

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Proposals for Future Actions and Strategies

Plenary Session

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

The working groups have presented their work and they have had the opportunity to discuss their work and give perspectives of their future work. They have requested to allot a small amount of time to this closing session in order to present a summary of the debates and discussions they prepared after their presentations and what developed out of the sessions. In this session the task group on Curriculum asked to give a short presentation and I would like to ask them to go first. I hope that it will not be as extended as the sessions and we will continue after with a discussion.

Kees Doevendans, Eindhoven, the Netherlands

There will be a short presentation and only a few words from me as I was fortunate to chair the task group last year. What did we do during these meetings? We had the presentations; which were based on the results from the meeting in Antwerp and the results of the questionnaires. During the meeting there were discussion groups and workshops on curriculum, sometimes with a few members and once with almost the whole group. We made a summary of the discussions with the main topics that came up and based on this we made a plan for the future. This indicates that we would like to continue our activities as a group. I hope this will be possible and maybe there will be some new people that would like to join this group. I am very grateful for all of the contributions and the things that have been done, I would like to give the floor to Loughlin, our secretary who will present the summary of the discussions and our action points for the future.

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Good afternoon. I would like to report quickly on the work of the group on Curriculum and the workshops as well as present this afternoon, a perspective on the work of the meeting that has its origins in Hania. We have seen it developed in three phases since then with the support of the ENHSA network. The phases can be described as the agenda phase, which occurred in Antwerp, the investigative phase through the questionnaires distributed by ENHSA and the discussion phase here. What we present now is an outline of the discussion phase and some conclusions. Of these conclusions the central one is that we have unfinished business that requires, we believe, a further phase if much of the value of the work that has been done so far is not to be lost, but for the moment here is an outline of the discussion of this meeting. The contributions to the discussion were as normally the case, a mixture of reflections on the information generated by the questionnaires, some reactions to other people's reflections, accounts of related experiences and attempts to perhaps relate questions of curriculum to political and market pressures. We do not feel that we should document individual contributions in this report here now. Participants are aware that the sessions have been recorded and I am not sure whether there will be a transcript at some stage, but if they are you should be able to reconstruct the details of the various contributions from that. The principal themes that emerged in our discussion were the question of the bachelor level and what it means in terms of competences, the potential role of graduates in the industry, the general need to describe curriculum in terms of competences, the knowledge and the skills to be focused upon, the impact of the market on the approaches and priorities in education and training, the question as to whether there were commonalities of knowledge

and experience that had to be protected in the new educational space, the question of the role of practicing architects in schools, the relationship between practitioners and academics, the impact of the research driven agenda at master's level, the need to research the culture of architecture, the need to monitor developments in the bachelor/master relationship as experience accumulates, the need to report developments here and in Hania next year, the relationship between generalized architectural education and specific related domains such as urban design and landscape architecture. These need to be investigated and reported on. Now from these I suppose certain conclusions can be drawn from the exercise we have been through, bearing in mind that the purpose of the whole exercise is to develop a knowledge and understanding of a rich and complex tapestry in such a way that the task of the members of the meeting here in shaping their direction can be supported and they can find other people to support them also. We felt our purpose was to clarify not to simplify. There were two principle conclusions and from these conclusions we also put forward a number of actions that we see as necessary. These were put forward not because we want to make more work for ourselves, but in order to bring what has been done to a point to where it is really helpful. So, the first conclusion is that a further analysis of the questionnaires is necessary. In particular, it is necessary to cross-relate certain key categories of information. This became very apparent from the very first presentation of our group when Kees showed you the kind of information that was arising from the questionnaires. The second conclusion is that we, as a meeting of heads of schools, are not yet in a position to engage in fruitful discussions about the replacing of research in the architectural curriculum. Further developing the first conclusion might assist in resolving the second issue, so accordingly we wish to state a proposition regarding the work of the Curriculum group in the hope that the meeting will support it as we look forward to Hania, 2004. First we propose to generate a series of matrix sets that would relate various factors identified by the questionnaires: size of school, staff structure, program structure and specializations to name a few. We hope to present the results next year in a format that would facilitate deeper discussion based on common ground. Secondly, we propose action to help clarify ideas about research. For this purpose we would like to initiate a dialogue between existing networks of schools that have research collaboration as a key objective. At this time we have four examples in mind and there may be others that we will need to include in this, but the four that we know of are, the work of the Nordic Academy,

