

Chapter 2

Shaping the Relations between the European Higher Architectural Education Area and the Professional Bodies

In the 2002 Hania debate, it became clear that the funds for education are progressively cut, a phenomenon that pushes schools to seek funding from, and therefore become dependent on, external bodies which may threaten their academic freedom. Moreover, the relationship of schools with professional bodies degenerates to a relationship of control and interference of the profession in school curricula, which may threaten their academic liberty.

It was agreed that schools have to preserve their close links with the professional bodies in order to follow the tendencies of the profession, while however protecting and maintaining their academic nature and freedom.

It is crucial to find out ways to redefine the grounds of this relationship at European level, and the initiatives that have to be taken in order to ensure the conditions for the successful generation of the European Higher Education Area.

Introduction to the Session

Panel

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, United Kingdom

Leen Van Duin, Delft, the Netherlands

Chair

Michèle Tilmont, Lyon, France

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Michèle Tilmont, Lyon, France

As Chairwoman of this session, along with Denis Radford, we will open this new session with the report from the working group in Antwerp about "Profession and Education". I would like to first of all thank Richard Foqué, the Dean, who welcomed us in Antwerp for two days last March and opened the door for us to discuss this main issue and wish to also thank the members of the group, Denis Radford from Leicester, U.K., Lawrence Johnston from Belfast, U.K., Heiner Krumlinder from Bohum, Germany, Sylvain De Bleeckere from Diepenbeek, Belgium, Bal_zs Balogh from Budapest, Marina Roosebeeck, from Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and Leen Van Duin from Delft, the Netherlands, for their hard and work. My special thanks go to Leen Van Duin and Lawrence Johnson who were in charge of setting up the questionnaires, examining the results and reviewing all of the answers from the thirty-four schools of architecture. We express our thanks to those schools that took time to complete this form and returned it back to Lawrence and also extend our thanks to Lawrence for all of his work.

I would like to take the opportunity to make some preliminary remarks. First, I do believe that professional education is a very important question for the future as life long learning is an issue to deal with. Secondly, there were large variations in answering the questionnaire due to specific national situations, and there is no need to enter into an extended dialogue with the profession on the subject of having to act more closely. These ethnic differences are reflected in the different positions on internship, which is also a large problem, ranging from the stance that internship is not needed to the position that more internship should be required as a prerequisite to practise architecture. From my point of view, education should not be too close but not too far from professional contacts. Now I will ask Denis to delve more closely into this subject.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Our group met in Antwerp along with the other groups and I think it was very interesting because this group of volunteers was diverse, and it was the first time we had ever met and worked together. The notion at that stage was to start to hammer out the route forward. It was quite interesting that after perhaps half a day of discussion, we realised we had to begin to define what the terms meant, we needed a sort of "common currency". I think that was Lawrence Johnston's suggestion, which was a very healthy one and out of that evolved the questionnaire. Perhaps, in hindsight, we realise that all the questionnaires could perhaps have been put together. There was a fair amount of overlap but that's inevitable when you have new groups working and the groups were beginning to work on what seemed to be separate, but in fact, are a series of interlinked problems. Discussions at lunchtime very interestingly let us note how quickly the factual base has changed. Around the table we began to realise that some of the facts that Lawrence is going to present to you today, are already beginning to change. This led us to discuss that the motion we needed was more dynamic and fast moving or should we say a fast input base, upon which these records could be kept, because obviously if your information is out-of-date you find yourself in a very difficult position, especially with the architectural profession changing and the various bodies who are involved in this. I unfortunately missed this afternoon's workshop but I believe that this notion of a database is something that is surfacing and something that I think we are all very interested in, participating in, and working out. It should be theoretically possible to have this, the technology is there and maybe we need as a group to find the money for that. Anyway, Lawrence will take

us forward and present the final or the interim report. I think we are going to move on from this and then various members of the group will give us their input. So with that I will hand you over to Lawrence.

