

STUDY

Requested by the CULT committee



Research for CULT Committee - Education in Cultural Heritage



Culture and Education



Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies
Directorate General for Internal Policies of the Union
PE 617.486 - June 2018

EN

Research for CULT Committee - Education in Cultural Heritage

Abstract

After a résumé of basic definitions this work aims at recommending to the CULT committee how, in order to contribute to sustainable development, cultural heritage and education should be integrated into an inclusive, horizontal and lifelong learning approach. It is highly recommended having cultural heritage at the very core of education and not as a stopgap and seeing education more deeply rooted in cultural heritage through adequate and efficient mutual long-term partnership policies.

This document was requested by the European Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education.

AUTHORS

Nicole Gesche-Koning

Research manager: Katarzyna Iskra

Project and publication assistance: Lyna Pärt

Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies, European Parliament

LINGUISTIC VERSIONS

Original: EN

ABOUT THE PUBLISHER

To contact the Policy Department or to subscribe to updates on our work for CULT Committee please write to: Poldep-cohesion@ep.europa.eu

Manuscript completed in June 2018

© European Union, 2018

This document is available on the internet in summary with option to download the full text at: <http://bit.ly/2Kyb4V8>

For full text download only:

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/617486/IPOL_STU\(2018\)617486_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/617486/IPOL_STU(2018)617486_EN.pdf)

Further information on research for CULT by the Policy Department is available at:

<https://research4committees.blog/cult/>

Follow us on Twitter: @PolicyCULT

Please use the following reference to cite this in-depth analysis:

Gesche-Koning N., 2018, Research for CULT Committee – Education in Cultural Heritage, European Parliament, Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies, Brussels

Please use the following reference for in-text citations:

Gesche-Koning (2018)

DISCLAIMER

The opinions expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Parliament.

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorized, provided the source is acknowledged and the publisher is given prior notice and sent a copy.

© Cover image used under licence from Shutterstock.com

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. CULTURE, EDUCATION, AND HERITAGE: KEY CONCEPTS	7
1.1. Culture	7
1.2. Education	9
1.3. Cultural heritage	11
2. DYNAMIZING THE CULTURAL HERITAGE. BEYOND PERPETUAL MOTION: POTENTIAL SYNERGIES BETWEEN EDUCATION AND CULTURAL HERITAGE POLICIES	15
2.1. Cultural heritage education to “poetically inhabit the world”	16
2.2. Culture and cultural heritage education policy examples in different Members States	19
3. MODEL SYNERGIES TO BE DEVELOPED BETWEEN CULTURAL HERITAGE AND EDUCATION POLICIES	25
3.1. Successful programmes	26
3.2. Moving forward	28
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	31
4.1. Incorporate structurally heritage education in school curricula	31
4.2. Disseminate good practice transferable examples	32
4.3. Shared information	32
4.4. Encourage training courses in heritage education	34
4.5. Ensure adequate financial resources	35
CONCLUSION	37
REFERENCES	39
ANNEX	45
1. Questionnaire on potential synergies between education and cultural heritage policies and persons who answered	45
2. Let us protect our heritage together	47
3. Best Practice examples	49

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCE	Creativity Culture and Education
CECA	Committee for Education and Cultural Action
CHCFE	Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe
CLA	Cultural Learning Alliance
CoE	Council of Europe
CULT	European Parliament Culture and Education Committee
ECCO	European Conservators'-Restorers' Organisation
ENCATC	European Network on Cultural Management and Cultural Policy Education
FARO	Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society
GEM	Group of Education in Museums, UK
GLO	Generic Learning Outcomes
HEREIN	European Cultural Heritage Information Network
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
ICOM	International Council of Museums
ICOM-CC	ICOM Committee for Conservation
ICOMOS	International Council for Monuments and Sites
JPI	Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage
NEMO	Network of European Museums Organization
OECD	Organization for economic co-operation & development
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
Strategy 21	European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The aim of present study is to provide an in-depth analysis of potential synergies between the education and the cultural heritage policies. **Synergies between education and heritage policies** exist; they nevertheless are **insufficient** and **not structured** in such a way to be helpful enough to both sectors. Links between culture and education and vice versa are not systematically organized, as in the majority of countries they belong to different **separate ministries**.

Following questions have thus been addressed:

- What are the reasons justifying these synergies?
- What goals and initiatives does the EU wish to support by linking cultural heritage and education policies?
- What are the barriers to recommendations put forward since the end of the 20th century and why did they not have the proper follow-up?
- Where has one failed to achieve in this area? And
- What can the EU Parliament do to help?

Europe is facing major changes in **education**, one of the domains, which has evolved less than others since the 19th century. Rethinking the educational system tends to break down barriers and adapt to a changing world. However, the **school curricula** still remain too centred on key subjects with little connection between one and another, not sufficiently related to present-day realities and not sufficiently encompassing skills in digital technology. This leads to poor PISA results, early school dropouts and increased unemployment. In cases where schools and teaching institutions see in culture and cultural heritage an important mind-opener they remain too imprisoned in a day-to-day organisation **lacking flexibility, personnel** and appropriate **financing**. Field trips require **time, money**, efficient, properly **trained** teachers, and **shared responsibilities**.

The **heritage sector** is in constant evolution, rethinking its goals, encompassing new fields and being at the core of new declarations and conventions. It enhances **participation**, engaging not only specialists but also the layman. In developing **public-oriented activities**, from schools to adult lifelong learning, the awareness and need to protect our common heritage has grown, as has the idea of considering it a **shared responsibility**. However, heritage education as such is too often related to one-time events and not centred enough on the long-term. **Integration of heritage matters** in a variety of sectors among which education is an important if not **essential answer to**:

- Democratic citizenship;
- Environmental protection;
- Job growth;
- Social inclusion;
- Sustainable development; and
- Well-being.

The answers to the questions mentioned above reveal:

- **Insufficient communication** and **synergy** between both sectors, the most difficult issue with the quantity of information available nowadays being how to organise it in an efficient way;

- **Lack of structural timing for cultural heritage education** within the present school systems (Culture et Démocratie, 2009);
- Failure to adequately **disseminate good transferable examples** past and present (Collard & Witte, 2015);
- **Too rare long-term programmes** linking education and cultural heritage;
- Insufficient systematic **training** in cultural heritage education (Cramer, 2003); and
- **Too scattered** financial support to ensure both training and cultural heritage education activities.

The **first chapter** analyzes some key concepts related to culture, education and heritage. Building up **responsible citizens** is nowadays advocated as an essential aim for education, preparing people to become more **creative** and **innovative** in a society in search of **new values, equality, social inclusion, and justice** towards a more **sustainable** world in which cultural heritage education may play a key role.

The **second chapter** “Dynamizing the cultural heritage. Beyond perpetual motion” analyzes the potential synergies between the education and cultural heritage sectors showing relevant examples developed in different Member States.

Chapter three describes some past model synergies which could be developed following the major recommendations listed in Strategy 21 according to its three main components, social, territorial and economic and knowledge and education.

Finally the recommendations put forward in the different chapters are grouped in a last chapter. They all derive from the answers to the questions stated above and have the same goal: finding new ways to **open structural synergies** between the education and cultural heritage sectors on a **long-term** and efficient **co-constructive** basis leading towards greater **sustainability**. It is thus here recommended to have this achieved by:

- **Integrating structurally cultural heritage education in all school curricula;**
- **Maintaining and developing** existing synergies;
- Developing new synergies between education and cultural heritage policies on a **long-term, integrated, and inclusive** approach;
- Having **centralized, practical, useful** and **shared information** between both the cultural heritage and education policies;
- **Disseminating good practice transferable and/or adaptable examples** ;
- **Developing systematic training courses** in cultural heritage education ; and
- **Ensuring adequate financial resources** to meet these recommendations ;

1. CULTURE, EDUCATION, AND HERITAGE: KEY CONCEPTS

KEY FINDINGS

- The words **culture**, **cultural heritage** and **education** have evolved through time and are not understood in the same way when going from one language to another.
- **Culture** must be seen as a **main generic term**.
- **Cultural heritage**, both tangible and intangible, concerns both the past and the present, integrating also the arts.
- **Education** and **culture** are **key components of all learning processes**.
- **Education**, **culture** and **cultural heritage** should not be seen as solely a response to the market-based economy; it is recommended to consider them as **tools towards sustainable development**.

Before analysing potential synergies between education and cultural heritage policies, one should first define how culture, education and heritage are understood according to the latest European and international documents, in order to understand their evolution through time.

1.1. Culture

Reference is here made to following key documents described further down:

- The *European Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe* (1954);
- The *Agenda 21 for Culture* adopted in 2004;
- The *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, further referred to as the *FARO Convention* (2005);
- The *Fribourg Declaration on Cultural Rights* (2007); and
- The *Hangzhou Declaration* (2013).

The “European Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe” (1954) insists on the role of culture “in the **progress of social knowledge, the understanding of others and the transmission of values**”.

In the Undertakings of the *Agenda 21 for Culture* (II, art. 17 to 45), one of the first international documents “systematically addressing the importance of the relationship between culture, citizenship, and sustainability”, art. 38 is interesting in stressing the importance of generating “**coordination between cultural and education policies**, encouraging the promotion of **creativity** and **sensitivity** and the **relations** between **cultural expressions** of the territory and the **education system**”.

The nine sections addressed in the *Agenda 21 for Culture*¹ all have a **direct link to heritage** issues which culture and heritage education could enhance through efficient

¹ Cultural rights; Heritage, diversity, and creativity; Culture and education; Culture and environment; Culture and economy; Culture, equality, and social inclusion; Culture, urban planning, and public space; Culture, information, and knowledge; and Governance of culture.

collaboration policies. Heritage definitions are included in this chapter as they should be considered as an integral part of culture. They are further developed under 1.3.

The words “culture”, “cultural identity” and “cultural community” used in this study refer to the slightly different definitions in the FARO Convention and the *Fribourg Declaration on Cultural Rights*.

In the **FARO Convention (art. 2)**:

a. **Cultural heritage** is “a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time”.

b. A **heritage community** consists of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage, which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations.

Whereas in the **Fribourg Declaration (art. 2)**: “culture” encompasses “cultural heritage” with no direct reference to the past which prevents considering present heritage as being part of the cultural heritage, the “heritage community” becomes a “cultural community” and a third notion is added, that of “cultural identity”:

*a. The term “**culture**” covers those values, beliefs, convictions, languages, knowledge and the arts, traditions, institutions and ways of life through which a person or a group expresses their humanity and the meanings that they give to their existence and to their development;*

*b. The expression “**cultural identity**” is understood as the sum of all cultural references through which a person, alone or in community with others, defines or constitutes oneself, communicates and wishes to be recognised in one’s dignity;*

*c. “**Cultural community**” connotes a group of persons who share references that constitute a common cultural identity that they intend to preserve and develop”.*

The FARO definition mentions the word “environment” and the “interaction between people and places through time”; it also includes the notion of transmitting the heritage to future generations what is not explicitly stipulated in the Fribourg Declaration.

Bearing these two definitions in mind, for this study it is recommended to adopt the terms “culture” and “cultural identity” from the Fribourg Declaration and refer to the FARO Convention for the definition of “heritage community”, but giving it the wider name of “cultural community”.

As to the last document, the Hangzhou Declaration places culture at the very **heart of sustainable development policies** through the specific contributions that it can make: “In the face of mounting challenges such as population growth, urbanization, environmental degradation, disasters, climate change, increasing inequalities and persisting poverty, there is an urgent need for new approaches (...). These new approaches should fully acknowledge the role of culture as a system of values and a resource and framework to build truly sustainable development, the need to draw from the experiences of past generations, and the recognition of culture as part of the global and local commons as well as a wellspring for creativity and renewal (...) as a driver for sustainable development, through the specific

contributions that it can make – as knowledge capital and a sector of activity – to inclusive social, cultural and economic development, harmony, environmental sustainability, peace and security”.

