is its purpose truly to achieve social justice or rather to reinforce the sovereignty of free market economics for the benefit of the most powerful countries and businesses?
- That reason and rationality could become the great 'European value' is a wonderful dream but far from the reality. Indeed, Europe's claim to be the champion of democracy, places it at odds with this very concept, because democracy is how we allow prejudice, emotion, narrow self-interest and partial personal experience not only to be incorporated but to be given pride of place in our decision making process.
- Europe has produced an astonishingly rich and varied collection of artists, artistic traditions and artefacts. These are widely enjoyed and valued. But when do these become 'European'? Shakespeare, Goethe, Mozart and Cervantes are all of course European, because they were born and practiced within its geographical boundaries. But their essence and meaning lies within much more local traditions definitions. When some argued, for instance in the case of Central Europe, that they could see a 'great European cultural tradition' the definition of what that included would not be seen as having the same meaning in Iceland, Croatia, Ireland or Spain. Nor does the idea that they might not be European in any way mean a diminution in the extent to which they are valued. It may be that we want to call them European to recognise that some artists and art works are of exceptional value, in the way that we label UNESCO world heritage sites. But this does not mean that UNESCO had anything to do with creating these sites or there is a long UNESCO history of which they form a part. It is simply a means by which we express our appreciation for something.
- And finally the relationship between Europe and diversity is riven with conflict and contradiction. If the European Union is the champion of democracy – defined as support for political plurality and the right to self-determination why did the President of the European Union tell Scottish voters just before the national referendum on independence that if they should vote for separation

from the UK, they would be thrown out of the EU, could not guarantee that they would be allowed back in and if they were would have to adopt the Euro? He did so because he was supporting the interests of three of the largest and most powerful countries in the EU, Spain, the UK and Germany, against the right of the Scottish people to choose their own future.

- But more importantly, there was overwhelming support among those consulted during the preparation of this report for the idea that Europe should be fully inclusive and that it should be defined as incorporating the full diversity of the many nations, cultures and peoples within its borders. However this in itself is a contradiction. Since now within its borders and within every European city you will find all the cultures, traditions and ethnicities of the world at what point does European identity cease to be European and simply become universal. Nor can it be argued that the European idea can be built around our appreciation of this diversity because firstly, we have not really learnt to accept it and secondly there are many places around the world - particularly around the edges of the Indian Ocean - who have tolerated high levels of cultural and ethnic diversity already for centuries (and it was usually the arrival of the Europeans that upset the delicate balance). Because most places in the world have for some period in their history been part of an empire ruled by a European country, and most of those European colonial powers used the 'divide and rule principle', pitting different cultures, races and ethnicities against each other to maintain control, huge swathes of the world are still subject to conflicts which a largely the long-term consequences of this colonial practice.

Many people will disagree with much of what we say here. Indeed, it can be guaranteed that almost everyone will disagree with some of this. But this is the point. If creative and cultural education is to contribute to the development of a stronger European identity, then we have to decide what that identity consists of. In this research we spoke to many people, who argued eloquently and powerfully in favour of specific identities for Europe, but none of these identities have anything close to universal support and many are in conflict with each other. This report could never aspire to resolve these conflicts. The truth is that there are fundamental differences

and inherent contradictions in what we all think Europe means politically, economically, socially and culturally and as the European Union has expanded and more and more people from outside Europe have come to live here, these tensions have multiplied. Nor are any of these issues likely to be resolved soon. In fact, it is entirely natural, given the scale and diversity of Europe, that there should be fundamental disagreements on the issues we have highlighted. Indeed, perhaps the 'crisis', 'conflicts of interests', 'constant debate' and 'disagreement' is the natural state of Europe, the inevitable democratic development journey Europe has been on since the end of the second world war, and the one which will continue for decades to come.

