



WELCOME TO THE FIRST SECEB NEWSLETTER

The SECEB project is a challenging opportunity for the European universities as it aims at generating knowledge, experience and new ideas connected to employability, mobility and quality assurance system in the field of cultural education.

From a political point of view the *Bologna process* is a very complex issue needing continuous analysis. This process means new important changes as well as major and serious consequences for the labour and financial market. It opens, theoretically, unexpected opportunities for the reinforcement of the European cooperation aspect of cultural management higher education and vocational education. Therefore, it is important and strategic for the cultural management and policy training and educational sector to have offered opportunities to meet for learning more about the Bologna process implications and, benefits and potential risks.

The practical exchange of ideas and activities between universities on this specific issue are both valuable and inspiring, and is already taking place, notably through ENCATEC. More precisely, in the past 3 years, the debate within ENCATEC has developed from a criticism of the European higher education development for the cultural education field to a more pragmatic, active and pro-active approach to seeking new ways and new solutions and implementing them.

The truly innovative SECEB project allows people responsible for the implementation of the Bologna process in the cultural education sector to go further in their cooperation in the educational cultural field, and to overcome the future challenges and risks linked to the realisation of a Higher Educational Area.

A crucial element of the project is the regular exchange of information and best practices between ENCATEC members and the main stakeholders involved in the process. The participation of

universities and universities' networks, representatives from the National governments and from students' unions will help the project partners to redefine existing and developing new methodologies, and thus provide consistency and reliability to the work already undertaken at national level.

The findings under the SECEB will provide well-founded arguments for an improved future discussion on educational cultural policies not only at national level, but also at EU-level. The findings might also provide input to the ongoing discussions taking place within the national government, UNESCO, and within global academic networks.

The project represents a great challenge and the outcome will depend on the hard work to be undertaken by the 6 partners during 14 months.

There is no doubt that the SECEB project presents a new unique opportunity for the ENCATEC members and all the institutions on the way to realise the European higher Educational area.

Giannalia Cogliandro
Project manager

IN THIS ISSUE

<i>THE SECEB PROJECT</i>	Pag. 2
<i>THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE UK</i>	Pag. 3
<i>THE PROJECT CONSORTIUM</i>	Pag. 5
<i>THE BOLOGNA PROCESS IN FRANCE</i>	Pag. 6
<i>THE STATE OF ART IN SPAIN</i>	Pag. 9
<i>REPORTS FROM THE FIRST WORKSHOP</i>	Pag.11

Editor: Giannalia Cogliandro
ENCATEC Executive Director

A NEW CHALLENGING EUROPEAN PROJECT: ***Sharing Experiences on Cultural Education: realising the Bologna process (SECEB)***



SECEB is a project financed by the European programme SOCRATES. It started in November 2005 and will last till December 2006.

The Bologna process opens theoretically, unexpected opportunities for the reinforcement of the European cooperation aspects of cultural management higher educational and vocational education (Bruges process). However, the concrete implementation logic of the Bologna process still have some difficulties in being adopted and understood by the academic circles all over Europe at least as far as cultural management is concerned.

The **main objective** of this project is to **analyse and evaluate the implementation** of the two-tier degree structure in the field of cultural management and policy education (higher and vocational sector) to generate knowledge, experience and new ideas connected to employability, mobility and quality assurance system. The essential is to take into consideration the nature of the different educational levels and systems (polytechnic, art academy and multi-faculty university) and the comparability of the different modes of realization of Bologna process.

The project will meet its objective in focusing on three steps: Collecting data; Organization of 2 European workshops (one In Brussels, one In Bratislava); Organization of a Final Conference

The **project consortium** is composed by five universities, all ENCATEC members: University of Barcelona, University of Grenoble, University of Bratislava, University of Potsdam and Jyväskylä University.



The **Research part** of this project is **extremely important**. Data collection activities will particularly focus on the following topics: Adoption of a system essentially based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate, promotion of mobility of students and teachers, and promotion of the European dimension in the higher education in the art / cultural management and cultural policy programmes. The data collection will be conducted by internet questionnaires among ENCATEC members and main European institutions.

The project **primary beneficiaries** are: people responsible for the implementation of the Bologna process in the cultural education sector; representative from the UNESCO, Council of Europe, European Parliament and European Commission in charge of the following up of the Bologna process, representatives from the Minister of Culture and Education in Europe and beyond, representative from the major stakeholders). **Second beneficiaries** are: researchers, students, journalists, anyone, interested in cultural cooperation in Europe. All these stakeholders rarely meet together and they don't have many opportunities to talk each others even if they work on the same dossiers.