1.2. Education²

Key documents referring to education are mainly references to publications published this century except for the works of Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, Gardner, 1993, and Delors, 1996. A balance has been searched between French and English speaking publications as education has different connotations according to country and language, which this section will address.

The word ‘education’ in this study is taken in its broader sense of **construction of opportunities** enabling people to **develop skills and mindsets** that help them not only live in ways that advance “worthy goals” (Reimers, 2018), i.e. market-led, but prepare them to become **responsible and active citizens** in a continuously and rapidly changing world in which what one has learned today will be obsolete tomorrow, people being thus obliged to constantly adapt to new jobs probably far removed from their basic knowledge and skills. “How can the traditional education systems be made fit to meet the challenges caused by the rapidly changing conditions of the European economies which are increasingly in competition with a globalized market” (Wimmer, 2006)? Twelve years later, this question remains more relevant than ever. “Economic realism cannot be the sole response to today’s challenge”, cries out professor Winand in his presentation at the 1st World conference on humanities in Liège last August (Winand, 2018). It is time we “give a human face to globalization” as Audrey Azoulay stated in her opening speech November 2017 as new Director general of UNESCO.

The words ‘teaching’, ‘learning’ skills and ‘knowledge’ encompass all language distinctions between goals (acquisition of knowledge and skills), methods (formal and informal), formal division (preschool, primary, secondary, college, vocational, university, lifelong learning), and means (learning, pedagogy and training).

Education is still too knowledge-oriented on a day-to-day basis, lacking flexibility. It is in crucial need of rethinking its main goals and methods **including cultural and cultural heritage matters**. It is more centred on an individual search of personal goals, which the **use of arts** and **cultural heritage education** may enhance.

The school system³ is in need, not of continuous reforms but of a real transformation both in its structure and its means; following sociologist Delvaux, changing our present societies can only be done according to the values one wants to give them in terms of equality, justice and democracy (Delvaux, 2015). The process might be a long one and seen as utopian. It requires knowledge but also **personal implication** involving both spirit and body - which culture and cultural heritage education may develop - to understand what the different identities are and therefore getting involved more deeply in the knowledge of our **common heritage**. Key competences will remain necessary (Steiner & Ladjali, 2013) but may be no longer acquired through traditional vertical transmission but on a more individual search of one’s personal goals. Within these new dimensions, the **use of arts**

² The main references used are in chronological order: Meirieu, 2001, Robinson, 2001, Wimmer, 2006, Culture & Démocratie, 2009, Biesta, 2009, Taddei, 2009, Thomson, 2010, Perrenoud, 2011, Culture & Démocratie, 2011, Steiner & Ladjali, 2013, Morin, 2014, Biesta, 2015 a, b & c, Delvaux 2015 a & b), Develay, 2015, Elfert, 2015, UNESCO, 2015, and Reimers, 2018.

³ For an overview of European education systems, see: www.euroeducation.net/prof/ and recommendations following the Gothenburg summit: www.schooleducationgateway.eu/en - Accessed 7 March 2018.

and cultural heritage education, which already appeared in a number of school mission statements some twenty years ago, may play a **key role**. As further stated in the recommendations they should nevertheless be integrated systematically and **structurally** in all education institutions (Culture & Démocratie, 2009), with schools having to “fundamentally reflect on the cultural and heritage dimension of its goals” (Meirieu, 2001) in order to be better adapted to the changing society and the world of internet.

Building up **responsible citizens** is nowadays advocated as an essential aim for education. It is nevertheless too often only seen as the potential acquisition of jobs and an answer to the consumer market in which “individual and collective identities and behaviours are undermined by a culture of competition” (Thomson, 2010) leading to the PISA surveys and the much-criticized so-called “Finland syndrome” (Biesta, 210, Taddei, 2009). According to the Belgian 1996 *Décret missions* defining the main priority missions of primary and secondary education, education should prepare all students to become responsible citizens, able to contribute to the development of a democratic, sharing and pluralist society, open to others (Art. 6)⁴. The final goal remains nevertheless market-oriented as in the future *Pacte pour l'excellence*⁵, setting forth the goal of becoming excellent in terms of the competitive economic market. Responsibility appears also in ‘Une toute autre école’ (A completely new school) which revises the goals and methods of education and advocates meaning making, personal development towards better living in harmony within a new humanity and society⁶.

In this neo-liberal context how can schools adapt themselves accordingly, and foster competition to meet the OECD standards in a profitability and efficiency perspective? What remains from the desired emancipation described some twenty years ago in Delors’ four pillars (Delors, 1996): learning **to know**, learning **to do**, learning **to live together** and thus learning **to be**?

If the goal of the school is to train people for life, the traditional disciplines mainly taught include only occasionally new disciplines such as new technologies, media, health, inter-cultural analysis, religion, citizenship, technology, sustainable development issues and cultural topics like arts and heritage (Perrenoud, 2011).

The *Manifesto for changing education* (Morin, 2014) considers that the first mission of education is “**learning to live**”, meaning learning to be confronted with complexity, to understand the world and human beings, to live one’s human condition as inhabitant of the earth. Understanding humans is for Morin one of the keys for the future of education: “it is not only our personal lives which are destroyed by incomprehension, it is the entire planet which suffers (...) Incomprehension bears the germs of death”.

It is therefore recommended as further stated to see education as a way of preparing people to become more **creative** and **innovative** in a society in search of **new values**, **equality**, **social inclusion**, and **justice** towards a more **sustainable** world. There should be a “**new balance** between the arts, sciences and humanities in education and in the forms of thinking they promote. They should be taught in ways that reflect their intimate **connections** in the world beyond education” (Robinson, 2001), with “**creativity** bringing with it the ability to question, make connections, innovate, problem solve, communicate,

⁴ *Décret définissant les missions prioritaires de l'enseignement fondamental et de l'enseignement secondaire et organisant les structures propres à les atteindre* : http://www.galillex.cfwb.be/fr/leg_res_01.php?ncda=21557&

⁵ <http://www.pactedexcellence.be>

⁶ https://www.toutautrechose.be/category/groupes/tout_autre_ecole - Last accessed 8 March 2018.

collaborate and to reflect critically, ... skills ... vital for young people to play their part in a rapidly changing world" (Thomson, 2010). Slowing down, as recommended by Professor of Education and Director of Research Biesta (Biesta, 2010), needs time for meeting and practising what he calls "grown-up-ness", i.e. meeting the world. Cultural heritage may be considered as a way to achieve this sustainable goal.

1.3. Cultural heritage

The concept of **cultural heritage**, which according to ICOMOS must be considered as a **cornerstone of any cultural policy**, is constantly evolving. The following recent documents shed new light on cultural heritage:

- The so-called *FARO Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage* (2005);
- The *Bruges Declaration on Cultural heritage: a resource for Europe* stressing the benefits of **interaction** (2010);
- The *Namur Declaration* (2015) considering that cultural heritage is "a **necessary response to the current challenges**" (I, art. 3);
- The EU funded project *Cultural Heritage counts for Europe* (CHCfE) (www.encatc.org/culturalheritagecountsforeurope);
- The *European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century* further referred to as Strategy 21 focusing on the three main components of cultural heritage: social, economic and territorial, and knowledge and education;
- The *EU-wide survey on cultural heritage Special Eurobarometer 466 on people's involvement* with cultural heritage and the **value** they attach to Europe's cultural heritage, including the **barriers** of access to culture.

Beyond the FARO Convention definition of cultural heritage

The definition used in this study relates to the FARO Convention (art.2a) commented above under the sub-heading "culture". Concerning the words "cultural heritage", the notion of 'past' is not clearly timely defined. We therefore also include in this study our immediate past which makes it possible to incorporate into the cultural heritage all contemporary expressions of art, which already belong to the past as soon as they exist.

A definition of the adjective 'cultural' linked to heritage is missing. We therefore include arts and link the arts with heritage, the latter appearing usually at the end – if ever - of long lists of what is understood under the heading of "cultural policies".

As already stated above, the heritage community definition (art. 2b) is more restrictive than the 'cultural community' defined in the Fribourg Declaration, which we prefer mainly because of the idea of shared references that constitute a common cultural identity.

The Namur Declaration

The Declaration was adopted in April 2015 at the end of the 6th conference of the Committee of Ministers of the European Council in charge of heritage organised during the EU presidency of Belgium; it states in art. 2 that "cultural heritage is a key component of the European identity; it is of general public interest and its transmission to future generations is a shared responsibility; it is a unique resource, fragile, non-renewable and non-relocatable, contributing to the attractiveness and the development of Europe and, crucially, to the creation of a more peaceful, just and cohesive society" and art. 3, that "a Strategy for redefining the place and role of cultural heritage in Europe is therefore a necessary response to the current challenges in the light of the changing European socio-

economic and cultural context". It insists also on the role of cultural heritage for social cohesion, intercultural and intergeneration dialogue, topics which are all addressed in Strategy 21.

Strategy 21 and the cultural heritage integrated approach

Strategy 21 starts by giving a thorough analysis of the words "cultural heritage" from Antiquity to present days with the term replacing the expression "historic monument" from 1970 onwards. The issues dealt with in the 21st century refer more to the question "who should one be preserving for" rather than just preserving the heritage, this being "the very rationale" of the Faro Convention, "which underpins the entire process of the European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century". The aim of Strategy 21 is to "reposition cultural heritage policies, placing them at the heart of an integrated approach focusing on the conservation, protection and promotion of heritage by society as a whole."

Strategy 21 therefore strives to create an integrated heritage management in accordance with three main components, "social" (S), "territorial and economic" (D) and "knowledge and education" (K), with each component developing its own challenges, recommendations and courses of action. Must these three components be considered as three different aspects of heritage or should they not be constantly put in relation, which would allow for a larger amount of convergence?

One can see from the Venn diagram, which illustrates how the three components are integrated by the means of links between the Strategy 21 recommendations and challenges that great efforts need to be made with regard to the education sector; the latter appears as the poor relation in regard to the social and territorial and economic components of the strategy. As the interfaces between the three components show the areas of convergence, one can see that many recommendations of the K component lack interfaces with the two other components and that the K component is underrepresented in the main area of convergence. This will be further discussed in Chapter 3.

Strategy 21 may be seen positively by the fact that it does not consider the economy as the first key component. Economy appears in the second position and after the territorial development. Knowledge and education appear third. One may ask if one should not take things in reverse order starting with point 3, then 1 to end with point 2? This would perhaps make it possible to find alternatives to the present market-driven world that is putting both people and the earth, and hence our heritage, in danger. As already stated in the executive summary and further recommended, **Education** has to be considered as a **key component** in the world development, dealing in the first place with human beings, from which social inclusion and its challenges will be attained, then leading in the end to the development of territorial and economic issues towards sustainable development.

The Eurobarometer 466

Eurobarometer 466 was commissioned by the Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture in order to evaluate the attitudes and opinions of European citizens regarding the cultural heritage. Following questions were addressed:

- Personal implication and interest towards cultural heritage;
- Barriers to access to cultural heritage;
- Importance of cultural heritage for the local community, the region, the country and the EU in general;
- The values linked to cultural heritage;

- The impact of cultural heritage on tourism and employment; and
- The bodies in charge of cultural heritage.

Next to the data from Eurobarometer 466 stating among others that three quarters of Europeans think that the EU and its Member States and public authorities should **allocate more resources to protecting Europe's cultural heritage** and that cultural heritage should be part of school curricula (Table 1), data presented for the launching of the European Year of Cultural Heritage assert that only 17% (2014-2016) and 16% (2017) of the supported actions within the Creative Europe programme are related to cultural heritage.

