Malgorzata Sternal

International Policy Fellowship 2003

Cultural policy and management education
in Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland

Draft research paper

Initial remarks

This paper, called a 'draft research paper' may differ substantially in its structure (not to mention the content) from the final research paper that is supposed to present the results of the International Policy Fellowship research. More than anything else, it is a summary of my work up to date on the chosen topic, partly reporting on and reflecting my research of the secondary data that have been available. I wanted to underline this, because a crucial part of my IPF research is collecting the primary data through a survey and a series of interviews in the three countries. This part of my work had been planned for the second half of the fellowship period.

The structure of the paper
1. Introduction
2. Main priorities of cultural policies in Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland.
3. Education as a cultural policy instrument.
4. Trends in education in cultural policy and cultural management in Europe.

Introduction

Having observed the field of arts and culture in the
countries of Central and Eastern Europe over the last several
years, one can easily notice that the cultural policy and the
cultural management are the issues that have been increasingly
discussed. The cultural sector overall, and its particular sub-
sectors have undergone substantial changes as a result of major
political and social developments in the CEE. How those changes
influenced cultural policies and what challenges it posed for the
management, has been quite extensively analysed and described.
This research focuses on one element of the cultural policies
which does not seem to have enough attention — **education in
policy-making and management within the cultural sector.**

One of the basic questions that one might ask while
analysing cultural policy in the CEE region is — how well the
educational programmes in cultural policy and management prepare
their graduates for the work in the cultural sector? And what is
the role, if any, of the managers of the cultural sector in
cultural policy making?

Cultural policies in the region were substantially
redefined after 1989. On the one hand they were following the
strong tendency to underline the national cultural values, on the
other — trying to respond to market economy demands, as well as
the requirements of the international bodies, e.g. Council of
Europe.[1] It is in this latter context where the need for
specially educated and/or retrained professionals for the
cultural sector was expressed more and more often.

At the same time the role of the state within the cultural
sector was widely discussed — even to the point where the need
for the Ministry of Culture was questioned. The state cultural
policy was for many a relict of the communist regime, and the

statement of the Czech Minister of Culture, that "cultural policy is a communist invention" and that the Ministry of Culture should be abolished, was an example of an extremely liberal approach.[2]

That was also the time of rapidly shrinking state subsidies, also in the cultural sector, as well as growing impoverishment of the culture consumers, which resulted in dwindling numbers of cultural institutions' clients. The demands of more 'managerial', 'entrepreneurial', 'market' approach of the cultural institutions directors was a natural consequence, and specialized training in management was seen as a must.

And although the professionalisation of the cultural management is often stressed as an important factor of the sector development, it is very rarely seen as a priority in the cultural policies on the national or regional level.

MAIN PRIORITIES OF THE CULTURAL POLICIES

Before discussing the main priorities of the cultural policies in the respective countries let us make a general remark on the place of the cultural policy making in the international context, and the role of some organisations.

Cultural policies have been seen as an important element of a contemporary state not only by respective governments, but also, and sometimes one could say foremost, by intergovernmental organisations such as UNESCO or Council of Europe.

The European Union introduced an article dedicated to culture only in the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) — article 128, which then became article 151 in the Treaty of Amsterdam in 1997. The role of the Community is seen as 'encouraging co-operation between Member States' leaving the responsibility for shaping cultural policies on the national, regional or local level. The real influence (or lack of it) of the European Union on the cultural policies of its Member States is an interesting subject, however it does not belong to the scope of this paper.[3]

UNESCO has been undertaking several initiatives concerning cultural policies.[4] Through publications and documents, as well as the Stockholm conference on the cultural policies for development (in 1998) it has worked on raising knowledge and awareness of the topic. In the practical dimension UNESCO supports establishment and co-operation of the UNESCO Chairs in Cultural Policy and Management all over the world. In the CEE region the UNESCO Chairs operate for example in Bratislava or Vilnius.