This project will **raise awareness** across Europe and beyond of best ways of implementing the Bologna process and overcome the future challenges and risks. It also has the **uniqueness** of offering to cultural management and policy trainers and educational staff the opportunity to meet together at European level and discuss about common concerns.

In a **long-term basis** the project partners will work towards a **long-lasting platform within ENCATEC** where European training institution active in the cultural field can develop and exchange best practices, ideas on future plans, policies and scenario.

THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE UK

Michael Quine

Department of Cultural Policy & Management
City University London



SECEB Workshop, Brussels, December 2005

Most of those attending this workshop will recognise know that the Bologna process in many ways seeks to take the mainland of Europe towards the pre-existing British norm: the question, then, is one relating to how we view a potential synergy, and what we see as challenges and opportunities.

For years, in essence for ever, the British system has had a 3 year first degree, undergraduate degree, Bachelors degree – the names all mean the same thing: then for a few of those who succeed here, a Masters Degree: then for very few a doctorate process. Students enter this Higher Education system at age 18 or 19, and the majority leave it after the first degree at 21 or 22.

Of course there are exceptions to any system, and the reader should be aware of them: as examples,

- Scottish universities typically offer a four (not three) year course, and at the end of is a Master degree. Typically they do not have a bachelors title.
- At Oxford and at Cambridge, the typical first degree, especially in the arts, is a Bachelor's degree. To get an MA, you wait three years and pay a small fee, £10 or £20.

Of course, these are outside the normal run of things, but they exist and they may have some influence on whatever happens in the near future.

In the UK, Universities are for the most part autonomous, not in any way run by the state: they award their own degrees. Since they are responsible for their own standards, it was a little difficult even to think of a quality assurance system which is national in its mechanics. However, in recent years, we have become used to people treading on our toes, but they must not break them.

Let me offer an example. My own university receives some of its money from the state, in relation to student number targets set down: the rest comes from students. My own (postgraduate) department was 'inspected' by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) some 5 years ago. A team of three people along with a supervisor spent an entire week looking at 6 aspects of how we worked: these six aspects were

- Curriculum Design, Content and Organisation
- Teaching, Learning and Assessment
- Student Progression and Achievement
- Student Support and Guidance
- Learning Resources, and
- Quality Management and Enhancement

Working under the title Quality Assurance they made our lives difficult for a full six months, quite apart from the relevant week. What were we delivering, why, and on what evidence; and how did we know that we were delivering it appropriately and well. They inspected our teaching, our students' written work, our feedback to it: they watched some of our teaching.

I need to emphasise the bureaucracy of that process: the time it takes, and – like all bureaucracies – the games we learn to play in order to meet the rules. Simply put, had we evidence that we knew what we were doing? Once you know the core question, then of course it is inevitable that you know where to find the evidence that will meet it; and where to bury the evidence that might (if there were any!) deny it.

That was a time-consuming and wasteful process, and I am pleased to report that it has been modified. Much more of the Quality Assurance process has been devolved to Universities, and with a heavy emphasis on the student experience: and with reports, advice and recommendations available on the web for potential students and others.

This is our first concern: we in Britain believe it is essential that in the business of quality assurance and achieving high standards there should not be excessive bureaucracy. In Britain, we have the way of establishing quality procedures and not fixed and consistent syllabus content.



Brussels Workshop, December 2005

We now work to a system which awards Credits for a combination of Learning Outcomes and the time which we assess as the typical number of hours required to achieve them. Each Credit takes 10 hours: the Credit is deemed to be at the level consistent with the Learning outcomes – at HE3 for Degrees, at M (Masters?) level for Masters Degree, at D level for a Doctorate. Note that these are not ECTS credits, but ‘British’ credits, with each British credit deemed to be worth 2 ECTS credits.

Thus: to achieve a Degree, the student must earn 360 credits at HE3 level; to achieve a Masters Degree s/he must achieve 180 credits at M level. So the students in our Department, taking a one-year Masters course, will be expected to commit 1800 hours to their learning, in a combination of taught sessions, seminars and tutorials, private study and writing, and other ‘notional learning time’.

This is a second point of concern. In Britain a Masters Degree is usually achieved in one year, full-time (or two years, part-time). We have gone the way we have because of the emphasis on learning outcomes rather than on the time taken.

This means increasingly we have to commit our energies to the description and assessment of learning outcomes at the various levels. The table which follows sets out in outline the guidance offered to us by the framework for Higher Education qualifications.

In summary, are two issues which concern us, and one set of practices which involves us. The issues:

1: to keep an emphasis on learning outcomes and, consequently, to watch carefully the debate about the duration of courses

2: to insist that quality assurance procedures do not become over-bureaucratic or onerous.

The set of practices: writing and re-writing appropriate outcomes, increasingly in sufficient detail to guide the taught curriculum.