EAAE – ENHSA Inquiry on Architecture Profession and Education – Working group

Summary of findings from the questionnaire received

Lawrence J G JOHNSTON, Co-ordinator of Working Group on Professional Education

Heading - Responses

UIA Definitions

Generally a majority of respondents agreed with the definitions overall. Some disquiet about the restrictive nature of the wording and the scope.

Fundamental Requirements

Again there was general agreement that the fundamental requirements were a good guide. However it has become clear, since the date of introduction that the social, economic, professional and ecological/environment aspects of the context of architectural education has changed. In some places this change has been rapid and almost imposed e.g. Information Technology. In some sectors the change has evolved due to economic or social pressure, e.g.; entrepreneurial skills and management led procurement. In some sectors it is climate and environment awareness e.g. Sustainability.

Codes of Ethics and Conduct

General agreement on these. Disagreement contrasted from "two loose", "too restrictive", "not enforced".

Registrations, Licensing, Certification

Overall general agreement. Major differences between those states that have legislation in respect of architecture and those that do not.

Forms of Practice

Overall agreement in the majority. Observations and disagreements including "too restrictive", "out of date". These reflect the changes in our professional scope of services as mentioned under Fundamental Requirements. Several returns highlighted the concern of "legal entity" and what that meant in a particular state, e.g. Legal registration is a weak barrier towards free market forces". Also noted was an observation that the presence of many very small, often individual practices were small forces, politically and economically against larger professional companies, e.g. engineers.

Practice of Architecture

Majority agreement across returns with the disagreement including: too restrictive, out

of date with the diversity of activities that architects engage in e.g. web design, fashion and information technology.

Scope of Practice

General agreement, with points noted as before.

Practical Training Experience

This sub topic provided a wide range of responses.

Internship

Initially the question was on definition, later in this working group further questions were posed, as to whether or not it existed, how it existed and did it have any place in the overall scenario of architectural education and training.

Several disagreements were strongly made on the need. Majority agreed, several wanted more time for training.

Accreditation Validation and Overall majority agreement with the definition. Several Authority/Body Undertaking these disagreements with the principle of it. Good range of authority/bodies undertaking this including: Professional body, State body, Independent Quality Assurance Agencies, Panels of Experts, Academic Internal Institutions. One return indicated the % balance across six bodies including national and regional representations on Accreditation bodies.

This next section of this inquiry covers the topic of the profession, the requirements needed to pass a gateway to permit the practice of architectural services and to establish what processes are undertaken by each state in terms of control, licenses, limitations.

Voluntary Professional Body

This was an important question to ask. Why, because it asked if the body to which architects joined was voluntary or not. The majority of responses indicated that each state with some minor expectations has a body. Where there exists legal or state legislation the body may be managed by the authority. In many states there is more than one body. So the picture we get from this is; Professional body yes, often State/National body yes, and very frequently regional or local body.

Gateway to Profession of Architects

Generally for this topic all of the responses agreed with academic evidence, examinations etc. Method and means of assessment is part of another working group.

Internship

The subject of practical training/internship was rather more mixed. The responses can be grouped as follows:

- a. No internship required at all. The academic qualification or academic award is

sufficient for full ability to practice.

- b. Periods of internship built into the curriculum as part of the academic and professional content of the award. Periods range from six weeks to six months.
- c. Periods of internship undertaken midway through the academic study and after completion of studies, often as an examination requirement. This formed the greatest majority of responses.
- d. Observation from many responses that more internship should be required and in several instances a prerequisite to professional life as an architect. Several states are in a process of implementing this.
- e. Observations that employment difficulties would mean in some states, that students of architecture may not be able to find a suitable practice for such employment and if those students were not interested in the practice of architecture mainstream then they could go into other areas of activity, e.g. fashion, information technology, interior design.

Entry Examination to Permit Practice

This question highlighted the variations which exist across states, the responses can be grouped into three.

- a. No further examination required and to introduce one would be interference on the freedom of architects.
- b. Yes, examinations in one form or another do exist and they are managed/controlled by a wide range of bodies, including one or more of these: academic, professional body, state legislative body, national body, and regional body.
- c. Recognition that entry examinations are needed and assessment combined with practice experience and evaluation are required to be put in place to maintain high standards of professional services and quality provision.