Table 1: Key statistical data regarding cultural heritage

EUROPEAN CULTURAL HERITAGE	%
People considering cultural heritage as important for the EU	80%
People estimating cultural heritage as very important for the EU	39%
People wanting to know more about the European cultural heritage	68%
Cultural exchanges play a big role in mutual understanding and more tolerance	82%
Barriers to cultural heritage access: lack of time	37%
Barriers to cultural heritage access: costs	34%
Barriers to cultural heritage: lack of interest	25%
Cultural heritage should be taught in schools	88%
Public authorities ought to spend more on European cultural heritage	74%
National authorities must be the first responsible of caring the European cultural heritage	46%

Source: EUROBAROMETER (2017) 466

2. DYNAMIZING THE CULTURAL HERITAGE. BEYOND PERPETUAL MOTION: POTENTIAL SYNERGIES BETWEEN EDUCATION AND CULTURAL HERITAGE POLICIES

KEY FINDINGS⁷

- **Synergies exist but need to be structurally organised.** Even if they may sustain both **social inclusion** and **territorial and economic developments**, the potential synergies should not be seen as solely market-oriented.
- Revising the entire **“school culture”** is the first key topic to deal with before even thinking of building up synergies.
- **Cultural heritage education** and **arts education** should be put at the **same level** as **culture sustaining education**: reflections on synergies between arts education, culture education and education policies are **transferable to the cultural heritage education field**. **Cultural heritage education is a key component to the entire learning process** and should not be seen as an **enhancement to nationalistic pride**.
- **Cultural heritage education** enhances people’s capability to become not only **fulfilled citizens** able to live in society but also **responsible citizens** regarding the protection of cultural heritage.

Creative Alliances for Europe

The report *Creative Alliances for Europe* (Collard & Witte, 2015) prepared by the BkJ (German Federation for Arts Education and Cultural Learning) and the CCE (Creativity, Culture and Education) and funded by the Stiftung Mercator delivers interesting findings regarding cultural education. It is mainly centred on creativity and cultural education defined as such: “the term creative and cultural education is used in this report to cover a wide variety of practice, including but not limited to arts education, creative education, cultural education, creative or cultural learning, as well as activity which takes place in the formal, non-formal and informal sectors. It is also important to remember that these terms do not always easily translate into other European languages, and frequently change their meaning when they do. What is important is that the use of the term creative and cultural education in this report is intended to be as inclusive as possible”. Culture education is seen as the path to **“strengthen our understanding of the value of Europe”**, enabling people to become “active and **constructive citizens** of Europe” by developing the “capacity to solve problems without violence”, the “creativity and resilience to imagine and realise a **better world**”, “daring to be different and valuing **diversity**”. This applies also to cultural heritage education if one accepts as analyzed in the 1st chapter that cultural heritage is *per se* cultural. Useful statements in this report are:

- “The problem lies not in having strategies (about creativity and cultural heritage), but in why they are not implemented by policy makers” who are considered to be “convinced of the need and benefits (of it);

⁷ The key findings in this chapter derive from following publications: Cramer, 2003, Bamford, 2005, Wimmer, 2006, Branchesi, 2007, van der Auwera, 2007, Culture et Démocratie, 2009, Kerlan, 2009a, van Lakenfeld & Gussen, 2011, Stevenson, 2012, Kaysers & Kunz-Ott, 2012, Nardi, 2012 & 2016, Bordeaux, 2013, Collard & Witte, 2015, European Commission 2017b & c, Fontal & Marin, 2012 & 2016

- According to the huge differences in investment and quality between different parts of Europe (which appear also in Eurobarometer 466), cultural heritage education cannot be “addressed by generalised approaches”;
- In order to “navigate the complexities” of the world, “high quality creative and cultural (heritage) education can develop the skills necessary to achieve this goal⁸;
- It is highly recommended to “firmly anchor cultural education in schools”;
- Distinction is made between “education in the arts (learning about the arts), education for the arts (developing the skills, knowledge and techniques necessary to be an artist) and education through the arts (using the capacity of the arts to develop one’s potential and understand the world)”. These ideas are developed hereunder widening the concept to cultural heritage education.

2.1. Cultural heritage education to “poetically inhabit the world”

Cultural education⁹ refers most generally to arts education. Arts education is far more integrated in the school systems than heritage education. It is the core of most workshops organised both in schools and by art museums education departments. When well conducted and perceived they can be very productive and useful. However they have often been criticized for being not ‘serious’ enough within a heritage setting like museums and potentially disturbing visitors, which accounts for their location sometimes being far from the objects or works of art analysed. Both cultural education and cultural heritage education are left more to the teacher’s and the heritage educators’ personal appreciation. They seldom figure within the school curriculum as in some countries art(s) or education do (Cramer, 2003).

Arts education can be seen ‘in’, ‘for’, and ‘through’ the arts. The nuances in the different conceptions behind the words ‘in’, ‘for’, and ‘through’ are key to the goals fixed when looking for potential synergies between education and cultural heritage policies.

Education ‘in’, ‘for’ and ‘through’ culture and heritage

Linking education and cultural heritage can be tackled from different angles¹⁰:

- Education **in** heritage: initiating and discovering the richness of heritage with students;
- Education **for** the heritage: being at the service of the heritage by initiating shared experiences with people from here and elsewhere but also by seeing the heritage as something to be transmitted to future generations;
- Education **through** heritage: using heritage as a learning tool to discover the world and one’s own identity and enabling to build up knowledge, skills and learning to live.

Tackling only the knowledge approach is not in our opinion the best solution: some school visits to museums or heritage sites may remain but will find their way into attics of our

⁸ According to education programme manager and senior consultant in heritage and museums Arja van Veldhuizen, in one of her answers to the survey sent out for this study, it is of utmost importance to add the notion of **dealing with complexity** to the admitted set of 21st century skills in a period where ‘truth’ seems to become more and more a vanishing concept, and where one-liners seem to rule the world while at the same time communication structures get more and more complex.

⁹ For country profiles, see: Wimmer, 2006 & European Commission (2015): ec.europa.eu/education/monitor

¹⁰ I am most indebted to Michel Dechamps from the association Patrimoine à roulettes for his unpublished report for this analysis: *Une éducation au patrimoine, pour le patrimoine ou par le patrimoine.*

memory. Learning 'for' or 'through' the heritage will be more efficient as students establish links, which will **anchor the acquired knowledge** in a knowledge network.

Studies in pedagogy reveal that knowledge acquired by personal investment and experience has more impact than transmitted knowledge passively received (Hein, 1998). Moreover, the more links that one can establish between different topics, the deeper the roots of knowledge and the bigger the motivation. Not only do the students learn something about heritage, maybe most importantly they are able to do something with this knowledge, eventually going on to develop other abilities. Learners become not only "aware of the value of heritage as such" but also of "its value for their own learning and development processes" where heritage is not a goal as such but a "vehicle for personal learning and development" (van Lakerveld, 2011), leading to an "ability to question, make connections, innovate, problem solve, communicate, collaborate and to reflect critically" (Thomson, 2010).

It is thus recommended as stated further starting learning 'through' the heritage before 'for' the heritage, learning 'in' heritage being left to one's own appreciation.

Heritage as tool, answer and support

The heritage can be used:

- a) As a **learning tool**; but also as
- b) A firm link to bring answers to **questions** that arise during learning; and
- c) As **learning support**.

It is a valuable tool for many disciplines and offers unexpectedly rich possibilities for developing further competences among students, for example:

- Linking mathematics and heritage by constructing measuring tools, thus enabling students to compare the height of buildings, calculating surfaces, etc.;
- Asking oneself questions about the places one passes through every day and wondering how the names of the streets are chosen;
- Using the heritage for language learning¹¹; and
- Using the environment of a castle as a film or theatre setting (van Lakerveld, 2011).

In addition to supporting classical disciplines taught in schools, heritage can also serve to support other crucial disciplines in our troubled world and furthermore linked to **values, citizenship** and **identity**. It may also enhance **transversal competences** like entrepreneurial and initiative spirits, data search abilities and team-working, promoting "social learning, motivation and improving social ethos" (Thomson, 2010), building up "enlightened, creative citizens with critical thinking" about oneself and the world (de Ville, 2014) and solidarity minded (Steiner & Ladjali, 2014). Integrating arts and culture within education may help to building up inventive, autonomous and responsible citizens. According to Yves Hanosset, founder of the association Patrimoine à roulettes, "Heritage is **universal** regarding the questions it asks and determines **identity** in the answers it brings".

¹¹ This is used in many museums and heritage sites, all the more so in light of the new migrants' arrival in urgent need of developing basic skills in the language of the host country. Museums and heritage sites are of great help in this matter as they allow people to find empathy with an artist or any form of heritage when not recalling and linking them with their own past.

Some key questions found in the reviewed literature (Thomson, 2010, Hein, 2012) are adapted hereunder to match the Strategy 21 report in linking education and heritage policies to the social and economic components.

Cultural heritage education is crucial to education as it may be seen as:

- Life pathways towards **social futures**: who am I, where do I come from, and where am I going?
- An introduction to **multi-literacies** and **communicational media**: how do I make sense of the heritage and communicate with the world about it?
- Leading to **active citizenship**: where are my rights and responsibilities in communities, cultures and economies regarding heritage?
- **Environments** and **technologies**: how do I describe, analyse and shape the natural and cultural world around me?

Cultural heritage education

According to the Euro barometer 466, 9 out of 10 people think **cultural heritage should be taught in schools** because it is about our history and our culture (Table 1). They were not asked to justify their choice, which would have been interesting. The only nuance was according to where people lived. Those living close to heritage were more in favour than those living far away. All the museum educators, museum and heritage site curators and directors, teachers, school teachers, professors and consultants in heritage matters approached by the survey sent out for this study answered in the same way, arguing and giving thorough examples of how they have linked cultural heritage and education for more than forty years and are convinced of the benefits for all (Appendix 1). No general studies of these benefits really exist. When they do exist (Fontal & Marin, 2016) they refer most generally to arts education sometimes included in heritage education. The fact that teachers and heritage educators continue practising culture and heritage education speaks for the implicit recognition that they are doing the right thing and that culture and heritage and their pedagogy are key factors towards tolerance, civic and social integration (CoE, 1998). It is not because they are doing something that one can decide that what they are doing is good. Nevertheless, in the case of cultural heritage education, the different studies used for this analysis all witness this implicit recognition. They all recommend to have **cultural heritage matters integrated** in the local, regional and national education policies together with cultural and heritage policies. Let us foster, even if sounding as a political statement, following heritage professionals Grever & van Boxtel, "building bridges instead of walls", developing a "dynamic" multi-perspective approach of heritage (Grever & van Boxtel, 2014) and linking cultural heritage education and education in a "mutually beneficial relation" (van Lakerveld et al., 2011).

Culture and cultural education must integrate cultural heritage education and we therefore suggest integrating the latter in the conclusions of research and surveys about arts education. Future research should clearly mention the words "cultural heritage" in their presentations.

Arts, culture and cultural heritage education must not be seen as quantifiable disciplines but on the contrary, must enable children to "poetically inhabit the world" (Lauret, in Saez et al. 2014). Their educational advantages are obvious:

- Cultural education may be approached through a variety of angles and seen as a multi-sensory, emotional, cross-disciplinary and constructivist (Hein, 1998) approach;

- Cultural heritage education is not a question of only knowledge; one can smell, breath, touch the heritage; it moves our spirit, our senses, our hearts. A great variety of doors may lead to cultural heritage education, among which oral and intergenerational transmission should not be forgotten.
- It is about “personal **emotion** and **sensory apprehension**”, developing “knowledge, creativity, artistic sense, and critical judgement, a teaching approach which exploits all the senses in order to favour **inclusion** over exclusion and is capable of **integrating** anyone” (Branchesi, 2007: 44).
- This includes Gardner’s “multiple intelligences” (Gardner, 1993). The author stresses that students learn in different ways according to their different minds: visual-spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, linguistic, logical-mathematical.
- It also refers to the “flow experience”: “A state in which people are so involved in an activity that nothing else seems to matter; the experience is so enjoyable that people will continue to do it even at great cost, for the sheer sake of doing it” (Csikszentmihalyi 1990).

