Malgorzata Sternal

International Policy Fellowship 2003

EDUCATION IN CULTURAL POLICY AND MANAGEMENT IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HUNGARY AND POLAND

Research paper

1. INTRODUCTION

Culture needs participants, professionals and informed audiences.

The education system needs to help supply all three.

(Simon Mundy, Cultural policy: a short guide)

Cultural policy and cultural management are those issues that have been increasingly discussed in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe over the last several years. 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 focused on one element of cultural policies, which does not seem to have got enough attention **education in cultural policy-making and in management within the cultural sector.**

The most general context embracing not only the CEE region, has to be outlined by two fundamental questions   what is the place and recognition of cultural policies as a part of public policy, and   on the other hand   what is the recognition of cultural management as a profession. Departing from those two aspects we can explore more specific problems, which in the CEE region seem quite important, namely: what is the role, if any, of the managers of the cultural sector in cultural policy making? And   is there a relevant educational offer in cultural policy and management to prepare for the work in the cultural sector in general and for cultural policy making in particular? If we recognise and accept that sustainability of the cultural sector is resting on sound cultural policies and professional management, then the educational offer has to be evaluated, and adjusted periodically. It is also necessary to work towards increased awareness of importance of cultural policy making, both nationally and locally, but also in the international context.

This paper has been written as a result of research done in three Central European countries   the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. Through document analysis and interviews, as well as personal observation and participation, data have been collected to make an attempt to analyse and compare situation in cultural

management education, as well as to define areas for further research. The interviews were conducted in the period of August 2003   March 2004. The respondents (listed in Appendix 1), quoted anonymously throughout this paper, are marked with a capital letter and a number.

After general remarks concerning the possible roles of managers in the policy making process, and the management education for the public sector, the paper goes on to presenting approaches to cultural management in the European and international context. In this light, the situation in the three countries is described and analysed. Possible policy alternatives are discussed in the next section, and recommendations and conclusions close the paper.

2. CULTURAL POLICIES AS A PUBLIC POLICY FIELD

Picture, for a moment, the following scene. A politician is holding a press conference during an election campaign. A journalist raises a hand to ask this serious candidate for high office a question: Could the candidate please outline, for the general public, the party's economic policy? The politician looks blank for a moment, hesitates, and looks nervously at his or her advisers. They look back unhelpfully with a faint shrug of the shoulders. The politician, searching desperately for inspiration, decides to play for time. "I'm sorry," he or she haplessly replies, "but what exactly do you mean by economic policy?"

(…) It is hard to imagine such a scene ever taking place. All serious political parties and candidates have an economic policy of some description, and elections are frequently won and lost on how persuasive they are in advocating it. If, however, we substitute the word "cultural" for "economic," then the scene no longer strains credulity. To say that few political parties in most modern industrial nations devote much energy to cultural matters is to state the obvious. Some political parties--most notably in the United States--have no formal cultural policy at all. Others treat the cultural life of their region or nation as a minor or marginal issue, a field in which government can do little more than dabble or occasionally pontificate. The idea of an election being won or lost on the strength of a party's cultural policy is almost unimaginable.[1]

(Justin Lewis, Designing a cultural policy)

This lengthy quotation presents a picture illustrating all too well a possible approach towards the cultural policies issues. The example, taken from the American environment is quite close to European realities as well. There seems to be a certain discrepancy between the intentions declared by governments, present in international conventions or resolutions, where importance of culture is underlined, and the national or local policy-making, where the cultural sector almost inevitably remains as one of the last pretenders to the public money. The ministers of culture are most often the less important members of the cabinet; culture departments on the regional and local levels have similar positions. As Moleda-Zdziech pointed out: "In all CEE countries there is also a marked disparity between declarative cultural policies and its everyday practice. (…) The Ministry of Culture is the last in the 'pecking order' for state funding. The managing of this ministry is not considered to be particularly prestigious and the scale of its operations is quite small. In consequence, the potential damage from political manoeuvring and unwise decisions is not very significant when

compared with the risks involved in such areas as privatization or restructuring of the social security systems".[2]

This is a characteristic which is very visible, but not limited only to this particular region. In the Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development *Our Creative Diversity*, published by UNESCO in 1996, in chapter titled *Rethinking cultural policies*, the authors write: Unrecognized as a central component of public policy, responsibility for the arts is often subsumed under other, higher priority areas such as social welfare, health or communications"; and "cultural purposes can be abused for economic and employment objectives".[3]

2.1. Policy making process   role of managers: expertise and implementation.

"The idea that cultural policy is mainly the responsibility of national decision-makers and public administration is being replaced by a concept of 'creativity governance and management'"[4] *(Danielle Cliche, Culture, governance and regulation)*

The changes in the cultural policy making approaches have been widely discussed, especially with regard to the increasing role of participants other than public authority bodies. Cliche points out that both the private sector actors (cultural industries) and the civil society have influenced the cultural policy making in a more and more substantial way. International agreements and regulations have also to be accounted. The participation in the policy making process has been open to various actors in different aspects of cultural policies   e.g. production, distribution, preservation, management and consumption of culture. Looking only to the public sector actors, one can recognise the roles of diverse participants, including state employed teachers (also academic), artists, non-artistic staff in cultural institutions, organisers of cultural activities, media workers, etc., in different functions of "creativity governance" process.[5]

In this section we are going to have a closer look at the possible roles that the public sector managers can play within the policy process.

If we agree with Colebatch that policy rests on: authority, expertise and order,[6] we also need to acknowledge that those three attributes are not equally important at all

moments of the policy process, that they may be opposing, and that various stakeholders have their chance to influence the policy-making at its various stages. Which brings us to the issue of participation of cultural managers in the cultural policy making. Authority, expertise and order are the bases for participation in policy process. Authority has the most obvious role, providing the framework for the policy activity, and through this framework it encourages or prevents other actors to take part in the process. Colebatch underlines that policy is not only about decision-making, but also about problem solving, and therefore the expertise is needed, in order to identify and/or describe a problem, as well as propose a solution to it. Here is where the cultural managers as well as researchers can contribute to the policy making. As one of the respondents in the survey conducted within the research stated:

"I do not need policy makers, it is them who need me". [A-3]

The relationship between authority and expertise in the policy process is particularly meaning if we look at the process in the *purpose perspective*[7] - if policy is about achieving goals, who is to set up those goals? Who defines which goals are worth achieving or needed by our society? What is more, the knowledge of the specific field of the public life is rarely homogenous and certain pieces of expertise may be contradictory, which introduces additional tension. Nevertheless, the participation of experts is desirable at more than one phase of the policy process. If we follow the model structured in the following way: *determining goals – choosing courses of action – implementing them – evaluating the results – modifying the policy*,[8] we see the role of the cultural sector experts — the academics and practitioners alike, firstly in defining goals, then in implementing them, and evaluating the results. The separation between those who make decisions, and those who implement them seems to have been blurring in today's public sector — *managers are expected to take and active role in developing policy. They may do this by initiating the preparation of policy statements – that is systematic, intention-driven portraits of their organisation's activities*.[9] As one of the respondents said:

"We help the ministry to think how to organize and finance theatres"

[B-2]

It is obvious that for the successful implementation commitment and skills are indispensable. This is one of the clearest reasons why **the governments, national and local, should have not only the interest, but also the obligation to make sure that those who implement the policies are well educated and trained.** That concerns both

the leaders of particular governmental units — culture department, ministry, etc., and the executives of the organisations that those authorities supervise. The managers of cultural institutions in the public sector are expected to work towards the goals determined in the policies statements; therefore their knowledge and skills are vital for the policies success. When the Arts Council of England recognised in the 1960s that the arts sector is getting more and more complicated in terms of law, taxation and funding system, it took a leading role in the training of administrators, whereas the National and Local Government Officers Association introduced their own trainings for arts and leisure officers.[10] The educational institutions followed the example, establishing programmes of study at universities and business schools.

In other European countries the involvement of authorities took various forms, e.g. in France a special unit of the Ministry of Culture was established — the Delegation au Developpement et aux Formations, with the aim of furthering co-operation with other ministries, as it is more and more recognized that the cultural policies have to be developed in inter-sectorial collaboration.

In the CEE region the direction has been reverse — it was an initiative of the educational institutions, and / or non-profit organisations to start providing specialised training for the cultural sector management.