How present changes affect courses in cultural management

While there are one or two undergraduate courses in arts management or in other subjects with a element of arts management, the majority of courses are at Masters level.

1. Until some just a few years ago, students did not have to pay fees for undergraduate degrees, and they were eligible for a grant towards their living costs. Now they must pay fees and there are few grants towards living costs. This means that they are very likely to finish their three-year course with a substantial financial debt to the state: they will start to pay this back when their income rises above £15,000 (not a large salary these days).

If they want to move to a Masters degree, they will carry existing debt while having to pay additional fees and living costs for a further year. This is bound to make many think hard before moving in to extensive Masters courses in cultural management

2. There is at present almost no mobility between these courses in the UK, nor yet any joint design of courses which might facilitate mobility or just bring economy of costs.

3. It might be argued that all the courses (depending how they are classified, one can count anywhere between 10 and 20) are competing in terms of learning outcomes. In fact, there is rather less overt competition than one might expect. Some students want to be in London, others want to be in a less metropolitan centre, in one with more of a community feel to it, such as Sheffield: some institutions are more active in research than others; some more international; some charge higher fees, some no fees because they are, for the moment at least, in EU-advantaged areas: some may have a better track-record in post-course employment.

4. There are no moves yet towards the kind of private accreditation body which Mireille Pongy refers to: rather, the possible move is towards a series of sector-led bodies (Sector Skills Councils) which will have the ability to encourage, lead and validate. At City we have had approval for one of our courses from the Cultural



Heritage National Training Organisation, “as offering a vocational education relevant to employment in the museums, galleries and heritage sector”, and a new Skills Council has very recently been launched. Creative and Cultural Skills is:

“the Sector Skills Council for advertising, crafts, cultural heritage, design, music, performing, literary and visual arts. We are an industry-led organisation that campaigns hard across the United Kingdom to deliver the skills and support that employers, artists and freelancers need. Our aim is to make Britain a world-class hub of creative enterprise and diverse cultural industries <http://www.ccskills.org.uk/>”

5. Increasingly we can expect the issue of credits from other places to become significant: not necessarily in terms of courses in our subject, but maybe in terms of people coming from, say, a Business or Management course, maybe from something more diverse. How are we to judge the validity or indeed the recency? And what about the matter of prior learning? – someone who can prove that s/he can match the learning outcomes for one or two modules on the basis of working experience?

Can we think go enrol them on a course, let them take and complete the other two modules, and then grant them a degree?

This seems to be un-charted ground. But it is ground which will have to be reviewed if we are to achieve the mobility goal of the Bologna process.

THE PROJECT CONSORTIUM

The partners of the project SECEB are five prestigious European universities: the University of Barcelona, the University of Grenoble, the University of Bratislava, the University of Potsdam and the Jyväskylä University.

The SECEB project leader is The European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centers, ENCATC. This unique network has a membership of over 100 members which cover 35 countries, including all the countries eligible to the Socrates programmes. ENCATC is being recognised as a serious, solid, high profile network by external organisations, like the Commission, UNESCO, European Cultural Foundation and other sister networks.

The continuous collaboration of ENCATC with universities, educational, training, research and cultural institutions all over Europe during the past 13 years has led to an accumulation of knowledge and expertise in the educational and cultural policies and in programmes and actions taken by the national authorities in the field of education, culture and youth all over Europe (Europe of 48).

ENCATC also has close co-operation with international organisations, associations and networks that operate in the educational and cultural sectors as such as UNESCO, Council of Europe, European Commission, European Parliament, EUA, ESIB, and ELIA etc...)

Since many years, ENCATC has been deeply involved in the Bologna process as many of its member institutions are scientific or art universities. It has also extensive experience in the Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programmes as many of its member institutions have been involved in these exchange programmes. It has also closely monitored the development in the construction of European Education Area. Some of its members are leading specialists in Europe in heritage training (informal, formal or vocational training) or in the performing arts training and education, areas which are to be covered by the study. All the members are also experts in the cultural actions, programmes and initiatives in their respective countries.

The person in charge of the implementation of this project within these five universities are well known European experts on this specific topic and all of them are fully involved as adviser or expert for their own university in the design of new courses according to the Bologna criteria. Many of them have already starting to collect material and many of them published outstanding article on this topic.

THE BOLOGNA PROCESS AND PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED COURSES IN THE FIELD OF CULTURAL ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

Mireille Pongy

*Institut d'études politiques de Grenoble
Université Pierre Mendès-France*

What is known as the Bologna Process grew out of the declaration signed in the Italian city on 19 June 1999 by 29 European countries. It is the first significant reform of higher education in Europe decided by the governments of the Member States of the European Union¹.

