

Chapter 5

Proposals for Future Action and Strategies

This session attempts to synthesize the discussions and suggestions made in the previous days with the ambition to draw useful and constructive conclusions, as well as to generate a framework of agreements on the various themes, and to decide on ways forward.

Interventions of Session 5

Chair

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Chairman's Introduction

James HORAN

University College Dublin, School of Architecture, Dublin, Ireland

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We now deal with the final session, the closing session of this meeting. And I would hope that we could use this final opportunity to try and tie up some loose ends from the discussions that have taken place over the past few days, to identify what we would like to do in the context of the 8th meeting in Hania next year, what we need to do in the meantime during the course of the coming year in preparation for that and any other suggestions and ideas that people may have that they wish to present to the meeting before we finally start to go back to our respective schools and countries.

Before starting the discussions and talking about these issues, we are fortunate to have a representative, a co-ordinator of the Arts and Education Thematic Networks with us. Ms Truus Ophuysen from the Netherlands is here and I think she might like to say something to us today. She introduced herself yesterday, but as we have the benefit of another network co-ordinator I think that a small discussion around that will hopefully add to our body of knowledge and will hopefully add to the wisdom we need to apply in carrying out our own work. Could I invite you maybe to talk and we'll have a brief discussion when you have made your introduction. Thank you very much.

Thematic Network in Higher Arts education in Europe

Truus OPHUYSEN

Coordinator of the TN in Arts Education. Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Thank you very much for your kind introduction. When people say "she's Dutch, from the Netherlands", I tend to answer that I may be Dutch but that I'm here on behalf of a European organization, and that is the capacity in which I'm here, and in that respect at least I feel very European. Higher Arts education in Europe, the main associations in Higher Arts education, the Thematic Network in Higher Arts education in Europe - we are all in the same process and in the same situation as you are. We not only share a closeness, a proximity of disciplines, but we are also in the process of trying to get to know each other better, trying to work together, trying to define a European agenda. So that's the reason I'm here; there are connections between the arts and architecture, and we have seen today from the example of Trondheim these are sometimes very close. Having been present at your discussions yesterday and this morning, I would first of all like to say that, from an outsider's point of view, these are very important issues, especially those discussed this morning. I think it's extremely important for all disciplines, and not only for architects, to define their relationship with the profession and with world around them.

The rest of the remarks I would like to make all tend towards the same question: isn't it time that you, the architectural schools, and we, the schools in fine arts, in theater education or dance education or music education, tried to 'put our act together' and better define a European agenda? Neither yesterday nor this morning did anyone ask what we were going to do with this exchange of views that we are now engaged in and these differences (and maybe similarities) that we are all aware of. I think it's time that differences and similarities, but especially differences, were better mapped and better discussed, in a way not tending towards harmonization, or even towards tuning, but perhaps more towards a better understanding of differences, a better development, the emergence of a shared terminology.

This is basically what I want to say to you, that from my point of view it's time that we developed a shared terminology and, possibly, a shared but not necessarily identical view on the further development of our types of education in Europe. Within my organization the name given to this process is 'organized diversity'; so it's not about harmonization, it's not even about tuning or aligning, but it is about better understanding of, especially, the differences.

I cite the example of a broad international working group in fine arts education, a group as diverse as yours that managed, on the basis of the values and the characteristics of their field of education, to start from scratch and to map them out and develop them into competences. And if you start working on tuning I would advise you to take these learning outcomes or competences as starting points, as you have begun to do already, but take them on your own terms and based on what you find important and crucial in education in architecture. That's one point.

I said earlier that we should develop a European agenda, and there is more to that than working on learning outcomes. Again, I'm saying that you should do it but I would like

you to be aware of the process that we are all in. It is very difficult at this point to look too far ahead or to say what the process is exactly. Bologna is a very complicated process, and it's not all evil but it's not an innocent either, so we have to be aware and we have to beware of unknown consequences. There are a couple of things that I want to mention. I think you should think about whether or not to link this process in the future to quality – quality assurance, quality enhancement. In the European University Organization there is already a discussion about whether that organization should become the subject-specific quality assurance or accreditation network. In my own organization ELIA, too, there are those who say that we from the Arts should develop our own criteria and our own peer network for quality assurance before someone else does it for us. So, I think it would be good if you were to discuss this as well, with a view to what may happen in the future.

We are also working on setting up a register of experts both in the field of quality and also in other fields – for instance in research, in order to be able to find ways for external persons to be external examiners, or another way to make better use of the qualities and expertise that already exist within the organization. We are also thinking about setting up peer visits to support organizations and help them self-evaluate better, and also some other initiatives along the same lines.

In a European agenda you could also think about encouraging Master's programmes, and probably joint degrees in Master's programmes. These are being developed, but it's still difficult to define, with any precision, the criteria that must be met by Master's programmes. I would advise you to look into the Erasmus Mundus Programme, and see whether it would help you get such a programme off the ground. At the Bachelor's level, I know that the engineers have a Eurobachelor degree. For me, in fine arts or in theatre education, this is not really feasible; but it may be for you. That might be another line to develop, or not, that's up to you; but I do think – and I had a discussion about this over lunch – that you as an association have a certain responsibility to the sector, to your schools, to be prepared for whatever may happen and not to be a victim of the Bologna developments, to be proactive and to define what you want and what you do not want.