Policy-making is not widely seen as an activity crucial for cultural managers, they do not always see their responsibility there. What is more, it seems that policy-making is "a stranger" to the arts and culture world. It may be partly caused by the fact that, on the one hand, *"professional policy-makers develop their own technical jargon, which obscures communication with the outside world and constrains their own thinking"*,[11] and on the other the arts and culture people are not able to communicate with the "other side" either. One of the respondents in the research said:

> *"Unless the people who know the sector talk to decision makers, nothing will really change. The trouble is that they think if something is clear for them, it is clear for everybody"* [A-2]

The reluctance to accept policy-making, as an essential component of the arts world, is present also on the other side of the Atlantic, although the reasons for that

are very different from those in Europe. Andrew Taylor, the director of Bolz Center for Arts Administration (University of Wisconsin-Madison), writes:

There's a word that's guaranteed to cast a glaze over the eyes of my arts management students, to encourage a silent slouch in the nonprofit board room, and to dampen even the liveliest discussion of the arts. The word is 'policy,' and it's arguably one of the most important words that arts managers don't want to say.

The deadening dullness the word inspires in most conversations is a result of a skewed perception of what it means. It calls to mind European cultural ministries, impenetrable stacks of documents written in legalese, and congressional debates among elderly former-attorneys with watch fobs. Policy is boring. Policy is bad. Policy is contrary to the creative spirit.

But what would happen if we perceived policy in a different way:

Policy is constraint on behavior.

Constraint is the essence of art.

Policy is ultimately an individual, an organization, a community, or a larger collective saying: 'we can choose to do things a thousand ways, but together we are going to choose one particular way.' When used properly, policy can direct our attention to appropriate goals and means, and can make our work clearer and more transparent to those around us.[12]

2.2. Education as a cultural policy instrument

Education as a cultural policy instrument is most often placed in the context of the "cultural education" – educating people to the art/culture perception, or "education for creation" – in the sense of educating professional artists, through a system of institutions of different level. The Webster's World of Cultural Policy (WWCD)[13], next to those two aspects, mentions also influencing curricula in primary and secondary schools, so that pupils get informed for example on the cultural diversity, etc. The authors outline the cultural policy process in the following way:

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: preservation, dissemination, creation, research, training, education, and animation. "Training" covers not only the education of artists, but also arts administrators, and workers in related fields.

The idea that *cultural policy-making* itself should be a subject of education and training does not seem widely adopted yet.

As mentioned before, the role of government is crucial in this area. It is the question of recognising the responsibility for the sustainability of the generally under-funded sector, and setting professional standards that have to be met in the public cultural sphere.

3. CULTURAL MANAGEMENT AS A PROFESSION   CHALLENGES IN EDUCATION

The term "professional" is the one that seems to cause a bit of a problem. Almost inevitably it is associated with the optimal, the best quality, something that one should achieve. In the arts and culture sphere the term may have quite ambitious or broad meaning, as some of the respondents in this research stated:

> *"To be professional in culture management means to find ways to prove the importance of arts in the 21ˢᵗ century"* [B-4];
>
> or:
>
> *"Professional management is a combination of certain artistic visions and economic responsibility"* [A-5]

For the management, especially in the arts and culture, the term *professional* does not have a really clear usage. There are two basic reasons for that: the first is that it is still questioned and discussed if management IS a profession in such a sense as professions of a lawyer, a doctor or an accountant, the second is the feeling that the arts and culture management is not considered a profession, because - *"though recognised as a highly specialised and skilled activity, still does not readily fit into any one academic category".[14]*

One of the respondents in this research stated frankly:

> *"The biggest problem is that nobody thinks it is a real profession"*
>
> [B-5]

The International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) adopted by the International Labour Organisation does not include "cultural (or arts) manager" as a separate profession/occupation. For the purpose of the ISCO classification system, the decisive factor for determining how an occupation should be classified is the nature of the skills that are required to carry out the tasks and duties of the corresponding jobs, and not the way in which those skills have been acquired.[15] The absence of cultural manager's occupation is not surprising then   especially if we agree with Pick that arts administration rests on *"an extraordinary and variable span of skills involving art, arts criticism, politics, psychology, information science, economics, sociology and education."[16]*

The complex nature of the arts/culture manager's job does not allow fitting it into this particular framework, even though there are holders of a diploma, or an academic degree in cultural management.

If one does want to search for a place in the ISCO classification, it could be either in the major group 1: *"All occupations which consist of jobs in which the workers have mainly legislative, administrative or managerial tasks and duties should be classified to major group 1 'Legislators, senior officials and managers'"*, or in the major group 3, "Technicians and associate professionals", where we find a group 03 90 07 "Artistic, entertainment and sports associate professionals".

What might be worth noting is that in the locally adopted versions of the ISCO classification one can find for example "sports manager", as well as "sports discipline manager", but not "arts manager". In Poland there is an occupation of "sports manager", and a "discipline of sport manager", and an "organizer of sports events', but not their equivalents for the arts. One can perform the occupation of an "agent of artistic activities" instead.

3.1. Management education

The question is management a profession? is one of the two basic dilemmas linked to the question of "professional manager" and the ways of education for this job. The other is: what is the difference, if any, between the management of the private and of the public sector?

Joseph Raelin argues that management is not and should not be a profession.[17] Referring to the "profession-conscious" approach prevalent in the USA, he underlines that professionalism does not always mean *increasing the service ethic*, but is conceived more in terms of *respectability in the academic circles*. Considering the following attributes that define a profession: systematic body of specialized knowledge, autonomy, commitment and identification, and standards of conduct, Raelin points out that none of those attributes is really applied in the managerial field. Specialized management knowledge has to be adapted and interpreted according to the industry, taking into account particular contexts. Autonomy in the sense that one can be controlled only by one's own peers is also not applied, what is in fact expected from a manager is 'loyalty' that is particularly valid in the light of what we said above on the

role of managers in implementing policies. Commitment and identification is probably one of those attributes that are much more present in the cultural management than in others – it does not happen very often that a cultural manager changes fields, moving from theatre management to factory management. Standards of conduct according to Raelin are established by particular organizations, not universal business codes. Taking all this into account it seems not desirable to teach management as if it were a profession, that is through academic programmes enrolling not experienced students, to teach them a set of "professional" skills. After completing the programmes they cannot be effective managers, as the learning has to be continued – *constant and interactive*.

The need for specialized culture management training – in various forms and settings – is more visible if we agree that there is no universal set of managerial skills. What Whitley wrote in reference to business management, is also very much relevant to culture sector: *"Since large firms are able to exercise considerable discretion over business policies and how they structure, integrate and direct resources and activities, managerial tasks and problems can vary considerably between firms and industries, and so too can the managerial skills required."*[18]

One of the respondents in this research, who had working experience both in private and in public sector, claims however that while moving from one field to another within the public sector *"there was not much difference; subject is different but skills are the same. The difference is between the sectors"*. [B-3]

That is another issue to be considered for the management education - the question of differences between private and public sectors. The subject has been broadly discussed and in the light of existing research it seems that especially for the cultural sector some differences are valid and influencing the management of this particular field.

In the *new public management* concept managers are increasingly expected to initiate, to propose, to be pro-active. The role of the public sector manager – be it a governmental unit or an organisation providing services – has been changing. Following this trend, the cultural organisations in the public sector, which are also increasingly perceived as "cultural/educational services providers", have to face new challenges linked both to the understanding of the role and place they play in the

society, and to understanding of the function and position that the leaders (executives and artists) have to fulfil.

The critics of the *new public management* concept underline that the public sector is so much different that business management skills are not so easy transferable to manage it successfully. George Boyne in a review of arguments on this particular issue recollects the main points where the two sectors are different.[19] Some of them seem to be particularly valid with reference to the cultural sector. The literature on the differences between public and private management focuses on four main aspects: organisational environment, organisational goals, organisational structures, and the values of managers. Those aspects influence the way in which the management is carried out in the two sectors. As for the organisational environment out of many qualities mentioned by the authors quoted by Boyne, the *complexity* of environment (variety of stakeholders), *instability*, and *absence of competitive pressure* seem to be particularly relevant for culture. Although the competition for the cultural activities is increasing, the lack of competitive pressure is true in the sense that the public cultural institutions are either in dominant position in a given environment (e.g. the only theatre in town), or that they can provide the same sort of "services", and are not regarded as competitors, but rather as collaborators in a common effort to advance cultural development.

Organisational goals this aspect is especially important for the public management in culture. What influences the management of cultural institution is not only the fact that there are sometimes conflicting goals to achieve (e.g. to promote unpopular and difficult genre of art, and to remain financially stable at the same time) but also the fact the goals are normally intangible, and extremely difficult to measure, therefore also the performance of managers is not easy to assess.