2.2. Culture and cultural heritage education policy examples in different Members States¹²

Astonishingly the Education and training monitor (European Commission, 2017) in its analyse of school systems in need of revision, does not mention culture and cultural heritage education as potential factors of innovation and creativity as reported in the Creative Alliances for Europe (Collard & Witte, 2015). The main difficulty in establishing constructive synergies between the heritage and the education policies is the variety of bodies to which they belong: Minister of Education, of Education and Culture, of Sports and Culture, of Science and Research, etc. As further recommended, listing per country all bodies and levels (national, regional or local) in charge of education and heritage matters would greatly help moving forward. Moreover, all national Observatories of culture should integrate cultural heritage.

Analysing the potential synergies between the education and cultural heritage policies, one must also stress the important challenge of ensuring the right for all to participate in cultural life (Romainville, 2013), taking the structural and financial barriers in the access to culture into account (Zdrojewski, 2018). In addition to financial barriers, education constitutes another barrier in explaining the great lack of interest for culture (Eurobarometer 466), hence the importance of developing efficient synergies allowing for a better use of cultural heritage within, as already stated, a structural integration in the school system.

In Belgium¹³, the *Décret Culture-Ecole* (24/3/2006) from the Federation Wallonia-Brussels funds long-term and one-shot collaborations between schools and an institutional partner next to more thematic structures based on an annual call for projects. All awarded projects are published annually in a downloadable publication, *Chemins de traverse*. The French speaking *Décret missions* recommends the transmission of cultural heritage in all its aspects and discovering other cultures in order to weave new **social links**, preserving the **memory** of events, which help to understand the past and the present (Art. 9). “*Bouger les*

¹² Many examples listed here can serve as model examples which can be added to the more concise list in Chapter 3.

¹³ For Flanders, see : Van der Auwera, S. (2007), *Erfgoededucatie in het Vlaamse onderwijs. Erfgoed en onderwijs in dialoog*, Brussels, CANON Cultuurcel.

lignes" (Moving Lines) is a new umbrella alliance bringing together the education and culture ministries of the present legislature (2014-2019); through the motto "federate to succeed", with the PECA programme (Parcours d'éducation culturelle et artistique), synergies between schools and the cultural world are encouraged; the word cultural heritage is nevertheless not mentioned as such; it is strongly recommended to include it to all documents dealing with cultural education. For best practice examples of programmes linking education and heritage, see Annex 3.

The education policies of most **Central and Eastern European countries** include arts and visits to heritage sites at least at the primary school levels and encourage further practice in the arts. The number of hours dedicated in schools to art and cultural heritage matters is more important than in Western Europe, yet even if considered as serving the children's fulfilled development, people see this integration of arts and culture in schools as a tool for promoting **nationalistic pride**. In view of the growing extremism Europe is faced with, this dimension must be taken seriously all over Europe. Fortunately this promotion of nationalistic ideas is not a general tendency as in **Poland** the Laboratory of Creative Education (CCA) in Warsaw has proven since its creation and recently in its helping reshape the Muzeum Sztuki in Lodz. In **Hungary**, the legal framework encourages heritage education and activities, mainly led by the Museum Education Centre (MOKK) located in the Hungarian Open Air Museum in Szentendre, however with no class time or financing provided (Balázs-Bécsi, 2016). The **Czech Republic** famous for its Centre for museology and world heritage centre in Brno has also developed museum pedagogy (it is not clearly stated if cultural heritage is included as a special topic (Jagosová & Mrásová (2015)). In **Slovenia**, the heritage department Motovila is led with the support of the Ministry of Culture and the Directorate General for Education and Culture, in collaboration with the Communications Networks of the European Commission. In **Slovakia**, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural development is in charge of the Museum St Anton, one of the most active museums regarding tangible and intangible heritage education (Ciz, 2012).

Northern countries praise school outings to cultural and heritage sites and have a far more democratic approach to education through and with the help of arts and cultural heritage, and have invested massively in cultural access and free tuition. They have been among the first to tackle the problem of migrants in an integrative approach in their education and cultural programmes and activities (Chayder, 2012). The strength of their education centres (skoletjenesten) is their long established relation to museums and heritage centres for whom they coordinate all school visits.

Similar centres exist in **Germany** (Museumsdienst in Cologne and Museumspädagogisches Zentrum (MPZ) in Munich). The department for heritage and monuments (Denkmalschutz) within the different Länder and also the museum educators association (Bundesverband Museumspädagogik) develop more and more synergies with schools and lifelong learning (Kaysers & Ott, 2011).

France has integrated history of art as a compulsory topic for all children in primary and secondary schools, not limiting it to being knowledge based but also enhancing the practice of arts. Initiated under the ministry of Jack Lang at the beginning of the century, it has undergone revision before being officialised as the "artistic agreement" under François Hollande. The aim of this alliance between education and cultural policies is to provide all children a chance in a social inclusion approach, since arts education is considered the best tool for cultural democracy to help in the transitions we are faced with in education – such as passing from a page- to a screen-based education and from "piled-up knowledge" to a sort of "archipelago knowledge" (Collin & Karsenti, 2013).

Arts education may, according to the transnational research conducted between France and Germany (Saez et al. 2014):

- Encourage inter-culturality;
- Make use and take advantage of digital cultures;
- Support jobs creation in the cultural spheres, as artists are needed; and
- Encourage dynamic partnerships over the long term.

In the **United Kingdom**, schools are privileged in being able to rely on the numerous activities and documents proposed by **Historic England**, the former governmental English Heritage and nowadays a charity, bringing the story of England to life through inspiring visitor experiences yet making sure that the historic sites and artefacts are being properly maintained. The long lasting **Group for Education in Museums** (GEM), which has a very user friendly and efficient website, sees itself as the “voice for heritage education” (Stevenson, 2012). Valuable input on heritage education and learning will be found in publications as Anderson, 1997 & Lang, Reeve & al., 2006. Two evaluations¹⁴, one for the Department for Education and Employment and the Museums and Galleries Education Programme, the second for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport and the Department for Education and Skills, questioned the value of heritage education. The research both show the importance of museums in stimulating learning, with a number of potential learning outcomes for pupils and teachers linked to the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLO), i.e. :

- Knowledge and understanding;
- Skills;
- Attitudes and values;
- Enjoyment, inspiration, creativity; and
- Action behaviour, progression.

The second evaluation has identified various barriers to using museums, which are:

- Difficulties of transport and its organisation;
- Levels of administration and risk assessment;
- Perceived constraints of curriculum;
- Getting cover for teachers in secondary schools;
- Lack of knowledge of what it is possible and realistic to expect museums to do; and
- Limited communication with the museum.

In **Greece** the Department of Educational Programs of the Ministry of Culture and Sports is designed to develop educational programmes aiming at encouraging children and young people to become involved in the country’s history and cultural heritage and become aware of the importance of heritage conservation. This last issue of heritage conservation is very

¹⁴ *Learning through culture is working* (2002) & *Inspiration, Identity, Learning: The Value of Museums* (2004): <https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/museumstudies/rcmg/projects/learning-through-culture/Learning%20through%20Culture.pdf> & www.culture.gov.uk/global/publications/archive_2004/va_lueofmuseums www.teachernet.gov.uk/museums www.le.ac.uk/museumstudies/rcmg/rcmg.htm

seldom tackled. This was stressed in the European Raphael programmes “Training of guides” and “Let’s protect our heritage together”. These programmes were conducted by the Université libre de Bruxelles (Périer-D’Ieteren, 1998) in partnership with ICCROM and other conservation institutes in France, Ireland and Belgium (1996-1998). The need for heritage education awareness has been further developed when I was asked to present as museum heritage educator the importance of dealing with heritage conservation issues within cultural heritage education (Vienna, 2007 at the annual conference of the committee on conservation of ICOM (“Five minutes for eternity”) and at the HERITY conference in Rome (Gesché-Koning, 2014). The main argument was to convince heritage educators to spend a minimum of five minutes on conservation issues allowing for many hours of restoration to be avoided. Many heritage activities for schools have been developed and supported by the Melina programme Education and Culture (Papanikolau, 2016). Due to the financial crisis little remains of the fabulous activities organized in the 1980’s and 1990’s and presented at museum education conferences around the world¹⁵.

Croatia has been very proactive even during the difficult times of the splitting up of former Yugoslavia and takes an active part in linking both the cultural heritage and education sectors (Vujic & Babic, 2012). The city of Dubrovnik hosting the annual cultural heritage conference “The Best in Heritage”¹⁶ created by Tomisláv Sola is called the “Cannes of heritage”: all heritage awarded museums, heritage sites and institutions all over the world praised for the education and conservation roles they play in society are gathered here for four days. The numerous presentations are all of very high level as only awarded sites and museums are invited to present. Even if sounding too colloquial, this is a not-to-be-missed annual event one can share thanks to a model website described in chapter 3.

Italy has a lasting heritage policy through the Ministero per I Beni culturali and the Commission for the study of museums and territory didactics (Commissione di studio per la didattica del museo e del territorio) as well as since 1998, through the Ministry of Public instruction. The European analysis on cultural heritage education (Branchesi, 2007) was conducted in cooperation with the Council of Europe, the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education and Training System (INVALSI) and the Ministry of Education. Contributions from experts in heritage education stressed the importance of decisions taken at political and institution levels to develop relevant projects linked to cultural heritage education. The association HERITY linking the two words Heritage and Quality, analyses heritage sites in order to certify their heritage quality in terms of:

- Value (the perception of cultural significance);
- State of maintenance (conservation);
- Communication (information provided to the visitor); and
- Services (quality of reception and services offered).

The link to education applies to all four components in the messages delivered for schools and the way the heritage is presented: cultural heritage education plays here a crucial role.

ICCROM based in Rome has launched many programmes linking heritage and education as “The City beneath the city”, “Stop Graffiti”, “MediaSaveArt”, “Youth and the safeguard of heritage”; ICCROM was an official partner of the EU funded programme “Let us protect our heritage together” insisting on the visitors’ role in protecting the heritage (Périer-D’Ieteren, 1999). The very successful world famous and still running programme RE-ORG¹⁷ founded

¹⁵ www.icom.museum/ceca/publications/conferenceproceedings

¹⁶ <https://www.thebestinheritage.com>

¹⁷ www.re-org-info.

by Gaël de Guichen, advisor to the Director general of ICCROM plays a leading role in conservation of heritage; it consists in a thorough reorganisation of museum storages all over the world involving the whole museum staff from curators to custodians and cleaners, and engaging all participants within the community they serve. Their asset is to encourage museums, which have undergone reorganisation, to train other museums, multiplying the quantity of museums with reorganised storages. Such an efficient programme must be encouraged and widely disseminated as it allows for many people to get involved in the protection of their heritage, enabling future interesting partnerships beyond education and heritage.

In the **Netherlands** workshops are currently being organized for both teachers and educators on “heritage wisdom” (erfgoedwijsheid), inspired by the ongoing research conducted by professor Hester Dibbits and Maria Grever (Erasmus University Rotterdam and Reinwardt Academy in Amsterdam), which invites people to think about how they value cultural heritage, how this varies depending on one’s own position and perspectives. Though being often considered as a ‘historical value’, heritage is still understood too much as a given fact, rather than a product of a “dynamic” mechanism within society (Grever & van Boxtel, 2014).

In **Spain**, research is led by the Spanish Heritage Education Observatory (SHEO – in Spanish OEPE) funded by Spain’s Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness and the National Education and Heritage Plan: its “main priorities is to cater for audience diversity as a value inherent to the very concept of heritage”; it has led to the research model “Heritage Education in Museums: an Inclusion Focused Model” (HEM-INMO), and Spain becoming “a focal point in the general field of educational research” linked with heritage issues (Fontal & Marín, 2016), often related to diversity and accessibility (Marín & Fontal, 2012).