Council of Europe has also initiated and supported several important initiatives linked to education and training in cultural policy and management, for example through a Travel Bursary scheme helping the students and practitioners of cultural management. The European Network of the Cultural Administration Training Centres was also established under auspices of the Council of Europe in 1992, and more recently two important programmes aiming at strengthening the cultural sector were initiated — MOSAIC for the South-East Europe region and STAGE for the Caucasus region.
Moreover, the cultural policy publications of the Cultural Policies Research and Development Unit play a very important role for the cultural community in Europe.[5]

In many European countries cultural policies on the national level often follow the main guidelines established by organisation like UNESCO or Council of Europe, and the growing importance of the education in this topic is owed also to the influence of those organisations.

When analysing the cultural policies of the European countries, searching through the national profiles in the *Cultural policies in Europe — Compendium of basic facts and trends*[6], one notices that only a few countries express directly their interest in the cultural management education and training, when formulating the current priorities. The postulate of strengthening/promoting the cultural sector or its certain sub-

sectors appears more often, which implicitly includes the professional management of the sector, but it does not have to be always the case that the a direct link is made.

Some states are even trying to free themselves from the responsibility for the management of state cultural institutions, with the most spectacular example of Italy, where the management of public museums may be conceded to private bodies.

Only in the description of the cultural policy of Finland one can find that one of the priorities is 'financing and management of cultural institutions', the Netherlands see as a priority 'cultural entrepreneurship', and in Polish profile we can read that one of the (many!) priorities is 'training of managers and animators'.

A rather common approach of expecting a professional management of the cultural sector without really looking for and supporting the basis for the professionalism — which means providing or supporting the relevant education and training, as a policy objective - is widely present in the CEE countries.

Czech Republic, the only one out of the three countries targeted by this research, has its cultural policy document published in English on the Ministry website. According to this document, published in 2001, the main cultural policy objectives are the following:

to guarantee artistic freedom and create conditions for using this freedom,

to create conditions for the cultural activities of citizens, above all on the basis of civic associations,

to create conditions for the decentralisation of decision-making in the cultural system as a whole and for the transference of decision-making processes outside the authority of the state administration, and for their independence including economic independence ("artists decide for themselves"),

to guarantee equality of access for citizens to cultural treasures and to facilitate this access to disadvantaged social groups (minorities, the disabled),

to guarantee the protection of the cultural heritage and promote the care of it,

to guarantee free access of citizens to information and to support the exchange of information within the cultural system and between the cultural system and its external environment, irrespective of linguistic and administrative barriers,

to support education and raising awareness of the creative process and the use of cultural assets,

to curb the negative influences of cultural commercialisation.[7]

Out of these objectives only one is seen as requiring particular attention in terms of preparing the specialised staff — protection and taking care of cultural heritage. In the article 39 of the document we read:

'The relevant bodies of the state administration are aware that the improvement in the care of the heritage requires for the future a greater emphasis on the <u>assurance of the special qualification of district authority employees in heritage care</u> and its continuous upgrading.
Furthermore, the specialist component of the system of state heritage care cannot exist without securing specialised education in heritage care at selected schools at the level of universities or technical colleges. <u>That is why the Ministry of Culture, in co-operation with the Ministry of Education and with representatives of selected schools, will endeavour to establish specialist study programmes and to increase the numbers of specialist staff</u>. A similar concern exists in the other substantial component of the cultural heritage - the area of care of museum and gallery collections. To secure the appropriate personnel it will be necessary to continue to <u>improve or develop</u>

study programmes, mainly museology and management of collecting institutions, and to set up specialised secondary or post-secondary studies for middle level managerial staff.'[8] [underline original]

It is a very important declaration of the Ministry. The effective ways of implementation of this particular article will be scrutinised in the later phase of the research.

The cultural policy of Hungary is presented in the published by the Council of Europe and ERICarts *Compendium of basic facts and trends*.[9] Since the early 1990s 'the cultural policy objectives have been: to safeguard the conditions for free opportunities of creation and transmission, an operational system of institutions, and a balanced cultural life.'