Considering the organisational structures: the public sector managers have to face more bureaucracy, than their private counterparts; they also enjoy much lower autonomy. In case of cultural institutions that lack of autonomy, which often means that hiring or firing according to artistic/cultural merit is very difficult or even impossible, poses particular challenge. The issue of values and attitudes towards their work seems to be of utmost importance for the managers of cultural institutions. Therefore they have to accept not only much lower financial rewards, but also the fact that there is no direct financial link between the quality of their work and rewards.

All those differences may influence both the way, in which management is performed, and the way, in which prospective and current managers are trained for their job. The training reflects the complexity of the public sector environment for example an attempt to implement national policies and serve local communities at the same time. It may mean on the one hand a diverse offer, and on the other problems with quality and design of the training, responding to the needs.[20]

In the analysis of the educational offer for the public sector in the 1990s, Martin underlined that the public sector is characterised by *interprofessional leadership, interdisciplinary working and development of multiskilled workforces able to work effectively in teams*, and that the responsibility for professional development of the workforce belongs also to the manager / leader of the organisation. It is stresses that the offer for management training in the public sector should be coherent and integrated, to respond to needs of the sector where *managers and leaders have to deal with a wide range of unfamiliar processes in a fast-changing environment but do not have time to develop their own skills before performing in the floodlight of public accountability*.[21]

What is worth noting is that the issue of professional development should be seen as responsibility shared between the governance bodies, the organisations, and the managers themselves, with collaboration of the educational organisations. In the cultural sector, especially in the CEE region it is still hard to find the balance where on the one hand organisations would recognise that investing in professional development would strengthen the organisation, and the managers commit themselves to lifelong learning and encourage their staff to do the same; and on the other the local authorities that supervise the cultural institutions would offer commitment and support complemented by coherent and diverse training offer provided by educational bodies. The management education for the cultural sector is initiated and developed mostly by the educational organisations, the demand from the authorities concerning the professional development of cultural organisations is very weak or non-existent, and only the managers of younger generations (most often on middle and lower managerial level) recognise their need for acquiring new knowledge and skills. What is also missing is learning in the organisational setting that has long been recognised as an important tool of professional development.

There are still some training options that are not well developed in the region.[22] Next to the formal academic degree, university-based education, there are some

important training initiatives realised by non-governmental organisations, such as the programme of the ECUMEST association (Romania) and the European Cultural Foundation *Policies for Culture*, which through its very diverse and transnationally conceived and performed activities addresses the current and acute need for education in policy-making.[23]

Certain forms of training are almost completely absent in the region – most notably the mentorship schemes, prolonged internships (up to a year), or in-house training schemes. Moreover, the information and experience sharing through professional networks, conferences and peer group meetings seem not to get enough attention as an educational tool. Professional arts/culture management related publications are scarce. Non-formal learning is underdeveloped. One of a few examples of non-formal learning that illustrates also the possibilities of collaboration between the local governments and educational institution is the series of open lectures "Ambassador", organised by the Jagellonian University School of Cultural Management, with the ongoing support of the City of Cracow Culture Department. The simple formula of inviting the ambassadors resident in Poland to present the cultural policy of their own country is an interesting and valuable supplement to the regular cultural policy courses offered at the university. Moreover, it offers additional opportunities to set up international contacts, and to get acquainted with the cultures of other countries, as the lectures are normally accompanied by an artistic event.

This type of non-formal learning seems not to be fully appreciated, and the opportunities not fully acknowledged.

3.2. 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 settings. 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, and then in most countries of the CEE region, as the "culture

animation" or "culture pedagogy" subjects. 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.[24] 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). An example of a transnational, regional programme is also the course of Postgraduate Studies in Cultural Management and Cultural Policy in the Balkans organised by the University of Arts in Belgrade, in partnership with the French universities Paris IX Dauphine, Lyon II and the Institute of Political Studies in

Grenoble. All those programmes include study visits and/or internships abroad, which remain an indispensable element of studies 'in European dimension'.

Another tendency reflecting change of attitude towards the role of culture and development 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 on 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 universities. 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. Ellmeier talks about "entrepreneurial cultural worker": *In this new model, the historically clear demarcation between worker and entrepreneur is being eroded. New models of general social security systems and new models of training are necessary to meet new demands of economy and society in the age of globalisation. The former cultural worker, the artist has gradually been changing into an entrepreneurial figure. Management vocabulary is widely used throughout the cultural sector and the cultural sector has been described as a highly important future market for new labour and cultural policy concepts*[25].

These changes in the labour market and arising needs are 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:[26]

1.   further internationalisation of the education, not only in terms of content but also in terms of teaching staff and student group composition;

2.   growing importance of new technologies in the learning process   distance learning, video-conferencing, on-line learning;

3.   growing co-operation between educational establishments, most notably through networks like the European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres;

4.   a challenge of harmonisation/standardisation of curricula as a result of the Bologna declaration process;

5.   growing importance of training provided by the local development agencies;

6.   especially in the CEE countries   growing need of professional training for the cultural industries;

7.   development of new tools of evaluation for education and training programmes;

8.   increase of mobility (students, teachers, practitioners)

9.   growing role of the labour market changes that will be reflected in curricula, especially of short, tailor-made courses;

10.   in the CEE countries new programmes are needed that respond to the local development and cultural development issues.

Another important issue in the education for the cultural sector is the cultural policy making. Many authors, both European and American, have presented the rationale for cultural policy as a subject of studies and teaching at universities. For Lawrence Rothfield the need for the culture specific policy studies (separate from general public policy) is clear: "*Why should humanists get involved in issues that are better addressed by administrators, economists, lawyers, and the policy analysts (…) The answer to this question is that if you leave the support of the humanities to the policy people, they may not do it at all. (…) Policy analysts have no particular reason to focus on culture among the many possible domains they could study*[27].

Rothfield goes on explaining why the research done by specialists other than humanities people is not satisfactory: *economists, demographers, statisticians, and policy analysts evaluating culture often ask what many humanists consider the wrong questions and measure what many humanists consider the wrong things. (…) Supporters of the arts and humanities need such research, but they also need to demand that every effort is made in this research to take into account the complexity of the effects of aesthetic or intellectual experiences and the difficulty of measuring the good that artists and humanists do. If cultural policies are defined by economic criteria (…) then the norms inherent to neo-classical economics – the bias in favor of efficiency and the systematic undervaluing of what are called 'externalities' – are likely to dominate cultural policy research.*

The danger of "economic domination" looks quite real in the CEE region, as the shift towards marketisation of culture and ongoing criticism towards public cultural institutions for their (true or not) reckless use of public money is a constant element of the debate – if such debate exists at all – on the development of cultural sector. In the light of that it seems particularly important to support cultural policy studies as a subject taught at universities. Until now there is no single programme within the region that is dedicated solely to cultural policy studies, the programmes that exist combine (also in their name) the issues of management and policy. It seems still too early for introducing such programmes, when even the "general public policy" programmes are not very well developed at universities. Then comes the lack of clearly defined employment possibilities. If we notice that cultural manager is an occupation that is rather difficult to be placed in a clear place within the labour market, then the

"cultural policy analyst / maker / planner" seems still a luxury for many in the political, educational and cultural (alas!!) circles in the CEE region.

If one would like to make a distinction between courses that teach **on** cultural policy and teach **for** cultural policy (similarly to the distinction between research on policy and research for policy[28]) it is easy to notice that teaching FOR policy, in the sense of education and training in policy-making skills, has to be developed. The understanding and participation in the complete policy-making cycle is an area not fully covered by the cultural policy courses available in the CEE region. They are much more concerned with teaching ON policy, analysing what happens / happened and what the consequences are, or what conditions have to be fulfilled in order to achieve desirable results. Initiatives such as already mentioned programme *Policies for Culture* in the South East Europe region, that also practically oriented, are valuable and they show even more acutely the need of systematic education provided on a regular basis.

4. CURRENT CULTURAL POLICIES CONTEXT

4.1. European and international approaches

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.[29]

UNESCO has been undertaking several initiatives concerning cultural policies.[30] 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. After the World Conference on Cultural Policies in Mexico, in 1982 UNESCO called for such cultural policies that would refer to the anthropological concept of culture, embracing not only arts, but also ways of life, human rights, customs and beliefs. This approach requires interlinking policies in the fields of culture, education, science, and communication and it stresses the importance of the cultural dimension of human development.[31]

In this context UNESCO has also voiced the need for training in management. *"Principles of good management should apply as much to publicly supported arts institutions, programmes and projects, as they do to all state-supported services. As the scope of cultural responsibility must be widened, building a broader, new awareness has become even more essential. (…) The training provided by existing courses in cultural policy and management does not meet this need".*[32]

In the current UNESCO Programme (years 2004-2005), *Strengthening the links between cultural policies and development policies* is one of the main priorities, and the Main Line of Action 1 within this priority is formulated as *Assistance to Member States in preparing and applying innovative cultural policies*. For this line of action training of

managers and decision-makers responsible for implementing public cultural policies (especially in Africa) is seen as one of results, which will be assessed by *number of professionals trained in the management of public cultural policies* and *number of institutions and UNESCO Chairs involved*.