The main target of this Process is the creation of a European Higher Education Area between now and 2010. Several intermediary objectives will serve as milestones along the way. The first aims were to make it easier to interpret and compare higher education qualifications, which in practical terms translates into a harmonisation of the structuration of higher education studies. The two main instruments for this are the setting up of a two cycle degree system and a credit system. The first cycle lasts three years (undergraduate or first cycle) and leads to a first or Bachelor's degree (*licence*). The second one lasts two years (graduate or second cycle) and leads to a Master's degree. The second part involves the implementation of a common European system for attributing credits (European Credits System Transfer or ECTS) for courses carrying 180 credits for a Bachelor's degree and 120 for a Master's².

Halfway through the process, the reform appears to be generally accepted and the different countries have begun to set it in place. Some of them are still waiting for national legislation to clarify its implementation³, while the autonomy already acquired by universities in countries other than France means that they have less need for regulation.

The French version of the Bologna Process is known as the "LMD" reform, which stands for "*licence-masters-doctorat*"⁴ or "3-5-8 years reform". At the beginning of the 2004-2005 academic year, this reform was introduced on a large scale and should affect all the

French universities at the start of the 2005/2006 academic year. As in other countries, the reform enables the introduction of the changes planned, or even previously attempted, but which had to be postponed for different reasons. This is the case in France as regards the reinforcement of university autonomy and the bringing closer together of the universities and "*grandes écoles*"⁵ through the adoption of a common degree, the Master's.

This article is intended as a short overview of the implementation of these reforms in France with regard to professionally oriented courses to the administration of culture.

1 – The restructuring of higher education and the question of the professionally-oriented studies

The installation of the first cycle of three years poses fewer problems than that of the second two-year cycle because the new Bachelor's degree already exists as such (*licence*). On the other hand, setting up a Master's cycle of two years entails the replacement of the present system of "1 + 1" (*maîtrise* + DESS or DEA⁶) after the Bachelor's degree, in favour of an integrated two-year Master's degree, which should eventually lead to the suppression of the *maîtrise*, as well as to moving the selection process from entry at the beginning of the fifth year (second year of the Master's) towards selection at the beginning of the fourth year (first year of the Master's).

However, the majority of the professionally-oriented courses in cultural administration have continued, for this first year of their installation, to be given over only one year, in this case during the second year of the Master's (the former DESS). The *maîtrise* courses that have become the first year of the Master's are for the moment still general "academic" courses, but in the future in all likelihood should offer a more professionally-

¹ Following on from the Bergen Conference in May 2005, which brought together the ministers of higher education, 45 countries (including non-EU countries) are now participating in the Bologna Process.

² The other objectives set out in the Bologna Declaration are the development of a life-long apprenticeship process, European co-operation with regard to evaluating the quality of courses, encouraging mobility and promoting European dimensions within higher education.

³ For example, decrees were issued in January 2005 in Spain and in February 2005 in Portugal.

⁴ In English, standing for: 'Bachelor's-Master's-Doctorate's

⁵ The "grandes Ecoles" are the most selective and prestigious seats of higher education in France, leading to careers in management, business administration, engineering, the sciences, the humanities, politics, the civil service, and the army.

⁶ *Maîtrise*: 4-year university degree. DEA: Diplôme d'Enseignement Approfondi / University Post-Graduate Research Degree leading into integration into the university professions ; DESS: Diplôme d'Enseignement Supérieur Spécialisé / University Post-Graduate Professional Degree leading to integration into the labour market : 5-year university degree.

oriented course over the two years. In parallel, the desire to continue to Master's level has led a number of IUPs 7 (graduation *baccalauréat* + four years) or institutions offering professional degrees to extend their courses and set up Master's courses. This evolution is extending a specialised and professionalisation route that began for the students on entry into higher education. A move towards extending professionalisation courses has been observed just as much for former DESS graduates (towards the fourth year) as for those with professional Bachelor's degrees (towards Master's level). Given the poor prospects in higher education and research sectors, one of the main challenges of the reform is the capacity of universities to produce professionalisation in teaching of the quality required.

In addition, the reform has led in an overall manner to the development of Master's courses with each professor wanting to have one "for him/herself". The Ministry of National Education, Higher Education and Research (MENESR) has so far interpreted the desire at both national and European level to increase the autonomy of the universities by reducing government hold over them by operating a mild selection process. As university regulation at the local level is still in its early stages, the reform has led to an explosion in the development of Master's courses, which is particularly marked in the area of courses in cultural administration that attract a large number of students. This situation is posing an acute problem for job prospects and for the interaction between employment and training.