The priorities before 1998 included:

safeguarding the autonomy of culture;

development of the conditions of cultural plurality;

promotion of technical modernisation;

creation of the multi-channel financing of culture

As priorities of the cultural policy after the year 1998, the following are mentioned:

preservation and handing down of cultural heritage, its further enrichment;

integration of the protection of the monuments into cultural policy;

promoting the culture of Hungarians living beyond the borders;

promoting the cultural role of the Churches.

As the profile presented in the Compendium is not an official statement of the government one cannot claim that the Ministry of Culture in Hungary does not pay enough attention to the

professional development of the cultural sector workers. It is very hard, however, to find any confirmation that the education and training in the field of cultural management and policy-making is taken into consideration as a factor of strengthening the sector.

Poland does not have its official cultural policy document either, and the national profile published by the Council of Europe is again our basic source of information.[10] It summarises a couple of documents issued by the Polish Ministry of Culture over the 90s (e.g. The Principles of the Cultural Policy, 1993 or The Directions of the Cultural Policy of the State from 1999). The basic criticism towards Polish cultural policy is that there are too many priorities, which results in having no priorities. In 1993 the objectives of the state in the field of culture were:

- to encourage the growth of democracy and civil society;
- to make it easier for artists and institutions to convert to a market economy;
- to protect the most precious cultural assets;
- to introduce and encourage legal solutions that facilitate the development of new forms of activity.

In 1995 the following objectives were added:
- to adopt a new approach which connects public and private funds;
- to eliminate the stratification between the dynamics of culture and economic development;
- create space for family oriented participation in culture;
- **training managers and cultural animators;**
- eliminate differences between high and popular culture;
- initiate activities which aim to reinforce the educational role of the media;
- encourage inter-ministerial co-operation for culture;
- protection of cultural heritage;

foreign promotion of Polish culture

support for research in the field of culture.

In 1999 the basic duties of the state were described in such a way in a document published by the Ministry:

enhancement and development of national civil community;

enhancement and dissemination of national heritage;

formation of principles aimed at support for creativity and cultural education

foreign promotion of Polish culture.

Although it is explicitly expressed that one of the cultural policy objectives is training of managers and animators, it would be quite difficult to exemplify this intention with concrete actions. This will be discussed later on.

A deeper analysis of the cultural policy goals in the Central European countries goes far beyond the scope of this paper. What is worth noting, however, is the important role of the cultural heritage and its protection as an objective of the cultural policy. There might be many reasons for that – starting from the already mentioned questions of the national identity promotion, through the very basic respect for the past and its monuments. It is also recognised that taking care of the cultural resources of the past is generally not so controversial or difficult as developing new cultural activities, and often protection of the heritage is simply more urgent that supporting new art. That is why most cultural policies underline the meaning of heritage protection.

The whole subject is however not so easy as it may seem. The built heritage is very often too easily commercialised and this is the reason for some of the 'strategic dilemmas' of cultural policy[11] – how much can the cultural heritage be protected (which often means 'kept in an unchangeable state') and how much can we interpret it in contemporary context, without abusing its core

meaning? This is unfortunately still very rarely an issue of debate. Therefore it is worth stressing that the 'specialised staff' mentioned for example in the Czech cultural policy document has to respond not only to the demands of the strictly managerial job, but also know how to shape cultural policies, especially on the local level.

EDUCATION AS A CULTURAL POLICY INSTRUMENT

Education obviously makes a part of any cultural policy, however most often that means 'a cultural education', that is educating people to art/culture perception, often realised be artistic/cultural institutions. Another aspect is 'education for creation' — in this sense we talk mostly of 'education of professional artists' through a system of educational institutions of different levels, although 'amateur arts' have also its place and opportunity to develop in many societies. Still another aspect is influencing the curricula especially in primary and secondary schools, so that the pupils get informed on the importance not only of history and literature, but also of the cultural diversity, etc.