Permission to Practice

The responses to these questions were very clear. They subdivided into categories

- a. There exists no state legislation on architecture. There is no restriction on the practice of architecture and no licenses, controls required. This was a small number of returns.
- b. There exists state legislation and there is some form of control, but may not include a physical action, such as stamping or licensing for each project.
- c. State legislation exists, projects and architects services are licensed/stamped to prove evidence that the architect has the ability and quality to provide for that project. Authorities undertaking this included Professional body, Chamber of Architects and a particular state and/or Regional state Authority, or combination.
- d. In some responses there exists a separation between licenses to the architect controlled by state and certificate to the project controlled by local authorities.

Practice Services, Scope, Limitations

The question in this area were an attempt to find out if the previous definitions the UIA definitions were still relevant on the scope of architectural practices. To see if states had

placed limitations on architect's services and to find out if it was a free market with architects having to compete for work with non architects delivering architecture services.

Responses fell into three groups:

- a. Free market, anyone can practice architecture – this was a small number of states. Under certain floor areas, architects not required, again a small number of responses.
- b. Architects deliver architectural services with no limitations on size, complexity, etc, use complementary professionals, e.g. engineers, landscape, and interior design all part of the character and culture of architecture design.
- c. Architects can deliver services but with existing limitations for experience or quality or enhancements. Sub areas included in the majority urbanists, urban projects and conservation projects. Often special certificates were needed in addition to the architects mainstream qualification.

Education and Professional Relationships

This section of the questionnaire addressed the education providers, the professional bodies, the state legislative authorities and finishes with a factual request in respect of the Bologna agreement on course structures, having asked about autonomy of provision.

This part of the inquiry produced the most variation and probably the range might have been expected but still surprising. Some responses declined to answer this at all.

- a. In respect of no relationship between education providers and any professional body, 15% said this was the case and comments went on to say that in several states they did not wish to have any relationship.
- d. For a close relationship, 21% indicated they had this and comments ranged from very valuable, hoped it would continue as long as it was fruitful and healthy, close interrelationships which was beneficial to both parties, and the University should be allowed to be a laboratory and ahead of the profession.
- c. For several responses, this question proved to be too black and which, there emerged the grey areas. These included some dialogues between providers and professional bodies/state authorities and some tensions over the process and procedures of Accreditation for the course and education/training providers.

Control of Provision

The overall majority of responses 71% said that they had autonomy of control of the provision of architectural education, and in their respect of comments they all wished to retain that autonomy. Several suggested they wished to have more independence and freedom.

12% indicated they had partial autonomy or a range of autonomy in various sectors e.g. autonomy over delivery, but not of facilities or contents or equipment.

Dialogue Between Education Providers and Professional Body, Stage Body

Three responses indicated they wished to have no dialogue with professional body/state body, now or in the future.

better. Several had dialogue but did not wish to be interfered with. Many indicated that it was in existence and healthy.

Four responders said they partial dialogues with professional body and other authorities.

Office Ready

53% believed that practitioners wished to have architectural students office ready. 18% said no to this question. Two said it varied.

Bologna Accord Structure of Architecture Course

This was an attempt to find out what was up to date perspective on the Bologna Accord and may overlap with other working groups on the subject.

NOT INTRODUCED		11
ADOPTED		16
IN PLACE	YES	7
	NO	4

AWARDS

- The awards range included:
- Bachelor
 - Masters
 - Doctorate
 - Masters and Special
 - Subject With
 - Research Element

Shaping the Relations between the European Higher Architectural Education Area and the Professional Bodies

Discussion

Coordination by

Michèle Tilmont, Lyon, France

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

I think we can open the floor to discussion now.