5. WHAT SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF CREATIVE AND CULTURAL EDUCATION IN EUROPE?

In this understanding of Europe, creative and cultural education has an enormous role to play in contributing to a creative, dynamic, prosperous and yet peaceful democratic European future. It can do so by making Europe's contradictions visible and tackling them with and through the eyes of young people. It lies in its ability to nurture and develop in young people the skills, attributes and behaviours which negotiating this complex world requires. Of course numeracy and literacy are important basic skills, but they do not develop in young people the ability to resolve conflicts without recourse to violence. In the way that the traditional subjects are traditionally taught we do not develop in young people the creativity and imagination they need to develop the new solutions to Europe's and to the world's problems that we need. We do not do enough to encourage young people to dare to be different and yet to value diversity. We do not do enough to help them to become resilient or collaborate. We do not provide enough support to empower them to have the courage to engage with the democratic debate. These are skills that a creative and cultural education can develop and if we were able to reach more children and young people with programmes which are also focussed on the development of these skills we would not resolve the many arguments and contradictions that surround the idea of Europe, but we would be able to develop creative citizens capable of engaging and contributing to these debates positively, creatively and constructively without

resorting to violence, conflict or exclusion. Indeed, this seems to be the contribution which can be made by creative and cultural education.

How would we define these skills? In earlier work, and on the basis of an extensive survey of international literature⁵, CCE has defined creativity as being:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1. Inquisitive | Wondering and Questioning
Exploring and Investigating
Challenging assumptions |
| 2. Persistent | Tolerating uncertainty
Sticking with difficulty
Daring to be different |
| 3. Imaginative | Playing with possibilities
Making connections
Using intuition |
| 4. Disciplined | Crafting and Improving
Developing techniques
Reflecting critically |
| 5. Collaborative | Cooperating appropriately
Giving and receiving feedback
Sharing the 'product' |

These are the very skills that would equip children and young people with the ability to navigate the complexities of being an active citizen of modern Europe. Additional research, conducted for CCE by the Universities of Cambridge and Nottingham⁶, established that the learning environment that most enhanced these skills and behaviours in children and young people could be summarised in the following diagram. The left hand column represents more traditional pedagogies and the right

⁵ Spencer, E., Lucas, B. and Claxton, G. (2012). Progression in Creativity: developing new forms of assessment – Final Research Report. Newcastle: CCE <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/progression-in-creativity-developing-new-forms-of-assessment>

⁶ McLellan, R., Galton, M., Steward, S. and Page, C. (2012). The Impact of Creative Partnerships on the Wellbeing of Children and Young People. Newcastle: CCE <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/the-impact-of-creative-partnerships-on-the-wellbeing-of-children-and-young-people> and Thomson, P., Hall, C., Jones, K. and Sefton-Green, J. (2012). The Signature Pedagogies Project: Final Report. Newcastle: CCE <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/the-signature-pedagogies-project>

hand-column a learning environment which is conducive to the development of higher levels of creative skills:



This is not to argue that the left hand side represents ‘bad’ teaching and the right ‘good’. Both approaches to learning are necessary. In addition, some pupils flourish learning in a more traditional way. However, it is also true that the style of teaching represented by the left hand side predominates in most schools and disadvantages many pupils.

What is also clear is that the style of learning represented on the right is usual present in creative and cultural education. It is a style of learning which is physical, mobile and social. The learner is the key learning resource, in that their experiences, questions and relents shape the learning. You cannot explore arts and cultural issues without engaging your emotions.

We argue therefore that a creative and cultural education of good quality creates a learning environment in which a specific set of skills can be nurtured, and that it is precisely these skills that children and young people need to become active European citizens.

6. WHAT STRUCTURES WOULD BE ABLE TO SUPPORT AND EXTEND THE REACH AND IMPACT OF CREATIVE AND CULTURAL EDUCATION IN EUROPE?

As part of this report, we considered the structures that currently support and promote creative and cultural education. It is not possible here to summarise the complex range of European, national, regional and local structures, nor the full panoply of foundations, networks and NGOs active in this field.

However, it is worth noting some aspects. The EU provides mechanisms for Member States (MS) to compare and share their practice and approach. Participation in such dialogues is voluntary. There are also schemes which support exchange and mobility within Europe and these are valued. However, in general terms the EU has very little competency in culture, education and in the youth sector, meaning that MS are responsible for cultural, education and youth policy in their own countries and the EU has no authority to impose policy.

Officials responsible for policy in ministries of education and culture across Europe come together informally in ACEnet, a network which meets twice a year and whose participants are in regular contact during the year. There is no requirement for countries in Europe to attend and participation is patchy. However over the last three years, under the chairmanship of officials from the Flemish Ministry of Education and Culture, the network has grown in influence and effectiveness.

International Drama/Theatre and Education Association (IDEA), International Society of Education through Art (InSEA), International Society for Music Education (ISME) and World Dance Alliance (WDA) are associations whose members are predominantly teachers within the art forms they champion. Individual members join national organisations, and the national organisations form the membership of the European bodies. They also co-operate on the international level and form together the World Alliance for Arts Education (WAAE).