The following actions are usually undertaken when creating a cultural policy[12]:

1. defining cultural values, goals and priorities;
2. introducing programmes of initiatives and expenditures which can advance those goals (explicit cultural policy-making), and
3. monitoring indirect policy, establishing a means of handling implicitly defined cultural policy;

Within the 'explicit' cultural policy-making category that is normally carried out by governments on various levels, most of the following actions are involved, according to the Webster's World pf Cultural Policy: preservation, dissemination, creation, research, training, education, animation. Adams and Goldbard describe education in this context as playing 'a key role in

explicit cultural policy, since learning about community cultural life is essentially an educational process.' In this process the policy makers have to look for answers to questions about the aim of arts education — to train "arts practitioners" or "arts appreciators"? Is creation for professional artists only or will education try to involve all students in creative activity? What cultural values are transmitted by the approach to learning and its context? And so on.

Different issues are covered by actions described by those authors as "training" — the education of artists, arts administrators, and workers in related fields. And the crucial question is the role of government in this area. It is the questions of recognising the responsibility of the government on all levels for the sustainability of the sector that is generally under-funded, and setting professional standards that have to be met in the public cultural sector.

Among the direct policy instruments that might be used within cultural policy are legislation, employment and job creation, financial instruments including grants and awards, providing cultural facilities (e.g. libraries), but also providing services.[13] Providing training and/or supporting other educational initiatives, in the field of cultural management does not seem to be an instrument used by policy makers in our region.

The education in this sphere has always been initiated either by educational establishments — universities, arts academies or business school (not so often in the CEE countries) — or by non-governmental organisations operating in the field of arts and culture.[14]

As for the cultural policy studies, which are still not so common and their rationale is sometimes questioned (especially outside Europe),[15] those programmes have been most often initiated by the sociology or cultural studies (anthropology) departments within universities.

It seems that the new approach to cultural policy-making and cultural management as opposed to the "old regime",

centralised and directive policy-making in the CEE countries has its strong roots much more in the artistic and intellectual communities than in governmental public policy-making circles. Moreover, the intellectual/artistic/cultural organisations, often from the third sector seem also to recognise better the need for education and training than the governments on all levels. An interesting example, to which we return later on, is a programme of the ECUMEST association (Romania) and the European Cultural Foundation — Policies for Culture, which addresses the need for education in policy-making.[16]

TRENDS IN EDUCATION IN CULTURAL POLICY AND CULTURAL MANAGEMENT IN EUROPE

The ideas on the cultural management, cultural policy-making and education in these areas differ quite a lot across Europe. That is mostly due to different approaches to the role of culture in society, understanding of the scope of the term 'culture', as well as to historical development and resulting from them social and political set-ups.

Over the last thirty years various factors influenced the types of educational programmes in European countries. With ideas of democratisation of culture and the need for the 'animator' profession came the programmes of 'animation' or 'mediation culturelle' in France. Decentralisation of culture resulted in the need for 'culture (or arts) administrator'. Economic changes, especially in the 80s brought the recognition of business skills for the cultural sectors in the light of dwindling public subsidies and growing importance of the private sector in the culture — both in the role of corporate financial support (sponsorship) and in the strengthening of cultural industries. The fall of communism brought substantial changes in the CEE countries, and the demands for new type of administration and management in the cultural sector appeared. Growing importance of arts and culture for the economic development, particularly on

the local level, leads to articulating more and more often a demand for a 'cultural planner', 'urban cultural development specialist', and so on.

All those factors — very generally mentioned here — influenced the content and forms of curricula in the cultural policy and cultural management programmes of studies.

At the moment we can distinguish several trends in the cultural management related education in Europe. There are now more than 220 higher education institutions providing education or training in 34 countries.[17] The number of non-higher education establishments offering training in the field is even bigger. They are however mostly focused on providing rather short courses in specialised, narrow aspects (like fundraising or sponsoring, or communication skills), designed for professionals, whereas universities, arts academies or business schools offer undergraduate and graduate courses, as well as opportunities for research on the PhD level. They cover a wide range of subject reflected in the names of the courses, which I would like to cite here, when indicating some trends.