We have, as I said, two networks that work closely together. There is also a music education network, and there is some idea – and it is still only an idea, but we wanted to lay it before you – of organizing a joint conference, possibly in 2006, but the date would be decided after further discussion of course. A joint conference between these three networks in the arts: music, architecture and the general arts thematic network. One of the issues that could be on the agenda is this: Our networks have been requested by the European Commission to participate in a pilot-mapping of rare knowledge, traditions and innovations in our sectors, in order to see what can be done to support either traditional crafts or ways of doing something, or traditional institutions and how to link this with innovative strategies – this could be a possible subject. Since all three of us, music, architecture, arts, will be working on that, it might be a good subject for discussion, and there may be more that we could undertake jointly.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you very much. I think it is very beneficial to have the experience of what another network is dealing with and to get the perspective that they have, based on their

experiences and totally separate from what we have been discovering. I would say that we will actively consider the notion of an interaction between the two networks and a joint conference; I think that this is very much a possibility. I believe that in the council we will put this on our agenda to discuss in the coming months, and I think there are benefits to be gained; in fact, I would more or less set out as a general principle that there is always benefit to be gained by engaging with others in discussions. There is absolutely nothing to be gained by declining to discuss, so thank you very much for your contribution and hopefully we will be of mutual assistance to each other.

We now need to dwell, just for a moment, perhaps, on the outcome of the last few days' discussion. I would like to allow for discussion and comment from the floor about what has happened here over the last few days and the significance of the topics discussed, and I suppose more particularly the significance of issues like Bologna and the tuning process. And with that in mind, we might discuss a bit more thoroughly what we want to do between now and this time next year. There is no doubt that we will arrange another meeting, in Hania hopefully, as we have done for the past seven years. In the past few years, the preparation work that has taken place between the meetings has been of exceptional benefit.

Sometimes I wonder whether we shouldn't be trying to introduce at least one topic of hot controversy at some point in our meeting, if only to produce a more animated debate at a level that would yield, as in cooking, an outcome that is more than the sum of its parts. Because of the level of preparation in which we've engaged prior to these meetings, we very often arrive with a large amount of the discussion matter dealt with, at least in our minds; and while I'm not wishing to provoke a fight I would very much like to think that we might up the ante a little bit on one or more topics in the coming sessions. So before we begin to discuss next year, maybe I would just open the discussion to the floor.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

I'm not criticizing things, but I attended the previous session and I noticed that in the panel presentation everyone was invited to speak, for example, on access to the profession. This is something that I have described before, including in an article published in a newssheet. The reason I mention this is because I think it is very important that, before we go to the next meeting, we find a mechanism for going more thoroughly into what we have already done. You may remember that when I became President of this association I complained of the lack of cumulative knowledge, and I think this is what is happening here. Maybe it's because we don't have enough time to spend on that, and I'm not blaming anybody; but at the same time I think that it's one of the weaknesses of the process that although we come here with very good intentions, we still have not developed a mechanism for ensuring that we are better informed, in order to proceed and not to repeat.

Urs Hirschberg, Graz, Austria

In some ways what I'm going to say ties in with what Herman Neuckermans just said. This was my first time here, and I think it's just a wonderful event and I'm really grateful to have been able to attend, but I would have expected more in the way of questionnaires and printed material, in the sense that Herman just mentioned. Some general information should perhaps be given to everyone before we start, to get the context straight. For

example, everyone that comes up to speak before the panel should not have to give a profile of his own school before he can say anything. It would be wonderful if this body could prepare little fact sheets about all these schools, noting the number of students, the annual budget, the floor space the department has available, things that don't need to be raised here, but that serve to set a context within which one can discuss content. And similarly with curricula: this organization would provide a really great service to everyone if things like that could be collected and made available to all participants, so that we could all have a complete picture of the different curricula. I know this involves a lot of work, and again this is not a criticism, but I think it would improve discussions from here onwards if we had something like that available as a basis.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, I think that that is quite a valid and good suggestion. We already do have quite an amount of information about schools in the guide, which covers some of the information you're speaking about, but there may be other specific aspects that we haven't documented, and it might be worthwhile exploring what they are and how we can make that body of knowledge available. I know very well as a Head of School that there is nothing so good when you are having an argument with your own institution as being able to put out an example of somebody else who has succeeded in doing something that you are trying to persuade them to agree to.

Leen Van Duin, Delft, The Netherlands

You took the words right out of my mouth. I just wanted to tell you that we do have a guide with a lot of information about the schools connected with the EAAE, and I understood that everybody, every member school of the EAAE, received the guide a couple of weeks ago. So there is lots of information available. But I have the same quibble with regard to the General Assembly. I think it is insufficient if in the General Assembly you do everything without preparation. I think the schools need to be informed, at least two weeks beforehand, about the budget, the agenda and anything else that has to be decided; because we are not only a group of friends: we are a formal organization with statutes. And I think that in the same way we have to send more material around before we enter this room. Thank you

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, Leen, for that. For those of you who don't know, Leen has been responsible for the production of the guide, and when I mentioned yesterday the work he had done he wasn't here to receive the compliment on the work that he has put into this. I think the point he has made is very valid, and that perhaps we should be circulating more documentation in advance of the meetings.

