



The European Forum
for the Arts and Heritage
Le Forum Européen
pour les Arts et le Patrimoine

Report of the workshops

- Access to Creation
- Education and Learning
- Audience and Participation
- Interface between Artistic Creation
and Cultural Industries

The workshops, which took place on Saturday 25 October from 12 p.m. till 1.15 p.m. at 'La Friche La Belle de Mai', were designed with the aim of broadening the consultation and 'structured dialogue' process launched by the European Commission in June 2008 via three thematic civil society platforms.

Four workshops took place dealing with the following topics:

1. Access to creation (*page 2*)
2. Education and learning (*page 4*)
3. Audience and participation (*page 6*)
4. The interface between artistic creation and cultural industries (*page 8*)

These topics focus on the same issues as four of the eight working groups of the 'Access to Culture' and 'Cultural and Creative Industries' Platforms. Through these workshops, the aim was to bring participants up to date with the work of the platforms (in which over forty networks and European organisations are participating). The workshops also allowed participants to formulate recommendations and proposals that will be integrated back into the Platforms' work.

Background information

The Communication on a European agenda for culture in a globalising world was published by the European Commission on the 10th May 2007 and was adopted by the Council of EU Ministers of Culture in November 2007. In addition to structuring its ambitions around three main objectives (cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue, culture as a catalyst of economic development and culture in EU's external relations), the European Agenda for Culture also proposes, next to the traditional Community programmes and actions, two new instruments to deliver those objectives: the setting up of an intergovernmental process called the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) in the field of culture, and the improvement and structuring of dialogue with European civil society. During the first semester of 2008, and in parallel with the Member States nominating experts for a range of thematic intergovernmental working groups (the OMC process), cultural organisations were asked to group themselves together in three civil society Platforms:

- the already existing Platform for Intercultural Europe (the Rainbow Platform)
- Access to Culture and
- The Potential of Cultural and Creative Industries

A call for expression of interest to participate in the two new platforms was launched and around 30 organisations were selected to take part in each platform. The platforms met for the first time in Brussels at the beginning of June 2008. Both new platforms decided to organise their work in thematic sub groups.

- 'Access to Culture': creation/production, participation/audience, education/learning.
- 'Cultural and Creative Industries': regulatory environment, support for Small Medium-sized Enterprises development, exchange/export, circulation of works and artists, the interface between artistic creation and the cultural industries.

The Platforms are expected to prepare a first draft of policy recommendations to be presented to the broader sector at the next EU Cultural Forum, which will take place in the autumn 2009.

Workshop 1 - “Access to Creativity”

Consultation led by Milica Ilic (IETM) and Sieglinde Tuschy (Haus der Kulturen der Welt)

Introduction by Mercedes Giovinazzo (Interarts)

Report by Valeria Marcolin (Union des Théâtres de l'Europe)

Introduction

The workshop was introduced by a presentation of the structured dialogue process and the objectives of the ‘Access to creativity’ working group within the ‘Access to Culture’ Platform. A general comment was made about the challenge faced by the cultural sector in the context of the *European Agenda for Culture*, cultural actors have the opportunity to engage in European issues and to formulate recommendations to the European Commission and to the Member States at national and sub-national level, however, civil society actors also feel that they have been pushed into a process without a real understanding of what is exactly expected from them. This is especially true for the ‘Access to Culture’ Platform, considering that its thematic focus does not appear as such in the *European Agenda for Culture* and that only one of its working groups (education and learning) has a direct counterpart in the Open Method of Coordination process.

The Platforms are asked to produce policy statements defining a collective position as regards a vision for the sector in the future. They were also asked to make recommendations to the sector, the Member States and the European Union, which should cover essential issues and pose challenging questions beyond the contents of the EU’s *Agenda for Culture*, including proposals to be fed into the new generation of programmes/policy.

For the participants of the working group ‘Access to Creativity’ of the ‘Access to Culture’ Platform, creation has been defined so far in terms of *products* but also *processes*. They want to consider and improve the fundamental conditions for creativity to flourish: this includes but is not limited to policies, legislation and current practices concerning social and legal aspects, as well as mobility. But what is really meant by creation and creativity? This question is challenging considering the diversity of participants in the Platform and the tight deadlines imposed by the structured dialogue process.

Discussion

The structured dialogue processes

Ideas to strengthen participation and engage with new actors

Lobby organizations (such as Culture Action Europe, the European House for Culture project, etc) are important links to the European level (**bottom up approach**). Many cultural actors develop their activities internationally, and those operators have to be represented at the appropriate political level.

The European Commission asks operators to decentralise to the national and local level the discussions initiated at the European level. The Commission could also implement this idea itself and organise, for example, in parallel to the main Cultural Forum, **27 parallel small-scale events** in all EU countries. Those national meetings would broaden the debate and allow artists and professionals who do not have access to mobility funds to take part in the discussion.