In **Portugal**, to mention one example, the city of Faro gave its name to the famous FARO Convention insisting among others, on the role of communities in protecting what they consider being their heritage and enhancing social inclusion, as at the Museum of Portimao, which won the Council of Europe Museum Prize 2010, being “a fine example of good practices and an important counterpoint of preservation and reflection on cultural heritage, in a context of a mass tourism region”¹⁸.

In order to have education and cultural heritage meet it is necessary to deal with the most important topic: the revision of what one can call “school culture”. This is mandatory before even thinking of building up sustainable synergies. So far too many “band-aid solutions, which comfort politicians” have led to individual initiatives and are not thought on the long-term (de Ville, 2014).

Therefore both sectors need to be given the place they deserve in society through following recommendations to the EP and the EU as further discussed in the last chapter:

- According to the European Reference Framework (Jaap van Lakerveld et al. 2011), cultural heritage education offers “great potential in term of:
 - o Raising and maintaining motivation;
 - o Innovative cross-curricular approaches;
 - o School community links;
 - o The European cultural dimension; and

¹⁸ <http://presentations.thebestinheritage.com/2011/Museum%20of%20Portimao> - Accessed 10 February 2018.

- Reaching the Lifelong Learning transversal key competences: learning to learn, social and civic competences, sense of initiative and entrepreneurship, and cultural awareness and expression” leading to “personal fulfilment, active citizenship, social cohesion and employability in a knowledge society”.
- **Adequate education, cultural policies and working conditions**, which acknowledge the benefit of building up synergies in terms of not only social inclusion, territorial and economic developments but also to leading to a better future thanks to fulfilled, responsible and active citizens;
- Appropriate **training and recognition** of teachers, heritage educators and artists involved in heritage education programmes;
- **Involving the whole school and education system** and not left to the motivation and conviction of few passionate teachers, educators and artists; this means having politicians at all levels integrating heritage education on all fields as a commitment, duty engagement, obligation, responsibility towards lifelong learning, social inclusion and territorial and economic development.
- **Structural timing** within the education institutions.

3. MODEL SYNERGIES TO BE DEVELOPED BETWEEN CULTURAL HERITAGE AND EDUCATION POLICIES

KEY FINDINGS

- **Building upon existing and successful examples of synergy.**
- **Surveys on the value of heritage education** need to be encouraged.
- What can one call “**best practice**” in cultural heritage education?
- “**Good practice**” examples may serve as sound basis for **research** on how to better move forward with heritage and education developed in synergy.

Following our assumption in chapter 1.3 that knowledge and education should be considered a key component before the economic and social components as also mentioned in Strategy 21, we suggest analysing the “poor relation” in terms of knowledge and education with the social and territorial and economic components. Tackling the issues the other way round starting from the courses of actions and the examples given in Strategy 21 may prove more successful and serve as starting point in this analysis. Nevertheless, too much information may be counterproductive and be more discouraging than constructive. For instance if one must praise the HEREIN¹⁹ database, efforts should be made to have it better known within the local, regional and national education policies; mutual links should be encouraged with the heritage centres, institutions and policies. The programmes and actions listed in the HEREIN database are so numerous that it is sometimes difficult to find one’s way through countries, topics and goals. To find relevant information concerning possible synergies between education and cultural heritage education means scrolling through all national reports under the headings knowledge and access and interpretation. The latter concerns the “public aspects of heritage policy (...) establishing “the importance of public involvement in valuing and interpreting heritage”, this theme being divided into 4 sections: Public access to sites and information; Education and awareness-raising; Tourism; and Promotional activities and dissemination. This makes it quite difficult to scrutinize and needs rethinking. The same applies when trying to filter transnational programmes, which would be most interesting.

In order to have both the education and the heritage policies meet, I would suggest as key recommendation to list just a few examples that have proven successful, developing them according to a “long-term vision, promoting change in people’s behaviours and feelings from a local and bottom-up perspective” as stated by encatc, the European network on cultural management and policy created in 1992: encatc enhances having a “cross-sectorial approach and identifying programmes and actions to link education systems to cultural heritage and creative sectors”. It meets the purpose of this analysis, when recommending “greater synergistic relationship/s between culture and education” which “could help strengthen European identity not least by promoting the awareness of the fundamental values of ‘democracy and tolerance, intercultural competences, critical thinking, media literacy and cultural capabilities [that] will make of our youth creative, critical and open European citizens”²⁰.

¹⁹ <http://www.herein-system.eu> - Major information goes through the national reports structured in 7 chapters: organisations, knowledge and protection, conservation and management, finances, access and interpretation, digitalization and legislation.

²⁰ <https://www.encatc.org>

3.1. Successful programmes

Many programmes funded by the EU²¹ have proven successful and are often quoted in present research studies (Périer-D'Ieteren, 1998, Branchesi, 2007). The projects listed hereunder met many of the recommendations listed in Strategy 21. They were or are still planned in synergy with schools, heritage centres, museums, heritage sites, and local citizens; some have involved third party partners related to SMEs and/or tourism organisations, artists, and volunteers; they were, generally speaking, multi-funded (EU, national, regional, local).

The Council of Europe partner NGOs and/or other funding sources have been running successfully for many years. Others were one-shot projects but their goals were thought and meant for possible long-term follow up. They can all be easily **transferable** and adapted to other countries.

A **deeper reflection** is needed to analyze whether the scattering of funding among the different European Commission's DGs (Directorate General) is not counterproductive and if it would not be more efficient to enhance synergies first of all among the different Commission's bodies, then between them and the Council of Europe and NGOs regarding common topics linked to cultural heritage knowledge and education including the social, territorial and economic aspects involved; this could possibly allow for larger amounts allocated to the supported projects and/or more long-term funding possibilities.

From "Schools adopt a monument" to "Adopt a monument"

Originally founded by the former Pegasus foundation, a European association for culture to promote European identity through education activities, the programme "Schools adopt a monument" has evolved to "From one street to another" and to "Adopt a monument"²² enlarging thus the scope of target public. The aim of the founding project was to raise awareness among school children about the cultural heritage in the neighbourhood. Led by teachers it enabled pupils to get acquainted with the heritage but with no or with seldom contact with heritage educators and experts; these projects remained a one-shot event relying on the teachers' good will and enthusiasm. Some schools however adopted the theme for one or two terms, allowing the pupils to deepen their knowledge by interviewing local citizens and politicians, and contacting the local press, heritage institutions and restorers who helped them develop some basic technical skills.

Over time, the "Adopt a monument" programme has evolved the way it has in **Finland** with citizens protecting the monuments in their environment and taking on the responsibility of upkeep of the monument and restoring its visibility, for which they have received the 2016 Europa Nostra award²³. Enhancing communities' participation is considered to be beneficial, as people tend to appropriate the heritage with a feeling of pride. Elderly people are asked to tutor the younger generation by story telling, recalling memories of their youth or passing on skills for future generations.

The strong point of the school programmes is the great enthusiasm encountered by the pupils and the quantity of cross-cultural disciplines that can be used. A real eye-opener, the monuments discovered have also enabled to tackle disciplines not directly linked with the

²¹ From the former Raphael and Culture 2000 programmes of DGXXI till the present with Creative Europe, even if the numerous reports sent to the EU and the Council of Europe seem to have vanished in the air or are difficult to find.

²² See in Ireland: adoptamonument@heritagecouncil.ie.

The same idea may appear with different wordings, e.g. "Schools in the manor".

²³ <http://www.europeanheritageawards.eu/winners/adopt-a-monument/> - Last accessed 8 March 2018.

school curriculum, such as citizenship, difficult memory, conservation, heritage awareness, social inclusion, and diversity.

The weak points are:

- The difficulty obtaining the **finances** necessary to develop such programmes in terms of material needed for creativity in school, organising the school field trip, developing further partnerships, giving visibility to the project;
- The **lack of follow-up** and **surveys** on the value of such heritage programmes;
- The **absence of heritage experts** in some programmes and links between the heritage and education sectors.

The City beneath the city

This cultural heritage awareness campaign and project competition for students from participating European countries was initiated by ICCROM²⁴ in cooperation with the Cultural Heritage Division of the Council of Europe. The target group was 6 to 12 years old children and the programme was meant to last one to two school terms. The project was about learning to look at one's direct environment and analyzing how the cities have evolved through time. Building upon this project would be very easy, as the teacher's pack in English and French created on the occasion in collaboration with one of the partners, English Heritage, is easily adaptable and translatable in languages from different member states.

Let's have another look at what surrounds us²⁵

This is the title of a range of activities organised by the City of Brussels within the "Heritage and Citizenship classes" programme launched in 2005 and led since 2008 by a heritage association in charge of the archaeological site under the Royal Place. It allows for many new synergies with the surrounding area comprising museums, restaurants, shops, cultural centres, the royal academy and the park, meeting some of the goals listed under the social and territorial and economic challenges, recommendations and courses of action in Strategy 21.

The European Cultural Routes

The European cultural routes²⁶ offer a great range of themes depending on place, space and time, which may be discussed and studied at school. Based on a touristic approach to the heritage, these routes may help students reflect and analyse why and how people, goods and ideas have travelled and still travel, leading them to become better aware of the risks endangering the heritage and to find solutions to fight against it. Moreover, with the migrant and refugee crisis Europe is confronted with nowadays and the rise of xenophobia, these cultural routes may open up many synergies not only between the education and heritage sectors but also with society, the environment and the economy, meeting thus challenges and recommendations in those sectors of Strategy 21.

Many other routes may be added to those initiated by the Council of Europe. Let us just mention the European Route of Industrial Heritage (ERIH) with some thirteen thematic routes showing the diversity of industrial landscapes and industrial history across Europe.

²⁴ www.iccrom.org

²⁵ http://www.classesdupatrimoine.be/fr#classesdupatrimoine_home

²⁶ See the study commissioned by the Council of Europe and the Competiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP) of the European Commission: *Impact of European Cultural Routes on SMEs' innovation and competitiveness*: <https://rm.coe.int/1680706995>

As with the “Schools adopt a monument” programme, there are infinite ways of approaching them; this is also true of the “Routes4U” joint programme with the EU Regional policy. The Belgian carved altar route created in 2000 on the occasion of Brussels as cultural capital could find partners in many other countries up to Estonia and Sweden. The same applies to the new European Union Grant Agreement “Fostering regional development through transnational cultural routes, heritage policies and practices”, which was signed between the DG REGIO and the Council of Europe.

Even more general routes may serve the education and heritage sectors. “Europe seen by its rivers”, “All Roads Lead to Rome” and the railway programme “ENRICO” have been funded by EU programmes in the 1990s. Their interest lay in their **partnerships** between heritage institutions and conservation centres, schools, museums, art centres and touristic venues across Europe. The first two included students’ active and creative participation in the project based on a reflection on heritage issues with heritage experts and educators.

Starting from “Rhine without borders”, the programme, which was at the origin of the “European Heritage Classes”, the “Europe seen by its rivers” project (Rozé, 1993) has influenced new programmes such as the “world canals” (Jansen et al., 2016) or the “European Hansa” and “Viking routes”. The natural and cultural heritage linked to water and maritime transport opens a variety of new sectors, which may be of interest for both education and heritage linked to the social, territorial and economic components of Strategy 21 as the “Discovery Bus” programme, which linked people in the UK, France and Spain to learn about their shared maritime history.

The title of the “All Roads lead to Rome” project related first to a topic present in all European school curricula, the Romans. It had also been chosen to illustrate all the pathways, which can be used towards cultural heritage awareness, combining creativity, a close collaboration between museums and schools together with scientific research in each participating country. ICCROM planned on the Roman forum a quiz in five languages, based not as for many school visits on its history but on its conservation and restoration issues; this was also the case with the visits to the site of Ostia and Hadrian’s villa. These activities prepared by heritage experts have certainly proven for the success of the event. Through a survey, which I conducted ten years later to find out the impact of this project on the 400 adolescents from 10 European countries (Gesché-Koning, 2011a), 80% had returned to Rome and remembered the issues discussed during their visits.