Architectonics, the French discussions and I am sure there are others. We would propose that the outcome of this dialogue would be focused on a presentation at Hania next year and hope that then there would be an opportunity to advance our understanding to a workshop discussion. Here we conclude for the present time; we believe if our common purpose in meeting here is to advance our understanding in order to help us shape education in a way that supports architecture in a changing world and that we have to continue to build on what we are learning and what is already done. We hope that EAEE and ENHSA will continue to support this agenda in the ways we put forward today.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I consider this as a proposal on behalf of the task group and I would like to open the discussion with this proposal and with any remarks, comments or other ideas that you could contribute to a better formulation of these issues raised by this working group.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Without sounding too glib I propose that we accept the proposal by the working group and give them the mandate to go forward.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

As all of you know the members of the group, not only on Curriculum but for each working group that we defined last year, made a request and put their names on a list. I would like to ask if there is anyone here for the first time who would like to add their names to the list or anyone who made the decision last year not to participate in those working groups to reconsider so that we can have an enrichment of this initiative.

Kees Doevendans, Eindhoven, the Netherlands

This is an invitation to those people who want to participate to email me and then we will see how these people can be of service and divide tasks among the members, as we have a lot of work to do. Please email me if you are interested in the work of the task group and, also, if you think you may have information that could be useful, such as information about networks of curriculum and research development. Please let us know.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Just as a point in connection with what Kees has just said and following on the invitation that I offered yesterday for people to communicate with me and with the council directly about any issue. If somebody feels they would like to join a working group under any of the headings we have dealt with they should make that known today before the session ends. You can always communicate later by email but we are here, now, and there is an opportunity to consolidate something and to give mandates for people to continue to develop the work to be done. If people really feel they would like to identify themselves to be involved in a working group, and, indeed, if someone is in a working group and would like to maybe work in a different group, there are no rules about this, we should allow people to do however they wish, but it is better if we do it before the business of the day closes.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I would also like to propose something practical. We could probably arrange for the working groups to have dinner together this evening in their groups considering that as a first step of this future collaboration that will develop during the year. If you don't agree, it is just a suggestion, not an obligation.

Christian Huetz, Regensburg, Germany

How about those people that do not belong to groups? What will happen to them?

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Nobody threw you out, okay. Not to create some kind of exclusion because we invited all the people who put their names on the lists.

Christian Huetz, Regensburg, Germany

Well, I was on the list but I do not know what happened!

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Could I perhaps make another point that we have just begun to discuss and explore in connection with next year and what we are going to do. Constantin Spiridonidis has very fortunately been able to tell us that there is a very strong possibility that the seventh meeting of the heads will take place in Hania next year because there are funds being made available by the efforts that Constantin Spiridonidis made on behalf of the organization. It's important that we might look at the way to develop and advance, and this year has been particularly successful because of the fact that the working groups prepared a lot of ground work beforehand, and the calibre of the discussion and the information presented was the result of a number of meetings with each group during the year. I think this has been hugely successful. One of the difficulties of course is that we could do the same thing next year and find we are in the same place. So, a suggestion that we have begun to explore and, again, I would welcome your comments is that we would identify a single area as being the central theme of next year's meeting. It doesn't mean that the working groups won't report, they will. But one of the areas of investigation should become the in-depth work of the next conference. If that were identified we could begin to prepare for that now. It is very difficult in what is a relatively short space of time to cover the full landscape of matters that we have been discussing over the last week. So, I ask, if you want to make suggestions about this, that the council will over the next number of months identify an in-depth session for next year on one particular aspect and, if we were to get that level of depth into the discussion, I think we could make some serious advances.

Stéphane Hanrot, Marseille, France

On that point perhaps we could ask ourselves if the next meeting is mainly an informative meeting on what has been seen throughout the different working groups or if we could prepare through the working groups some, not decisions but some key points on which the assembly could take a stand. I think this meeting was very interesting because of the information that was brought out and presented. I am not sure we would be able together to go into depth on any subject but it would perhaps be easier to discuss some proposals according to the problems we have seen at the moment and the ones to be discussed.

