

Chapter 1

Opening of the Fifth Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture

From the debates in the past Meetings of Heads it became apparent that the perspective of the creation of a common European Area for Higher Education reveals four basic and strongly linked questions to which schools of architecture are invited to respond and with their responses to structure their political choices: The structure and the contents of the curriculum, the mobility and the exchanges, the evaluation of the academic programme and the relation of architectural studies with the profession. The Fifth Meeting of Heads will discuss these questions again but in separate sessions this time, aiming at recording systematically the trends and dynamics which have been formed to date, opening up the discussion on what is possible to be done or what should not be done in the light of the creation of a Common European Area in Architectural Education. These questions constitute the broader context, which is seeking for more specific issues that will organize and lead the discussion and the actions to be taken in the near future.

EAAE Hania Meeting: Past and Future

The Heads' Meeting in the Framework of the ENHSA Project

Constantin SPIRIDONIDIS
Thessaloniki, Greece, EAAE-ENHSA Project Coordinator

Dear colleagues and friends I would like to welcome you again in the Fifth Meeting of Heads of European Schools of Architecture. I am delighted to report that this year we have many more participants than the other years, we are about 110 participants, representing a big number of schools of almost all European countries. So, this is always a sign, which encourages us to continue this effort and to proceed, and try to organize this event better and better.

This year as I told you yesterday, the event is framed by a kind of new condition, which is its introduction to the Socrates Thematic Network Program and it is partially financed by the European Commission. I would like to start this presentation by explaining to you what this project is about, how it's started and which kind of new conditions and frameworks it creates in this Meeting. I would like to start from the history of those Meetings. As most of you remember because there are people, who are in Hania for the fifth time, we started those meetings as a kind of investigation of the possibility to establish a dialogue between the Heads of Schools of Architecture. The question at the time was: Can these people speak with one another? Do they have common issues, common questions and is this dialogue fruitful to them? The experience shows that there is a ground for discussion and debate and the proof is that most participants come again and again to this meeting considering that they have to gain from it.

After the Heads Meeting in 2000 with Herman Neuckermans we decided that it would be probably a good idea to make an application to the European Union in order to get funding from the Programs related to Education. With Maria Voyatzaki from Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, we started to work on this proposal. We had to adapt ourselves to the constraints of the Socrates Thematic Network Program that is to say to submit a proposal for a complex project with articulated actions and objectives.

So, we submitted the application inviting as partners the participating schools in the 3rd Meeting of Heads from the twenty nine eligible European Countries, according to the regulations of the Socrates Program. Since it was necessary to have at least one school from each eligible Country, we had to invite in addition some more Institutions which were not present in that Meeting, like the schools of Architecture of Malta and Budapest. The EAAE, initiator of this effort, presented in this application as one of its partners. The European Commission agreed with this proposal and the European Network of Heads of School of Architecture approved as a project, which has as main objective to support the participating schools in their effort to be adapted, involved or incorporated in the new European Area for Higher Education that European policies try to develop in Europe.

The development of this project and the incorporation of the Heads Meeting as well as of a part of EAAE academic activities in its framework, raise a practical, operational,

political and moral problem, that of the unintended discrimination between the members of the EAAE especially for those members who belong to the non eligible countries. All of us are frustrated about that. The EAAE, as a global European Association of Schools of Architecture will undertake all the necessary initiatives and measures to eradicate this difficulty.

I would like to make a short presentation of the project in order to give you an idea of what it is about. My ambition of this introduction, which I consider necessary and I apologize that I steal a part of the time of the discussion, is that after this presentation there will be no questions or ambiguities as to what this project is about and what we have to do in its framework. As I told you previously, the main objective of this project is to offer a support to schools of Architecture in Europe in the process of their integration into the new common European Higher Education Area. The main question in the structuring of the Project was how someone could establish a number of activities which will create information, generate knowledge, select and elaborate data and bring them in this Meeting in order to enrich the horizon of knowledge of the persons who have the responsibility of the management of academic issues in a school. The main expectation is that through this information, those persons will have a better decision making process. The project is structured around four parallel axes or actions.