Pierre von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

Having worked on several peer committees on evaluations, I must say one of the most confusing situations has to do with internship. There are schools where they even count internship as credits, which we would absolutely refuse in our school. There are schools where they do internship in weeks and others where it is at least twelve months of which at least six months are consecutively in the same office, which is completely different. We will probably have to wait ten or fifteen years until there will be any directives, so why doesn't, the EAAE make a recommendation which would make it easier for people who are working in the different countries to at least have an EAAE statement/confirmation saying that internship is not permitted to count as credits. Then of course some countries may ask for four months, another one twelve, but that is where we have to be clear on things like that. I don't think it will come from anywhere else so that's why I say this could be an EAAE recommendation along with other things as well. There are other things that could be added, your groups are now working on these things, and from that I would expect that maybe in a year from now we can have something that carries us a little bit further than just among ourselves.

Leen van Duin, Delft, the Netherlands

It is a good idea, if we can work it out, maybe in the future we can have a sort of Hania statement too.

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, United Kingdom

We now have that information and we can put it together from the responses of this inquiry.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Quite a significant thing came up at lunch time and Heiner, who was part of our group, could tell us of a development in his own part of the world.

Heiner Krumlinde, Bochum, Germany

I spoke about this theme in the working group before. Some weeks ago a letter came from our regional government saying we have 15% too many architects in our country. So the government said that because the building market is very low in Germany for new buildings, we have to cut the staff of our school by 15%. So that is the danger of politics if the schools of architecture are too close to practice. Unless our schools claim that we are not only doing practical training close to practice but we are also doing research and looking to the future by cooperating with other disciplines and other European states and schools, so in the future we will have a European community in education and research and so on, there will be no chance to keep alive even very small schools like ours. We have about 600 students in Bochum and this is a normal situation in Germany. There are many, maybe forty, fifty, sixty and some universities, but most students of architecture in Germany are educated in the smaller, regional schools, so there is always the fear of them being closed down. The problem is thought to be financial, politically speaking, however it is not proper or right because there is another movement in Germany saying we have to be more cultural in architecture. It's the year of culture in architecture and there are two different political directions, the regional and state politics. In regional politics there is a finance minister who decides how much money we receive but tells us that we are very autonomous with our school, so we get some funds but we have to decide what it is for, so that is the danger we have in Germany now. I am very hopeful that we will get a European recommendation from Hania and that we must be a European 'concert' of architectural schools with a network working together for the future of Europe.

Aart Oxenaar, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

I would like to react to the proposition of Leen van Duin to make an EAAE statement against awarding points for practice or at least for internship. I would like to move strongly against this motion and I will speak for six other schools in the Netherlands. We have been awarding points for practice, at least in our school, for almost a hundred years now with great success. Our school has recently been validated and accredited as a four-year, full time Master's Program. We award 120 ECTS points for academic training within the school and we give another 120 ECTS points for practical training. We have just defined competencies for what we expect students to do in external training. So from the point of view of education and as an educator, controlling it by the diploma you give out, you can define the competences that you expect your students to acquire before they become practising architects. The point is not to move against awarding credits for practice but to move for extending architectural training to include practice. There are many countries that already do that and Part III in England also demands a certain amount of practice before you can get formal registration. Belgium does the same thing and in Holland our state architect is now moving towards a system where you first have your academic training, you get a Master's Degree, and then there are two years of practice with defined competencies and slowly but surely moving towards some sort of an exam. The point is, we should not award points for internship or working practice and,

I would be strongly against any kind of EAAE statement for this, but we should say a Master's program is two years, with some period of practice then you will have, as Delft very clearly stated: "We do not train architects, we train engineers and Masters of Science who have a specialty in Architecture. If you want to be a professional architect, and to be active in the profession, you will need another two years to become one". That trajectory needs a curriculum, defined competencies, and may need some form of examination, Britain already has it, and may need points.

Another interesting point that we are starting to discuss in Holland, now; is that we may also need some money from the state. If there is a political move towards demanding from professional people that a Master's is not enough, further formalised practical training, and that the state has passed legislation to implement full time four-year Master's Program, irrespective of whether we agree or disagree with the decision, then we can approach the state and make some demands. We can claim that if the state is expecting from us, together with the profession, to come up with a 120 ECTS points and the profession will do most of the educating work, but we have to steer towards and accredit the points, then they will have to give us some money to do it. Again, my opinion is, let's not move against something, it's never a good idea to move against something. Let's move for something and let's move towards a stronger position for these two extra years that you need in order to get fully accredited as a practising architect, as a Master of Architecture rather than as a Master of Science in Architecture.