Richard Foqué, Antwerp, Belgium

Yes, that's very true. But to come back to the point made by Herman and our colleague from Graz, I agree that we should be elaborating and building on what has gone before. As for what you said about having more provocative sessions, one well-known method of doing that is by preparing a position paper on certain selected topics and inviting

some of our colleagues to take the opposite position. This is a well-tried method, and I think it might enhance not only the level of animation but also of the level of the content of the discussion. This is something we might try at the next conference.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I think that we have already had some discussion over the past few days on the possibility of increasing the intensity of the debate around certain issues, and it's something that I think we will explore very firmly for the next session. I would like to think that we may have almost a double layer to the activities of a meeting like Hania, the first layer being the continuity of networks and the continuity of the discussions we've been having for the past number of years; but then in contrast to that there should be something highlighted which has got some real controversy built into it so that it becomes a platform for serious but hopefully constructive debate.

Christian Huetz, Regensburg, Germany

I was just thinking about the debate yesterday, and what an important subject it was – research in architecture, what it is, where it goes to; but I also think that we didn't have enough time, and anyway I rather thought that we were a little bit too tired. ..

Dimitri Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

There are three points and questions raised till now. The first is about Bologna process and the Hania statement where I would like to remind that we say "in the framework of the Magna Carta Universitatum, the Joint Declaration of the European Ministers, the Salamanca Convention of European Higher Education Institutions, the student declaration of Gothenburg...", In fact the framework is general, it is broad, it is not contained within the Process. And that statement was made in the heat of people being in the Process, and the statement is quite cool about the Process. Now that we know that there are many problems with it, this cooling off is even more important. So actually if we stick to the Hania declaration we are not within this Process but in a broader context.

My second point is related to this broader context, because the first thing words in this declaration are, "the Magna Carta Universitatum", which means University. Now, and this is very important, we are not included in this. In 2003 the universities in the European University Association gave a definition of a university which, if we accept it, will exclude many people in this room and will invalidate the Hania declaration. This is why this morning I did not use the word 'university', but said higher education instead. It would have been unfair, both to people in this room and to my ideas, if I had used the word 'university'. That is why I was careful not to do so. Now I will read you the definition of a university. As of May 2003 University means: an institution with full power to award doctorate degrees. And then there is an explanation: "the European higher education landscape has a maximum of one thousand institutions"; but in this definition Europe means only those who have signed the Bologna declaration. This is not the same as the European Union, to which this Association belongs, and which has 4,000 institutions. So whatever we say here, whether it is about freedom or about the unity of research and education, whether higher or lower, does not legally refer to universities, but to higher education in general. This is a very crucial point. Before 2003 it was not so crucial, because the definition had

not been formalized, but now it is very crucial. That's my second point.

My third point, which is about method, is that it would be disastrous to follow any predefined method – it makes no difference whether it is the tuning method or any other. It doesn't matter where you choose to start from: the method can be developed along with the subject. The starting point is not critical, but I think that we should not use a predefined method.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

This is the very type of topic I think that could usefully be explored in some considerable depth. And going back to the Hania declaration – the spirit of that declaration very clearly identified the right of any university, or indeed any higher education institution, to establish its own methodologies in how it engaged in the business of teaching or transferring knowledge. There is a very grave risk, and it has been identified by more than one person that the Bologna Accord and the subsequent structures, like the tuning programme being put in place, could be regarded as a type of academic straightjacket into which people were expected to fit. I believe this is an area on which position papers could very well be prepared and a serious discussion take place followed by a serious communication to the Educational Ministries of Europe about what this meeting feels. So this might be an example of a topic that we could put on the agenda for a future meeting.

Heiner Krumlinde, Bochum, Germany

I want to add something to what Urs and Christian said. I also believe in being realistic, and I should like to make a suggestion for the next meeting. Perhaps it might be possible to set one day aside for projects, realized projects, possibly networks or workshops or intensive programmes. Some schools may not know very much about these things, and may need help to prepare better for these meetings, to get to know the different possibilities, our suggestions, our definitions, and how these can be realized with help from Brussels. So maybe this could be a discussion point for the next working groups.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, Heiner, again I think it's a valuable suggestion. To some extent when you set out to come to Hania each year you think that the time is going to be forever, three or four days of discussions and meetings and dinners at night and conversations into the small hours of the morning; but it passes by very quickly, and inevitably you go away with the feeling that there were things you should have done, people you should have spoken to, conversations you should have initiated and possibly relationships you should have established.

There is no question about it that this meeting has been hugely successful over the years in building relationships, friendships and all sorts of alliances; but you are right, there are so many things we could do in the time available. I almost feel that there should be an obligation that everyone has to come two days in advance, spending those two days eating and drinking until they have almost forgotten what that's all about and then get down to some serious work. Sometimes it is a little difficult at 9:00 o'clock in the morning to focus your mind on what you want to say to people when in fact you were still talking to these same people at half past two that same morning. However, these suggestions

are being recorded and we will endeavor to work constructively to accommodate as many of these as we possibly can.