3.2. Moving forward

Moving forward to see both the education and cultural heritage sectors meet in a beneficial relationship needs further reflection as to the best possible synergies. Both the CECA committee in ICOM and The Best in Heritage have conducted this reflection.

From the different evaluations analysed for this study, one tends usually to explain the context eventually describing what was at stake, but seldom how it all started or why the programme was launched and for which goal. This had led the CECA committee in ICOM to launch its “Best Practice Tool ».

Best Practice Tool

Marie-Clarté O’Neill (Ecole du Louvre and Institut national du Patrimoine) and Colette Dufresne-Tassé (University of Montreal) have developed a comprehensive working document enabling any people wanting to start a museum education project to ask the right questions regarding conception and planning of the programme, carrying it out and evaluating it. Planned and written in French it took many discussions to find the appropriate

wording and phrasing for English and Spanish speaking people, the two other languages in which this tool is available²⁷.

The reflection behind this tool makes for its success. Launched seven years ago, it led to a Best Practice Award and an annual publication describing the awarded projects²⁸. The newly awarded programmes may serve as source of inspiration for many other colleagues; it will allow all professionals to take the best decisions in function of their institutions, goals and work environment; as to researchers they will at last have comparable data from different European countries (table 2).

The Best in Heritage

Attending the annual gathering in Dubrovnik of The Best in Heritage is the best way to remain informed about good practice worldwide (see above). The very user friendly website²⁹ of the organisation is an excellent entry to discover the awarded projects and to read the reasons behind the award. Many museums and heritage sites are praised for their strong educational involvement and social inclusion. Moreover education is one of the entry categories for the Europa Nostra award³⁰, which insists on the crucial role of cultural heritage education. The description of the projects is clear, thanks to the overview of all awarded projects presented by year, country and category, among which art & culture, education, interpreted monuments and sites, social/community.

²⁷ <http://network.icom.museum/ceca/best-practice/users-guide/>

²⁸ <http://network.icom.museum/ceca/best-practice/award/>

²⁹ www.thebestinheritage.org

³⁰ www.europanostra.org

Table 2: ICOM-CECA Best Practice European Award proposals³¹

COUNTRY	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Armenia	-	1	1	-	2	4
Belgium	-	-	1	-	-	1
Denmark	-	2	1	-	1	4
France	2	-	7	6	1	16
Germany	2	-	2	-	-	4
Greece	4	1	-	-	-	5
Italy	4	3	5	1	2	15
Lithuania	-	1	1	-	-	2
Macedonia	-	1	-	-	-	1
The Netherlands	-	-	4	-	-	4
Portugal	1	-	-	-	-	1
Romania	-	1	-	-	1	2
Russia	-	-	1	-	2	3
Spain	1	2	1	1	1	6
Switzerland	-	-	1	-	-	1
United Kingdom	1	-	-	1	-	2
Total per year	15 (26)	12 (15)	25 (35)	9 (24)	10 (23)	71 (123)

Source: Best Practice 2011-2016 – A tool to improve museum education internationally, 2016.

³¹ () relate to the total number of answers including countries outside Europe, i.e. Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Korea, Malawi, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, United Republic of Tanzania, United States and Venezuela. Armenia has been included in this table due to its cultural, historical and political links to the Europe.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Incorporate structurally heritage education in school curricula**
- **Dissemination of good practice transferable examples**
- **Shared information**
- **Encourage training courses in heritage education**
- **Ensure adequate financial resources**

The listed recommendations for the knowledge and education components of Strategy 21 will certainly benefit from better synergies between both the education and the cultural heritage sectors. The same recommendations apply in this analysis. We therefore strongly recommend MEPs to implement them through their different funding programmes and appropriate EU-level policies³².

4.1. Incorporate structurally heritage education in school curricula

This has been discussed at large in the preceding chapters and is THE key recommendation. It has been strongly recommended by 100% of the people who answered the survey; 88% answered 'yes' to the two questions including the cultural heritage dimension in education as a study in its own right (1a) or seen as a fertile source for studies in other subjects (1b). This distinction is important because 1b may be more easily implemented in schools than 1a, which needs finding structural timing. But to make sure 1b becomes something natural among teachers and educators, they must have been familiarized with heritage matters during their training. And here again, time must be found to integrate this topic and related fields in their programmes. Belgium has decided to add one year training for primary and beginning of secondary school teachers.

Depending on which bodies are responsible for education and cultural heritage matters, make sure:

- The different bodies in charge of education and cultural heritage pass on the same information with useful links;
- Cultural heritage is included and not as the poor relation next to arts;
- Regular meetings are organised by the different bodies in charge of education and cultural heritage (see in French speaking Belgium "Bouger les lignes" – <http://www.tracernospolitiquesculturelles.be>);
- Encourage the creation of centres aimed at linking more efficiently education and heritage matters: Skoletjenesten (www.skoletjenesten.dk), MPZ (www.mpz-bayern.de), Museumsdienst Koeln (www.museenkoeln.de), GEM (www.gem.org).

³² Similar recommendations for building synergies between education and culture have been released by the Network of European Museums Organisation (NEMO): <http://www.ne-mo.org/news/article/nc/1/nemo/recommendations-for-building-synergies-between-education-and-culture/376.html> - Accessed 4 June 2018.

4.2. Disseminate good practice transferable examples

- Have useful documents on heritage education and schools further translated and disseminated, such as:
 - "*Learning from objects*" (Durbin et al. 1990)³³;
 - "*Heritage in the classroom. A practical manual for teachers*"³⁴, taking though in consideration my remarks about the purpose of art based activities related to the heritage (Gesché, 2011b);
 - "*Let us protect our heritage together*" (Annex 2)³⁵; and more recently:
 - "*Acquiring competences through heritage education for lifelong learning*" (<http://the-aqueduct.eu/>);
- Disseminate the call for projects of the national and European photo competitions linked with the European heritage days;
- Add, where not already implemented, a special day for schools during the European heritage days in synergy with heritage centres;
- Encourage the creation of centres such as the successful Centre of European culture at Saint-Jean d'Angély (France) (www.cceangely.org);
- Disseminate the "Best Practice" document established by Marie-Clarté O'Neill and Colette Dufresne-Tassé for developing quality activities within museum and heritage sites (Nardi, 2012 & 2016).

4.3. Shared information

Efforts are being made towards useful information easy to share. Crossing interests when planning websites remains a critical issue. What is listed on sites and database related with heritage as HEREIN does not clearly appear in education database; the questionnaires sent out to all national HEREIN coordinators show little information about education in relation to heritage. **Where** this information should be publicized as a priority, and **by who**, requires further consultation among all persons who could benefit from it. Only with efficient communication and cross-discipline search engines will one manage to reach an "integrated policy approach to heritage in the EU and guarantee that the multiple benefits of cultural heritage are realised in practice" as stated in the Cultural Heritage counts for Europe report (Europa Nostra, & encatc, 2015).

The two umbrellas in this study – education and cultural heritage – are *per se* a difficult issue in terms of visibility. As discussed previously **education** covers different levels according to age, type (public/private, local, regional, national), vocational, training, lifelong learning. Tackling but all the domains of non-formal education opens a wide scope of possible entries: health institutions are more and more in contact with heritage in a variety of programmes dedicated to people suffering from Alzheimer and dementia³⁶. All these entries do not necessarily belong to the same governing bodies and would need one main national cupola. Moreover education encompasses in different languages different meanings: in English, education, learning and training; in German, Ausbildung, Fortbildung,

³³ See also follow-up activities: http://www.gem.org.uk/res/advice/ball/res_ifo.php - Translations and adaptation exist in Dutch and Spanish.

³⁴ <http://schoolweb1.gemeenschapsonderwijs.be:8101/Files/HereducComplete.pdf>.

³⁵ Translations available in English and German.

³⁶ See the research carried out by museums in the UK around the health and wellbeing benefits of museums through the 'Not So Grim Up North' project: <http://www.healthandculture.org.uk/not-so-grim-up-north/project-updates/welcome>. See also the research conducted by the university of Murcia on the museum as social inclusion space: <https://digitum.um.es/xmlui/handle/10201/50763>

Weiterbildung, etc. Nevertheless one should not neglect the use of heritage in language education³⁷. All these findings speak for the need of synthesis, cohesion and unification of terms, which MEPs could implement even if their scope of action may be here low.

Heritage is also difficult to scrutinize; here too, according to the definition given to it and analysed in Chapter 1, it will also encompass a variety of possible entries: tangible, intangible, natural, cultural, sites, museums, training institutes, conservation centres, to list a few. An interesting comment from the survey conducted for this study and received just before concluding this work comes from the Manchester Museum. It shows precisely the difficult question to be solved and which MEPs could reflect on at European level when speaking about cultural heritage, hence its mention within the recommendations for this study; after a detailed analysis of all words discussed previously about cultural heritage education, the conclusion says: "In order to explore and fully capture the full extent of any potential synergies between education and cultural heritage policies, the use of terms such as 'culture', 'cultural heritage', 'education', 'cultural heritage education', 'arts education', 'education through arts' etc. should be avoided as they are too specific and exclude much of the great work and thinking that would otherwise be acknowledged through the use of broader terms such as heritage and learning. To ensure the broadest possible understanding rather than limiting the reach to particular (and artificially defined) domains of knowledge, **heritage** and **learning** would best capture the true breadth and scope".

Once a consensus has been found internationally using the broadest scope for the words heritage and education, experts in communication may only then start thinking of how to best link these two sectors in the most efficient and useful way. Software engineers are therefore required. As stated above the organisation of the GEM (www.gem.org) or The Best in Heritage websites could serve as model as do the portal "Search Culture" for the Greek cultural heritage in the digital public space (<https://www.searchculture.gr>), "Follow gondola" in Venice (<http://www.followgondola.it>).

MEPs could recommend through their different programmes they consider most appropriate different organisations or bodies to take the lead of this shared information. These could be:

- The national observatories of culture, of heritage education – where they exist as in Spain with the Spanish Heritage Education Observatory SHEO;
- UNESCO;
- ICOMOS;
- ICOM;
- NEMO;
- Europa Nostra or
- Any programme MEPs would consider the most appropriate.

Efforts are being made but the task is gigantic and asks a thorough knowledge of the national, regional and local bodies in charge not only of heritage and education matters but also of linked fields both social and economic, which only a solid network of trained and multilingual people may achieve.

³⁷ See the 4 year PhD research studentship (Autumn 2018) on « The rôle of cultural institutions in promoting language Learning opportunities » : <http://www.lucid.ac.uk/news-and-events/news/phd-opportunity-the-role-of-cultural-institutions-in-promoting-language-learning-opportunities/>

4.4. Encourage training courses in heritage education

There is a strong demand for adequate training in cultural heritage matters and training courses are recommended by 100% of the people who answered the survey. EU funded projects as LEM, The Learning Museum or MuMAE, Museums meet adult educators should be developed. GEM training courses could serve as model³⁸; these can be offered worldwide in partnership with the British Council. National training courses should be listed and offered as Erasmus+³⁹ possibilities.

Partnerships and exchange of trainers should be encouraged across Europe. Training must not be limited only to heritage educators but should also address other fields like health care, tourism, volunteer training, and digital media. Programmes such as Erasmus+ already exist. It is strongly recommended to have further programmes developed according to the budget at MEPs' disposal for the coming years.

Developing knowledge banks of local and traditional materials and techniques and know-how must be automatically integrated and should be put in synergy with training systems for heritage professionals and non professionals. To take the lead at European level could be encouraged by MEPs.

Anyone interested in entering the profession should make sure that the training centre they wish to join is member of the European Network for Conservation Restoration Education (ENCoRE - www.encore-edu.org) and find the relevant competences needed for access to conservation-restoration professions as recommended by the European Confederation of Conservators'-Restorers' Organisation (E.C.C.O - www.ecco-eu.org), which will guarantee that professionals working on listed heritage have the adequate skills (K8). Entering in the EUROPA Nostra award scheme is another guarantee. Moreover, all heritage-training institutes should be members of these two organisations, which would allow meeting the K10 recommendation of Strategy 21: Encouraging and supporting the development of networks. MEPs' role is here crucial in putting forward and recommending these two organisations.