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, and are of substantial help in the cultural policy training.[33]

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*[34], 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'.

Cultural policies in the CEE 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.[35] 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.[36]

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 demand of more 'managerial', 'entrepreneurial', 'market' approach of the cultural institutions directors was a natural consequence. However, this rather common expectation of 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 still widely present in the CEE countries.

4.2. Cultural policies and cultural management in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland

The Czech Republic, as the only one out of the three, has its cultural policy document published (also in English) on the Ministry website. According to this document, published in 2001, the main cultural policy objectives are the following:

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

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

c. 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"),

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

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

f. 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,

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

h. to curb the negative influences of cultural commercialisation.[37]

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 study programmes, mainly museology and management of collecting institutions, and to set</u>

<u>up specialised secondary or post-secondary studies for middle level managerial staff.</u>'[38] [underline original]

It is a very important declaration of the Ministry. But, as the research proved, the effective ways of implementation of this particular article still need to be developed.

The cultural policy of Hungary is presented in the published by the Council of Europe and ERICarts *Compendium of basic facts and trends*.[39] 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:

a.   safeguarding the autonomy of culture;

b.   development of the conditions of cultural plurality;

c.   promotion of technical modernisation;

d.   creation of the multi-channel financing of culture

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

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

b.   integration of the protection of the monuments into cultural policy;

c.   promoting the culture of Hungarians living beyond the borders;

d.   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.[40] 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 real priorities. In 1993 the objectives of the state in the field of culture were:

a. to encourage the growth of democracy and civil society;

b. to make it easier for artists and institutions to convert to a market economy;

c. to protect the most precious cultural assets;

d. to introduce and encourage legal solutions that facilitate the development of new forms of activity.

In 1995 the following objectives were added:

a. to adopt a new approach which connects public and private funds;

b. to eliminate the stratification between the dynamics of culture and economic development;

c. create space for family oriented participation in culture;

d. **training managers and cultural animators;**

e. eliminate differences between high and popular culture;

f. initiate activities which aim to reinforce the educational role of the media;

g. encourage inter-ministerial co-operation for culture;

h. protection of cultural heritage;

i. foreign promotion of Polish culture

j. 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:

a. enhancement and development of national civil community;

b. enhancement and dissemination of national heritage;

c. formation of principles aimed at support for creativity and cultural education

d. 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.

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 source of some of the 'strategic dilemmas' of cultural policy[41] - 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 on any level lower than intergovernmental organisation (e.g. UNESCO). 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 take responsibility for cultural policies, especially on the local level.

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.[42]

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 and relatively new example of the public authority recognition of importance of sector specific training is provided by the Czech Ministry of Culture. It is a document approved at the beginning of the year 2003, Concept of a More Effective Care for Movable Cultural Heritage in the Czech Republic in 2003-2008 (Museum Management Development Concept). Recognising that *museum work and museum management is a complex multidisciplinary area*, it points out as one of the weaknesses of Czech museums the fact that *"although education opportunities in the museum management and museum theory areas at universities have improved, the teaching is not co-ordinated and its quality varies"*. One of the Strategic Objectives of the Concept is to improve the quality and extend the range of training in museum studies and museology, which is supposed to be done through co-operation with *universities and selected higher education schools in designing museum studies and museology training.*[43]

4.2.1. Educational offer, needs and opportunities

The type of education that is mentioned in the Museum Management Development Concept of the Czech Ministry of Culture has still not been developed in the country. If this should be carried out at universities, remains an open question that needs further exploration. Most of the respondents underlined that the right type of knowledge and skills is available not through university studies, but only through practical work. The dilemma seems rather virtual, because there are no curatorship or museum management studies in any of the three countries examined in this research, yet.

In this section we will have a closer look at the data gathered in the research. Methodology that has been used includes on the one hand analysis of available documents, on the other mailed questionnaire survey and interviews, as well as personal observation and participation. More than 120 managers of public cultural institutions and local government representatives in Poland have provided the data collected in the mailed survey, whereas interviews were conducted in Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic with selected persons representing four groups of

stakeholders: directors of public cultural organisations, educational institutions, graduates of cultural management programmes, and local government representatives (27 persons). Both in mailed survey and interviews the respondents were asked to make a ranking of skills (proposed in a list of 30) according to their utility in the job of cultural manager. They were also asked to provide their opinion on availability of education in cultural management in their countries, and on validity of diploma in cultural management. The interviewed respondents presented also their views on best ways of acquiring knowledge and skills for their work, recalled their best learning experience, and reflected on their role as cultural policy makers.

It has been mentioned already that the higher education offer in the sphere of culture management related studies is not very well developed in the countries of Central Europe. For example the studies in curatorship and museum management are not offered in any of the three countries. In Poland three universities (Warsaw, Torun, and Cracow) provide an opportunity to study museology. Those programmes are conceived as one-year part-time course designed for people who are active professionally in the field and hold an MA degree.

This type of studies   one year (two terms) of part time activities   is the most popular in the Polish offer in the culture management field. In the research at least 12 such courses with various profiles have been identified in Poland, next to 3 courses leading to BA degree, and one course leading to MA degree[44]. The programmes are offered by universities (both public and private), business schools (academies of economics) and music academies.

In the Czech Republic (3 programmes)[45] and Hungary (3)[46] available studies programmes have been designed as graduate   BA and MA degree   and are provided by universities (Hungary) and the music and theatre academies (Czech Rep.) There are no programmes that would be dedicated only to cultural policy; this issue is usually covered by varied number of hours within the programme of cultural management.

Apart from the higher education system, there are not so many other opportunities for training in cultural management issues. The Hungarian Ministry of Culture (Culture 2000 National Contact Point) organises short courses dedicated to "grant application writing" and "culture in EU", which are answering to the most immediate needs of managers linked to fundraising at the European programmes.

Those courses cover issues such as project and application management, budgeting, co-operation with foreign partners and EU history, EU decision-making mechanisms, structural funds and culture, non-profit sector in EU, etc. Similar courses are offered by Polish National Contact Point. Examples of training organised by providers other than higher education institutions are courses proposed by National Cultural Centre in Warsaw (an institution under the supervision of Ministry of Culture), focusing on the regional cultural co-operation and cultural project management.

Another type of training available in all three countries is provided by cultural organisations - both of public and third sector such as Multicultural Cultural Centre in Prague (training for librarians) or Malopolski Institute of Culture, Cracow (training for directors of local cultural centres). Those short courses usually focus on one particular subject and are directed to a defined group of participants, with which those training providers collaborate on various projects.

One more type of educational opportunity that has been identified is consulting activity. There are several consulting organisations, such as Institute for European Consulting (Cracow), which offer consulting or short trainings most often focused on the issues of grant application writing, or other very practical issues.

The educational offer in each of the three countries is not extremely rich then. It is not well known, either. Overwhelming majority of respondents said that they had never heard of such type of education in their own country. At the same time they expressed an opinion that education and training of managers for cultural sector is needed:

> *"Training managers [for theatre sector] is of huge importance. It is more important than educating actors" [B-4]*

> *"There is a disproportion: a lot of money is spent to educate young performers, and very little for education of people who will employ or promote them" [A-8]*

> *"The need of educating people who would take top management posts in cultural institutions is very visible. However there is also a need to*

educate the lower managerial staff – in the artistic departments,
marketing, audience development, etc. In this field one needs to have a
very comprehensive knowledge both in management and in music."
[C-1]

Also the representatives of public authorities who answered to questionnaires stated that a diploma in cultural management is an asset for potential directors of cultural institutions. It is still not officially required though, to employ as managers people who have documented acquired knowledge in cultural management.

"Holding a diploma in cultural management is a very big asset; it is
not a legal requirement, though, when employing a director. The skills
[in the questionnaire] refer to the theoretical management model – not
only for the cultural sector. But this is exactly the type of managers
that I expect at the posts of directors' [O-3]

And the situation where candidates for posts of directors of public cultural institutions do not have to have a particular type of diploma does not make it easier to establish proper relationships between the cultural organisation, its director and the local authorities. It means that anybody, fulfilling some basic criteria, can be employed for this position and that it is not the professional merit that gives the power and autonomy to the director but the decisions (more or less reasonable) of the local politicians. As one of the respondents mentioned:

"I want to underline that the status of the director of a cultural
institution has not been determined yet, from the legal and
organisational point of view. The governing board [local authority]
treats the director as its own employee, for whom they want to take
decisions, define the type of activity, and the ways of realising those
activities." [C-3]

If such attitudes appear, it might seem natural that the local authorities take care or assume at least partly the responsibility for the training of managers that they supervise. This is unfortunately not the case yet.