Per Olaf Fjeld, Oslo, Norway

Just some short remarks. This meeting takes on many tasks in a very short period of time, and there is a certain quality in that. Each one of us changes in some way over these few days. I think that everybody leaves here with something they didn't have before. So from the traditional facts to the social context and so on, there is a linear series of things that in fact each one of us brings with him. With regard to this meeting, if you have attended it for some period of time I think it becomes very clear – and this has been stated several times already – that the factual base for the discussions is essential. In other words, we have to have a base from which we can understand each other, and that is a matter of circulating information throughout the year. Then it's up to each one of us to read that information and to use it, but all the discussions should not be based on things that we have "done" before.

I think it's essential, especially given the title of this meeting, the Meeting of Heads, that the meeting continue to broaden its own facts. At each meeting you receive new facts, and they are worked upon throughout the year, and it is important that the question-sheet in some way continues; but the question-sheet is not the meeting in itself: it is just part of the continued work of broadening the facts. We can continue to discuss the Bologna agreement if that is what we want, although I don't know how much more there is to say about it in a general sense; and we can also continue to discuss things like research, and the profession in relation to education. But if we are going to continue that sort of discussion it has to be staged in a way that gives us something new to talk about. If we are going to continue discussing things that we are familiar with and that we know we will never agree on anyway, then we have to be more imaginative and creative in our preparation.

For me the most interesting aspect of this meeting, in which I felt that neither the answers nor the discussion were precise enough compared to other discussions, was the idea of the profile. I think that the idea of the profile, which outlines a school's position on certain things and then gives enough content so that we have some awareness of how general or how specific it is, is something that so far has actually been very little discussed, because we tend to focus on the type of programme the school has, its mix related to the content and the profile, and so on. This is an area that I think has not been fully enough covered. Thank you.

Pierre Von Meiss, Lausanne, Switzerland

I would like to support the profile idea that was just mentioned. One would have to work on how a profile can be defined, because it is not a matter of every school just telling its story. There has to be some sort of codified way to define this profile before the meeting. I'm absolutely convinced that there are far too many architectural schools in Europe; but since they exist, at least they should find a way to differentiate their profiles and not all try to be just the same as the one ahead of them. So I think that this is a good idea and an interesting topic for heads of school or their delegates.

The second thing I wanted to say is that I don't know how Constantin Spiridonidis proposes to use the material of these two or three days for the project. Because we are talking

about a project and with a project there should be fewer questions rather than a whole series, and those who intervene within these workshops on these questions have an obligation to stick to those questions and not talk about something else. I would really like to know what you expect to gain, for your project not for yourself, from these two days.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, Pierre. I'm going to ask Constantin to respond to that; but before he does, I would just say one thing about your comment. It raised an interesting question: are there too many schools of architecture in Europe? And on what basis should the number of schools in any area of Europe be decided? I am just tossing that out. We won't discuss it today, but it's something that we might like to think about.

Constantin, would you like to respond to Pierre?

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

I think that this question cannot have a direct answer. But I would just like to remind everybody that it is not my project, it is our project, and it is the kind of project that must be kept alive by collective effort. The idea behind the themes for this year was that the meeting and the project and the association must submit or produce tools for the schools of architecture. This is how the application defined the aims of the project from the very beginning, as a framework to facilitate the debate toward this Higher European Architectural Education Area. So the question was what kind of tools people could offer: that was the conception of the role of the project.

One of the tools was information: we tried to collect information and bring it here so as to diffuse it, or discuss it, or try to create the conditions for its codification through the publication of the proceedings, etc. The second effort that we made for this event and that was what was discussed in Antwerp and later in the council, was to be prepared to discuss curriculum if anyone wanted to do so. We have been talking in a non-codified and non-organized way throughout these past three, four, perhaps even five years, and every year we repeat the same arguments, the same information, the same presentations, often of the same schools.

The idea is that, instead of leaving the discussion about the curriculum open, we would use the terms 'learning outcomes' and 'competences' in order to define them again, but this time in a different way, so as to give all of us the possibility of expressing what we really mean when we state what we think the graduate profile should be like in terms of qualities. What does a school mean when it says that it "educates researchers"? Does this refer to what they want to give the graduates, or to the teaching processes? And what kind of professional abilities or competences do the programmes want to assure in order to promote the professional development of their graduates?

So the discussion was not supposed to be about the schools, or about research, or about the relationship between the programmes and the profession. That was the not the purpose. But what did we discuss? In the end what we discussed was the description of the schools, the role of research in architecture and the relationship between the programmes and the profession. So I cannot help feeling that there is a resistance on the part of the participants, and that even if there are other ways to re-structure the

event this resistance is so strong that in the end we remain stuck with the same type of discussion. I am ready to accept that it was a failure to organize the event in the way we did, and that this is why it happened, but I think it is not fair for us to assume the entire responsibility for this, because after all we did do our best by giving you the precise questions beforehand and trying to keep our discussion to something that could go a step further.

But to return to your question of whether it was useful, my answer would be that yes, it was useful, and I might even say very useful, because one thing that I noticed was that in the list of competences that we tried to elaborate, first in Antwerp after working with Loughlin and later in the council, no new competences appeared. Since nobody proposed a new competence, I would take that to mean that we covered more or less everything, and therefore we can consider it to be useful on the operational level.