One of the growing trends is the European (or international) dimension of courses — programmes like MA in European Urban Cultures (co-operation of four universities: Tilburg, Brussels, Helsinki, Manchester), or DESS Management Culturel en Europe (Paris VIII), MA in Cultural Management in European Context (Utrecht School of the Arts), or MA in European Heritage Protection (Viadrina University, Frankfurt/Oder).

Another tendency reflecting change of attitude towards the role of culture is the growing number of programmes preparing professionals capable to conceive and promote cultural projects influencing tourism and economic development of a certain territory. 'Cultural development of cities' (La Rochelle, France), 'Local development — tourism and culture' (Angers, France), 'Strategies of cultural development', or 'Local administration, cultural and local development' — those titles exemplify the mentioned trend. These are the programmes that link

the cultural administration and management with cultural policy-making on the local level, without directly stating it in their name. The interdependence of cultural policies and local development policies is present very strongly in the curricula. This type of programmes is nearly non-existent in the CEE region on the university level. Some links of the two spheres are made in the area of academic research, but it is still far from practical education or training.

Most of the programmes in the CEE countries reflect another big trend, one could actually say — the mainstream of the cultural management education. Those are the programmes that focus of managing the organisation. The curricula concentrate either on management of organisation 'mediating the arts and culture to the society', which means often big structures, usually state subsidised, or small, entrepreneurial units perceiving their role as providing entertainment. Another aspect might be the management of big cultural projects (festivals). Still another — management of heritage related institutions. In this 'mainstream' most of the training and education providers in the post-communist bloc see their place. Improving the management of institutions, especially in the public sector, that are rather heavy structures with inefficient modes of action, without clearly defined mission statements, or with missions that encompass virtually everything that might be conceived for a cultural institutions — this is the training need perceived by university programmes. On the other hand we observe courses (usually short) initiated by NGOs, addressed to small, new organisations, trying to establish their position, building their sustainability mostly basing on foreign grants. The two types cross sometimes but apparently not often enough to create a diversity of training provision for all types of organisations.

Important changes in the labour market, also in the cultural sector, that is characterised more than any other by short-term contracts, temporary work, self-employment have inclined some institutions to providing education for 'cultural

entrepreneurship' also when managing individual careers. This need is not yet perceived as urgent in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Certain trends for the nearest future in opinion of some leading experts of the field include:[18]

- further internationalisation of the education, not only in terms of content but also in terms of teaching staff and student group composition;
- growing importance of new technologies in the learning process — distance learning, video-conferencing, on-line learning;
- growing co-operation between educational establishments, most notably through networks like the European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres;
- a challenge of harmonisation/standardisation of curricula as a result of the Bologna declaration process;
- growing importance of training provided by the local development agencies;
- especially in the CEE countries — growing need of professional training for the cultural industries;
- development of new tools of evaluation for education and training programmes;
- increase of mobility (students, teachers, practitioners)
- growing role of the labour market changes that will be reflected in curricula, especially of short, tailor-made courses;
- in the CEE countries new programmes are needed that respond to the local development and cultural development issues.

How do existing educational programmes in cultural management and cultural policy fit not only those predicted trends in the field, but foremost the existing training needs is the main point of interest in my research. The next phase of the research project is gathering the primary data helping to describe and analyse the issue.

Opinions of practicing cultural managers of the public sector, and local government officials that appoint them will provide some data on the real training needs of the sector. On the other hands – analysis of curricula, as well as opinions of programme directors, students and graduates will describe the existing educational offer. How do the offer and the demand fit together? What is the role of the government in supporting and strengthening the public cultural sector? Trying to find the answers in the three countries (Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland) and comparing them in order to look for common problems/challenges and relevant solutions will constitute the next parts of the research and will be presented in the final research paper.