There a wide variety of other networks and agencies promoting the benefits of specific art forms, such as the European Music Council, and RESEO, the European

Network for Dance and Opera Education. All these do important work promoting the benefits and value of their respective art forms. More recently, ICEnet, a network of programme managers and practitioners has been formed. Most of these agencies and networks, but not all, are members of Culture Action Europe (CAE) which is active at the European level on behalf of all parts of the cultural sector.

Many foundations across Europe support creative and cultural education and have piloted and supported inspirational and innovative programmes. Among the larger and most active foundations in the field of creative and cultural education are the Paul Hamlyn Foundation in the UK, Gulbenkian Foundation in Portugal, Botin and Caixa Foundation in Spain, Cariplo Foundation in Italy, Robert Bosch, Bertelsmann Foundation and Stiftung Mercator in Germany and Erste Foundation in Austria.

As far as research into the reach and impact of creative and cultural education is concerned, an international network of researchers was formed after UNESCO's Second World Conference on Arts Education in Seoul in 2010. This network, entitled INRAE (International Network for Research in Arts Education) currently brings together 24 academic researchers from 17 countries. INRAE is now considering establishing a European chapter with the proposed title of the European Network of Observatories in the Field of Arts and Cultural Education (ENO).


So far this report has argued that creative and cultural education, through its capacity to develop particular skills, behaviours and attributes in young people, has a vital role to play in supporting Europe's future development. In addition, it has recognised that the majority of decision making in respect of the delivery of creative and cultural education is taken at the local and regional level and that therefore structures need to be developed which support and can influence the outcome of these decision making processes, projects and programmes. However, these local and regional support mechanisms must be connected nationally, across Europe and beyond and so a locally active but internationally connected structure is required.

It is also true that those networks which currently exist do not interact as effectively as they should or work to promote particular segments of the creative and cultural education sector. Where they do combine, as in Culture Action Europe, creative and cultural education has a low profile in their work. This is quite understandable

because CAE has an enormous brief, limited resource, and creative and cultural education is only a small part of the activities they promote.

In order to improve the reach and impact of creative and cultural education in Europe, a structure of three interlocking stakeholder groups is proposed, building mostly on existing initiatives. These groups are:

- ACEnet, the informal network of officials responsible for cultural education in ministries of education and culture around Europe,
- ENO, the European Network of Observatories in the Field of Arts and Cultural Education, which brings together researchers in arts education from around Europe
- and the broad sector of programme deliverers, funders, universities and further training institutions, practitioners, local and regional decision makers, which, it is recommended in this report, will be represented by Creative Alliances for Europe:



These three sectors will sit at the heart of a more visible sector of creative and cultural education in Europe. The three stakeholder groups came together for the first time to discuss creative and cultural education in Europe (and not just as participants at an internationally themed conference) in Wildbad Kreuth in May 2015

for Polylogue III. The previous edition of this event, Polylogue II, had a much smaller contingent from Europe and while ACEnet also attended, the range of practitioners and programme managers present at Polylogue III was unprecedented. Polylogue III helped the three stakeholder groups understand themselves and their roles within the European sector of creative and cultural education. This first step will help provide the basis for more effective cooperation and for easier public and political recognition of this sector called creative and cultural education, which, until now, has not yet defined itself as a relevant sector of society in Europe. The scope of course still has to be broadened by integrating more groups of interested practitioners, local administration officials, foundations and other relevant groups.

Participants in Polylogue III reported very positively on the mix of delegates from the three stakeholder groups of research, policy making and practice and the amount of time dedicated to discussion in groups of varying size and composition. This allowed much more space for real learning to take place. The inclusion of participants from outside Europe was particularly valuable, as they added many fresh and relevant perspectives on Europe and European culture which helped those from Europe understand their own practice better.

It is therefore recommended that a biannual conference on creative and cultural education (polylogue) is established to bring together these three stakeholder groups to guarantee and underpin the regular flow of information and debate within the sector.

6.1 ACEnet

In order to develop the capacity of European Member States to collaborate on the development of creative and cultural education strategies a forum within which officials from ministries of education and culture can come together is required. Such a network already exists in the form of ACEnet, an informal network of policy makers who meet to share information, knowledge, experience and inspiration in cultural and creative education and learning. They see their mission as being to put cultural and creative education at the

heart of European society and are therefore deeply committed to improving the impact and reach of creative and cultural education.