What was also, useful, in my opinion, was that we opened the discussion of this subject. It is my understanding, and I'm sure it is the understanding of the council as well, since we already discussed it, that the notion of competences and learning outcomes is a useful tool. Even if it was suggested by the tuning project, which is a project prepared by academics and not by bureaucrats, after all, I think that it contains significant elements and I absolutely agree with those who pointed out that it should not be used as a prescription. But the notion of competences itself is something that is a useful starting point. As for the further development of the project, of course we have to redefine its future, but I don't feel that it has been a useless experience for the project as such.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I can see that there is an immediate response from the other thematic network, so maybe you might like to say something on that.

Truus Ophuysen, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

I just want to add that, although I missed the first meeting about profiles and the discussion on the idea of profiles, I think that in fact you are very close to putting something on paper, possibly in terms of different profiles or by grouping the schools under a number of profiles – two, four, six, maybe even twelve, although that might be a bit too many. But both in terms of research and in terms of the relationship with the profession I would say the material is there to put together such a document, which might be too simplistic, or might not cover everyone's sensibilities, or might need further refinement or development, but which would at least be saying something, would be taking a stance. Such a document, even if it did have to be further developed or refined, would at least be a starting point for discussion and a reference point for the future. And I think you are very, very close to putting it on paper.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you very much. It's interesting to note that an outsider's observation suggests that there is a sense of closeness in what we're doing or at least a sense of potential conclusion. However, I would feel that maybe there are two comments to be made here. Firstly, when we go back to our various schools and get into our day-to-day housekeeping business, it's very easy to quickly forget what happened here in Hania each year and the discussions

we've had, but I know that on many occasions I've had the recourse to take out the copy of the proceedings and read something just to remind myself about how I want to deal with a specific issue in my school and this is the real value of Hania. And if we were to produce, even in documentary form, profiles of architectural school types, I think that it would have to have a category called "other", in the same way as the list of competences did. The one thing we must not do is to produce a set of profiles that defines or attempts to define the character of schools of architecture in Europe for evermore. There have to be other ways to look at things.

Roger Liberloo, Limburg, Belgium

With regard to the organization of the meeting, if the participants in the question sessions had had more time, or there had been more time to prepare for these sessions, it would have been better. But also if you look at the schedule, there was one hour for eight speakers and they had three answers to give and five minutes to do it in, so there is something wrong with the organization of these sessions, too. So there is a dual problem here, I believe.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Yes, I think that Roger is right – there was indeed a problem. It happened because we were rather late in preparing the structure of these sessions, so we had to invite more than the ideal number of people to allow for the possibility that some would be unable to come, since it was summer and many people would be on vacation. This is how the first session ended up with eight participants instead of the optimum six. So I agree with you that it was a problem of organization.

Marvin Malecha, Raleigh, USA

I have both a true outsider's view and at the same time some kind of an insider view. Twenty-five years worth of experience with similar administrator's conferences in the United States have taught me that one of the problems we have is that there is a rotating group. Every year there is approximately 20% of the group that is brand new, which means that they bring other kinds of issues to the table. In the United States we deal with that by actually having a day prior to the administrator's conference which you participate in for new administrators to be brought up to speed with agendas, with dealing with faculty, with the business and the art of leadership. Because many times people in the room are just trying to catch up with the agenda and that really does influence the discussion and it explains why the same topic is covered over and over and over again. That's one thing.

Secondly, there are certain topics that are going to be annual dilemmas. Assessment, which we call accreditation in the United States, is actually dealt with annually in a separate meeting and the discussion there gets very heated sometimes over nuances. James and Richard witnessed an incredible battle over accreditation at that meeting last year. And then there is the topic of the meeting itself. This year the topic of the meeting is addressing change; how change is addressed within the architecture curriculum and what can be done. And while this is segmenting things a bit, at the same time it allows people to focus, and speakers can be brought to the table exactly for the specific topic.

Also, there is a dependence on the network, so that there is no longer a feeling that every school has to present its programme over and over again because that's been anticipated. You can go to the website or you can go to the ACSA guide, so there is not a re-representation of "this is how we do it at Texas, in Austin, or in North Carolina State University or at Berkeley". What the speakers are asked to do is to use their experience base to comment on the subject, which then really frees the discussion, because the information is dealt with in another way.

I suggest that what is happening here is that, after seven years, your meeting is now maturing to the point where you expect it to be more than just a presentation of how schools are doing things relative to a question, because you can deal with that in some other way. So that would be my observation from what was happening during the first couple of years to what people are now expecting. And I would venture to guess that three quarters of the people in this room were not here at the beginning, because like any lively organization it's turning over, so perhaps some of that approach would help you at this moment. It's helped the ACSA tremendously. We were in Miami a couple of years ago talking only about the community involvement of my schools, and there were very specific case examples of how Miami has a community design center, and then professionals were brought in relative to their involvement in community design centers. This year it's going to be 'Changing within the institution'. And I think that that would help you a great deal. Again, that's an observation from the outside, but since James and Richard both participated last year I think they have a perspective on this.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, Marvin. The experience that I had last year at the New Administrators Conference in the United States was quite, quite special. Marvin and others, over a period of years, have prepared a handbook of extraordinary content. Everything from guidelines, to anecdotes, to information. It's like a small Encyclopedia Britannica on how one addresses the business of being the head of a school of architecture. I have my copy of this, it's very bulky, but I think from what Marvin has said that maybe I will bring it along to the next council meeting and see where that takes our discussions. Richard...