Dimitri Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Only a quick response to that. If we are to do in-depth work we should not just continue with the four groups. The four groups should finish the publishing job very quickly and publish only the information, nothing more than that, and then discuss in-depth about

the whole subject. If we go on and establish these groups as groups of action that would not be in-depth work. So my proposal for this is to conclude with this phase of the information and then start the in-depth discussion on what the future mission is of EAEE.

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Yes, I am conscious that it is always difficult to get information around quickly but it does strike me that if we are to move things on at our next meeting, in whatever format it takes, we need to accept the discipline of having papers circulated in advance and if you like, working backwards from that to establish a timetable for the work that is done.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I would like to add a few comments to that. We need first of all a conclusion from the working groups. In order to achieve better understanding and knowledge we need to raise more profound information about these issues that we developed and raised up until now. This work must be done, but on the other hand it is not possible to continue these meetings in the same manner. We have already covered these issues through debate and I have the feeling even this year that we discussed the same issues and arguments in the same way. We have to go one step forward with a more focused approach and thorough information that we collect and proceed that way. We have to find a combination or such as like what James is proposing more focused on something, like curriculum for example, and to use the other groups to support this discussion or anything else that we will decide together, but at the same time to generate more systematic, diffusible and coherent information about the state of the art of architectural education. I would like to repeat once again that we have to avoid directing ourselves towards statements and common decisions, in general, because it is evident in this room that there are so many views and we have to protect ourselves in order to remain open and to give this meeting the character and opportunity to be a free step for debate, dialogue and exchange of aspects from all the spectrum of different view points that someone can project into the European Schools of Architecture.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I might make one quick suggestion before Richard takes the microphone. We do need to try and deepen the discussion and I don't think we have any difficulty with agreeing that is a good principle. The trick is how to do it. One proposal that I would make to the meeting is that the working groups become enriched with new people that can help complete their work much in the way Dimitri has identified so that there is some base document from each of the working groups. Maybe the meeting of the working groups could be earlier, because last year we only got moving in March, so, could we possibly start before this and get some work done before the end of 2003? We could identify a single topic at the meeting of the working groups, the first one whenever that is, and then ask a number of people who hold opposing views about this topic to prepare position papers to make a very serious, harsh and deep debate and maybe reach a conclusion or agree we can't reach a conclusion. I was impressed this morning by some of the aspects that Marvin Malecha was telling us about American accreditation. There is a big difference, however, between the United States of America and the Europe in which

we live. We are in a multicultural, multilingual society and the type of rigor that is applied across the United States of America can't just be imported into the European situation. It's complex and maybe the model may be informative but it certainly can't be imported exactly, any more than American automobiles can comfortably travel between the narrow streets in some cities in Greece. We have to find a European model, which is going to be complex, difficult and protracted. I am suggesting we might begin to find a way in which the debate is advanced and Herman was right this morning when he said we mustn't re-invent the wheel every time. So some how we must find a new mechanism to push the advancement of one topic at least for next year, which would be an improvement and if that happened for five years we have then advanced the entire discussion. It's not as fast as we might like, but at least it is movement and in a direction.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

May I ask for clarification of this idea? It is probably possible to find one topic that would have a very particular view on these four subject areas that we are discussing, how we see curriculum, the profession or anything else the four working groups see through a very particular view point. That could be one focus that would legitimise the presence of the working groups that must contribute to that topic so there exists a kind of correlation between them. Do you have any proposals on that or is it just the structure that you propose?

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

If we could identify the topic early enough, as we know that the nature of architectural education means that the events that have been taking place in the individual working groups can't really be seen in total isolation, they do actually impact on each other. If one was identified as the focus, the work of the other working groups could be steered towards looking at that aspect of their work and then could be continued with another aspect the following year.

Juhani Katainen, Tampere, Finland

There is one critical aspect and, that is, if we lose the architecture directives, as is the case today, we should somehow seek ideas on how to replace the essential parts of the directives because we know that all of our agreements in the outside world are based on these principles and also the actions that have happened during the years from 1985 to this day. We are the only organization in Europe that could produce productive ideas on that evaluation and whatever it includes. I am not saying that we are making unified systems with pressure; this is a huge challenge, but if we can't answer to that nobody will answer on our behalf, so this is the most crucial point that should be studied.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Could I respond to that Juhani? As I mentioned yesterday, the Architects Directive, as you and I both know, as we have worked many years in this organization, is likely to be abandoned by Brussels. I also said in discussions yesterday that we should not jump into sudden decisions or to make statements until we are ready to make them. However, the

directive or at least the eleven points in the directive are hugely flexible. They are the basis on which most of our schools, or at least those schools in the European Union, are recognized and identified. There is no reason, in my opinion, that this group today in Hania next year, could decide to say that we, as a group, support the spirit and the points of the Architects Directive, no more, no less. All we are doing is reiterating and saying to Brussels, before you guys throw this thing into the dustbin, bear in mind that one hundred schools of architecture don't think you should.