ACEnet has been chaired for the last three years extremely effectively by officials from the Ministry of Education and Training in Flanders but responsibility for chairing the network for the next three years has now been passed to Scotland. The chair is now Joan Parr from the Scottish national agency for culture and the arts, Creative Scotland.

In accordance with the findings of this report, however, it is recommended that ACEnet is supported to develop further. As part of this project, we supported the transition of the chairmanship from Flanders to Scotland and enabled the recruitment of new countries, such as Scotland and Wales. The key priorities now are:

- To bring more of those ministerial co-workers responsible for education and culture across Europe into the network. To be effective, it is important that the network includes those responsible for devising and implementing creative and cultural education policy. In Germany, as mentioned before, this is the Länder, and therefore a strong new effort needs to be made to recruit the relevant officials also from this level of Government.
- To reach out to those countries not currently actively represented, particularly, France, Spain, Italy and Poland. In the case of the latter three, representation for the regions might again be most appropriate.
- To facilitate the participation of more countries, translation of documents and simultaneous translation during meetings is a priority, but this is currently beyond the means of the network.

We recommend that ACEnet is supported to drive forward these new developments.

6.2 European Network of Observatories (ENO)

Consistent with the recommendations of the Seoul Agenda, a clear priority emerged during this project around the need to support the generation of new high quality research. A consequence of Seoul was the establishment of a network of observatories on arts education in the Asia Pacific region under the patronage of UNESCO. Plans have now been developed for the establishment of a similar network of observatories in Europe. The role of the European Network of Observatories in the Field of Arts and Cultural Education will be to:

- Support the development of new research initiatives in the field of creative and cultural education,
- Develop new quality frameworks and criteria,
- Evaluate new research initiatives and their implementation,
- Monitor the implementation of creative and cultural education in Europe, using the Seoul Agenda as a guideline,
- Distribute their results by operating a website and publishing an annual yearbook.

The network is seeking to establish a membership based NGO located in the Netherlands which will seek official UNESCO accreditation.

This is an important initiative and will greatly facilitate the generation and dissemination of high quality research in the field of creative and cultural education. ENO has already attracted partners from Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, France, Spain, Portugal and England. The network plans to have an inaugural meeting in Genshagen, Germany in the autumn of 2015. They will focus in the first instance on the themes of:

- equality and access of participation,
- diversity,

- co-operation between schools and external partners,
- cultural identity
- expression, communication and transfer.

All these are consistent with the priority of extending the reach and impact of cultural and creative education as it will help understand better the issues which lie behind these challenges.

ENO will also have the function to guarantee via its contacts with INRAE and UNESCO that the European research sector is related to research on all other continents.

We support the establishment of a European Network of Observatories in the Field of Arts and Cultural Education as described above.

6.3 CAFE

This report has highlighted the need to develop a structure that is able to act locally but is connected internationally. It has also stressed the importance of developing new alliances. Combining these two concepts leads to the conclusion that the most effective way of developing this, is to develop new alliances locally. Extending the reach and impact of creative and cultural education requires funding, intellectual rigour, effective management and experienced practitioners. It is proposed therefore that we encourage the development of local alliances which bring together this mix of skills, consisting typically of programme managers and/or designers, funders, practitioners from the formal and non-formal sector, academics or researchers. They would also often be public/private partnerships.

The inclusion of academics or professional researchers also in the local alliances would address a key concern of this report. A frequently expressed frustration is that there is insufficient research to support the claims of the creative and cultural education sector. This is not because there is an absence of published material - there is a great deal. It is because such a high percentage of the 'evidence' is of such poor research quality. It is important, if research is to be credible, that it is designed well and developed prior to the

start of programmes. To assist programme managers and practitioners, professional researchers and academics should work with them on the design of programmes to ensure that this quality threshold is achieved. In this way the evidence to support the arguments of the sector will be generated.

As these local alliances developed in capacity, confidence and experience they would be able to support the development of similar alliances in other regions and cities, using their knowledge and expertise to stimulate the creation of new partnerships and mentor them to maturity. CAFE would consist of a European wide collection of such new alliances which would aspire to develop the following characteristics:

- They will be active in managing programmes which bring together schools, creative practitioners and cultural institutions at a local or regional level.
- They will be focussed on meeting the needs of children and young people.
- Their international connections will enable them to improve quality of practice and to foster implementation strategies by building the knowledge and rigour underpinning local initiatives.
- They will support the development of new alliances in other regions and localities within their sphere of influence.
- They will provide advice to schools, creative practitioners and cultural institutions beyond their immediate region.
- They will bring together in each alliance practitioners, programme managers, public and private funders, academic researchers and trainers.