Once trained, it would be interesting to think of providing time and funding for study and research through encouraging the establishment of a sabbatical year for teachers and heritage educators. This could be one of the possible initiatives with a 2025 perspective supported by the new EU funding programme proposed towards cultural cooperation as mentioned in the Gothenburg report "Strengthening European Identity through Education and Culture" (EU, 2017).

This reflection phase would allow seeing all efforts led during the European Year of Culture Heritage leave an imprint beyond 2018 and developing new programmes of collaboration grouped according to the four principles listed by the Council of Europe regarding engagement, sustainability, protection and innovation.

³⁸ <http://www.gem.org.uk/cpd/fc/fc.php>

³⁹ https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/node_en

4.5. Ensure adequate financial resources

As said above, implementing the first recommendation will lead to more and more young people practising heritage as recommended in Strategy 21 (K2) and being encouraged to more creativity (K3). This nevertheless needs finances, which must be implemented in the general budget of all education and heritage bodies depending on the EU budget. This is not an easy task and needs thinking in how to be implemented. MEPs could recommend and encourage further financing to following examples:

- The cultural rucksack in Norway: www.creativitycultureeducation.org/cultural-rucksack;
- Culture passes or cheques "to take part in cultural activities and access cultural performances and heritage" as stated in the proposal "The European Culture Cheque" (<https://www.youthplan.eu/en/culture>).

CONCLUSION

Synergies between the cultural heritage and education sectors are the best way to achieve inclusive, integrated heritage based education towards a sustainable development. Let us conclude this study saying Europe is a “privileged place”: “The future seems to smile on everyone motivated by the ambition to open the wealth of heritage to all” (Branchesi, 2007). Heritage has a leading role to play. This can only be achieved by excellent management starting with education, training, lifelong learning at all levels of the society, also engaging those in charge of the heritage, i.e. the local communities (Zagato, 2015).

“Do not just invite audiences to participate in your museum or heritage site, but, as a museum or heritage site, participate in their life, culture, worries, ambitions, challenges, and joy” was the human recommendation received by Theodorus Meereboer in his answer to the questionnaire sent out for this study. This same idea of building strong relationships rather than one-shot events was at the origin of the German conference “Event zieht, Inhalt bindet” (Event attracts, content builds ties)(Commandeur & Dennert, 2004).

To conclude let us never forget that both education and heritage is about human beings. As such we are a mixture of emotion and reason. The role of heritage and education is to discover how to meet both. We should therefore never forget that behind each museum object, each element of the heritage there is a human being with his/her own existence and story. Generally speaking, he/she belongs to the past, and so do the objects they have produced; but it can also be skills or traditions one wants to pass on to future generations.

REFERENCES

- Committee on culture – United Cities and Local Governments (2008), *Agenda 21 for culture* <http://www.agenda21culture.net>
- Anderson D. (1997), *A Commonwealth: Museums in the Learning Age*, London.
- *Arts and Cultural Education at School in Europe*, 2009 (www.eurydice.org)
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/113EN.pdf
- Accessed 13 February 2018.
- Balázs-Bécsi K. (2016), *Cultural Heritage in Hungarian education*, in *Sociology Study*, July, vol. 6, n°7 -
<http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/582bc6f32625a.pdf>
- Bamford A. (2005): *The "Wow Factor": Global research compendium on the impact of the arts in education*, Munster/New York, Waxmann.
- Biesta G.J.J. (2009), *Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education*.
- Biesta G.J.J (2015a), *Beyond learning: Democratic education for a human future*, London, Routledge.
- Biesta G.J.J. (2015b), *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*, London, Routledge.
- Biesta G.J.J. (2015c), *Beautiful risk of education*, London, Routledge.
- Bordeaux M.-C. & Deschamps F. (2013), *Education artistique, l'éternel retour ? Une ambition nationale à l'épreuve des territoires*, Toulouse, L'Attribut.
- Branchesi L. (2007), *Cultural Heritage in Europe*, Armando.
- *Chemins de traverse*, Cellule Culture-Enseignement, Ministry of the Federation Wallonia-Brussels.
- Cíz M. (2012), *Return to Nature: Old or New Questions – Old Good Answers*, in Jelavic Z. (ed.).
- Collard P. & Witte R. (2015), *Creative Alliances for Europe*, report prepared by the BkI (Germany) and CCE (England) funded by Stiftung Mercator.
- Collin, S. & Karsenti, T. (2013). *Approche théorique des usages des technologies en éducation: regard critique*. Formation et profession: revue internationale en éducation.
- Commandeur B. & Dennert D. (eds.)(2004), *Event zieht – Inhalt bindet. Besucherorientierung von Museen auf neuen Wegen*, Bielefeld, transcript.
- Council of Europe (1998a), *Cultural heritage and its cultural implications: a factor for tolerance, good citizenship and social integration*, Brussels.
- Council of Europe (1998b), *Recommendation No. R (98) 5*.
- Council of Europe (2005), *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society*, Faro.
- Council of Europe (2011), *Impact of European Cultural Routes on SMEs' innovation and competitiveness*: <https://rm.coe.int/1680706995>
- Council of Europe (2015), *Namur Declaration* - <https://rm.coe.int/16802f8a59>

- Cramer E. (2003), *Rapport prospectif sur l'éducation artistique à l'école, en partenariat avec des artistes, des institutions et des opérateurs culturels*, Brussels, Culture et Démocratie.
- Culture et Démocratie (2009), *La culture au cœur de l'enseignement, un vrai défi démocratique*, Cahier 2.
- Culture et Démocratie (2011), *L'indispensable révolution. Culture et création au cœur de l'enseignement*, Cahier 3.
- Csikszentmihalyi M. (1990), *Flow. The Psychology of optimal expérience*, New York.
- Delors J. et al. (1996), *Learning: The treasure within*. Report to UNESCO of the international commission on education for the twenty- first century. Paris.
- Delvaux B. (2015a), *Une toute autre école*, Girsef-UCL (Pensées libres), Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Delvaux B. (2015b), "Pour une tout autre école", dans *Le Journal de Culture et Démocratie*, n° 39, p. 18-20.
- Denuit R. (2018), *Capitales européennes de la culture: un rêve de Melina*, Académie royale de Belgique.
- Develay M. (2015), *L'école, les savoirs et la culture comme possible principe de régulation*, www.pedagopsy.eu/develay/html
- de Ville S. (ed.)(2014), *Neuf essentiels pour l'éducation artistique et culturelle*, Culture & Démocratie.
- Durbin G., Morris S. & Wilkinson S. (1990), *A Teacher's Guide to Learning from Objects*, English Heritage.
- Elfert M. (2015), *Apprendre à vivre ensemble : retour sur l'humanisme au cœur du Rapport Delors. Recherche et prospective en éducation*, UNESCO, Paris.
- Encatc (2015), *Cultural Heritage counts for Europe*. - http://blogs.encatc.org/culturalheritagecountsforeurope//wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CHCfE_FULL-REPORT_v2.pdf);
- Europa Nostra (2015), *Cultural Heritage counts for Europe. Towards a European Index for Valuing Cultural Heritage* - https://issuu.com/europanostra/docs/chcfe_final_conference_e_reader
- European Commission (2006), *Strategic Plan 2016 – 2020 – DG Education and Culture* - https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/strategic-plan-2016-20202020dgeac_march2016_en.pdf
- European Commission (2017a), *Education and training monitor* – <http://ec.europa.eu/education/monitor>
- European Commission (2017b), *Mapping of Cultural Heritage actions in European Union policies, programmes and activities* – http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/reports/2014-heritage-mapping_en.pdf
- European Commission (2017c), *Strengthening European Identity through Education and Culture* - https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/communication-strengthening-european-identity-education-culture_en.pdf
- European Commission (2017d), *Eurobarometer special 466, Cultural Heritage, Report* – <http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion>

- Fontal O. & Marin S. (2012), *Heritage education in museums and their universal accessibility. Research-Evaluation of educational programmes and definition of quality standards*, in Jelavic Z. (2012), *op. cit.*
- Fontal O. & Marin S. (2016), *Heritage Education in Museums: an Inclusion Focused Model*, in *International Journal on the Inclusive Museum*, n°9, January.
- Gardner H. (1993), *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*, New York.
- Gesche-Koning (2011a), *Impact du programme européen Tous les chemins mènent à Rome après dix ans*, in : *Congrès de Namur, Actes (Proceedings)*, Namur.
- Gesche-Koning (2011b), *¿Sensibilizar en Patrimonio : pretexto o fin ? Los usos didacticos banales del Patrimonio – Heritage awareness: fixed purpose or excuse ? Inappropriate uses of the Heritage*, in *e-rph (Revista electrónica de patrimonio historico Electronic journal on historical heritage)*, n°8.
- Gesché-Koning (2014), *The right message in the right place at the right time. Only adequate tools can involve visitors in protecting their heritage*, in M. Quagliuolo (ed.), *Observing Cultural Heritage. Evaluating the State of Conservation and Communicating it to the Public*, Herity Dossier n°3 (2010), Rome.
- Grever M. & van Boxtel C. (2014), *Verlangen naar tastbaar verleden : erfgoed, onderwijs en historisch besef*, Hilversum.
- Hein G. (1998), *Learning in the museum*, London, New York.
- Hein G. (2012), *Why Museum Educators?* In Jelavic Z. (2012), *op. cit.*
- Jagoová L. & Mrásová L. (2015), *Tradition of museum pedagogy in the Czech Republic and the role of Brno museology in its development*, in *Museologica Brunensia*.
- Jansen E., Weyermans I. & Enklaar I. (2016), *Wereldgrachten (world canals)*, in Nardi E. (ed.)(2016).
- Jelavic Z. (ed.)(2012), *Old Questions, New Answers: Quality Criteria for Museum Education*, Zagreb.
- Kaysers A. & Kunz-Ott H. (2012), *Schule@Museum*, in Nardi E. (2012), *Best Practice 1. A tool to improve museum education internationally*, Rome.
- Kerlan A. (2009a), *Education through Arts and Culture: A Forward-looking perspective*, *The International Journal of Arts Education*, vol. 7, number 2 July, National Taiwan Arts Education Center.
- Kerlan A. (2009b), *L'école, les savoirs et la culture*, in *La culture au cœur de l'enseignement*, Brussels, Les Cahiers de Culture et Démocratie, n° 2.
- Kerlan A. (2011), *Arts in Schools as a Change Model*, in Sefton Green J., Thompson P., Bresler L. & K. Jones (dir.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Creative Learning*, Routledge.
- Kraeutler H.(ed.) (2007), *Heritage Learning Matters. Museums and Universal Heritage*, Vienna, Schlebruegge.
- Lang C., Reeve J. & Woollard V. (2006), *The Responsive Museum. Working with Audiences in the Twenty-First Century*, Ashgate.
- Meirieu Ph. (2001), *L'éducation et le rôle des enseignants à l'horizon 2020*, UNESCO Report, Paris – www.meirieu.com/RAPPORTSINSTITUTIONNELS/UNESCO2020.pdf