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

That is a very straight forward suggestion and I would lend it my support. I am not sure that it is going to have any immediate effect but at least it might prepare the ground for a more intelligent substitution for the committee that is now in suspension.

Richard Foqué, Antwerp, Belgium

I also support it because we don't realize the possible lobbying power we could exercise with what we now commonly know as Brussels. The variety in all of Europe, the different cultures and opinions and so on, is at the same time a richness but also a weakness. A weakness because we still operate on very individual and different positions. Therefore I support what you were saying James in that we should at least, by these conferences every year, try to define a few common ideas and agree on them step by step as we mount up the hill and see if we have a common ground, then go further. I would really like to support your idea of going into depth on a specific topic and from that make a couple of statements that we could all support as a common ground to use as lobbying power on the political level.

Dimitri Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I did not understand one point, if we say that we do not accept the Directive we have made a statement. So the best thing to do this year is to say that we have made the Hania statement and it states that we have to achieve the requirements of these three documents, the Architects Directives, the UIA UNESCO Charter, and the UIA Recommendations. We have taken a stand on that and if we now liquidate this position, that is a position and if we take a stand without a discussion that is a very difficult thing to do. So the proposal is to say nothing. We have the Hania Statement, so let's reaffirm the Hania Statement because it takes a stand on three things. First this, second the framework and it says that the framework is not only Bologna but also many other things. So the second position does not pick out Bologna as the privileged framework of the Hania Statement. It makes these relevant with the rest, so this is also in it. The third is the four points. So my proposal is to reaffirm the Hania Statement.

Selahattin Önür, Ankara, Turkey

I think we have a very strong topic "Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education". We are not finished with that so why don't we keep it. There could be one or two topics to add to that, but I think it is the process that will project us into the future. It may be a

good point to have a coherent, kind of running major topic because everything that we are discussing is related to this, so it is also my proposal.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

So shaping is the topic?

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

In response to Dimitri Kotsakis's comment I sometimes think Dimitri Kotsakis should have been a lawyer, he sees through to the kernel of things immediately. He's absolutely right that we have already identified the Directive as being important in the original Hania Statement and, now, I would like to say that maybe we modify the proposal to say that this meeting, two years later, reaffirms this position and that can be a statement from this meeting. In the absence of action from Brussels, this meeting reaffirms its position on the Architects' Directive. That is my proposal.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

So James will refer to me later the renewal of this agreement and we will distribute it to the participants as soon as possible.

Patrick Labarque, Gent, Belgium

I am new to this conference and I don't know exactly the statement of two years ago or other statements, but when I read some of the statements I have the impression that they are a little too defensive. It would be good to reread them and decide if they are only defensive and whether they should be reformulated to become more prospective. For instance, this morning the idea of identity and diversity was mentioned, and it was said we should respect the diversity and also have a maximum of diversity if it suits quality. I think perhaps we have to reread the statements.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

I would suggest not changing the statement because if you change what you say every year you will lower the power of what was said. If something important is put forth then that statement should remain. I just heard the comment that we should reaffirm the statement, which in fact means that we still agree with it and I hope if we do change our minds in a year's time and if we want to launch into reaffirming, it has to be officially regulated. Maybe we are all happy and nobody knows it. The Hania Statement has been sent to all of the ministers and I asked all of the participants in their country to also divulge it.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

So would you like to define the way that we would declare this?

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I think the actual wording of it has to be carefully phrased and perhaps in a single sentence, that this group that we identify as the Hania Meeting of the Heads of Schools with one hundred and ten delegates, representing eighty five schools of architecture, reaffirm the Hania Statement of 2001 in which the Architects Directive has been recognized and that we ask Brussels to take note of this, no more, no less. It wasn't my intention at all in fact to try and bring any statement out of this meeting because my starting position yesterday was a position of exploration and that still stands. But I think that it is very valuable that there is this enormous consensus among us about the need not to throw away something of value that we possess. That does not prevent us from exploring, investigating, asking questions, carrying out debate and reaching conclusions. Even if those conclusions are different from what we currently believe we should not reject what we already have until there is something that is better to replace it.