This idea had emerged from discussions during this project, but also from the study of literature on networks. Two particular approaches and reports contributed:

- The Lego Foundation commissioned Winnovation, the Austrian based think tank, to produce a report on designing successful networks. The

report was published in October 2014.⁷ This argued, from the study of multiple networks, that the most successful and sustainable networks had common characteristics. For instance, while some degree of organisational support is necessary there should not be a dominant centre which sets the rules and structures. The network should allow considerable scope for self-organisation, with smaller groups of members able to come together to pursue specific interests. There should be multiple sources of funding. On-line and off-line communication is necessary to build trust and productivity. Creating a virtuous circle of knowledge exchange between research and practice leads to greater levels of impact. Importantly, continual measurement of impact was considered one of the most challenging, but worthwhile, endeavours a network can perform. Therefore, networks must identify what to measure, and how, in such a way that will enhance the functionality and outcomes of a network, without discouraging members through too much additional administrative burden. All these have been taken into account in proposing the idea of CAFE.

- CAFE also borrows from the idea of the Quadruple Helix Innovation Model⁸, strongly promoted internationally as a means to drive innovation. Traditionally, the quadruple helix model of innovation brings together government, business, academia and the community, so the model for CAFE is a slight variant, but the principle is the same.

Local Alliances, operating individually, would be expected to source their own funding. The biannual conference of all CAFÉ stakeholders would take place within the context of the biannual Polylogue event. At the European level funding would be sought from EU sources for individual initiatives in the same way that the EU supports other similar activities.

We recommend that Creative Alliances for Europe should be established and supported.

⁷ The full report can be accessed at http://cache.lego.com/r/legofoundation/-/media/LEGO%20Foundation/Downloads/Foundation%20research/legofoundation_study-finalcor.pdf

⁸ For further information on the Quadruple Helix Model see <http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/growth-jobs/open-innovation>

7. PROGRAMMES, PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

In developing our ideas, we are keen to stress that it is important that access to creative and cultural education is provided at every level, and through all settings. Therefore we are keen to see support for activity in formal, non-formal and informal settings and at every level from pre-school to university and beyond.

However, given our focus on improving the reach and impact of creative and cultural education and building a stronger Europe, three immediate priorities emerge:

1. Because young people who do not participate in creative and cultural activities have to be reached, a major priority, in the first instance, should be on using cooperation with formal education as the means to engage these young people, but with clear pathways to opportunities beyond school. This is the most effective way of beginning to extend reach. There are a variety of approaches for accomplishing this such as projects which bring schools, teachers, pupils and artists together, strategic co-operation between schools and cultural institutions, the development of individual school development plans, and collaboration between schools and cultural education institutions in local alliances.
2. In the case of impact, the priority is on improving the training and professional development of those working with children and young people in the context of creative and cultural education, as well as in formal and non-formal education.
3. To build the understanding of young people of the complexity and diversity of Europe and its competing visions, more opportunities for young people to travel across Europe and work constructively in cultural education programmes or projects with each other should be developed.

The three stakeholder groups ACEnet, ENO and CAFÉ, described above would all be composed of members with their own activities and projects which they would be responsible for funding. However, to create effective links between the local, regional, national and European levels there are some additional activities which the

stakeholders would need in order to address the priorities described above and these will require additional funding. These are:

7.1 Translation

To ensure the effective dissemination of research and best practice there is an urgent need for key documents and research papers to be translated in different languages. It will be important that a quality control mechanism is designed so that the highest quality and most relevant research is prioritised for translation. It is suggested that ENO would have this role. To extend the reach of the networks beyond those countries that most frequently participate, there is also the need for more translation in preparation for and at key meetings and conferences. In other words, simultaneous translation at meetings, the translation of papers, agendas and minutes has to be supported. Finally, to broaden access to and the scope of mentoring, peer review and exchange programmes, a similar level of translation provision will be required. It is important therefore to explore how an effective and light touch funding mechanism can be developed to support translation in the field of creative and cultural education.