Financial or other types of support strengthening **cultural advocacy actions at national and regional level** would also allow operators to run local campaigns for culture on topics, which advance European policy objectives and priorities.

Supporting the emergence of **new types of partnerships and networks** is also key to connecting different actors, in different configurations, not only focusing on « big umbrellas ». Networks in the visual arts field, for example, need to receive incentives and support.

What do we mean by creativity? Which actors, spaces, and processes should we focus on?

A system to **share existing knowledge and expertise** on the fundamental conditions for allowing creativity to flourish should be set up. A European database of studies, reports, law texts, publications, recommendations, research centres, public meetings on cultural issues could be imagined in order to develop new paradigms on the basis of previous reflections.

A **call for contributions of artists** (independent but also members of leading cultural institutions at local, national and international levels) could be launched to identify the main obstacles to creation.

The importance of European-level reflections and actions around the **social security status of the artists** was also underlined. In Germany there is an insurance system for retired artists, while in France the « intermittence » system is already a model. Through those legal and social measures that Member States and Europe can support creativity in the arts sector.

The need for an official recognition of and support to « informal networks » and residences (Chartreuse les Avignon and others) that offer artists **space and time to research, experiment and exchange** was also recognised. Science and research sector structures were suggested as good models for further thinking.

Funding for new infrastructures (through the structural funds, but also the pre-accession funds) is also key to supporting access to creativity, as new infrastructures facilitate the development of the independent artistic sector. The emergence of new models of governance of those infrastructures should also be supported in order to build hybrid partnership models between traditional cultural institutions and alternative spaces of creation.

European projects should also support activities developed in **rural areas**, and not only focus on 'creative cities' and urban development.

Literary translation is a key element to access to culture and mobility. Translators should be recognised and supported as important actors of the creative processes. Translator houses, for example, located across Europe, should be supported as essential meeting places for authors, translators, libraries, editors, etc.

Finally, impediments to **mobility** and in particular the visa issues were also identified as key obstacles to the flourishing of creativity.

EU funding for culture - How could EU funding programmes be improved in order to better support creativity spaces, processes and products?

Small grants for local actions with a European dimension should be developed, maybe by different or new funders. Larger grants are difficult to obtain for artists or small companies, as they do not have the necessary human resources to administer the grant's financial framework. Artists or small operators also need very often to partner with more important and visible partners in order to access European funding; is this another limitation to innovation and diversity?

Another idea was a better design of **funds for single events with a European dimension**. It should be possible to apply for small amounts of money with no application deadlines. This would multiply cultural exchanges and reinforce creative processes. Such small scale funding should also be allowed to work within less demanding reporting systems. A new financing methodology based more on process and less on results must be developed as small-scale projects are often weakened, and sometimes even made impossible, because of extremely heavy administrative tasks and accounting controls. The evaluation process could also be adjusted.

Some **non-formal civil society gatherings** (like collectives of artists, researchers, writers, etc.) do not find it easy to apply for European funds. This unbalanced support to non-institutionalised (but often very creative) structures do not allow for the development of long term innovative actions at local level, which could help to advance European priorities like support to creativity and access to culture.

A system to share best practices should be set up with the objective of **comparing the structures and opportunities offered by the different EU programmes**. The structured sharing of feedback from cultural operators having used different calls and different programmes could help improve the application and management processes of the Culture programme. Youth programmes have, for example, workable application forms for mobility grants, conferences, etc. even for small organisations with limited human resources. The Research programme, on the other hand, could be a good example for developing models of individual grants for artists around the objective of 'innovation' and 'experimentation'.

Workshop 2 - “Education and Learning”

Consultation led by Rolf Witte (BKJ) and Ilona Kish (Culture Action Europe)
Report by Pierre de Gelder (Culture Action Europe)

Introduction

The ‘Education and learning’ working group of the ‘Access to Culture’ Platform is the only one out of the three Platform working groups which has a direct counterpart in the intergovernmental OMC process: a European group of ministerial representatives on arts education in primary and secondary education that has already existed for some years. It has recently renamed itself ACEnet (Arts and Culture Education network (www.cultuur-school.net), and the name of the website “culture-school” already shows the main focus of their work: they are mostly looking at primary and secondary education. Non-formal and informal arts education¹, as well as cultural learning is not on their agenda. The network is planning to hold a conference on “Creativity, innovation and arts education” on 13-14 March 2009 in Brussels.

The working group ‘Education and Learning’ of the ‘Access to Culture’ Platform should also relate to the UNESCO Road Map for Arts Education adopted at the first UNESCO World Conference on Arts Education in 2006 in Lisbon. The European Union and its Member States still have a lot to do to implement this roadmap...