The first action is this event. We put this action as one of the first main actions of the project. Every year we will have a meeting of people, who have the responsibility of the decision making of the academic issues in the school or their representatives and this meeting will be the management and the coordination of the activities of the project.

The second action will be the creation of a website, which will become the channel of communication. You can reach it in the address www.enhsa.org. but I would like to show you now what we have prepared.

The third action is the thematic sub-networks. That was an idea of Herman Neuckermans' to create sub networks of specialized teaching areas. When we prepared this project it was just after his new presidency and we agreed with him to incorporate this idea in the application. We started in this proposal with four thematic areas, four sub networks: a) the construction b) the history and theory c) the urban design and d) architectural design. The idea of the sub- networks in this project was that the Heads of Schools of Architecture coordinate and introduce activities, which are mainly oriented towards the teachers of these specific areas in order to discuss and to develop innovative teaching approaches on this particular subject area. What we expected from that as an output to have a kind of description or registration or categorization maybe of different approaches of the teaching of those subject areas. We tried to move on that. Herman Neuckermans, organized a workshop on the theory and history sub network related to the conservation of historical monuments. Maria Voyatzaki, organized in Greece, in Thessaloniki, a similar workshop on the construction, of the teaching of construction in Schools of Architecture. Similar efforts have been done in the architectural and urban design sub-networks. We are discussing about the possibility to develop something on the research in architecture education depending on the funding that we will have for next year that will probably create a fifth sub network.

The fourth action is the research. The idea of this action was the following: We have the sub networks, which generate information about the teaching process, we have the Heads' Meeting, which is based on discussion and exchange on the management of

academic issues and these are the two big pillars of this project. There are two other actions: the one is the website, which gives information about both of them and the research is the mechanism, which collects information and diffuses it to these two pillars. At the same time, these two pillars pose questions to the mechanism of research, which is collecting this information and disseminates this information in order to make it useful. We have already diffused three questionnaires on the contents of which we will have the possibility to discuss during the Meeting.

This is in a few words the ENHSA project. I hope that now it is more clear for all the participants the framework and the context of the Meeting.

So, since the time is running, I would like to close my presentation reminding those who were here at last meeting, informing those who are coming for the first time or who were not in the last meeting that in the fourth meeting we finished our debates with a statement. That was a debate that started four years ago. It was a permanent debate on issues relating to architectural education. After four years discussion, communication, exchange and investigation of tendencies, conflicts, different views, we managed to produce a statement which had a number of political decisions in it.

The one was that we cannot understand the title of the architect after a period of studies shorter than five years.

The second political decision was that we have to protect our freedom in order to have the possibility to manage our curricula in a way of three and two, four one or without splitting them and having five years diploma.

We had a third point that the ECTS is something which will permit us to have a better communication on the ways that we teach and we evaluate our teaching activities which is not the same and we have to work on that.

Lastly we agreed that we have to work on the evaluation processes in a way that we will organize ourselves, our own ways of evaluating as a peer review and self-evaluation processes and not under a governmental and professional body accreditation which is something out of us and probably beyond us. That was a framework that was created in the previous years and it closed a circle of four years debate.

What we need now is to work on that. This Meeting must be a Meeting which will define a process. A process which will permit us in the future to have better collaboration and more useful conditions of exchange of information and experiences. This statement is our common ground of discussion and on this basis we will try to develop initiatives and processes in order to proceed on the issues that we have already stated in this statement. Our expectation from the Meeting is to have at the end of it clear axes on which we will proceed in the future. We propose to think this way on the basis of some working groups that we will create between us and those working groups will undertake to elaborate information and data raised by the discussions and our debates.

I would like to thank you for your attention and to ask if there are any questions from the participants.