Selahattin Önur, Ankara, Turkey

I have a short question. In Berlin there is the meeting of the Ministers and we have the position paper of the EAAE. I wonder if that is somehow going to be taken up in this meeting. There are many parties that are going to participate besides the ministers, so does that mean also that EAAE or anybody else could somehow be representing us?

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

Sorry I am taking the floor again . I was the President then and the idea of making the Hania Statement was, in fact, inspired by something that I had read in preparing how to learn about the European situation in architectural education. It was in one of the meetings of the Ministers that they really started to take into account the position papers because initially the Ministers had no position papers, and then some people started to react, so I said, "this is the moment for us to have a reaction". What happened after the Hania Statement is that I personally gave it to our Rector of the University who is on the board of the European Conference of Rectors preparing a paper (position and input) into the Ministers' conference. Of course I am not in Berlin so I gave it in written form and personally in speech. It has been sent to all Ministries in Europe and a few have acknowledged receipt.

The question is whether this can be followed up. I presume it can be followed up, yes.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I would like to add to what Herman said previously. The Hania Statement appeared in the official site of the Berlin meeting and that produced results because the key-note speaker that we invited to Hania that year was the same person responsible for the collection of the different positions on the Bologna process and after that someone confined the statement in the official site as a position statement. All of these documents produced on the processes have been directed towards the people who are decision makers. I am not sure if they have any influence but it is beyond our willingness. If there is anything else probably we can diffuse it the same way.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

Just another aspect of feedback, I know from the engineers that they envy us a little bit because they do not have such a position and I know from other colleagues that are involved in this kind of organization that they already know the position of the architects, so I know it went around and the position is well known.

Per Olav Fjeld, Oslo, Norway

For me it is important to realize or recognize that EAAE cannot necessarily make any school, or anyone of us better, and EAAE cannot save the schools either, but we do have the capacity to understand each other better. That is probably the strongest strength that we have. It means that we should continue to gather information that supports our common understanding of certain things. It is very important to realize that the diversity that came up during this meeting has matured since the previous meetings, which is probably our most common strength. It is not necessarily the commonality but the diversity in each of the schools together that makes this body very powerful. For me it is very clear that the position within this discussion is not based on finding all kinds of commonalities but to strengthen through the diversity of the schools in which there is another creative act within the discussion.

Pierre von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

Of course I still agree with the Hania Statement of two years ago but it would be a little weak leaving here with just restating what we said two years ago. This time we have the advantage, thanks to the ENSA project, that we are better prepared than before because there are the working groups, so the conclusion should be a little bit towards that and not just the restating of the Hania Statement.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Pierre, if I might just respond to that, I think you are absolutely right. If you were a cynical politician in Brussels you might very well take the view that the Hania Statement of 2001 was some kind of a hot headed response from a group of architects who happen to be taking in the sun in Crete. I believe that if we phrase this correctly, that as a result of two years of reflection, the establishment of sub networks among the schools of architecture, the meetings that developed the discussion around those subjects, that the level of thought and consideration has obliged us to restate the Hania Statement. We say not just that, but in the absence of action from Brussels, and in the context of these two years of very careful consideration, we are now telling you again guys; you haven't been listening to us. If this group will entrust the council with the phrasing of that document, because the way we write it in English can't be done at this meeting or in any other language for that matter, and give us the mandate, we will issue this statement within a week or two of this meeting. Can I ask for the mandate?

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, United Kingdom

Mr. President, I think it might help your statement to use the evidence that we gained in

our working group, which was to ask the schools if they agree with the fundamental requirements in the Architects Act 85. We now have the physical, electronic evidence that says yes, so it actually supports what we are doing as a group, and in the two years that investigation has confirmed it, so in fact it can be added into those words or statements you are going to make, because we can produce the evidence.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I think that would be very valuable. We shall definitely do that.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

It is rather interesting that Brussels is paying for the proceedings. I was going to propose that we have reached a point in this conference.....