The purpose of this workshop was to hear from Culture Action Europe’s member organisations and conference participants their opinion on the topic, to share experience and to feed proposals into the structured dialogue process.

Discussion

In Cyprus, theatre courses were successfully established in primary education, and advocacy by the Cyprus Centre of the International Theatre Institute is still ongoing to extend these courses to the compulsory curriculum in secondary education. Theatre education in formal education does not only contribute to cultural enrichment of pupils but is a necessary tool in acquiring a number of essential skills for the future social, civic, psychological and professional development of the children. **The fundamental importance of theatre and role-playing, neglected in current mainstream pedagogy, is to be reinstated.**

Finland is the best performing OECD country of the PISA study (Programme for International Student Assessment). Finland was actually surprised by its own performance and a study was undertaken to assess what was precisely causing the remarkable and unexpected prime performance of the Finnish education system (beating Japan and South Korea in 2003 and even improving its overall performance during the next round of assessments in 2006). The conclusions of this study were that the probable cause of this excellent performance was the very high enrolment of Finnish pupils in extracurricular activities, encompassing arts, sports and social activities after the regular school hours.

In Italy, however, there are increasing trends under the current government to abolish every form of arts education in the school curricula. These trends take place in a context where arts education is already not in the curriculum of all schools.

The importance of the skills and competencies derived from arts and creativity for the framework of lifelong learning was also discussed. Arts and cultural education institutions offer exceptional possibilities for the informal and non-formal acquisition of competencies. The amateur arts are practised by a large number of citizens which is also a political argument to be played out.

As a follow-up of the UNESCO Road Map for Arts Education Anne Bamford (author of “The Wow Factor: Global research compendium on the impact of the arts in education”) has published several national studies on the impact of arts education. The finding of these studies are impressive and could be used as evidence in order to influence decision of national political stakeholders.

1. *Formal education*: the hierarchically structured, chronologically graded ‘education system’, running from primary school through the university and including, in addition to general academic studies, a variety of specialised programmes and institutions for full-time technical and professional training.

Informal education: the truly lifelong process whereby every individual acquires attitudes, values, skills and knowledge from daily experience and the educative influences and resources in his or her environment - from family and neighbours, from work and play, from the market place, the library and the mass media.

Non-formal education: any organised educational activity outside the established formal system - whether operating separately or as an important feature of some broader activity - that is intended to serve identifiable learning clientele and learning objectives.

(Définitions available at <http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-nonfor.htm>)

Concerning the mobility of young people in the arts field a **'Culture-ERASMUS' programme** was proposed. Cultural organisations and institutions were also invited to **use much more the existing possibilities of the European Voluntary Service** in the framework of the EU-programme 'Youth in Action'.

A brief consensus discussion among the members of the workshop was to conclude that the working group 'Learning and Education" within the structured dialogue platform 'Access to Culture' was to push the Open Method of Coordination into adopting a **best practices review of the arts and cultural education sectors in the Member States** with an explicit emphasis on the key competencies for lifelong learning that are acquired through arts and cultural education.

Workshop 3 - “Audience and Participation”

Consultation led by Kathrin Deventer (EFA) and Jean-Sébastien Steil (In Situ)
Report by Daphne Tepper (Culture Action Europe)

Introduction

Participation in cultural life is a basic cultural right. The main concern of the ‘participation’ working group of the ‘Access to Culture’ Platform is therefore the audience - existing and future - and its participation in artistic life. Art domains and disciplines where the arts meet audience include - but are not limited to - performing arts, visual arts, street arts, audiovisual arts, digital arts, heritage, etc.

Since the main objective of the Platforms and their working groups is to produce policy recommendations to be addressed to the European Commission, the Member States, and the regional and local levels within the framework of the Open Method of Coordination, the time line foresees a second plenary meeting of the Platform ‘Access to Culture’ in the 1st semester of 2009, a mid-term public Cultural Forum in October 2009 and another Cultural Forum at the end of 2010.

In a bottom up approach, networks and initiatives taking part in the working group ‘Participation / Audiences’ are invited to feed into the process with the aim of producing concrete recommendations on how to enable, sustain and increase audiences and participation. The working group hopes to identify best practices in participation, translate those practices into principles, and those principles into political recommendations. The working group also hopes to build a collaborative working space for reflection and discussion that will create a pool of knowledge, best practice exchange, innovative approaches and collaboration, as well as providing networking opportunities to contribute to the mapping and evaluation of audience development practices across Europe.

Before opening the floor to the participants, the In Situ European network – focusing on arts intervention in public spaces - was presented. Through the concrete challenges faced by the network (but also a number of successes and opportunities that have been identified in their cooperative projects), a number of questions around the ways to facilitate encounters between the arts and its audience were raised.

Discussion

Advocacy for increased participation in the arts - at what level of power?