---

[1] Dragicevic-Sesic, M., The cultural policy in the post-totalitarian period in Eastern and Central Europe – between local and global; see also: Jung, B., Moleda-Zdziech, M., Central and Eastern European cultural policies, media reform and development of media market in the mid-nineties, Leisure Studies 17 (1998), E&F Spon.

[2] Pavel Tigrid, Czech Minister of Culture in an interview for the New York Times, 14.11.1995, Quoted from: Dragicevic-Sesic, M., op. cit.

[3] For an interesting interpretation of the article 151 see: Smiers, J., The role of the European Community concerning the cultural article 151 in the Treaty of Amsterdam, research paper, Centre for Research Utrecht School of the Arts, 2002, www.hku.nl

[4] www.unesco.org

[5] www.coe.int

[6] www.culturalpolicies.net

[7] Cultural Policy, 2001, Ministry of Culture of Czech Republic, www.mkcr.cz

[8] ibidem.

[9] www.culturalpolicies.net, Cultural policy of Hungary, prepared by Peter Inkei.

[10] www.culturalpolicies.net, Cultural policy of Poland, prepared by Dorota Ilczuk and Luiza Drela.

[11] Matarasso, F., Landry, Ch., Balancing act: strategic dilemmas in cultural policy, Council of Europe, 1999.

[12] Adams, D., Goldbard, A., Basic Concepts: Modes and Means of Cultural Policy Making, Webster's World of Cultural Policy, 1995, www.wwcd.org

[13] ibidem.

[14] The 'genealogy' of cultural management studies in Europe has been presented in many sources, recently by Boylan, P., Survey on institutions and centres providing training for cultural development professionals in Western Europe, and Dragicevic-Sesic, M., Survey on institutions and centres providing training for cultural development professionals in Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Caucasus Region, UNESCO-ENCATC, [in] UNESCO Directory of institutions providing training for cultural development, see also www.encatc.org

[15] see Rothfield, L., Cultural *Policy* Studies??!! *Cultural* Policy Studies??!! Cultural Policy *Studies*??!! A Guide for Perplexed Humanists, Working Papers, Cultural Policy Centre, University of Chicago, April 1999.

[16] www.policiesforculture.org

[17] For a comprehensive directory of programmes related to cultural development (which is broader than policy and management only) see the UNESCO Database of European Cultural Management Programmes.

[18] This summary points are one of the results of the interviews with experts gathered at the General Assembly of ENCATC in Turin, June 2003. The interviewed experts include: Janet Summerton (Sussex University), Helena Drobna (UNESCO), Corina Suteu (ECUMEST), Isabelle Schwarz (European Cultural Foundation), Emil Orzechowski (Jagiellonian University).

Additional bibliographical notes:
Apart from the sources listed in the notes to the paper, the following publications cover the discussed subject:
Bardach, E., The Eight-Step Path of Policy Analysis, Berkeley, 1996.
Colebatch, H.K., Policy, University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
D'Angelo, M., Vesperini, P., Cultural policies in Europe: a comparative approach, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 1998.
Dragicevic-Sesic, M., Central Europe: Cultural managers as mediators, [in:] Challenges for cultural policy and management in Central and Eastern Europe, Culture Committee of Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 1997.
Ellmeier, A., Rasky, B, Cultural policy in Europe – European cultural policy?, Vienna, 1998.
Feist, A., Cultural employment in Europe, Policy Notes, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 2000.
In from the margins. A contribution to the debate and culture and development in Europe, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 1997.
Mundy, S., (ed.), Cultural policy. A short guide, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 2000.
The governance of culture: Approaches to integrated cultural planning and policies, Policy Notes, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 1999.
Rasky, B., Wolf Perez, E. M., Cultural policy and cultural administration in Europe, Vienna, 1996.
Varbanova, L., The training needs in cultural management in Central and Eastern Europe, [in:] Arts administration and cultural management training in the Eastern European Countries, Working Paper, ENCATC, 1999.