2. Reduced public funding calls for a diversification in the financial resources for professionally-oriented courses

In France, and in very many other European countries, the reform is taking place with equal funding provided by the ministries of education. But, given that simply implementing, the reform leads to specific additional expenditures, the situation is becoming one in which the financial resources for the courses themselves are being reduced.

This cutback encourages the development of diversification with regard to financing, first of all on the part of public bodies in France other than the MENESR. As regards professionally oriented courses in cultural administration, territorial bodies, and the Conseils Régionaux (Regional Councils) in particular, generally support some courses for the development of international mobility, practical training and insertion into the professions concerned. The Ministry of Culture

encourages the professionalisation of the cultural sectors by assisting or continuing to assist some continuing higher education courses.

The entry fees paid by students constitutes another resource. Although very much lower for the initial course (paid by students) than for the lifelong learning courses (paid by companies), there is certainly a strong tendency towards an increase in these, but not to the levels currently seen in some countries, such as the United Kingdom⁸.

Depending on the course, there may be other financing possibilities. The apprenticeship tax⁹ contributes substantial funding for some training courses, especially in Paris where the large cultural institutions are to be found, but more generally-speaking, cultural bodies are not among the richest. Some courses occasionally obtain patronage and sponsorship from local or regional businesses, while others negotiate research agreements with professional partners for research to be conducted by the students within the framework of their courses.

The diversification of financial resources is accompanied by a loosening of the link between university institutions and the ministry with oversight for these professionally-oriented courses. As far as MENESR grants are concerned, up to now these have been regarded as less legitimate than the initial academic courses, and they may be obliged to increase the search for some funding from among "their clients", the cultural enterprises and beyond that, more widely from the private sector.

3. Knowledge and the evaluation procedures to be developed to measure quality

Within the framework of the LMD reform, the MENESR has bestowed accreditations according to academic and disciplinary criteria. On the other hand, graduates' futures, their employability and their professional careers are not taken into account by this ministry whose academic values are founded on an education system that is free and independent from the market. Another dimension enters here, however, in the search for balanced territorial development, particularly through sighting policies.

There is really no other way for evaluation courses in cultural administration at the moment. However, a quality assurance evaluation of courses is one of the main objectives of the Bologna Process. Evaluation is therefore becoming a market commodity, and such services are already being offered by private companies

⁷ The IUPs (Instituts Universitaires Professionnalisés - Professional University Institutes) are higher education colleges whose aim is to give their graduates the skills and practices which will be required of them at the outset of their working life.

⁸ The disparities between registration fees for European universities are greatest at the Masters level and pose significant problems for the development of Erasmus exchanges at this level.

⁹ The apprenticeship tax is paid by enterprises to professional training institutes.

¹⁰. In the face of this, some institutions such as business schools and the European League of Institutes of Art (ELIA), together with the Association européenne des Conservatoires (AEC), have set up their own evaluation system based on a series of objective criteria intended to enable them to negotiate terms more favourably with university institutions and ministries.

The situation is of even greater concern for training courses in cultural administration in the universities where we are seeing, as has already been emphasized, a proliferation of training possibilities in these areas that do not take into account the limited market for their graduates.

4. Courses in cultural administration – at the point of interaction between academic logic and professionally-oriented logic

The well-established, professionally oriented training courses in cultural administration already formed partnerships with professional circles whose expertise is necessary to the quality of the studies. Such a partnership sometimes takes the form of a joint leadership between a professor from a university and a professional person, or of universities delegating the implementation of their courses to bodies external to the university and in contact with the professions concerned.

Today, there is a twin risk to these courses from the implementation of the Bologna Process. The first lies on the side of professionalisation. Setting up shorter and more compact programmes, constructed like toolboxes or recipes, composed of independent modules, which can be made self-sufficient and therefore suitable for sale on the market, raises fears of a standardisation of content, which could be strengthened by the development of validation based on acquired experience.

The other risk, however, is that of becoming more "academic" and "university-based". The professionally-oriented courses under which the cultural domains fall were built twenty or so years ago on the fringes of university institutions, brought in by teachers and professors whose first concern was not for an academic career. Affording little legitimacy in the eyes of the leading elite of the university community, they were, on the other hand, in contact with the professional organisations and constructed professional systems of references with them.

The reinsertion of these courses into the academic fold thanks to the LMD reform could lead to the imposition of an academic logic to the detriment of a professional logic. Indeed, some courses have been set up because this or that professor hoped to have "his" course especially at Master's level. Certain "traditional" classes have been opened up and imposed onto professionally-oriented under cover of a common-core syllabus and the move towards Master's degrees. In addition, their high cost in comparison with general academic courses encourages the temptation to reduce the number of hours allocated to them, and indeed to suppress them completely given the reductions being made in public funding.