Harun Batirbaygil, Istanbul, Turkey

First of all, thank you for the presentation. I'm here for the second time with my deputy Dean. We are enjoying our experiences here, it's been a year we have not contributed

much to the idea of EAAE and learning about the experience of ENHSA we immediately wanted to contribute and be active in the venture, should I say, in the project. But you have been very hospitable to us here in Hania and all the people of EAAE have been very hospitable to us also. We enjoyed it very much I must state this. Now as I see in your presentation here I see that your hospitality is not reflected in the map, in your map because Turkey is not in slices. It's a whole country which should be reflected on your map. If you have an idea we will be very happy so, Turkey is not Istanbul or Attalia. Apart from that if I missed something please say so, but we have been appointed as the last to be member of the European Union, and signed the Bologna Declaration, one of the last who signed at last. I think we have the obligations in full so, I think not as a country but as a full member we will ask to be in this let's say project, if possible.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I would like to say that you are right. We understand very well the problem and I already mentioned it previously. But it's not something which depends on us. It's not our choice to have this condition between us. This project is running in the framework of Socrates Thematic Network Project which has as condition to accept as partners Institutions coming from the so-called eligible countries. Turkey, Switzerland, Russia, Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, Croatia, Serbia, Albania or Bosnia, even if they have schools members of our Association, they do not belong to the eligible countries so their school officially cannot become partners of the project. But, of course those schools can be associate members, or collaborators. The EAAE, in its effort to keep all European Schools together, took all the necessary preconditions to organize here a Meeting with participants from all the European Countries without any kind of exclusion. The way we organized this event proves that nothing changed since last year on the conditions of our communication and exchange. Now concerning the map in the site, we will correct it. We will do our best in order to avoid any suspicious misunderstandings.

Dimitris Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

In fact, this was a point I wanted to make and I'm sorry that I come second. I had to be first. My point was and I'm glad that we laughed at the mistake but I'll not stay to the laughter. I will ask why we do such mistakes as cutting Turkey into two pieces and taking the European piece into the map and leaving the eastern piece out. This is not just the mistake; we must wonder why we let ourselves into this kind of mistakes. That was hard of me. I don't mean that there are any intentions and this is why I was glad that we laughed. Laughing means that there was no intention behind it, that we all immediately recognize that it was a mistake and I'm doing some sort of political psychoanalysis now saying why we did that mistake. So, that's the first point I wanted to make and I wanted to have made it first and not second.

The second point is that we are sliding without understanding how we are doing this. Through this I thought in the beginning it was a sponsorship that we are getting somehow the companies out but we are sliding into from sponsorship to become a political framework. I mean the point was not to get the companies out and take the governments in. The point was to find a better way of communicating and structuring all this otherwise. We must state precisely and not let ourselves that we are changing from a European

Network in the full sense and that is why the first point was very important. For the full sense covers Russia, Turkey and so on has to slide from this full sense to the European Union. A web site that has the name, no matter whether we put Turkey back together or we let it as it is. The names, the website and everything is a way of sliding. Maybe it is simple only may be we give very good explanations which are accepted very kindly. I would also say by the members of this meeting. Good explanations kindly accepted. Nevertheless there is a Network which is not sponsored but which is in the frame of the European Union, it has a web site, it has names in it and everything so, my first strong comment in this Meeting is to be very careful about symbols because symbols mean something more. And they mean something more because we slide through symbols to things and we hide things even if our intentions are not that. I know very well that our intentions are not of this kind because I know the people but that's not enough, intentions are not enough. So, that was my point.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Ok, I think that we will have plenty of time to discuss all the points. Of course, it's better to have proposals than to have points so, hopefully, we will translate the points to proposals and we will see what kind of measures and initiatives someone could take in the existing environment of conditions, constraints and possibilities.

Towards a Common European Higher Architectural Education Area:

Introduction to the themes and issues for discussion

Richard FOQUE

Antwerp, Belgium, Meeting's programme coordinator

Dear friends good-morning. I think in Greek time it is still morning. Dear colleagues, Constantin Spiridonidis asked me to participate in the preparation of this Meeting and asked me to give you a short introduction and I hope to keep up with time. Constantin Spiridonidis already gave the introduction and the starting points, the Hania statement 2001 we put together, we agreed a text last year with four main points. I resumed them again the five years of study as a minimum 300 ECTS credits. I think Constantin Spiridonidis did not mention that we agreed last year that a Bachelor can not give access to the profession of architecture. That EAAE supports the ECTS system as a key to mobility, exchange of mobility and flexibility and that we will participate in the process of quality assessment and accreditation. Constantin Spiridonidis also added that we made a distinction between the academic assessment and the one exercised by the professional practice. I think this is the starting point and maybe some of you know already, but I think it's important to say, that our statement is very important as it is selected among the main documents the so-called opinion papers, which will be used for the bilingual session of 2003 of the Ministries of Education. It's among the selected papers so, I think it proves that our organization comes to, maybe modestly, but comes to maybe influence decision makers on a European level. It indicates that EAAE, and of course this Meeting particularly, will be not only a local or a sort of Meeting of friends but maybe as we discussed it can also exercise the function of the working group.