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Maybe there were other working groups that would like to contribute, like the working group on Curriculum, so, sorry but I think that it is legitimate to give the opportunity to the other working groups to present what they have already prepared, so Lawrence with the working group of Curriculum, Denis Redford and Lawrence Johnston.

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

Like the previous group, what we were seeking was some understanding from our group, in other words from the larger group here, we took down a reasonable number of notes, we had a meeting, compared our understanding and we have prepared a mandate for the future. I am not too sure what the debate of the last half hour will produce in terms of amending or changing that, so I think the best thing is to ask Larry, who was our scribe, to perhaps repeat these and then we can perhaps take it from there because a lot of the debate we have just had does have a material effect on our proposals. I am a little 'betwixt' and in between at the moment so maybe we could take it from there.

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, United Kingdom

We haven't got the presentations in terms of laptop but we did make some bullet points very much along the lines of the previous working group. We realize that these groups were established last year and it was our wish that we be endorsed to continue with the work, and I hope that will be the case from the forum. Already we have been approached from a number of participants who would like to join the group. In particular, Hans Lindgren from Goteborg, Sweden, who is here, voiced his support of the work we are doing and as Dinos and the President have said, we would be very happy for additional volunteers to help us with this. A number of us met, not everybody in the group because Marina is not here, and Leen wasn't in the lunch discussion, and we proposed that we would again meet in early spring, March as James has said is maybe a little late, so we can agree on a date. Whether the entire working groups meet at one time is up to the organization, but particularly we as a small group of eight or nine could do that. Arising from the discussion after the presentation there are a number of items that we feel we could

continue to look at. There seems to be a lot of debate about internship, office experience and training and where it really sits in the relationship between academic and profession. That is one area that we could perhaps gain more information on or perhaps get some more guidance on. The whole concept of life long learning, which James touched on it in his introductory inaugural speech, is a subject that our group could assist in. In the British Isles it is known as continuing professional development and I suppose in every state there is a phrase or a term that describes it. That is one area that this group could particularly develop because of the link between academia and the profession. In some states it's mandatory, and if you want to continue to be a registered as member of the RIBA in the UK you must complete a period of CPD every year. I can tell you friends it is monitored, as I had to do a return last year and not only that but I had to tell them what I was going to do next year. In some states it is actually very, very forceful. Also what came out of the discussion and much of the debate of the three days is that if there is a database produced, I am not sure if it is with EAEE or whether it is going to be some other organization, but that it has to be kept up to date and has to be resourced in terms of funding and human resources. Someone has to continually input that data, and I am not sure, James, whether that is within your mission statement, but certainly that is where the value of these meetings, the networks, and the contacts we make is very formative. Related to that we would like each of you to nominate, volunteer, or press someone who would be the contact person for us in your institution or your school that we could liaise and network with. I am right Denis in saying that? Those are the points I make and is there anyone else in our group that would like to add to those that weren't in our lunch discussion?

Denis Radford, Leicester, United Kingdom

One of the major things is to have an up-to-date base because the problem seems to be that often the information goes out of date almost immediately after it is produced. We need to find in the technological basis that we have now, a way of keeping the information really up-to-date and accurate.

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, United Kingdom

Part of that database would be to ask schools if there is an organization, institution or polytechnic university that keeps their own internal database of the destination of graduates after they receive their diploma. The debate that we had within the group and within the forum was we cannot do that, it is too big of an organizational problem, but if each institution has one, then we could tap into that and perhaps have evidence as to what happens to an architectural student after five years or ten years. It was generally agreed that two years was too short, twelve, maybe fifteen years was too long, so a period of between five and ten years is appropriate and that again might inform our curriculum group and might inform our training.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Lawrence, thank you very much. One of the things I would like to endeavour to do during the coming year is to make sure that our database is up to date and some people have already identified this to me since I became president yesterday, that some of the

information contained on the EAAE database is no longer valid. Could I please ask anyone who wishes to have the database modified to email it to me directly and I will ensure that happens. Luis.

Luis Conceicao, Setubal, Portugal

I noticed in one slide shown yesterday that the number of schools and the number of architects in Portugal was information from 1998 or '95 and it is not up to date. I don't remember the numbers that were shown but I do know the actual numbers.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

We will endeavour to resolve any ambiguities. With any database there is a two-way flow and we in the EAAE must be accurate and diligent about recording the information we receive. Equally, if a school has a change of something, a person in charge, a different email address, or something of the sort they should tell us as quickly as possible. If those two things happen the database stays up to date, so we need to cooperate on this one.