Richard Foqué, Antwerp, Belgium

Yes, having been at that conference, I can only confirm that. I have been listening very carefully to the discussion and it appears to me, and several other people have said the same thing, that up to this point our main purpose has been information exchange. On the other hand, however, this is a unique meeting. We should not forget that this is a meeting of the Heads of Schools of Architecture in Europe, so that means that we, here in this room, are policy-makers and decision-makers who come together once a year. So I would really like to see – and I think that we are now mature enough, since we've discussed so many things over the seven years and have proved with the Hania Statement that we can do it – us trying to get out position papers, as I said before. What is the position of this ENHSA meeting, and could it be adopted by the EAAE? And this, James, would also endorse the goal you put forward in your position papers, namely, that we should act more on the political level. And I would really like to see us, maybe not every year but at least every two years or so, taking a position on certain things. When speaking about profiles, for example, I would rather we put things on a different level, stating our

position on profiles – what we think of them, how we treat the issue, that sort of thing – instead of just what profiles are. I think Dimitri also pointed that out in his intervention. And Dimitri said that there is a lot at stake at the moment, and I think he is right. So I would prefer to put our meetings, the early meetings, on that level and to try to generate positions and political statements.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, Richard. Are there any more observations and comments? I think this has been quite a successful discussion. In fact, a whole lot of things have come to light at the end of our meeting and a lot of good information has just been literally handed across the table for the organizers to apply to the coming event of next year and other events besides.

Herman Neuckermans, Leuven, Belgium

I just wanted to say that I fully support the idea of the profiles, and I think that if we adopt it as a subject we should try to determine the elements that define the profiles, in order to be able to use them, perhaps, as the first paragraph in the guide. Because then when you see a school you will first see the profile and afterwards the factual data. And we also have to agree on how to describe the profiles in brief.

Julian Keppl, Bratislava, Slovakia

I didn't want to return to the subject of profiles, but I do have one recommendation to make, and that is that we should define the responsibility of the school and the responsibility of the student. Our faculty, for example, offers four profiles on the graduate level: architectural design, town planning, conservation and building structures. And these are electives, so it's the responsibility of the students to choose their final profile. We also offer many electives throughout our curriculum, and these are also the responsibility of the student. So I suggest that when we are talking about profiles we speak not only about our responsibility but also about the responsibility of the students, because we are dealing with mature people who to some extent are responsible for themselves. I would also like to add that this is my first time here and I found it very inspiring and I'm very grateful to the organizers and to everybody who contributed to my knowledge and to the good atmosphere. Thank you very much.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I also think it's important to define that word responsibility. It's the key to what we do and, irrespective of what this group may write about profiles or anything else, at the end of the day each school is responsible for itself and we as individual Heads of Schools have to decide the future for our individual schools in a responsible manner. And as to the other area of responsibility of students, I think there is a huge discussion here, particularly in a time when, as Loughlin Kealy mentioned this morning, there is a climate of litigation and the performance of academic institutions is being scrutinized to a greater extent. I think there is a topic for discussion in this one as well.

Patricia Ruisch, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

I want to continue with this topic, but first I too want to thank the organizers of this conference. This was my first time here and my first European meeting with so many faces and so many countries in one room. That gives a special flavor to a conference. I think you cannot put it into words, you would not see it in any position paper you prepared, but it's there between the lines all the time.

I think the student is a person whom we cannot forget, because you have to address the 'why' question; and I hope that future conferences will address a future perspective: that is, what will the people coming to the academies in five or ten years time have in common? And that is something broader than Europe, for there are some characteristics which are larger than that and are influenced through diverse media. And I think all academies have to address the point of the build-up of knowledge inside the academy, traditions from your own country, learning experience from your schools and your staff, and what you gain from having this new group coming in each year and the way the knowledge, the abilities and the skills are absorbed. And that's what the competences are all about, how they are absorbed by the student. And for us in our academy every year is an experiment; sometimes what we have done the year before works and sometimes it doesn't, but we're learning every year all over again. So I think it would be very interesting if all the schools could address this question of the fine edge between what students bring into the academy and what you as an academy has built up.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

I believe that this comment Patricia just made leads in a little bit to some of the discussions that we were just touching on about the pilot projects that will form part of next year's experience. And the pilot projects deal with the very things that perhaps are the richness of the diversity that exists between schools. Rare knowledge, for example. The sort of rare knowledge that would be held in the repository of the school's 'mind', to put it that way, would be vastly different from one school and one country to another. And the exploration of that, and indeed the exploration of innovative knowledge, is also likely to highlight the differences. And I think that at all times our starting position has to be to preserve the richness of difference and to preserve it in the same way that there is a concerted effort in Europe to preserve the cultures of Europe, because there is also a need to preserve the different cultures of the way architects are educated; and the benefit of these kinds of meetings should be that we can see what those differences are and benefit from that experience.

Sven Felding, Copenhagen, Denmark

First of all I want to thank you very much for the very inspiring days here in Hania – one thank you for each day! For me it has been incredibly inspiring. We are not better in the discussions than we are as persons. So we use the advance material that we get for the discussions as best we can, in spite of the lack of time and so on. So this is a basic element in our discussion here. It is also why our discussions are so fruitful, because you pick up things from the whole picture and you sharpen your own school by having the inspiration of the other Heads of School that you meet here in Hania.