We developed the Hania Meeting of this year round four sessions in fact in four items which came out of the Hania statement 2001. First item is the question of, or the necessity or not of building or discussing a European curriculum for architectural education. There are already some comments on that in your program and I believe that the Chairs of the several sessions will work on those comments. It is clear that

Chania Statement 2001

1. Five years of study or 300 ECTS
2. Bachelor cannot give access to profession
3. EAAE supports ECTS system as key to mobility, exchange, inclusivity & flexibility
4. EAAE will participate in the process of quality assessment and accreditation

Political Dimension of Chania Statement

- The Chania Statement 2001 is among main documents for the Berlin Summit of 2003 of European Ministers of Education
- 2. EAAE can exercise influence on decision making



we have to make choices that will take into account the richness in fact we have in Europe, the diversity of schools and the diversity also in approaching architectural education. It's a question and I think personally it's important to keep that and to build on that, rather than go for a sort of ideal curriculum, unified curriculum.

A second item is devoted to the problems of exchange of mobility, of collaboration between the schools. It is a topic we raised several times already during these meetings but as Constantin Spiridonidis said I think we have to get into more details and of course, all those four points are related to each other and are interconnected.

A third item and I don't think we can deny it, is maybe the most difficult or the most tricky one as I already experienced in the previous meetings but we cannot deny that our education to architecture is leading to a degree which gives access to profession of the architect, or what we call legally protected profession. It's usually one of the main entrance qualifications we have to have to enter the profession and of course the profession in some countries asks extras to enter it. So, I don't think we can avoid discussing this, this relationship between education and profession and I'm very glad to say that over the last year there was a research going on between our School and the Queen's School of Belfast. It was sponsored by the architectural education board of U.K. and I'm very pleased to say that in that session our colleague from Belfast Lawrence Johnston will elaborate and will present the results of this research.

A fourth item is the quality assurance and the academic assessments. We must point out that in our Hania Statement what is important, in my opinion, is that the EAAE should play a role in that actually. We agreed about that last year that we should proceed and commit ourselves to work on quality assurance, academic assessment all around Europe and try to establish some level of quality for schools.

These are four key-issues we should discuss and as Constantin Spiridonidis already pointed out, the idea we had is that this meeting should try to get as many opinions, statements and ideas around these four points and then establish working groups that could work during in the coming year trying to deepen the aspects of all these four points. We hope that it could be the input for the next Heads' Meeting for 2003, I would say in Hania Meeting I don't know if it would still be in Hania, but anyway there will be I hope a sixth Meeting. It is very clear, I think, that this is a quite extensive and ambitious task. It's a challenge to do this and it's obvious that we cannot complete it all in this three-day meeting. Especially I think the results may

shape architectural education in Europe for the next decade. So, it's quite a work. Therefore it is important that we elaborate on how we see this conference, I mean the nature of the conference. Over the last years our conference was maybe much more structured in a way that we had introductions, lectures, key-note speakers etc. It was much more typical in a form of a typical conference.

We see this Meeting rather in an open atmosphere; I call it an open Meeting, which would allow in fact as much time on discussion as possible. So, you may have seen already in the program that the several sessions are introduced, we asked a few people to do an introduction, it would be short introductions, it's time there will be a possibility after a short introduction to have an open debate session and then it will be followed by workshops. We will split as we did in the last years in two groups and the idea is that during these workshops we could produce ideas, confrontation of meanings, generate ideas, opinions, propositions etc. It's an open conference and also the program in fact is open to changes so, if there are initiatives or if there are ideas please tell us and we will try to cope with it and introduce it to the program. I think this is clear; this depicts the nature of the conference.