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, United Kingdom

Thank-you my colleague. In fact Leen Van Duin who had undertaken that research work with his university and the Council of Europe produced that overhead, so it was recognized as just a snapshot that is maybe six years old.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I would like to invite one of the two other working groups to speak if there are any comments, remarks, conclusions, suggestions, proposals or views. Yes, Michéle.

Michéle Michel, Bordeaux, France

I would be interested to have some information about the specialized seminar you organized on the field of Construction and Studio Design because it could be related to our debate and to know more about the kind of information exchanged during this seminar and the conclusion on the way of teaching in these fields.

Richard Foqué, Antwerp, Belgium

I don't know if this is an answer but the proceedings of these meetings are being published, you can see what has been said there, word for word. Did I misunderstand you?

Michéle Michel, Bordeaux, France

It is the question we ask about curriculum because we are in a large debate and we are always on a general subject, but during this seminar some important things may be emphasized or clarified.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I think Michéle is right because it appears there is a kind of split between the activities of the sub-networks on the specialized networks and the debates that we have here and the type of discussion that we developed during the meeting of heads is a little bit different from the types of discussions that those working groups develop and produce. All of this effort is unique and it is linked and we discussed here some structural and organizational issues, and of course the academic ones that were discussed during these meetings are equally significant and correlated. I am not sure it will be easy to find ways to interpenetrate these two kinds of discussions, but the people who participated are here now so they can contribute through their experience something about this issue.

Richard Foqué, Antwerp, Belgium

As our team came up this morning with a very lively discussion on the matters of Quality Assurance and Quality Assessment I don't think it is useful to start again, it's still fresh in everyone's mind. As a conclusion I would say a lot of themes came up with a variety of very great and interesting opinions and we concluded that we should absolutely go on discussing these very important topics. We also learned that a lot of schools, and this came up in the questionnaire, do self-assessment and that certain kinds of evaluations are going on. I would like to suggest to the council also to give the working group a mandate and I really invite other people to join us to continue this work and to hopefully present some more evidence and results next year.

Pierre von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

Maybe one should not wait until next year and it would be interesting if you could produce a sort of position and proposal and circulate it. This is a thought we had and maybe you will only get a two percent response, but it is more interesting to read that than the questionnaires because at least you see something that comes after the questionnaire that is the production now. If you could send it sometime in November or before the end of the year and let's say something to the different representatives of the different schools and ask them to respond, how about that?

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Richard I think if you are prepared to do that, that would be very wonderful because we know Pierre Von Meiss' view of questionnaires.

Pierre von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

Was that a question to have some intermediate in-between, now, and the proceedings that will probably appear in the beginning of the next year?

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

The proceedings will appear by the beginning of the year. We have a constraint to submit to the Socrates Program the report with all the work that we have produced. I think it is

the 30th of January, something like that. So until that date we have to have all of this material produced, the proceedings, documents and reports, etc. etc. The appearance of the proceedings could be useful for the working groups because they will reread or be reminded of the discussions and the debates that we had here. It would be rational to have the first meeting of the working groups just after the appearance of the proceedings. This is just one approach, but if we follow this logic, then the first meeting of the working groups can take place in February, which is not very different from being in March like last year and we recognize it was a little bit late since all the work arrived to be done during the summer. After saying that I feel that probably an earlier meeting would appear more reasonable and fruitful, say the end of November or the beginning of December. The working groups could probably make some suggestions during dinner today or by next week.

I just want to react to Pierre because he directed an invitation to me and of course I want to produce a couple of pages on this. But to be honest, it should be part of a global strategy within the total work of the organization, so I want to add that comment.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

As a member of that same group it was my intention, and that is why I circulated the list, to contact these people and ask them precise information about some of the issues we were discussing this morning and quickly further this collection of information.

Koenraad Van Cleempoel, Antwerp, Belgium

I think I can speak for the group on Mobility that we strongly support the idea of a database. As I heard in comments afterwards, people are really interested in the profile of each other's schools when we discuss mobility. It would be valuable if the database could be linked to the ENHSA or EAAE website and made available to everybody who visits the site. I don't know if that could be made operational in a short period of time.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

The database or the data?