However, given the high unemployment among young people, enclosing these training courses within university institutions and loosening the links with the professions would have a negative affect on their quality and their relevance. Opening up academic logic to the requirements of professionalisation, with reconciliation between and cohabitation of the two logics, is one of the main issues at stake in setting the LMD reform in place.

Conclusion

The construction of a European Higher Education Area as proposed by the Bologna Process constitutes a major reform of higher education courses in Europe. Apart from harmonising the structuring of the courses, the reform supports the professionalisation process and the questioning about the interaction between employment and education with which the university institutions are confronted. The objectives of professionalisation and of evaluation as well as that of a life-long apprenticeship process, validation of what has been acquired through experience and the move towards the creation of modules contests the hegemony of the "logic of the offer" that has until now characterised higher education and stakeholders who produced it, in this case the teachers. Now, the essential need for the professionalisation of a large part of higher education is accompanied by a new consideration for "the demand" or for "the customers", i.e., what the students, the professions and employers are asking for. In France, the professionally oriented courses in cultural administration have already fulfilled a good number of these objectives over the past two decades. The Bologna Process can now enable them to extend the objectives, always on condition that new regulatory modes are set in place.

¹⁰ The firm SMBG has set up an evaluation system for courses in the third cycle and in the Masters courses on the basis of the attractiveness criteria, the degree of student satisfaction and their first salaries, (see the weekly French news revue L'Express March 2005)

LA IMPLANTACIÓN DEL PROCESO DE BOLOGNA EN LA EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR EN ESPAÑA Y SUS IMPLICACIONES EN EL ÁMBITO DE LA FORMACIÓN DE GESTORES CULTURALES”

Lluís Bonet

Universitat de Barcelona



SECEB Workshop, Brussels, December 2005

1. La normativa y el modelo universitario de formación superior en España

A. El marco de partida

Para entender los efectos de la transformación del sistema de enseñanza superior en España es necesario conocer el marco y modelo de funcionamiento que ha regido hasta la actualidad. El sistema vigente se estructura en 3 niveles:

- Primer ciclo: Diplomatura (entre 2 y 3 años)
- Segundo ciclo: Licenciatura (de 4 a 6 años en total, siendo posible convalidar una diplomatura afín)
- Tercer ciclo: Doctorado y postgrado

Doctorado (2 años + elaboración posterior de la tesis)

Master (a partir de 320 h.) y Diplomas de postgrado (entre 120 y 320 h.)

El programa básico del primer y segundo ciclo así como de los doctorados es establecido por el Ministerio de Educación después de negociarlo con el Consejo de universidades dando pie a títulos oficiales válidos en todo el país. En cambio, los programas de los master y diplomas de postgrado son establecidos de forma autónoma por las universidades y dan lugar a títulos propios sin carácter oficial. En el caso de las universidades públicas, los programas que dan lugar a títulos oficiales están subvencionados por el estado mientras que los que dan lugar a títulos propios no, con lo que su precio de matrícula es mucho más caro. En contrapartida, cada director de un programa no oficial es libre de escoger su profesorado y su metodología docente, siendo el mercado (más que los mecanismos internos de control de la propia universidad) el que evalúa realmente dichos cursos.

Finalmente, cabe tener en cuenta que un crédito académico corresponde a 10 horas de docencia presencial.

B. El nuevo marco legal

La Ley de ordenación universitaria (LOE) y los Reales decretos de regulación de los estudios de grado y de postgrados de 21 de enero de 2005 establecen el marco, calendario y criterios de adecuación de los estudios de enseñanza superior españoles a Bologna. En un plazo de 5 años los actuales estudios deben transformarse en títulos de grado (entre 180 y 240 ECTS) o postgrado (entre 60 y 120 créditos ECTS). Para acceder a los programas de doctorado se necesita haber superado 300 créditos ECTS.

El catálogo de títulos de grado así como parte importante de su contenido es establecido por el Ministerio de Educación. Dicho catálogo es bastante reducido dando pie a una titulación por cada una de las grandes áreas de conocimiento (derecho, economía, historia, geografía, etc.) con lo que desaparecen las antiguas diplomaturas de especialización profesional. En cambio, da una amplia libertad a las universidades en el establecimiento de los programas y títulos oficiales de postgrado (el Consejo de Universidades y el Ministerio de Educación deben aprobar las propuestas pero no establecen ni el catálogo de títulos ni su contenido mínimo). Su número y contenido depende de la capacidad de cada universidad para financiarlos. En el caso de las universidades públicas, éstas proponen a sus respectivas Comunidades Autónomas (de la cual dependen financieramente) un conjunto de programas oficiales de postgrado que deben ser cubiertos con su propio profesorado ordinario. Así pues, las universidades con mayor número de profesorado o con un buen ratio de profesores en relación a la demanda de grado podrán dar más títulos de postgrado distintos. Dichos títulos, que incluyen los actuales cursos de doctorados previos a la realización de la tesis, se agrupan en programas oficiales de postgrado temáticos (POP) que incluyen diversos títulos oficiales de master. El carácter oficial de los mismos conlleva su integración al sistema subvencionado por el estado, con una tasa de matrícula mucho más económica que la de los títulos propios de postgrado. Éstos no desaparecen con la nueva normativa pero deben encontrar un mercado más profesional o de formación continua dispuesto a pagar tasas más altas por un título no oficial, aunque con una estructura, profesorado, carga horaria o programa mucho más flexible y adaptado a las demandas cambiantes del mercado.