Going back to the education provided by the higher education sector — the opinion on the ways in which the education and training should be carried out is understandably not unanimous, ranging from an answer: *"I don't think the universities are there for this purpose (…) I do not believe in university studies in this field [A2]"* to a statement: *"there is a strong need for this type of studies [C1]"*.

What one has to keep in mind though, is that the respondents were mostly senior (or top) managers, who themselves had not followed any studies in the arts / culture / museum management. Only small percent had participated in short trainings or internship (also internationally), and one person had followed a year-long Vilar Arts Management Fellowship Programme at the Kennedy Center, Washington.

It is therefore not surprising that their own experience supports a model of professional career where one gets university level education in arts or humanities, and through practical work acquires knowledge and skills needed for running an organisation. This approach is further confirmed by the ranking of knowledge and skills done by the respondents. In all three countries and types of institutions, the highest places on the list of skills needed for the job of a cultural manager were accorded to those skills/ knowledge that one can acquire not necessarily through management studies: **knowledge of a particular arts/culture discipline, foreign language, leadership skills, negotiation skills, decision making**. Leaving apart those skills that are sometimes regarded as innate abilities (decision making, leadership), although possible to develop and enhance, the other most valued skills/knowledge may in fact not be the core subjects of cultural management studies.

But then again it depends on the type of educational institution. If we have a closer look at the arts management studies offered by the arts academies, we see that the number of subjects (and hours) dedicated to the particular discipline is substantial — e.g. music history, musical forms analysis, aesthetics, music criticism, etc. at the music management programme (Music Faculty, Performing Arts Academy, Prague) or history of culture, history of world theatre, theatre dramaturgy, etc. at the theatre management programme (BA and MA) in Brno. The MA course in the latter programme is designed as a follow-up to the BA course within the same field, which

means that certain aspects of studies are covered only in the BA course e.g. economics (macro- and microeconomics), legal (public and private law, copyright) or marketing issues. The MA course then offers, apart from project oriented seminars and practical assignments, subjects such as sociology of management, psychology of personality, or art of negotiation. This course describes its graduates as prepared to work in posts such as: top manager of festivals/cultural projects, top manager of theatre, top cultural agency manager, or top manager in the field of culture in local governments. However, it does not seem that the programme content offers enough opportunities to get acquainted with policy making and/or public administration aspects of culture sector. The graduate can acquire extensive knowledge of theatre as an arts discipline, but not the local government specifics or policy making skills.

Similar concerns can be felt with regard to the university-based programmes in culture management. The curricula of management programmes (e.g. MA course at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow or Lajos Kossuth University, Debrecen) include cultural policy issues as a general introduction to models of state cultural policies and cultural policies and management in Europe, and the issue of policy making skills is not explored in depth. One cannot expect, on the other hand, that the university studies will be offering practical training; their role is fundamentally different. Therefore other options for getting practical skills have to be identified.

If we look back at the ranking of knowledge/skills valued most by the managers, we will easily recognise that apart from the knowledge of a particular discipline, the skills regarded as very important for the job of cultural manager are in fact not the ones that might be learned in the classroom leadership, decision making, building relations, etc. The higher education programmes cannot be blamed too much for not providing enough opportunities to learn this type of skills. Most of the respondents agree that only the real working situation enables acquiring certain experiences; for example:

> *"Vilar Arts Management Fellowship was the most valuable learning experience. It was involvement in real work of the Kennedy Center, I participated in meetings that were real working situations, and that was the best way of getting an idea how the process develops" [A-8]*

They also point out that while the academic studies prepare generally for the work, the understanding of the field and further professional development comes after one has started working:

> *"At the university I got general idea of the field. I then learned from my more experienced colleagues. Best way to learn is to get specific skills while working; only when you work you see a real need of training" [B-8]*

Therefore some ideas presented by the respondents sound particularly relevant in terms of preparation for the job. Many suggested that "getting the flavour" of the field is very useful:

> *"Best way to educate is to train on-the-job for about 6 months, and then go to study; to see if this field is really for him/her. This job is often not what people think it is." [B-5];*

or:

> *"For someone who wants to start in this field it is better to try first, through an internship" [A-8]*

Others underline strongly the need for putting the students in the situations as close to real working situations as possible:

> *"Our students have to go to rehearsals to see the production process, and not only the final product. (…) Luckily we have no books [in our own language] on management; they give general schemes, which make the students to take ready models instead of thinking" [B-7]*

When commenting on practical aspects, both teachers and students notice an occurrence that disturbs the education process at the higher education level:

> *"The problem with our education is that able people can get better jobs than teaching, and that the practitioners are not always welcomed at the higher education schools" [A-9]*

The perceptions of students and graduates of the programmes considered in the research confirm validity of programmes that they had attended, claiming that the

degree is/will be welcomed by their current/future employers. They underline again the importance of practical aspects within the course of study, but also draw our attention to another important aspect of education — exchange of experience through international programmes:

> *"I appreciate very much that I could use the Erasmus exchange*
> *scheme. I could use a much better library [than in my school], I could*
> *see the whole thing [arts management studies] differently" [A-9]*

That brings us to another issue that seems to have increasing importance in the field of education in cultural management — namely international educational and training projects funded by various international sources. It has been mentioned already that organisations such as Council of Europe, UNESCO or European Cultural Foundation initiate and/or support organisationally and financially development of cultural management training. The European Union programmes, such as Socrates (for the higher education), Leonardo da Vinci (vocational training), and Grundtvig (adult learning) seem to offer opportunities that have to be developed by the education and training providers.

Below are two examples of projects that are worth presenting at length, as they are interesting not only because of their content, but also because of the partnerships that have been established throughout the realisation of these particular ideas — "cultural mediator" and "cultural entrepreneur" training. In both projects there are partners from countries considered in this research.

EXAMPLES of EU-funded projects:

Example 1   EUROEDULT

Project background (all information quoted from the project's website):

EUROEDULT is a European project aiming to develop a special curriculum for Training Museum Staff becoming cultural mediators carrying newly constructed knowledge framed into Cultural Mediator skills.

(…) Members of the museum staff have to consider and develop new elements of the educational role of museums. The curriculum reflects the complexity of skills mediators of culture in museums must attain.

It is a specific duty of museum people and the authorities responsible for cultural services to create the best conditions for the use of museums by all sectors of society. But to face this challenge, new skills are needed in cultural professionalism. And these skills have to be developed at a transnational level, so that the essential objectives of mutual understanding and safeguarding of the European common heritage, largely considered as an essential resource for the future, can be targeted with success. Again, this is not a matter of choice; it is an imperative task as there is no alternative to this re-positioning of museums in the fast changing cultural European landscape.

The areas of skills and competences required is very large and the effort of the project is to define them on a practical ground so that the programme could be offered on the labour market as an innovative occasion both for the ones who are already working in this sector and for the ones who intend to enter it for the first time. The potential influence of Euroedult could exceed the limits of a specialized field to become an agent of change on a larger scale and touch also the cultural, information and leisure industry.

Partnership:

The Bayerische Volkhochschulverband in Munich, the Reggione Emilia-Romagna, The École du Louvre, the European Museum Forum and the University of Pécs. These partners have applied to the SOCRATES Programme to financially support the piloting of the outcomes of our curriculum development.

(…) The proposed framework makes no assumptions about the type of organisation that may provide courses leading to the qualification. Thus a provider may be a museum or gallery; a college or adult education centre; a training organisation (public or private); a university; an employer or employers' organisation; etc. In fact the overall structure of the qualification is designed to encourage partnerships and collaboration between these different types of provider, so provision may well be organised via a local consortium.

Website: www.euroedult.feefi.pte.hu

Example 2   CULTURE CAPITAL CREATION

Project background (all information quoted form the project's website):

The relationship between culture, business and educational providers can be used to develop new learning approaches, new products and innovative processes. Educational providers can use the "creative alliance" to meet the demand for new skills being demanded in the new economy. Combining elements of cultural and artistic creativity with management and learning skills is a dilemma and a meanwhile challenge. It is envisaged that the new ideas and products will lead to the development of new courses and learning techniques, hereby increasing competitiveness and visibility both in relation to old customers and possible new target groups. The new approach will promote not only a multi-skilled labour force, but also more entrepreneurial oriented behaviour.
A cultural entrepreneur can combine elements of cultural and artistic creativity, leadership and management life long learning to meet the needs of the multi-skilled persons demanded in the global economy.
The project addresses the major objectives of the Leonardo program: innovation, competitiveness and entrepreneurial culture, co-operation between educational providers, trainers as well as businesses both in the private and public sector.