Koenraad Van Cleempoel, Antwerp, Belgium

The data or the database.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

There is a very delicate issue and maybe it is not the moment to discuss it, but the question is whether we will present the data or not because the questionnaires arrived with some kind of information and what we presented was intentionally screened, and instead of names of schools we had numbers in order to avoid any kind of value judgements that someone could make or use. We considered that for many reasons we had to make the presentation this way, with the names of the schools replaced with numbers, because the information is sort of confidential up to a point that the schools sent to the working

groups and in order to make public this statement we have to have your permission. Of course it is an issue that we probably don't have to decide on right away, but it is an issue.

Pierre von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

Yes but the School which receives wants to know where it stands. At least you can give them their number.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Yes, that will be a possibility, yes, or the school can recognize his number because he has the data.

Marko Savic, Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro

Actually I would call this database 'net boxes'. All of us will return tomorrow to our schools and the result of this conference that is everyone will have gained ideas and share some information with their staff. In the development of the website of the EAAE it will be useful to make these 'net boxes' as links to the websites of the faculties of the schools. It will be part of the work of each school to make links especially formalized for exchange of ideas in the meaning of our work here and it will be very useful for those working groups to collect ideas and information from other schools than the ones they have in these small groups.

Pierre von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

I would advise you not to publish at all at this point the statistics you showed the first day. If they fall into the hands of politicians they could produce architects much cheaper than we do. So I think it is dangerous as they are not correct, not because of any of the work that you did, but because of misunderstanding of the people who responded to the questions. We have already seen sitting together here that there is a lot of misunderstanding. I still say the only way to get the right answers to the questionnaire is to send somebody to spend a day in each school and help the schools to fill them out.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I will just respond briefly to that Pierre, I heard the comment you made on the first day, and it is valid from a technical point of view. It is very difficult to know precisely what any organization is doing when they are filling out a questionnaire and even if you send somebody into a school and they sit down opposite of the head of the school at the table, you don't even know if he is going to tell you the truth. However, the point about this gathering of information is not the individual pieces but the trend. We can say that 30% of the schools have some difficulty about the ERASMUS or Socrates programs and they look for additional information from their students. That's valuable, it's not precise, it may not be a 'Swiss watch' but it's serious information, it's an 'Irish computer'. Well maybe for the next two years the best thing you guys are going to have is an 'Irish

computer' and maybe after that a 'Swiss watch', we are working up to it. I am personally saving up to buy a Swiss watch.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

On the other hand the elementary knowledge of statistics says there is no objective data but there is approximate data up to a point. It is not right to say that the data is not correct. We know very well about the quality of this information and it's not a question about correctness but that the statistical approach has its own characteristics.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I am conscience about the time. We have reached the point where we have discussed a great deal of things over a number of days. The level of discussion, the level of the information presented and the quality of what has happened at this conference has been exceptional. I personally am going away with a very positive outlook about what is going to happen over the next twelve months. I know that Constantin Spiridonidis may need to rap up technically and thank various people because there are many, many people to be thanked on an occasion like this. For my part I would like to first of all thank all of you, the participants, because this is what has made the thing work and function and to thank the working groups who during the year came here and presented the fruit of their efforts and directly stemming from that the amazing work of both Constantin Spiridonidis and Maria Voyatzaki who almost single handily allowed EAAE the possibility of this wonderful support from Brussels through ENHSA to allow these working groups to take place and to lift the level of what this conference is about. The Centre for Mediterranean Architecture has provided us again with this most wonderful place, and I thank them enormously and all of the people who contributed to every aspect of the running of this event. There are so many people behind the scenes; I don't even know where to begin. Only Constantin Spiridonidis and Maria Voyatzaki know the real story of what goes on here, but we as a group are eternally grateful for what they have done. I feel that we have arrived at a point of what I might call the beginning of maturity. There is a seriousness about our work and despite the heat of the debate that has occurred from time to time, there is an enormous unanimity of direction, because at the bottom of each of our hearts there is only one thing we are concerned about and that is the quality of architectural education, the philosophy behind it and how we can deliver it to our students and to the people in Europe generally. I hope that the next year will be equally productive, if not more so, than the one that has just gone by. I thank Herman Neuckermans, past president and the members of council and the 'chargée de mission' on the council or in the EAAE who have brought us to the point where we are now. The last point I would make to finally finish, our doors and our minds are open. Thank you.