As I said there will be four main sessions and a concluding session at the end of each session done by Chairs of the respective sessions and two parallel workshops for each session. So, to describe more or less the workshops, I think it's important that we all know each other and have quality discussion but it is also important at the end of the day to have conclusions which we can go home and work with. So, I think that the output of the conference could be on two levels. First, we should firmly agree on the four key-issues. I think we already did but maybe we can confirm that they can be the corner stones for the creation of a common European, our education area in architecture. Second, we should be able to try and define the 'issue statement' of the respective working groups Constantin Spiridonidis was speaking about. I think that means that we are the right, the correct crowd to do that and we have not only a creative power here as a whole but also we are a formal institutional power, which is important if you really try to go somewhere if you would like to reshape architectural education within the European context. (Slide 5)

To structure the workshops a bit, I think that the workshops should prepare the agenda for the working groups and I put six points. It was an idea, I discussed it with Constantin Spiridonidis but maybe you can add or you can skip points. First it's important that for the working groups there should be a starting point for next year; that we state the context

Character of the Conference

- ▢ Open meeting
- ▢ Stimulate discussion
- ▢ Confrontation of opinions
- ▢ Generate ideas, opinions & propositions

Output of the Conference

- ▢ Agreement on the 4 key-issues as cornerstones for the creation of a Common Higher Education Space in Architecture
 - 1.1 European Curriculum
 - 1.2 Mobility & Exchange
 - 1.3 Education & Profession
 - 1.4 Quality Assurance & Academic Assessment
- ▢ Defining the Mission Statements of respective working groups

Organisation & Structure of the Conference

- ≡ 4 main sessions & 1 concluding session
- 2. Each session is introduced by a chairman & highlighted by an invited speaker followed by plenary discussion
- 3. Two parallel workshops for each session

Task of the Workshops

Each workshop prepares the agenda for the working group by addressing:

- ≡ State the context regarding the subject
- ≡ Define the problem area to be covered
- ≡ Formulate questions to be answered
- ≡ Propose methodology
- ≡ Establish Mission Statement
- ≡ Suggest candidates for collaboration

Reports of each workshop are presented at the concluding session

regarding the respective subjects. Second, that we'll try to define the problem area to be covered as precise or as open as possible; that we'll try to formulate questions to be answered within the respective subjects; that we'll propose maybe a methodology, a way of strategy to work around and come to us as a conclusion, establish initial statements.

This is all about the working groups, this is what should be done next year and we hope to get a report on that for the next conference. The last point, maybe the most important one, is to appear candidates to take part in the work, in the respective working groups for next year. The idea is that at the closing session we will try to present maybe not the conclusions but the work, which has been done in the workshops so, we may ask and I think there is already in the conference pack a note for the workshop coordinators to produce by the end of the workshop maybe a piece, one or two pages that we can use for the concluding session. As you can see it's an ambitious task.

What is at stake is architectural education, the form it will take and the content that will have for the next decades; Bologna a sort of start process, which you like it or not, is going its way and I think we have to open it. It was yesterday at the excellent introduction by Professor Fatouros or as he said "Who cares?" and we should care. Indeed we cannot leave these issues about architectural education to politicians and administrative staff as we heard yesterday. Professor Fatouros was likely placed to say "who cares, who of those guys cares about it"? We have to take a public responsibility and use the available means to put our ideas. EAAE has already stated that we should play a key-role in this process and our president did not deny this, everyone agrees on this Statement and of course it can only be done if the organization, if the EAAE as organization is fed, is fueled by all of this, by all of you. We altogether in our schools, are important decision makers so, we should use this. It's good to see you so many and also to see a lot of new faces, it's remarkable, it means that this Meeting is considered to be not only a pleasant Meeting and a nice environment but also an important Meeting.

I would conclude to say let us use the magic of the place of the city of Hania but also of this restored building, beautifully restored building. Let us use the energy of the moment here, to be here together for three days to take a next step into the development and the propagation of architectural education. I wish you a fruitful, enjoyable but certainly helpful, creative conference. Thank you.