Partnership:
Educational perspectives:
Køge Business College (DK), West Pom Education Centre (PL), Haganässkolan (SE), University of Veszprém (HU)
Private sector perspectives and knowledge:
IKEA (SE), Nordea (DK), Innovation Centrum KHT (HU), WFG (DE)
Public sector perspectives and knowledge:
Älmhult Kommun (SE), Køge Municipality (DK), Department of Education and Culture (PL);
Cultural perspectives and knowledge:
ENCATC, Pomeranian Princes Castle (PL), Art Sketch Museum (DK)

Website: www.vein.hu/www/intezetek/npo/hu/nemz_kapcs/leonardo/ccc.htm

To sum up this section we can say that the situation in education and training in cultural management and cultural policies in the three CEE countries that was established a number of years ago is fairly stable and unchanged. The data gathered prove that it needs a lot of improvement, especially in terms of introducing new forms of training in addition to existing ones. Teaching methodologies seem to need further development and international co-operation might be regarded as an important aspect. Next section of the paper will focus on possible options for improvement.

5. POLICY ALTERNATIVES – OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

The results of research presented in the previous section lead us to a general reflection that the existing educational offer in cultural management and cultural policy in the three countries does not respond to real needs. The situation can be summed up in several points:

a.   cultural policy is not regarded as an autonomous subject that should be studied (leading towards a degree); that is linked to a lack of public policy studies in the region;

b.   cultural managers do not fully recognise their role as policy makers;

c.   cultural management is not recognised as a "real profession";

d.   there are too few programmes in cultural management;

e.   the programmes are not well known and recognised;

f.   an important aspect of management education, which is practical training, is not developed due to limitations of the existing higher education system;

g.   training options alternative to higher education programmes are very weak and few;

h.   international co-operation and funding present new opportunities for development of training options, but those opportunities are not fully explored and used.

Main challenges identified during the research include:

a.   lack of training needs assessment, which results in a substantial gap between real needs and existing offer;

b.   lack of well developed positive attitude towards lifelong learning concept, especially in case of older generation managers;

c.   no clear employment criteria for cultural managers linked to the lack of well defined profile of the job and expectations towards a potential manager of a public cultural institution;

d.   constant problem with not adequate funding for the cultural sector;

e.   not adequate governance on the national versus local level, e.g. too many museums are governed (and funded) on the county level in Poland, which results in not adequate funding;

f.   lack of assigning responsibilities for the field — it is not established who is to educate mangers for the public cultural sector;

g.   lack of knowledge of funding opportunities on international level for training and educational projects.

When looking for possible policy options that could be considered in the current situation one has to keep in mind especially two variables: low financial resources and existing educational system. Efficiency seems therefore the factor that might be decisive, however it is very important to consider also effectiveness and sustainability of proposed solutions.

Following the typology of policy instruments presented by Leslie A. Pal, we can discuss here three major approaches: doing nothing, indirect instruments and direct instruments.[47]

"Doing nothing" is obviously not a real policy instrument, however when this option is chosen by public authorities it may result in activities undertaken by other stakeholders, so it may lead to certain desirable actions. As Mercer puts it: *"There are tacit but not explicit policy frameworks – including non-existing policies – which none the less can have definite policy implications"*[48] That is possible to observe very often in the field of cultural management education. If this is the right choice is rather doubtful, as the lack of interest from the governments might be more discouraging than stimulating. And at least some governments in the CEE region seem to recognise that the concrete actions are needed (for example see the Czech cultural policy document).

Indirect policy instruments that could be taken into consideration include expenditure, regulation as well as information tools.

Possible *expenditure instruments* might cover various types of grants or awards. A couple of options are possible: grants to the cultural institutions that want to strengthen professional capacity of their staff, with an aim of participation in certain type of training or organising an in-house training session; or grants to educational institutions in order to develop a particular type of training suitable for cultural organisations governed by the grant donor (on local or national level). Grants could be also awarded to educational or research institutions, which would carry out research linked to enhancement of management of public cultural institutions, for example training needs assessment, effectiveness of particular types of training etc.

Individuals could be also recipients of similar types of grants, as well as awards, that would serve as recognition of achievements on the level of theory (researchers, educators), and praxis alike for example through awards for best managers.

There are policy alternatives based both on expenditure and regulation, such as decision on increasing the budget of an organisation by an amount that has to be allocated to training expenses of the staff. Subsidy might be increased, but it also might be only restructured with the regulation that certain amount of money is dedicated to professional development purposes.

Keeping in mind that the public cultural sector is characterised by low and unstable financial resources, expenditure instruments seem to be rather difficult to introduce. Resistance to this type of policy might be especially strongly felt by those cultural operators and artists who often quite rightly claim that the public funding should be directed first of all to the artistic / cultural production process, and that the administrative costs are usually a big burden for the organisational budgets.

The *regulation based policy instruments* might be effective in many ways in the cultural management education. Decisions such as *defining standards for managerial posts* in public cultural sector, linked with *formulating explicit criteria and requirements for employment* in the field are clearly needed. It might lead to better understanding of managerial competences in culture, and in connection with specific information tools and training opportunities easily available, might contribute substantially to strengthening managerial skills in the sector. Regulations may also concern educational institutions for example *recognition (accreditation) of quality education/training providers*. Such accreditation should be conferred in co-operation of educational and cultural departments on national or local level. Obviously, in order to provide such recognition, clear assessment criteria have to be developed first, which is another type of regulation, needed in this case.

Difficulties with introducing this type of policy instruments are linked with lack of agreement on the role of manager of cultural institution, linked directly with the prevailing understanding of the role of culture and its organisations in society in general, and in development (also in economic terms) in particular. The dilemma of artistic versus managerial/economic leadership within an organisation remains unresolved. The issue of accreditation of cultural management training is also quite difficult. Milena Dragicevic-Sesic points out that inviting external evaluators is

impossible for most of universities in the region,[49] and in case of non higher education training, there is no body that would be responsible for assessing and official recognition of cultural management related courses. What makes the situation even more difficult is the fact that a broad inter-sectorial co-operation is needed.

As for the *information-based instruments*, they seem to be relatively easy to introduce, however in most cases there is no way of assuring that the information available, which is supposed to lead to certain actions or behaviours is used at all. In our case there are plenty of possibilities that might be explored – one of the most effective seems *subsidizing production and dissemination of information* such as databases of training opportunities, online training materials, online documentary resources (legal documents, policy documents, etc.). Information instruments include also *producing textbooks, journals or periodic publications*.

When implementing this type of policy instruments, cost and technology issue have to be considered. The less expensive in production and dissemination resources, i.e. online publications are not easily accessed in smaller centres, where the IT equipment and infrastructure (and sometimes lack of skills) does not allow benefiting fully from this opportunity. On the other hand, for the younger generation of cultural workers, electronic resources constitute the main pool of knowledge, and developing this type of instruments seems to be particularly effective.

One more policy alternative that can be considered belongs to direct instruments used by governments. This is establishing an agency with an aim of providing particular services, in our case – training in management for public cultural sector. This solution is well known in some European countries (e.g. France or Great Britain), and to some extent present also in the CEE region – we mentioned before trainings provided by Cultural Contact Points (of Ministries of Culture) or organisations supervised by the Ministry (National Cultural Centre in Warsaw). None of these units had been established as a training provider, though, and understandably their training activities are quite limited. An alternative to government agency is delegating the task to an organisation, for example an NGO specialising in training activities. Challenges linked to such a solution include not only defining the decisions on who is to receive the subsidy – the providers of the service or the recipients, etc., but also establishing the ways of supervision and quality assurance.

Implementation of any of the instruments mentioned above requires attention to certain aspects that might be critical for success of policies. It has been already underlined that the public cultural sector is characterised by extreme complexity. We agree that *"[implementation] takes place in a world of multiple powers and authorities, organizations, and personalities, and therefore is inevitably a struggle"*.[50] Therefore the objectives of policy have to be clearly specified and agreed, in order to establish the evaluation criteria. Those criteria have to take into account not only the efficiency aspect for example how many people were trained at what cost, or how many publications produced, but also or rather first of all the effectiveness of particular instrument. That is much more demanding and difficult to establish mostly because the timeline for effectiveness measurement is longer, but also because the results are not always tangible and easy to measure. Managerial skills enhancement through training can be judged by the number of new projects initiated or better financial management of an organisation, etc., but assessing to what extent a particular policy instrument contributes to improvement requires a lot of time in a fairly stable and unchanged situation, which is quite difficult to attain in the culture sector in the CEE region.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education in cultural policy and cultural management in the CEE region is an issue that deserves much more attention than it gets right now. Existing educational offer does not fulfil the needs of the sector, which is very diverse and demanding. The involvement of governments both on local and national level is not sufficient, even at the level of declarations, not to mention real actions. The most dynamic, innovative and flexible approaches to the issue are presented by non-governmental organisations, often those that are operating internationally. The higher education programmes that have been developed need to be adjusted and/or new programmes have to be designed in order to respond to the needs of the sector. Those general remarks can be translated into a modest set of particular recommendations directed towards various stakeholders of this complex environment.