A first concern was raised concerning the political level to be approached to promote increased participation in the arts. Is this really a European issue? Shouldn't policy recommendations be rather addressed to Member States and local authorities within the framework of their respective cultural policies?

If the European Union is not supposed (or should not) take the place of national cultural legislations, it was however agreed that European trends need to be identified in order to promote a number of European values and objectives. **In promoting increased participation in the arts, the EU will indicate general directions, promote European standards in the protection of cultural rights, the protection of cultural diversity, the promotion of active citizenship and interculturality.** Another interest of focusing on local practices is to highlight good practices, which could then be promoted at the European level,

Increased participation in the arts – a sensitive question

First of all, it was underlined that **participation** is a concept that has **a different type of quality than mere ‘access to culture’**. For participation to be genuine and bear fruits, a long-term engagement of artists, audiences and funders is needed. To facilitate access for all Europeans to artistic activities and products, new audiences have not only to be targeted by audience development policies but should be included in the creation processes, in a process of reaching out to new populations.

On the other hand, **asking artists to meet new audiences is a highly political issue**, which obliges artists to think about their relationship with the audience. Although the importance of respecting basic cultural rights (such as an equal access to cultural life and the promotion of a diversity of cultural expressions) was generally recognised; the ever-present risk of instrumentalising the arts while pursuing citizenship/diversity objectives was also identified. An animated discussion on the topic followed: have publicly funded artists an obligation to broaden their audiences in

order to reach out to as many categories of taxpayers as possible, or does the artist's main responsibility lie in fighting for his/her freedom of speech and access to the creative process, rather than making sure that its audience respects imposed, politically correct 'quotas'? The **risk of tokenism** was also identified: i.e. cultural institutions supporting symbolic actions to comply with diversity and intercultural political demands.

Creating a culture of participation in the arts – recommendations

Certain arts forms, when present in the public space, have a symbolic function. The location of 'minority culture' institutions for example is of great importance. If located in a recognised art space, this art will be fully considered as artwork, but when located in a disadvantaged neighbourhood, it will rather be considered as a social project. It is therefore crucial for public authorities to **promote cultural diversity and broad participation at all level of arts production and within diverse cultural spaces** in order to genuinely develop audiences and not create new cultural ghettos.

The idea of a *European Year of Access to Culture* was rapidly dismissed. However, including a '**promoting access to culture**' criteria in **European funding programmes** was seriously considered as a way to make sure European funds do point the direction towards better protection and promotion of basic cultural rights.

Workshop 4 - “The Interface between Artistic creation and Cultural Industries”

Consultation led by Raj Isar (Culture Action Europe) and Anne van Otterloo (Kunstenaars & Co)
Report by Simon Mundy

Introduction

The Platform on the ‘Potential of Cultural and creative industries’ was set up, like the Access to Culture Platform, in June 2008.

The Platform has five working groups:

- ‘Regulatory environment’
- ‘Support for the development of SMEs’
- ‘Exchange/export’
- ‘use of the European dimension of the circulation of artists and cultural products’
- ‘The interface of artistic creation and the cultural industries’

The last working group, chaired by Raj Isar for Culture Action Europe (with the support of the European Music Council) focuses on artistic practice, as the core creative field of the ‘economy of culture’ and its relationship with current debate on ‘cultural and creative industries’.

The session in Marseilles informed participants of the topics addressed by this working group and consulted them on several key issues concerning the relationship between artists and industry. Before opening the floor to the participants, Kunstenaars & Co made a presentation entitled ‘Artists as core of the creative industry: stimulating entrepreneurship and economic independence’.

Discussion

Participants underlined that unemployment benefit is currently the greatest subsidy for independent creative work. On this assumption, a strong demand was made for major industrial players to be more involved in using artists as part of their research and development process, rather than subsidy seekers. **Industry should invest in the creativity behind the content**, and not just in the technology needed to produce this content.

Another comment insisted on the **lack of European policy “instruments” available to support creators in cultural industries**, considering that culture is still very much a question of national competencies. The creative industry policy emerging paradigm was also questioned, especially when state aid rules often clash with cultural sector needs.

The issue of definitions was also raised. Who is an artist? A video games designer tends not to be thought of as an artist until he is unemployed. However, where there is regulation, sooner or later the question of definition will have to be answered.

It was also said that restrictive practices and national company structures often hinder artists in the single market, both in terms of distribution and of access to retail sectors and broadcasters. A difficult **balance between artists, collecting societies and industry’s interests in intellectual property** also needs to be found. Artists seeking to exploit the internet freely are, in some cases, being hindered by copyright collecting societies’ contracts.

Finally, the continuing danger for artists to apply self-censorship to suit industry requirements was also discussed. Freedom of creation and expression must remain at the center of the sector’s concerns, even more when engaged in economic policy discussions.