7.2 Youth Mobility

While funding already exists to support travel and exchange programmes, programmes need to be developed which deepen the quality of the learning that takes place and broaden the reach. Projects which have shared creative and cultural activity at the heart of their plan appear to be the most effective in stimulating learning among the young people involved and this way of working needs to be further explored and disseminated. In addition, there is a fear that many young people from more socially and economically disadvantaged backgrounds do not access these opportunities to the same degree as pupils from more affluent backgrounds. New ways of reaching and engaging them need to be piloted. This will include the introduction of new short term formats, and exchanges of youth groups within the framework of contacts between the local alliances.

7.3 Staff Exchange

There is much to be gained and learnt on both sides when staff have the opportunity to do short and long term placements in other organisations. It would be of great value if this was possible to introduce on a European level particularly to allow staff launching or designing new programmes in countries with less of a tradition of creative and cultural education to study and work with those with more experience.

7.4 Peer Review and Mentoring

Having your programmes reviewed by peers, or having additional support through mentoring, are both known to be effective approaches to improving the quality of work and building the capacity of practitioners and programme managers. But this rarely happens in creative and cultural education on national level and even less on European level and it would greatly strengthen the quality and impact of work being delivered.

7.5 Professional Development

The impact of creative and cultural education would be greatly improved if more and better professional development was available to those working in the field. While most of this professional development needs to be managed and delivered locally, it would be very helpful if at the European level a core curriculum for such professional development could be devised which trainers, universities and colleges could access to devise and deliver programmes locally. This would consist of a wide range of modules, with supporting written and digital materials, which could be used to build training and professional development courses from one day workshops to two year masters degrees. The courses and workshop would be designed to meet the professional development needs of teachers, artists/creative practitioners, and those working in creative and cultural education (separately and together), and help establish appropriate training for intermediaries, those working between the cultural and education sectors as brokers and facilitators.

To enable this to happen, every local alliance should have a further training partner, and within this context the role of researchers as professional trainers should be recognised and enhanced. The training providers invited into the

local alliances should develop a further training or mentoring role for themselves in their city, region and beyond, supporting schools, cultural institutions and local practitioners.

7.6 Internships

To build the capacity of those wishing to work in the sector, properly funded internships should be established which would allow young people wishing to work in creative and cultural education to be placed in cultural education organisations or institutions elsewhere in Europe.

7.7 Measuring Progression

As explained earlier, agreeing on what is progress and how to measure it is a key factor in building successful and sustainable alliances. To achieve this, the local alliances should also partner with others in the development of such measuring instruments. This is a key issue for the alliances because many people argue that creative and cultural education is being squeezed out of the curriculum because of the priority that is given to subjects which do get measured. For instance, one of the key benefits of a creative and cultural education is the development of creative skills, and these are much valued by politicians. Therefore to be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of such educational approaches it is important to develop ways of measuring their impact. The OECD has recently started a programme to develop and test such an instrument, and a number of countries, including the US, Brazil, Russia and China, are already involved. It is important that Europe has a strong presence in this process and that the Creative Alliances For Europe are able to participate fully.

7.8 European Award

A European set of awards, for creative and cultural education might heighten awareness of the effectiveness of such programmes, projects or alliances, might help to collect data about the success factors of local alliances and might encourage the dissemination of good practice and also encourage more people to share what they are doing. This could include awards for local partnerships between schools and cultural practitioners, for sustainable local

alliances and for comprehensive municipal creative and cultural education programmes.

These proposals would all need additional funding to be raised, although not necessarily large sums. To look at the possibility of the major private foundations in Europe contributing to these ideas, we propose that a meeting is convened within the frame of a special interest group at the European Foundation Centre at which each idea can be considered.