Pierre von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

You can continue the discussion later but first of all I am not suggesting to move against something, maybe you are suggesting it, but just be aware of one thing, if the program is 120 ECTS points per year, three years for a Bachelor's degree and a minimum 120 points and two years for the Master's degree, in these credits, the credits for practical experience should not be included. That's what I mean. These credits are academic credits, because German schools have out of the 120 credits, 60 credits, twice a year, 60 are in practical experience and they count as academic ECTS, which I don't agree with. The situation in Germany is now very difficult because, as we have just heard, the whole education system is still with the regional governments and every regional government gives slightly different directives, so the difficulty lies in the fact that there is no point of reference.

Aart Oxenaar, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Already in Bachelor's studies, schools that have to cut costs resort to including some internship which is cheap and easy to do. The point we should make and we all agree on is that 120 ECTS points is a Masters and you need two full years of academic in-school training to become an architect. Many formal bodies of architecture and many states agree that the architectural profession needs two years of practice to register, like doctors and lawyers, etc. and, maybe, we should as EAAE move in that direction and say that we support a more formalised accreditation or curriculum for those two years in practice, leaving untouched 120 ECTS points for in-school training. By moving ahead together towards those two years of practice being formalised or at least strongly advised by the EAAE we might help ourselves, and especially help our German colleagues, but, of course, stressing and we all agree that you cannot do without these 120 points.

Selahattin Önür, Ankara, Turkey

There is something else that needs to be credited and it is rated with the evaluation of ECTS credits. In the ECTS handbook it says that internship practices are included as points. Now this is a great problem because in our system we have six months of practice during the undergraduate program. When you are going to evaluate and give sixty credits for every academic year there is a problem if you give credits to the practical work because you get points which are higher than sixty. So this needs to be clarified because it is demanded that you include the practical work of internship, so these ECTS credits include all kinds of work that students are expected to fulfill.

Leen van Duin, Delft, the Netherlands

The EU says though that we require two years of practice.

Selahattin Önür, Ankara, Turkey

But that's something else, it's after you graduate, but what I am saying is if you have the practice during your education, which is the same as with us, we have.... (interruption)

Leen van Duin, Delft, the Netherlands

This is not the point.

Selahattin Önür, Ankara, Turkey

The thing I have omitted and intentionally not included in the ECTS points is the internship program and I am doubtful if this is correct because it states very clearly that we have to include all kinds of work load in evaluating the total ECTS credits. In evaluating the total ECTS credits this needs to be clearly stated. It is not rated with the internship that you do after graduation and this is a problem.

Pierre Von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

I think quite a good system is the British system because they have a year out after the Bachelor's program. Of course not every country will want to do the same thing but I am sure in Switzerland we will adopt this. We will not accept any Master's students without having approved the Bachelors degree and one year of internship.

Aart Oxenaar, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

There is one other possibility like we have been doing the past one hundred years and it's what's called the concurrency system. In our masters program students will not be enrolled unless they have a position in practice, so they have to work a minimum of twenty hours of practice, usually it is thirty-two so it is four days, and spend twenty hours a week in academic training. That way in this concurrent system there is also symbiosis between working and practice and in-school training. It's a part time program over four years.

You receive 120 points not in two years but in four because you are combining education and practice. The one is constantly influencing the other so there is a back and forth movement between practice and education and there is growth because the one compliments the other. From this we have also been able to define very precise competencies. We check on what the students do in practice and every year they make a portfolio of what they have been doing and we make sure there is enough development. Also, from that there can be reciprocity in the sense that we urge students to discuss, with the architects with whom they are working with, their progress and also request from these architects tasks in order to develop themselves within the office. This is another model apart from the year out or apart from first acquiring a master's and then having two years of practice afterwards.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

I just wanted to add to the discussion something that you, probably, will all remember; although we discuss architectural education, we have also been stressing, which is in the Hania Statement, the diversity and specifics of the different schools. What I hear in this discussion again is that all the schools have to behave in the same way. Be aware of the fact that a lot of schools are moving from the education of an architect to the education in architecture and I presume that the cases of broadening choices in the profession are those we are talking about. Some people are talking about this, and others are not. That is one good reason to have internship after academic training.