1) Local and national governments are particularly responsible for sustainability and sound management of public cultural institutions. To ensure the right level of managerial competences it is advisable:

a.   to define clearly the range of tasks and responsibilities of a manager   especially the top level executives   in cultural institutions supervised by given authority;

b.   to define requirements   also in terms of managerial skills   for managerial posts, and introduce transparent procedures of recruitment, with attention to management education and training;

c.   to stimulate professional development of cultural organisations staff through introducing an obligatory item in the organisational budgets   dedicated to training expenses;

d.   to establish ways of recognition for outstanding managers   through individual and organisational awards;

2) Educational institutions need to recognise that their initiative remains crucial for the cultural management development and cultural policy awareness. Therefore they need to stay alert to changing requirements of the field through:

a.   regular research into training needs in the local environment;

b.   adjusting within the limitations of the existing system curricula and methodology of programmes that are currently carried out;

c.   giving more attention to research focusing on issues essential for cultural management development;

d.   introducing innovative forms of training, with greater participation of management practitioners as tutors and mentors;

e.   working towards establishing assessment criteria for cultural management education, also through international collaboration within networks such as European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres.

3) For cultural organisations it is vital to elaborate ways of permanent professional development of their staff. The concept of *learning organisation*, responding to challenges of operating in the complex public sector, competing (but also collaborating) with private and third sector actors, needs to be developed, taking as points of departure:

a.   closer co-operation with educational structures, resulting in developing training options alternative to higher education, more flexible and tailor-made for particular organisations;

b.   developing the positive attitude towards the lifelong learning concept, through encouraging the staff to participate in various forms of training;

c.   strengthening the peer group pressure opportunities for example through setting up associations of cultural managers that could work towards better recognition of cultural management as a distinct occupation;

It has to be underlined that a close collaboration between the major stakeholders, i.e. governments (national and local), educational structures and cultural organisations is a decisive factor of success of any policies in the field. In particular, co-operation is desirable when developing the following instruments:

a) governments and educational institutions

1.   information-based instruments: training opportunities databases, online training resources, etc.

b) educational institutions and cultural organisations

2.   establishing "platforms for knowledge updating"   peer groups/networks serving as information exchange and knowledge sharing forum;

3.   designing longer internship schemes as well as other forms of practice-based training, alternative to formal academic studies leading to a degree;

c) public authorities, educational institutions and cultural organisations

1.   tailor-made training sessions;

2.   initiating/participation in transnationally designed training projects, funded by international sources, such as European Union programmes, European Cultural Foundation, Visegrad Fund, and Central European Inititiative.

To sum up, it is worth stressing that the issue of education and training both ON policy and management of the public sector, and FOR policy and management is getting more and more attention. This is the case of the countries that have long tradition of education in these areas (such as USA, Canada or Great Britain), but also the countries that not so long ago recognised the need for development in this field. Some very good practices are being developed in the CEE region, but they are still more like "exceptions that prove the rule", and the rule unfortunately is that there are no systemic solutions to the problem explored in this research. As long as the link between capacity building of the public cultural sector, the level and type of education received by its managerial staff and the availability of education and training options is not established and strengthened over years, the sustainable development of the sector remains just wishful thinking. The decision makers should take an advantage of the huge potential and exceptional commitment of people working in the arts and culture, and accept the responsibility for their professional development. Not only a broad inter-sectorial co-operation is needed on the ministries level, but also small and concrete steps on local levels, helping the field to fill in the most visible gaps.

The dilemma "artists or managers", which practically means "supporting artistic activities or management development" will obviously never be resolved, but it exists and contemporary policy makers cannot avoid engaging in the debate and taking decisions that will bring benefit to the cultural development of the society.

References:

[1] Lewis, J., Designing a cultural policy, Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society; Spring94, Vol. 24 Issue 1, p41.

[2] 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.

[3] Our Creative Diversity, Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development, UNESCO Publishing, 1996, p.245-246.

[4] Cliche, D., Culture, governance and regulation, [in:] Matarasso, F., (ed.) Recognising Culture. A series of briefing papers on culture and development, 2001, p. 21.

[5] ibidem, p. 22.

[6] Colebatch, H.K., Policy, University of Minnesota Press, 1998, p 6.

[7] ibidem, p. 42-54.

[8] ibidem, p.43.

[9] ibidem, p. 95.

[10] Pick, J., Anderton, M., Arts administration, E&FN Spon, London 1996.

[11] Our Creative Diversity, p. 246.

[12] www.artsjournal.com/artfulmanager/words/policy.php

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

[14] Pick, J., Anderton, M., op.cit.

[15] ISCO, International Standard Classification of Occupations, http://www.warwick.ac.uk/ier/isco

[16] Pick, J., Anderton, M., op.cit., p.1.

[17] Raelin, J., Let's not teach management as if it were a profession, Business Horizons, Mar/Apr 90, Vol. 33 issue 2, p.23.

[18] Whitley, R., On the nature of managerial tasks and skills: their distinguished characteristics and organization, Journal of Management Studies, May 89, Vol. 26, issue 3, p. 209.

[19] Boyne, G., Public and private management: what's the difference?, Journal of Management Studies, Jan 2002, Vol. 39, Issue 1, p.97.

[20] Martin, V., Developing managers in the 1990s public services: New requirements in public service management development, Total Quality Management, May 1998, Vol. 9, issue 2/3.

[21] ibidem.

[22] For one of possible typologies of training options in arts management, see: Dewey, P., Training Arts Administrators to Manage Systemic Change, Occasional Paper no 19, Arts Policy Program, Ohio State University, www.arts.ohio-state.edu/ArtEducation/APA

[23] www.policiesforculture.org

[24] 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.

25 Ellemeier, A., Cultural Entrepreneurialism: On the changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment, The International Journal of Cultural Policy, 2003 Vol. 9 (1), pp.3-16.

26 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).

27 Rothfield, Cultural *Policy* Studies??!! *Cultural* Policy Studies??!! Cultural Policy *Studies*??!! A Guide for Perplexed Humanists, Working Papers, Cultural Policy Centre, University of Chicago, April 1999.

28 Mercer, C., Cultural policy. Research and the governmental imperative, [in:] Boswell, D., Evans, J., Representing the Nation: a Reader. Histories, heritage and museums, Routledge 1999.

29 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

30 www.unesco.org

31 Our Creative Diversity, p. 253.

32 ibidem, p.245.

33 www.coe.int

34 www.culturalpolicies.net

35 Dragicevic-Sesic, M., The cultural policy in the post-totalitarian period in Eastern and Central Europe – between local and global; [in:] Innovative cultural policies, SUN Reader, Budapest 2000; 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&FN Spon.

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

37 Cultural Policy, 2001, Ministry of Culture of Czech Republic, www.mkcr.cz

38 ibidem.

39 www.culturalpolicies.net, Cultural policy of Hungary, prepared by Peter Inkei.

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

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

42 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

43 Concept of a More Effective Care for Movable Cultural Heritage in Czech Republic in 2003-2008 (Museum Management Development Concept), www.mkrc.cz

44 Jagellonian University (BA, MA, postgraduate diploma); postgraduate: Instytut Badan Literackich, Warsaw, http://www.ibl.waw.pl/index1.php?page=integra; Wyzsza Szkola Umiejetnosci Spolecznych,

www.wsus.poznan.pl/zim.php; Uniwersytet Slaski, Podyplomowe Studium Menedzera Kultury, Wyzsza Szkola Zarzadzania i Bankowosci, Poznan; SGH – Warsaw School of Economics, http://akson.sgh.waw.pl/podyplomowe/studia/Menedzerow-kultury.html;

Dolnoslaska Wyzsza Szkola Sluzb Publicznych ASESOR, www.asesor.pl/st_kul.html; Uniwersytet Warminsko-Mazurski, Olsztyn www.uwm.edu.pl/wzia/podyplomowe2.html#kult; Akademia Ekonomiczna Wroclaw, http://www.ae.wroc.pl/studia/podyplomowe/gn/kulrek.htm, School of Trade and Economics, Lodz www.wshe.lodz.pl/dla_kandydata/mgr_marketing.php;

Academy of Music, Cracow, www.amuz.krakow.pl; Academy of Music, Wroclaw; Warsaw University, http://www.wz.uw.edu.pl/studia/psm-dla_artystow/index.htm;

[45] Performing Arts Academy, Faculty of Music in Prague; Performing Arts Academy, Faculty of Theatre, Brno, www.jamu.cz/difa/divfak.htm; Bata University, Zlin.