BKJ/CCE – October 2015

Appendix 1

List of those consulted

Name	Surname	Institution	Position
Jaroslav	Andel	Dox, Prague	Artistic Director
Philippe	Auzet	Ligue de L'enseignement	
Otilie	Bazl	Education, Society, and Culture Bosch-Stiftung Foundation	Deputy Head of Department
Isabelle	Battioni	ACCR	
Chiara	Bartolozzi	Arts & Culture , Fondazione Cariplo	Programme Manager
Ralitzza	Bazaytova	Ministry of Culture, Bulgaria	
Luca	Bergamo	Culture Action Europe (CAE)	Secretary General
Adam	Bethlenfalvy	OMC Creative Partnerships	Chair
Ulrike	Giessner-Bogner	KulturKontakt	
Andrew	Bollington	Lego Foundation	Global Head of Research
Tom	Braun	Bundesvereinigung Kulturelle Kinder- und Jugendbildung e. V.	
Lotta	Brillioth Biörnstad	Swedish Arts Council	
Gemma	Carbo	University of Girona	
Theresa	Casey	International Play association - IPA - Europe	President
Cristina	Chiavarino	Fondazione Cariplo	Director Arts & Culture
Glenn	Coutts	University of Lapland	
Andrea	Creech	Institute of Education, University of London	
Amanda	Colletti Curatolo	Zeterna Progetto Cultura, Italy	
Anna	Dammert	Ministry of Education and Research (Sweden)	
Christine	Debaene	Flemish Ministry, Department CJSM	
Maria	De Assis Swinnerton	Gulbenkian Foundation	Director of Education
Free	De Backer	Free University of Brussels	
Stine	Degerbøl	University of Copenhagen	
Alastair	Delaney	Education Scotland, UK	
Carla	Delfos	ELIA - European League of Institutes of the Arts	
Willem	Elias	Vrije Universiteit Brussel – Department of Educational Sciences	
Carmen	Fenollosa	Culture Action Europe	
Anna	Font	Fundació 'la Caixa	Head of Cultural Programs
Piet	Forger	Vlabra'ccent	Co-ordinator
Patricia	Frias	Fondazione Cariplo, International Relations	
Sarah	Gardner	International Federation of Arts Council and Cultural Agencies (IFACCA)	Executive Director
Peggy	Geneve	DG Education and Culture, European Commission	
Ulrike	Giessner-Bogner	KulturKontakt	
Mercedes	Giovinazzo	Interarts Foundation	

Sandro	Giuliani	Jacobs Foundation	Managing Director
Danuta	Glondys	Villa Decius Association, Poland	
Robin	Gosejohann	Erste Foundation	Project Manager Europe
Sonja	Greiner	European Choral Association – Europa Cantat	General Secretary
Piet	Hagenaars	Landelijk Kennisinstituut Cultuureducatie en Amateurkunst (LKCA)	
Christel	Hartmann-Fritsch	Stiftung Genshagen	
Katherine	Heid	RESEO European Network for Opera and Dance Education	
Andri	Hadjigeorgiou-Limbouris	Ministry of Education and Culture, Cyprus	
Vivian	Haverstadlokken	Oppland, Norway	
Ben	Hekkema	MOCCA, Amsterdam	
Philippe	Helson	CMJCF, Confédération des Maisons des Jeunes et de la Culture de France	
Anu	Hietala	The Finnish Association of Art Schools for Children and Young People	Executive Director
Mary	Howard	IDEA, Ireland	
Deborah	Hustic	Ministry of Culture, Bulgaria	
Teunis	IJdens	National Centre of Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur Arts (LKCA), Netherlands	
Benjamin	Jörissen	Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg	
Peter	Kamp	Arts4All	
Tintti	Karppinen	FIDEA, Finland	
Eija	Kauppinen	Finnish National Board of Education	
Kaisa	Kettunen	Annantalo/City of Helsinki Cultural Office	
Susanne	Keuchel	Akademie Remscheid, Germany	
Carin	Khakee	Ministry of Culture, Sweden	
Benedicte	Kieler	Ministry of Education, Denmark	
Anne	Kivimae	Ministry of Education, Estonia	
Timo	Klemettinen	European Music School Union	Managing Director
Jan Jaap	Knol	Cultural Participation Fund, Netherlands	
Zuzana	Komarova	Ministry of Culture, Slovak Republic	
Terje	Kongsrud	Oppland, Norway	
Gerrie	Koops	Kunstconnectie, Dutch Association of Institutes for Art Education and Participation	Office Manager
Timo	Köster	Zukunftsakademie NRW	Geschäftsführer
Gerhard	Kowar	KulturKontakt Austria	
Kristyna	Kratochvilova	Association for Creativity In Education, Czech Republic	
Sanja	Krasmanovic Tasic	IDEA, Serbia	
Daniel	Kropf	Universal Education Foundation	Chief Executive
Milda	Laužikaitė	Creative Partnerships Lithuania	Director
Margrit	Lichtschlag	Rat für Kulturelle Bildung e. V	Geschäftsführung