Secondly, I fear expressing the intensity of the contact with practice in terms of time, I prefer to have it in achievements. This is especially so because if you take two years I know what happens, (Juhani Katainen you should listen to this), practice is very reluctant to the abolishment of this kind of internship where our graduates after five years of study are paid as much as cleaners. Where is the competence?

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Have things past you by or do you still want to speak?

Stéphane Hanrot, Marseille, France

I just want to ask a question to the group regarding whether they have thought about the possibility, (perhaps a bit like Pierre Von Meiss said on the English system), for the student to have a practical period during the Bachelors cycle or just after. Not necessarily one year but enough to discover the way they will specialise during the Master's program, so this period is not for the accreditation to be a professional but it's a beneficial experience to understand the context of his next work or activity Have you thought about that?

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

I think the short answer is that we feel we are still exploring, and still as it were, finding out the range and the diversity that is available and trying to put that down in a meaningful way. So no, I think that is a short answer but Larry, Leen wants to add to that?

Leen Van Duin, Delft, the Netherlands

In the discussion Pierre was making I want to mention one extra problem and, I think the Greek people here raised it a couple of years ago. The Bologna system in the end can be for all of the universities in Europe a way to minimise the educational costs of our universities. This is especially important for the Master's courses because in Holland I think the Bachelor's courses are subsidised, but the Master courses in the future maybe have to be financed in another way. Our students at this moment in Holland doing their Masters are not full time students, they are already part-time, but they don't work in offices, they work in places like MacDonal'd's because they have to earn a living. They spend no more than twenty to thirty hours a week on their studies and 80% of the rest of the time at work to earn a living. This is a problem we have to address.

Theano Fotiou, Athens, Greece

Are fees paid for students for their master's course studies?

Leen Van Duin, Delft, the Netherlands

Yes, they are but that is not the problem, they have to live and rent accommodation, that's the problem.

Aart Oxenaar, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Already the point of what will happen to your student was raised, when he goes to work and I think here the Bachelor's degree is very important. The question is: What is the civil effect of your Bachelor's degree? What is somebody who has a Bachelor's in Architecture? In Holland, up to now, it has been a clear-cut position that in the collective contract of Dutch workers they are not interns when they come into the office. They get a form of what we call CRO income. It's a clear-cut position, our students have formal contracts with the offices they work in and they get paid the same as our colleagues because the civil effect of their Bachelors degree gives them the position of Draftsman Assistant Designer. So within this whole context it is very important that if you want to have your students do sensible work rather than work at MacDonal'd's, you should have a clear cut idea of what a Bachelor's degree is so you can discuss with the architectural firm that when our students go in as workers of a normal status, they should receive a fit wage. We never have financial problems with our students because they are given suitable wages. Another thing that is important when you talk about internships or dual trajectories of learning, which is very much in fashion now, where there are often three part-time contracts. It is a triangle: the school and the employer make a contract, the employer with the employee and, then the student and the school make a contract. We do not want that triangle because the school should not be in between a contract with an employer and an employee. We want to have a contract with our student where we demand things from him/her and he/she can demand things from us and the student has a contract with his/her employer. That way the employer can never say I am educating your student so I will pay him less. The Dutch government helps by saying that the VAT will decrease a little if you have somebody working in your office that is also studying. That way there is a small tax deduction but we do not want to get into the middle of that

because there is another danger which is and, you are very right in saying that interns will be abused by being paid a low income and can work for years with very low wages and not get ahead.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

I'd like to steer the discussion in another area at the moment and perhaps I could start with a sort of anecdotal emphasis. Many of you, or at least some of you might know that the University of Cambridge has decided not to offer professional education in architecture. They are now moving away from seeking recognition from the Registration Board and this might be a new beginning in Britain. You might begin to see research based institutions. Institutions that are particularly proud to have or wish to develop their research. Perhaps they are now finding that it is actually almost impossible to educate within a fairly restrictive or micro-managed environment in terms of the registration board and research is in its way so there seems to be that friction developing in Britain. One can imagine that the old Russell group of universities might go in the direction of not offering full professional education. Maybe people have some comments on other national perspectives about this situation. It could be particularly British or maybe it is a larger European one. Can I have any comments on this?