There are some topics that I think we should pay attention to at some point, if not in the next meeting perhaps in the one after that. The first one is the Bologna Process. It's going

on and it's a very strong process and all the universities of Europe have to be committed to it in some way or another. I find it would be very fruitful to discuss this topic from year to year. The Ministers will be meeting in Bergen, and somewhere else after that, and there are very many people preparing these meetings.

The next one is the issue of quality assurance, accreditation and evaluation, which is very important in all European universities right now, so it is definitely something we ought to be discussing. The next thing is the underlying debate about paedagogical principles in the field of architectural education that, for many reasons, exists among us here, so that is another thing we ought to discuss. And last but not least, I find the discussion of profile very inspiring and I think we should take it up next year. Maybe the participating schools could send some papers to the conference ahead of time. And again, thank you for a very fruitful conference.

Roger Liberloo, Diepenbeek, Belgium

There is another problem that I would like to speak about. It doesn't have to do with the conference in itself. Can I do it now, or should I wait until after any other speakers about the conference itself?

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Before you speak, I should say that I think that we've had a fairly interesting discussion, but I don't necessarily want to prolong it indefinitely. There have been at least fifteen really positive suggestions put forward and that's creativity in itself. So I think we can maybe end the discussion about the conference now. And if there are any other issues that people would like to raise or things they would like us to take note of, we can start with what Roger has to say.

Roger Liberloo, Diepenbeek, Belgium

The problem I have has to do with sense and sensibility, and the subject is the appointment of two members of the council. Now, I don't want to be rude, or to stir up a quarrel, but I was surprised and flurried with the proposal for the two new members of the council.

With regard to sense: I accept that the two nominees possess the right credentials, but as far as I know they haven't been participating in the activities of the EAAE. Second point. If it is important to have a 'critical screening' of the academic work of the EAAE, attending conferences and evaluating the papers and conferences, then, I believe, that's not work for one person. It should be the work of the council itself and the work groups that are connected to it.

With regard to sensibility: Belgium is, as you all know, a country with a complex structure – three languages, three regional governments and one federal government. There has also always been a split between the universities, with the engineer-architects and the schools of architecture. And in the minds of a lot of academics the concept of first and second grade universities that was spoken about yesterday, still exists. Now the point is that with the appointment of Dr Hilde Heynen strengthens the position of the universities in Belgium again, and in particular that of the Catholic University of Leuven. Now the secretariat in Leuven does excellent work and so does Herman Neuckermans, but I think that with the appointment of Hilde the point of gravity shifts not only further away from

the so-called non-university educations in architecture but also exclusively towards the Flemish part of the country. There are no Walloon colleagues here. I don't think the proposal is a very wise one and I think it will destroy, at least in Belgium and Flanders, a delicate equilibrium, and I think it has to be re-considered. Thank you.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Roger, thank you for that comment. One of the things that I believe we should be working towards and it takes some time to achieve this, but it's very much tied in with what I was talking about yesterday, is the arrival of such an organization such as EAAE at full professional level. In the past there was really no process by which people came on to the council other than being invited by the existing group, and in the beginning of an organization that is a completely acceptable manner to behave. But as an organization grows in maturity, that process has to change. And this was the first attempt to make a small change in that structure, to allow people to make nominations and to put forward reasons for those nominations. If we have missed the subtlety of the structure in Belgium I apologize, that was not intentional. The intention is that ultimately the positions of President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and indeed all council members, should be a matter for democratic election. And I would like to think that we can move to that position in a relatively short space of time. In order to be able to do that though, it will be necessary to have a fully professional organization which is beyond scrutiny to make sure that that process can be carried out without question. And therefore that is the direction in which I hope we will move.

Richard Foqué, Antwerp, Belgium

Yes of course, I don't want to make it a discussion about Belgium at all; but I understand what Roger is saying, and over the last few days some colleagues from other countries were also surprised and put certain things forward. But I want to raise three points, in order to give a positive contribution to what some people may find a very strange decision. The first proposition is that, with the departure of Stéphane Hanrot, we have Hilde Heynen appointed to the council. She is, of course a researcher, so why not also give her the responsibility for research in general, rather than just going to conferences, which I think is just a small part. As we know, every conference has a scientific committee that is responsible for the scientific quality of the conference. So my first proposal is, why not give Hilde Heynen the responsibility for research as well?

To come to my second, and related, proposal. We see, and it is a process that has been going on for a couple of years now, that more and more of our colleagues from the "new" countries are joining us here, and this is a very important process. And I just made a little calculation going through the list of participants: of the 90 participants, more than one third comes from what we call the "new" countries, meaning Eastern European and related countries, Turkey, Russia and countries that may be joining the European Union in the future. So that could mean that the vacancy left by Stéphane on the council could maybe go to a representative of these countries. I think that that could also enhance the broadening and the scope of the organization.