Ingrid	Leys	Flemish Ministry of Education & Training	
John	Lievens	Ghent University	
Sybille	Linke	Forum K&B, Geschäftsstelle "Kulturagenten für kreative Schulen"	Programmleitende Geschäftsführerin
Christoph	Ludwig	Bertelsmann Stiftung	Programme Director
Graça	Mota	College of Education, Polytechnic Institute Porto	
Eava	Mussaari	Annantalo/City of Helsinki Cultural Office	
Angela	Murr	Zentrum für Schulkunst-Stuttgart, Germany	
Ute	Navidi	Independent Consultant (formerly international Play Association)	
Szilvia	Nemeth	Tarki Tudok, Turkey	Programme Director
Barbara	Neundlinger	KulturKontakt	
Julia	Nierstheimer	Arts4All	
Julia	Osada	European Music Council	
Magdalena	Ozimek	Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, Poland	
Julia	Pagel	NEMO - The Network of European Museum Organisations	Secretary General
Matthias	Pannes	VdM – Verband Deutscher Musikschulen	
Joan	Parr	Creative Scotland, UK	
Tim	Plyming	BBC Learning, UK	
Michaela	Přílepková	National Information and Consulting Centre for Culture, NIPOS	
Asa	Ragnasdottir	FLISS, Iceland	
Niels	Righolt	Danish Centre for Arts and Interculture	
Kristin	Runde	IDEA, Norway	
Joachim	Reiss	IDEA, Germany	
Iñigo	Saenz de Miera	Botín Foundation	General Director
Jean Pierre	Saez	Observatoire des politiques culturelles, Grenoble	
Stephan	Schäfers	King Baudouin Foundation	European Programme Advisor
Mirko	Schwärzel	Bundesnetzwerk Bürgerschaftliches Engagement (BBE)	Projektleiter "BBE für Europa"
Oyvor	Sekkelsten	Cultural Rucksack, Norway	Acting Director
Irena	Sertic	Interacta, Croatia	
Dalia	Siaulytiene	Ministry of Education and Science, Lithuania	
Jessy	Siongers	Policy Research Centre on Culture, Ghent University	
Katarzyna	Skowron	ENCC – European Network of Cultural Centres	
Blasko	Smilevski	JMI – Jeunesses Musicales Internationales	Secretary General
Olga	Smit	City of Rotterdam, Department of Sport and Culture	
Marianna	Sršňová	Association for Creativity in Education, Czech Republic	Director
Jan	Staes	City of Antwerp, Culture, Sport, Young People	

Jane	Steele	Paul Hamlyn Foundation	Head of Impact & Evaluation
Vladimir	Sucha	Joint Research Council, European Commission	Director General
Charlotte	Svendler Nielsen	University of Copenhagen	
Katie	Sweeney	Department of Education and Skills, Ireland	
Tal Marlies	Tal	National Centre of Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur (LKCA), Netherlands	
Gerd	Taube	Bundesvereinigung Kulturelle Kinder- und Jugendbildung e. V.	
Pat	Thompson	University of Nottingham	
Marjeta	Turk	AMATEO - European Network for Active Participation in Cultural Activities	
Asta	Trummel	Ministry of Culture, Estonia	
Theo	Van Adrichem	Cultuur-Onderneman	
Nicolas Cellule	Van de Velde	Culture-enseignement du Minsitere de la Communaute Francaise	
Barend	Van Heusden	University of Groningen, Netherlands	
Willen	Van Moort	Voorzitter Raad van Bestuur	
Ocker	Van Munster	National Centre of Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur Arts (LKCA), Netherlands	
Marijke	Verdoodt	Flemish Ministry, Department CJSM	
Lode	Vermeersch	University of Leuven	
Esmee	Visnic	Zagred Centre for Independent Culture and Youth	Director
Ine	Vos	Flemish Ministry of Education & Training, CANON Cultural Unit	
Ernst	Wagner	University of Erlangen-Nuremburg	
Ute	Welscher	Bertelsman Stiftung	Programm Musikalische Förderung
Michael	Wimmer	EDUCULT - Institute for Cultural Policy and Cultural Management	
Petra	Winkelmann	Landeshauptstadt Düsseldorf - Kulturamt	
Ole	Winther	Ministry of Culture, Bornekulturens Netwaerk/Network for Children and Culture , Denmark	Director
Henrik	Zipsane	Jamtli Open Air Museum	Director
Maja	Zrncic	Ministry of Culture, Bulgaria	