Dimitri Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

It is both a comment and a question. There are about fourteen professional profiles, fourteen that a university can work on. I'll just read them: Architectural Interior Design, Building Design, Urban Design, Town Planning, Conservation, Landscape Design, Industrial Design, Construction, Art & Fashion Technology, Academic Teaching, Research and Professional Writing. These are the professions and I find the discussion here incomplete because it does not deal with those professions the old schools of architecture were teaching the students. Maybe Cambridge is trying to cope with the problem in an academic way. In these six-year discussions some of us, not everybody of course, have put forth another concept that integrated studies will lead to the maximum of those professions, that is it cannot be the fourteen of them but certainly not only one or two of them for example, Interior Design, Landscape Architecture or Conservation, which is one out of fourteen. Maybe Cambridge, in an academic way, is trying to respond to that and maybe we can look for other responses to this.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Any response?

Koray Gökan, Istanbul, Turkey

I think all of the universities have been changing quite rapidly and professional education is coming into university education. All of the professions are suffering from this along with architecture and medicine. I think architects are more worried about our professional education, which is why we are discussing how we can educate architects. What we are assuming is that all of our graduates are going to build houses; this is not true anymore

in the 20th Century. What is going on now is that our graduates of schools of architecture are not going to be practitioners in it at all. In our country we are probably educating too many architects, but that is another issue. If you look at what is happening, certain groups are discussing architecture without building houses and that in my words is 'virtual' architecture. They are experimenting in a new area of studies and probably they are democratic or are right and in the end there will be an outcome that might be suited to the university education concept. I think, especially in our generation, professors of fifty and sixty years old, are stiff and that is a mistake we are making and we should start changing our minds and start thinking about educating the students with new concepts. One thing we are certain of is that architectural education is one of the best in higher education in the universities because we teach the students inter-dimension versions, how to make decisions and we teach and make them aware of quite a number of other things. So in terms of general education our architectural education is one of the best compared to the other disciplines. Probably we are in a dilemma in this aspect, but we should stop talking about professional education and consider more theoretical aspects. I call it virtual education, this is a bit difficult....

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Anybody likes to comment on that? It has perhaps occurred to me to take the group's work forward and look at where graduates go. In other words, are we educating the majority of our graduates for the profession? Or are we educating graduates for a number of professions, the fourteen that were brought up? Maybe that is something we also need to find out. I know it is commonly held in the United States that only half the students who graduate register as architects. So the rest never pursue architecture as a formal career.

Pierre Von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

I have one question; I don't know if it is to your group or if I have to ask one of the other groups, but Dimitri mentioned a lot of other professions that architecture may lead to. We are considering, but I don't know what the attitude is elsewhere in Europe, to introduce into the Master's program the idea of a major and a minor. You would have a major in Architecture and maybe a minor in Landscape Design or a major in Architecture and a minor in Structures and so on. In Zurich for example, they are going another way, and thinking about introducing directly a Master in Landscaping, a Master in Structures or so on. So far we feel it is better to keep the general title instead of being enclosed into individual degrees like Landscape. I don't know whether your group is working on kinds of options like that or other ones, but I think this could be discussed.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Any other comments people wish to make? I think what I might do is hand the microphone over to Lawrence Johnston who is scribbling very heavily here, he has been the scribe I think this evening. Oh, Michelle Tillmont has been the scribe. I was just wondering whether we could sum up, I have been nipping around with this microphone so maybe somebody who has been taking notes might give us a summary, I will just ask the group, do we feel

we have sufficient material to move on to the next stage? We assume it is a working group with an onward momentum and that we haven't just dusted off a report and that is it. Could I perhaps have some suggestions then?