My third proposition is related to something you, James, said the other day in your position paper on the EAAE. One of the things you said was that it is important that we try to get more schools to join the association, that we should do more on the external relations

side and so on. I would propose, therefore, and the council should discuss this, of course, that they appoint what might be called ambassadors for the Association. People who travel a lot around Europe, and maybe abroad as well, could perhaps act as ambassadors and try to get new people and schools interested in the organization. So these are three positive contributions to what may have been a bit tricky.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, Richard, very much. That, in fact, has been not only positive but extremely creative in some of the suggestions you have made. You can be absolutely assured that those suggestions will be taken on board. I think that your last point about having this ambassadorial possibility for members of the association in their travels would be extremely helpful. We have known in the past that there are various ways in which schools can be contacted and hopefully invited to ultimately become members of the association. The best and most efficient method in my experience has been the one-to-one contact, the person who has met the Head of another school and said: "Would you be interested in joining the EAEE?" So that is something that will be put very high on the agenda of the council in the coming meetings. In addition I also think that your comment about the work of Stéphane Hanrot being taken over by Hilde is an absolutely natural position, and also the idea of wanting to open up the council to the new EU countries. On May 1st this year, as you are aware, ten new countries joined the European Union, and we on the council now have to very seriously engage those countries in the activities to a much greater extent. So I thank both you and Roger for your comments on this and we will very definitely and positively act upon them.

I'm now going to ask Constantin to say maybe a few words of summary and maybe a few words of thanks.

Constantin Spiridonidis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Not so much a summary but some kind of technical and practical information that I would like to ask of you. As you know, every year we have to produce the proceedings of this meeting and for this reason we will send all the contributors a message asking them to prepare their intervention in the form of publishable text. We will give you some instructions regarding the length of the intervention, so that we don't exceed the prescribed number of pages; so I would like to ask all those of you who had the opportunity to make a short presentation to respect the deadlines, because we are obliged by the contract to submit the final report by January 15th, so the proceedings must have been published by that time. I am asking you to respect the deadline that we will give you, so that we can submit the proceedings together with the final report.

The second is that, as you probably noticed, at the end of each volume of proceedings of this event there is an annex listing the significant documents related to the discussion, debate and policy on the higher education area; so if you think that you have such a document that we may not know of, please forward it to us by e-mail so that we can incorporate it in this annex, which every year gives the new material that has appeared on this subject. That is almost all I wanted to say about the practicalities, the last thing being that I would like to ask those of you who have not already done so not to leave this room without signing the documents, because it is very significant for us.

Lastly, I would like to say "thank you". First of all, to the thirty persons who spent a winter weekend in Antwerp collaborating with us in order to prepare this meeting. I would like to thank Richard for his offer of the venue for this meeting in Antwerp, and for assuring a very successful event.

I would also like to thank all the other people who collaborated with us after this meeting, and especially the co-ordinators, Loughlin Kealy, Kees Doevendans and Lawrence Johnston, who worked towards the codification of these debates and gave very useful insights for the organization of this event.

I would also like to address special thanks to Loughlin Kealy, because he came to Thessaloniki and for three days ignored the pain in his leg and worked very creatively. I'm really very happy for this collaboration, Loughlin.

I would also like to thank Roger Liberloo, because he sent me e-mails and suggestions about the organization of the meeting, so that was a very valuable collaboration.

I would also like to thank the council for their continued confidence in Maria and me, and for still believing that we can organize this event properly.

I would also like to thank the people who chaired these sessions, even when they were asked to do so at the last moment, as well as the contributors who at the last moment were informed and decided to accept the invitation to make those short presentations.

Of course, last and not least, I would like to thank all of you, and especially those of you who have been coming for several years. There may be a proposition from the council to waive participation fees for the following year's meeting for anyone who has attended for eight successive years. There are some of you, and I'm not going to name any names, but we find this very touching. But I would also like to thank those who came here for the first time and who had some rather positive feelings about and reactions to this organization.

Of course, we also want to thank the Centre for Mediterranean Architecture, and especially its art director; but I would also like to ask you to thank Christos, who is hiding over there. Christos has been everywhere these three days: he is the photographer of the meeting, the voice recorder of the meeting, the video recorder of the meeting and the sound technician, so he must be really exhausted, and I would like to thank him very much.

Finally, I would like to thank the two students, Irini and Phaedra, who tried to facilitate our conversation by carrying the microphones here and there. This is a very valuable job, as I know because when I was on occasion obliged to do it I found that it is not at all easy to run around all day like that.

Finally I would like to thank Lou Scholl, the secretary of the EAAE, who for the third year has been a very attractive figure in the reception and secretariat of the meeting and who has looked after a lot of things that we could not have managed since we spend all day at the meeting.

So that is all from me, and I think that James, as chairman, has to close the meeting.

James Horan, Dublin, Ireland

So just before we formally close this seventh meeting, I think the notion of a medal of endurance might be something we could look into seriously enough. I just want to endorse the thanks that Constantin has identified. An enormous amount of work lies behind this annual event, and it goes on for the entire year in one form or another. And it's only when

you find yourself in the position of being the President of the EAAE that you see the enormity of what is actually happening and the number of e-mails that come in and out on a daily basis, making the communication continue during the year between one meeting and the next.

The big word of thank you on behalf of the EAAE, on behalf of all of you here, is to Constantin and Maria...There is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that if they were not here this would not exist. It is simply that and no more. It's hard to describe the level of dedication and time that they both provide for this event and for the EAAE in general.

Finally, I just want to thank you for coming, for your presence here, your contributions, the suggestions that we go away with to work on for another session, and for the friendships that have grown between us, because long after the academic arguments are forgotten and long after the differences that we encounter from time to time have passed over, the personal friendships that exist between us will remain. Thank you very much.