[46] University of Pecs, www.pte.hu; Lajos Kossuth University, Debrecen, www.klte.hu; Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest, www.indi-go.elte.hu/kultman

[47] Pal, L. A., Beyond Policy Analysis. Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times, Nelson Thomson Learning, 2001.

[48] Mercer, C., op. cit., p. 394.

[49] Dragicevic-Sesic, M., Survey of Institutions providing training for cultural development personnel in Eastern Europe, Russian Federation, Caucasus, and Central Asia, [in] Training in Cultural Policy and Management. International Directory of Training Centres – Europe, Russian Federation, Caucasus, Central Asia.

[50] Pal, L.A., op.cit., p. 189.

APPENDIX 1

List of people consulted and interviewed within the IPF 2003 research project
Cultural Policy and Management Education in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland

Interview respondents:
cultural managers (practitioners)
cultural management educators (academic teachers and programme directors)
graduates of cultural management programmes
cultural management programmes teachers
Consultations:
cultural management programmes directors and teachers
international bodies representatives (UNESCO, European Cultural Foundation)
cultural networks representatives, NGOs representatives
local government officials

The Czech Republic
Hana Kabeleova, Project Coordinator, Multicultural Centre Prague
Eva Hallerova, Artistic Administrator, Czech Philharmonic Orchestra
Dr Alena Svobodova, Marketing and PR Manager, International Music Festival Prague Spring
Martin Pechanec, Head of Department, Prague Castle Administration
Dr Anna Janistinova, Director of Special Activities Department, National Gallery
Petr Nedoma, Director, Galerie Rudolfinum
Roman Belor, Director, International Music Festival Prague Spring, academic teacher of the Music Management course at the Prague Academy of Music
Eva Kesslova, freelance manager, graduate of the Music Management course at the Prague Academy of Music

Hungary
Dely Katalin, Financial Director, Katona Jozsef Szinhaz, Budapest
Mueller Peter, Director, Hungarian Theatre Museum and Institute, Budapest
Sillar Emoke, Deputy Director, Central European Cultural Institute, Budapest,
Zimanyi Zsofia, Managing Director, Budapest Festival Centre
Szabo Istvan, Hungarian Theatre Institute, academic teacher at the Cultural and Arts Management programme, ELTE University
Berczes Laszlo, Artistic Director, Barka Theatre, Budapest,
Magyarszeky Dora, Programme Manager, Budapest Festival Centre, graduate of the Cultural and Arts Management programme, ELTE University

Szabo Janos, Budapest Observatory, graduate of the Cultural Studies and Adult Education, Lajos Kossuth University Debrecen

Dr Szalay Andras, City Councillor, City of Veszprem

Dr Szabo Lajos, Associate Professor, Department of Management, University of Veszprem

Poland

Dr Anna Oberc, Director, Cracow Philharmonics

Dr Katarzyna Baranska, academic teacher at the Cultural Management programme, Jagiellonian University, Cracow

Dr Lukasz Gawel, academic teacher at the Cultural Management programme, Jagiellonian University, Cracow

Ewelina Swierad, graduate of the Cultural Management programme, Jagiellonian University, Cracow

Agnieszka Kozek, graduate of the Cultural Management programme, JU, Cracow

Stanislaw Krawczynski, Vice-rector of Cracow Academy of Music

- written answers to questionnaires were provided by over 100 Polish managers, including:

Agnieszka Morawinska, Director, Zacheta National Gallery, Warsaw,

Dariusz Jachimowicz, Director, National Creative Work Centre, Wigry

Krzysztof Czyzewski, Director, Osrodek Pogranicze, Sejny

Lidia Geringer d'Oedenberg, Director, Wratislavia Cantans Festival, Wroclaw

Anna Gawron, Deputy Director, International Cultural Centre, Cracow

- written answers were provided by 14 local and regional cultural departments directors

Other respondents and resource people

GiannaLia Cogliandro, Executive Director, European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres

Helena Drobna, Assistant Programme Specialist, Cultural Policies Department, UNESCO

Corina Suteu, President, ECUMEST

Isabelle Schwarz, Head of Advocacy Unit, European Cultural Foundation

members of the Working Group of the Culture-Capital-Creation – Training of Cultural Entrepreneurs.

APPENDIX 2

The following questionnaires were used throughout the research, to elicit opinions of managers (1), educators (2), and graduates (3). Attached list of skills was used in all cases.

Questionnaire 1

1. Information on the institution (type, size, number of employees), number of people with formal education in cultural management, preferences for employing people with cultural management diploma.
2. What is your opinion on the cultural management praxis in your country? Would you say that the cultural sector in your country is managed in a professional way? What is 'professional' in your opinion?
3. What are – in your opinion – the ways to increase professionalism in the management of the cultural sector?
4. Do you know any manager of a cultural institution, that holds a diploma (has a formal education) in cultural management? Do you know any institution / organisation in your country that provides this type of education or training?
5. If your started your career now, would you think of getting a degree in cultural management?
6. What would you advise someone who starts a professional career now, and wants to become a manager in the cultural sector? Would you recommend studying for a degree in cultural management?
7. How did you develop your professional knowledge? How did you learn? Any specialist courses? Learning by doing? What was your best learning experience?
8. To what extent particular knowledge and skills are important for your work? (the list of skills)
9. How would you describe your crucial function inside and outside of organisation? What is your role in those two dimensions?
10. Would you say that the cultural policy (both on national and local level) influences the way your perform your job? In what way?
11. Do you think that people in the positions like yours, should / could have any influence / responsibility towards cultural policy making? For example: agenda setting (identifying problems and setting them on political agenda) or policy formulation (what are the options, alternatives, etc.)

Questionnaire 2

1. Information on the type of programme, degree provided, short history.
2. How would you describe the main objective of the programme?
3. How would you describe the profile of a graduate?
4. What are the main methods / teaching methodology used within the programme?
5. Do you assure 'learning by doing' / the practical dimension within the programme?
6. List of skills / knowledge: what is their importance?
7. Which of them are best learned in the classroom?
8. Are there any skills on the list that cannot be learned in the classroom setting?
9. Do you keep any record of professional career development of your graduates?
10. How would you describe the main role of the graduates?
11. Do you think that cultural managers should have influence on cultural policy making? What are the skill needed? Do you think that your programme should prepare the students for that type of activity?

Questionnaire 3

1. Are you in a managerial position now?
2. Have you ever been in a managerial position?
3. Do you think your degree was relevant or decisive factor when you got your job?
4. What is your opinion on the importance of particular knowledge and skills (the list) in your work?
5. Which of those skills you acquired during your studies / in the classroom?
6. And which of them while doing your job?
7. What was your best learning experience?
8. Did your studies meet your expectations?
9. Do you think now that the studies prepared your well for your work? Did you think so, when you were leaving the school?
10. Have you ever taken any other forms of learning / training, apart from the university studies?

What is your opinion on the importance of particular skills and knowledge? Please, mark the appropriate column.

Type of knowledge / skill		This knowledge/skill I need				
		not at all	a bit	moderate	a lot	absolutely
1	Knowledge of many areas of culture					
2	Knowledge of one particular area of culture					
3	Team building / staff relationships building					
4	Leadership					
5	Financial management					
6	Knowledge of local political and social environment					
7	Budgeting					
8	Fundraising					
9	Marketing planning and implementation					
10	Knowledge of certain legal aspects (copyright, labour law)					
11	Setting up contacts/relationships in your sector					
12	Basic computer skills (text editing, email)					
13	Negotiations skills					
14	Staff motivation skills					
15	Knowledge of cultural sector in Europe					
16	Writing skills (offers, grant applications, reports)					
17	Oral communication skills (speaking in public)					
18	Foreign language					
19	Building relations with media					
20	Conflict resolving skills					
21	Organisational strategy building					
22	Manager's etiquette (standards of formal behaviour)					
23	Time management					
24	Knowledge of local cultural policy					
25	Knowledge of national cultural policy					
26	Decision making skills					
27	Task delegating					
28	Fundraising at the European funding programmes					
29	Creating new concepts, initiating projects					
30	Sponsorship relations					
	Other?................					