Juhani Katainen, Tampere, Finland

On reading the title, if I've understood correctly, we should be talking about the educational area and its relationship to professional bodies, but more or less we have been talking about internship, which is naturally part of this relationship but what about the professional bodies? I have been working on the Architectural Council of Europe for a third year now, that is one professional body covering Europe. We know the past so the question is, what kind of relationships are we going to build for the future? We could also include in these bodies the business of registration in different countries. There are statistics on what is happening but couldn't we add a few words about our attitude towards the business of entering the profession and how we see today's professional bodies? Are they working as they should be or do we want to send other messages to them? So this is one issue, which is interesting from our view, because they are sending messages to us asking about architects, so what is our message to the professional bodies? We should also remember we are not only academicians but professionals as well, part professional and the other half is teacher, so this is also an issue. I don't know whether we have time to talk about it at the moment but it is something we should do some thinking about it and not only thinking but writing and speaking.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

As a rule, from an ethical point of view, I think academic education has to be independent from practice. It has to develop a relationship, but somehow it should not be so extreme as it was said in Delft, that they must not care about practice, but I think that education should not have too many professional constraints because our students will be somewhere in the next ten, twenty or thirty years and it is not for the professionals of today to say what is required as an academic education in the future. We are supposed to have the vision of the future and we can consult practice, but the issue of internship is maybe the most intricate place where this relationship appears. But also there should be some kind of independency in terms of the competencies that is not expressed in time but in achievements.

Leen Van Duin, Delft, the Netherlands

I think tomorrow morning James Horan is going to go into detail about the question of the relationship with EAAE, ACSA and the other professional organisations. So maybe we can continue this item tomorrow morning.

Theano Fotiou, Athens, Greece

I would like to add an idea or thought completely different from what we are talking about at the moment. We face the professional bodies as they have existed up until now but the professional bodies of the future don't have the same power any more in a united Europe as before because the free market is more powerful and now the

professional bodies are threatened by the orders and the "cannons" of the free market. The free market is imposing its rule on our schools, so the enemy or the problem nowadays is not the professional bodies. They are more recognised now, so we have to talk with them to understand each other better. Autonomy is not a problem; we can keep it if we want to in our schools. We have to discuss seriously about the profession and the future of the professor with the professional bodies since the professional bodies are being attacked because the free market doesn't need the professional bodies anymore because of the free unions that exist and the free relationships between individual architects. Europe is now trying to change the professional bodies to unions of professions. It's not that simple anymore and it is something new that we have to face.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

We have five minutes left.

Steven Spier, Glasgow, United Kingdom

It seems strange to me that we are still talking about architectural education as if it is an entity because the "3 Plus 2" seems to me to change all of that. The lesson of Cambridge is that it is the first school in Europe that has drawn the obvious conclusions which is that the Bachelor in Architecture and the Master in Architecture will increasingly become very different things from each other and not all schools will offer the master's program. This seems inevitable and maybe something that we could discuss at this meeting is what the Bachelor's and Master's programs look like look because that starts to address one of the issues about the diversity of the profession and what it has become. Also, we can't talk about architectural education as if it is one big lump any more because people will leave, and in Britain people do leave education after achieving their bachelor's and they go on to be very productive people, but they do not become architects.

Michèle Tilmont, Lyon, France

The last opinion about that because we have to close this session is maybe we should invest in a survey with the schools on data about what becomes of our students, in which profession they head towards and what they do five, maybe ten years after leaving their schools. In France we have very few indications of what our students are doing but I think it is very precious to have a kind of photographic image of what they actually do after they study. Maybe some school of information about that.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Ok, the last remarks.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

I think this is an interesting suggestion but we have to reflect on how to do this because for example, our university is not so small, there are 27,000 students. They make it a rule to check what students are doing the first and second year after graduation and we get an idea. In architecture, there has appeared this transition of internship and all the other

things we cannot do so much about. So in turn, if we decide to go into this kind of inquiry, you have to think about when to ask graduates to respond and not one or two years after, but maybe five or ten years.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

That was "five or ten years we should look at" for those at the back.