2. El proceso de implantación de la reforma en España

La implantación del sistema de convergencia europea en el ámbito de la enseñanza superior, conocido como el proceso de Bologna, se ha caracterizado en España por:

A. Un gran retraso en su implementación

El anterior gobierno no llegó a aprobar la normativa de adecuación a Bologna antes de las elecciones de marzo de 2004 debido en buena parte a la fuerte resistencia del sistema universitario. Cabe decir que dicha regulación se enmarcaba en una profunda transformación del sistema. El nuevo gobierno tardó casi un año en aprobar los Decretos de referencia, y aun a fecha de hoy (diciembre de 2005) no ha fijado completamente el catálogo de títulos de grado. En este momento las universidades han planteado a sus comunidades autónomas los títulos de postgrado que quieren desarrollar hasta el 2010, algunos de los cuales se podrán empezar a realizar en septiembre de 2006 si obtienen el prescriptivo visto bueno del Consejo de Universidades y el Ministerio de Educación.

El retraso en la implementación del nuevo sistema en relación a buena parte de los países europeos, está teniendo como consecuencia una menor integración de las universidades españolas en los Master europeos de calidad.

B. El aprovechamiento por parte del gobierno y las universidades para conseguir otros objetivos económicos y pedagógicos

La transformación del marco legal se quiere utilizar no solo para facilitar la movilidad académica y profesional entre europeos, sino también para racionalizar y mejorar la calidad del sistema universitario español. La tradición académica y el sistema de créditos español se basan en la transmisión de conocimiento y la docencia magistral. El tránsito hacia el sistema ECTS pretende no solo contabilizar el esfuerzo del alumno en lugar del número de horas de clase, sino también impulsar una metodología docente más participativa, centrada en el desarrollo de habilidades y competencias. Por otro lado, se quiere reducir el número de doctorados existentes con una mayor exigencia de calidad. Pero todo esto se pretende hacer sin incrementar el personal ni el presupuesto, con lo que la capacidad de cada universidad para competir con la demás, en especial en el ámbito más suculento de los postgrados, dependerá de su capacidad para contener la oferta de grado (frente a la presión de la demanda de cada una de sus comunidades locales) y poder reciclar su profesorado hacia postgrados competitivos a nivel español y europeo.

C. El mantenimiento de una elevada incertidumbre sobre su aplicación práctica

La ambición de la transformación planteada está generando una gran lentitud tanto en la definición del mapa de títulos por parte del Ministerio como en el diseño de las estrategias competitivas en cada universidad y Comunidad Autónoma. Cabe tener en cuenta que se están definiendo las propuestas de postgrado sin conocer con certeza el número final de títulos de grado ni su duración temporal (no se sabe cuales serán de 180 y cuales de 240 ECTS). Por otro lado, la transformación de buena parte de los actuales cursos de doctorados en títulos de master deja sin definir cuales serán y como funcionarán los futuros programas de doctorado (dado que no se basarán en la docencia reglada). El Ministerio ya ha planteado que deben reducirse drásticamente dejando únicamente los que han obtenido la mención de calidad por parte de la Agencia Nacional de Calidad Académica (ANECA). Finalmente, cabe tener en cuenta que mientras no desaparezcan las actuales licenciaturas, los nuevos programas de postgrado competirán por los mismos estudiantes.

3. Efectos sobre el ámbito de la formación superior en gestión cultural

A. La formación actual en gestión cultural

Casi toda la oferta formativa en gestión cultural y del patrimonio desarrollada en España desde finales de los años ochenta se compone de programas de postgrado que dan lugar a títulos no oficiales de master o de diploma de postgrado, con denominaciones que van desde la más genérica de gestión cultural, a especialidades muy concretas (museología, turismo cultural, producción de espectáculos, etc.). Se trata, pues, de programas propios de universidad diseñados para dar respuesta a una demanda creciente de profesionalización del sector y que al no ser títulos oficiales deben financiarse en base a las tasas pagadas por los estudiantes. Solo en un par de casos existe un título oficial con una referencia al tema, se trata de sendas licenciaturas en humanidades con la especialización de gestión cultural (aunque dicha especialización es más ficticia que real pues se concreta solo en un par de asignaturas a lo largo de toda la carrera).

Así, pues, la formación en gestión cultural nace bien de la voluntad de unos profesores especialmente sensibles al tema, bien del interés de ciertas universidades en aprovechar la oportunidad para abrir un nuevo mercado.

B. Hacia un nuevo mapa de titulaciones en gestión cultural

La puesta en marcha de la reforma de los títulos de grado y postgrado en España plantea a las universidades con programas en este campo la disyuntiva de mantener los títulos propios (con la flexibilidad que los caracteriza y su financiación a través de las tasas pagadas por los alumnos), o intentar

presentar propuestas de título de master oficial dentro de los recién creados programas oficiales de postgrado (POP).

Tal como se ha comentado, solo universidades con suficiente capacidad docente pueden optar solas a ofrecer con su propio personal un programa de este tipo. Se trata de poder ofrecer entre 60 y 120 créditos ECTS y cumplir con la metodología docente asociada a la implantación de Bologna. Sin embargo, aquellas que se atrevan a ello contarán con unas tasas de matrícula mucho más bajas que las demás, darán un título oficial (de gran importancia en un país de tradición administrativa como es España), tendrán la posibilidad de alcanzar acuerdos con otras universidades extranjeras para crear Master Europeos (pues la normativa española solo lo permite a los POP) y habrán marcado una línea de especialización que las diferenciará de las demás.

Asimismo, respecto otras materias con licenciaturas en su campo, un POP en gestión cultural no entra en competencia por los estudiantes (al no existir ninguna licenciatura en la materia) durante el periodo transitorio existente hasta el 2010.

Ahora bien, la incertidumbre sobre como se desarrollará el proceso y la autonomía existente en los títulos propios hace que casi ninguna universidad española haya decidido de momento presentar un POP en este campo. Según mis informaciones solo en Cataluña (Universidad de Barcelona+Universidad de Girona) y en la Comunidad Valenciana (Universidad de Valencia+Universidad Politécnica de Valencia) se ha pedido a los respectivos gobierno autónomos la posibilidad de crear un POP específico para el curso 2006-2007. En el caso que dichas iniciativas prosperen (deben pasar aun por la autorización de la Comunidad Autónoma, y el visto bueno del Consejo de Universidades y el Ministerio de Educación) es posible que otras universidades hagan lo mismo.

Más allá del tamaño, experiencia y las razones estratégicas comentadas (entre las que no puede obviarse la posibilidad de mantener junto al programa oficial, algunos títulos propios más especializados), tanto en Cataluña como en Valencia existe un compromiso explícito de las universidades para ayudar a legitimar con la puesta en marcha de un título oficial la consolidación de la profesión de gestor cultural.

THE SECEB Newsletter is one of the SECEB project outcomes.

If you would like to **receive one copy** of this newsletter please write to g.cogliandro@encatc.org

ENHANCING THE EUROPEAN COOPERATION IN THE CULTURAL MANAGEMENT HIGHER AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AREA

1st SECEB WORKSHOP

Brussels, 8 & 9 December 2005

The Workshop on “*Enhancing the European cooperation in the cultural management higher and vocational education area*”, was organized in Brussels, Belgium, on the 8th and 9th of December 2005.

This Workshop was organised in close cooperation with the Institut d’Etudes Politiques of Grenoble and it was implemented with the active support of the University of Barcelona, University of Bratislava, University of Potsdam and the Jyväskylä University.

The **main objectives** of this first activity in the framework of the European project SECEB, were the followings:

- To **present, analyse and debate** the outcome of the national workshops previously organised by ENCATC during the whole year 2005;
- To **draft a list of topics** to be discussed and deeply analysed during the second round of Workshops planned by ENCATC during the year 2006;
- To start drafting a questionnaire to be posted on the ENCATC Internet for research action;
- To **collect experiences and new ideas** to organise education and training in different European countries and beyond and to explore the possibility of developing, designing and implementing a joint training programme among the project partners.

This workshop was **targeted** to ENCATC members and actors of the cultural training field will gather experts and representatives of international, European and national organisations involved in the implemenation of this process.

33 people coming from the European Commission, the European Parliament, ELIA, the European Unions of Students, the European Association of Universities and the Bologna ministerial group **attended this event from 11 different European countries.**

In order to efficiently prepare this workshop a number of articles were commissioned to several European experts. All the participants were also provided in Brussels with background material.