- Meirieu Ph. (2015), *Comment aider nos enfants à réussir, à l'école, dans leur vie, pour le monde*, Paris, Bayard.
- Morin E. (2014), *Enseigner à vivre, manifeste pour changer l'éducation*, Arles, Actes Sud.
- Nardi E. (ed.)(2012), *Best Practice n°1. A tool to improve museum education internationally*, Rome.
- Nardi E. (2016), *Best Practice 2011-2016, A tool to improve museum education internationally*, Rome.
- Papanikolaou P.M. (2016), *Homage to Melina's programme Education and Culture: From the Educational Programmes of Greek Museums to Art Competitions in Schools*, International Journal of Education and Social Science (www.ijessnet.com Vol. 3 No. 5).
- Perrenoud Ph. (2011), *Quand l'école prétend préparer à la vie*, Paris, ESF.
- *Promoting Cultural Education in Europe. A Contribution to Participation, Innovation and Quality – "Key Competences for Lifelong Learning – A European Reference Framework"- 2006 (8-10 June) Graz (Austria).*
- Périer-D'Ieteren C. (ed.)(1999), *Public et sauvegarde du Patrimoine. Cahier de sensibilisation à l'intention des guides*, Université Libre de Bruxelles (Université libre de Bruxelles is the official name of the university and is not translated).
- Reimers F. (2018), "A Road Map to Change the World", UNESCO Courier, January-March.
- Robinson K. (1999), report *Culture, creativity and the young: developing public policy*, Council of Europe, 1999.
- Robinson K. (2001), *Out of our Minds – Learning to be Creative*, Oxford.
- Romainville C. (2013), Neuf essentiels Pour comprendre les "droits culturels" et le droit de participer à la vie culturelle, Culture et Démocratie.
- Rozé S. (1993), *L'Europe des fleuves*, in Gesché N. (ed.), *European Museum Communication*, Brussels.
- Saez J.P., Schneider W., Bordeaux M.-Ch. & Hartmann-Fritsch Ch. (dir.)(2014), *Pour un droit à l'éducation artistique et culturelle: Plaidoyer franco-allemand*, OPC, Grenoble.
- Stevenson J. (2012), *Laying the foundations for heritage education training*, in Jelavic Z. (2012), *op. cit.*
- Taddei F (2009), *Training creative and collaborative knowledge-builders: a major challenge for 21st century education* <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2017.1384802>
- Thomson P. (2010), *Whole school change: a literature review (2nd ed.)*, Creativity, Culture and Education - www.creativitycultureeducation.org/research-impact/literature-reviews/
- UNESCO (2013), Hangzhou Declaration - <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/hangzhou-declaration>
- UNESCO (2015). *Rethinking Education: Towards a Global Common Good?* Paris.
- Van der Auwera S. (2007), *Erfgoededucatie in het Vlaamse onderwijs. Erfgoed en onderwijs in dialoog*. Brussels, CANON Culturrrel.
- van Lakenfeld J., Gussen I. & PLATO, Leiden University (eds.)(2011), *Aqueduct. Acquiring Key Competences through Heritage Education*.

- Vujic Z. & Babic D. (2012), *Education of Museum and Heritage Educators in Croatia: History, Organisation, Quality*, in Jelavic Z. (2012), *op. cit.*
- Wimmer M. (2006), Pre-Conference Reader for the European Conference *Promoting Cultural Education in Europe. A Contribution to Participation, Innovation and Quality*, commissioned by the Austrian Ministry of Education, Science and Culture - http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/michael_wimmer_2006_conference_reader.pdf
- Winand J. (2018), *L'Université à la croisée des chemins. Plaidoyer pour une université de la culture*, Bruxelles, Académie royale de Belgique (Belgian Royal Academy), L'Académie en poche, 2018.
- Zagato L. (2015), *The Notion of 'Heritage Community' in the Council of Europe's Faro Convention. Its Impact on the European Legal Framework* in Adell N., Bendix R., Bortolotto Ch. Tauschek M. (eds.), *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory, and the Making of Heritage*. Gottingen.
- Zdrojewski B. (2018), Report for CULT – 21-02 - <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fNONSGML%2bCOMPARL%2bPE-615.438%2b01%2bDOC%2bPDF%2bV0%2f%2fFR>

ANNEX

1. QUESTIONNAIRE ON POTENTIAL SYNERGIES BETWEEN EDUCATION AND CULTURAL HERITAGE POLICIES AND PERSONS WHO ANSWERED⁴⁰

-
1. How do you consider including the cultural heritage dimension in education?
 - a. Heritage education as a subject of study in its own right?
 - b. As a fertile source for studies in other subjects?
 2. Have you experienced linking cultural heritage with educational and vocational training? With whom?
 3. Have you conducted any interdisciplinary research on cultural heritage, heritage communities, the environment and their inter-relationship? Reference:
 4. Have you encouraged continuous professional training and the exchange of knowledge and skills, within and outside the educational/heritage system? Example:
 5. Which of the following topics have you been tackling during your heritage / education activities? (Recommendations within the Strategy 21 document)
 - Accessibility (sight & hearing impaired, Alzheimer, dementia, prisoners, migrants);
 - Citizenship;
 - Creativity;
 - Critical thinking;
 - Fighting against racism;
 - Heritage preservation awareness;
 - Improving quality of life;
 - Intergenerational dialogue;
 - Multiculturalism;
 - Participation;
 - Preserving the collective memory;
 - Promoting an inclusive approach to heritage;
 - Promoting heritage skills and professionals;
 - Responsibility;
 - Social inclusion;
 - Synergy with other institutions (universities, cultural associations, etc.
 - Other(s): details:
 6. From your experience give **one** to **two** recommendation(s) which you think should be addressed in priority to better integrate cultural heritage and education
 7. Culture, cultural heritage, education, cultural heritage education, arts education, education through arts: how would you **schematize the interaction** of these words taking into account the definitions towards social inclusion, economic, territorial and sustainable development as stated in the Fribourg Declaration (art. 2a) and the FARO Convention (art.2).

⁴⁰ The selected persons for the survey were chosen according to their long experience both in the sectors of education and cultural heritage education. A balance between different Member States has also been searched in order to reach a majority of Member States, all persons contacted having nevertheless not all answered due to the too short time allocated to answer.

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE SENT OUT FOR THIS ANALYSIS

Name & Country	Position
Mieke Bal (NL)	Professor, Amsterdam School of Cultural Analysis
Stefan Bresky (DE)	Training & Communication, German History Museum, Berlin
Stella Chryssoulaki (EL)	Director of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Piraeus & the Islands
Gaël de Guichen (IT)	Advisor to the Director General of ICCROM
Christine Deletaille (BE)	Teacher and heritage educator
Katrijn D'Hamers (BE)	Advisor Diversity and Participation, FARO, Flemish association for cultural heritage
Gislaine Devillers (BE)	Cellule internationale, Agence du Patrimoine wallon (International Department, Wallonia Heritage Agency)
Colette Dufresne-Tassé (CA)	Professor, Master in Museology, University of Montreal
Michael Fuhr (DE)	Museum Director
Rosa M. Hervás Avilés (ES)	Tenured Professor at the University of Murcia
Zeljka Jelavic (HR)	Head of Education, Ethnographic Museum, Zagreb
Hadwig Kraeutler (AT)	Independent museologist & museum consultant
Manchester Museum (UK)	Learning Manager
Theodorus Meereboer (NL)	Senior lecturer, creative consultant, curator
Olivera Misheva (MA)	Curator, NI Institute for protection of monuments of culture and museums, Ochrid
Nathalie Nyst (BE)	Coordinator of the Network of Museums of the Université libre de Bruxelles
Jelena Ognjanovic (SE)	Museum educator, Matica srpska Gallery
Julia Pagel (DE)	Secretary General, NEMO
John Reeve (UK)	Former Head of education, British Museum, Lecturer in Museum Education, UCL, London, International Museum consultant and trainer
Peter Schueller (DE)	CECA member
Mila Skaric (HR)	Independent Museum education researcher/consultant
Arja van Veldhuizen (NL)	Programme manager Education at Landschap Erfgoed Utrecht
Helena von Wersebe (DE)	Coordinator of Visitor Services, Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Foundation of the House of the History of the Germany), Bonn

23 answers out of 40 questionnaires sent out. Other countries contacted but with no answer received (too short time and/or too many requests: CH, CZ, DK, FR, HU, IRL, LT, N, PL, PT, RO, SE, SF, SK).

2. LET US PROTECT OUR HERITAGE TOGETHER⁴¹

Each element of our heritage is unique and **irreplaceable**. Productions of the past are not indefinitely repeated... Their **preservation** is not self-evident. It requires special means and aptitudes and our common alert efforts. The challenge is not only to collect this heritage but even more important, to be able to pass it over to the future generations and to add to it the creations and witnesses of our time.

Each element of our heritage is vulnerable, **fragile**: left abandoned, having been handled inappropriately or having suffered by time which transforms the substances, have fragilized it, have altered it in such a way that, if it is to survive, some conservation measures are requested: to consolidate, reassemble, stabilize every altered substances for as long as possible and without deforming them are difficult, sometimes dangerous challenges requiring great technicity. Our present times are those of the ephemeral: everything is replaced, renewed, consumed, nothing is meant to last. To make things last, one has to invent technical solutions which are - economically speaking - of no interest. Because of its special value, our heritage requires therefore special efforts.

Each element of our heritage is full of **meanings**, which as we know have evolved in the course of history. Some might need to be discovered or reinvented. Restoration must be respectful both of the history of our heritage and its future : it is legitimate to restore in order for an object or work to refind its significance after having been altered, partially destroyed or transformed by time. Let us nevertheless not forget that this new vision is that of today. Therefore, the impact of our intervention must be carefully thought and analysed and it is of utmost importance to leave the way open to new possible interpretations by leaving the original substances intact.

Do we know how difficult it is to make objects which are ineluctably transformed by light, climate, pollution "last" technically? Or do we unconsciously think that if they have reached us (if they are in a museum) they are invulnerable? Do we realize the wear each photography, each micro-shock, each touch cause when these are multiplied by 1000, 10.000. 100.000... actors? Do we understand the influence of all restoration on what we are given to see or do we think naively that this vision will remain as it has always been? Finally, is it not the same to look at a copy or an authentic object? Please give a thought to all these questions: the preservation of our cultural heritage is of common concern. Even it relies on numerous specialists, it still presupposes a **collective** effort.

Text written by the partners of the European programme Public and cultural awareness – Training of guides organised by the Université Libre de Bruxelles

⁴¹ Original version French. Translations in English & German.

LET US PROTECT OUR HERITAGE TOGETHER (Youth version)

Do you know what "cultural heritage" means? All monuments built by our ancestors, the cities of the past, but also all the daily tools and objects.

- "This is something for specialists, I am not concerned", you might think.
- "Not at all: to protect our heritage concerns us **all**."
- "But what can I do?" will you answer.
- "Maybe starting by answering some of these questions:

Have you already walked on an ancient wall? Have you examined how it was made? Was it strong enough? How many steps like yours, do you think, it could bear before falling apart? Could it be consolidated? How? What could be done, do you think, to preserve it in the best condition for the future generations?

There are maybe mosaics on the site you are visiting. Have you already closely examined a mosaic? It is composed of thousands of tessellae (little marble cubes). Some have disappeared, some are becoming loose. It could be tempting to take one of them as souvenir. And yet. How many visitors with this attitude would be needed to **completely** destroy the mosaic?

Each element of our heritage is full of **meanings** and contains several **messages** which have evolved with time or/and have still to be discovered or reinvented. What can we learn from an archaeological site? It can tell us that people like you have always wanted to live there, that they had very advanced techniques... It is now up to you to find many other messages. By **destroying this heritage, do you realize you are destroying your own past?** Each part is irreplaceable. Once damaged, it will be lost for ever. By taking but a slight part of it you open the way to systematic theft and illicit traffic.

Do you know why our heritage is so **fragile** and vulnerable and why we must respect it? The objects which have been buried have been transformed or altered due to the nature of the soil, the climatic conditions and many other factors. Their discovery has caused them a new shock: here they are again, exposed to daylight and open air.

Have you already seen a bronze vessel? Does it differ from a modern object in bronze? What has happened? How could you handle it? Is it worth consolidating? And how long will it still last? Especially with unscrupulous filthy hands continuously touching it?

Today, nothing is made to last. One throws everything away as soon as it has served or shows the slightest wear? Should we adopt the same irrational attitude in front of witnesses of our past? Have you thought how harmful light, climate, pollution may be? And what about the photographs, micro-impulses, touches of 1000, 10.000, 100.000... visitors?

The preservation of our heritage and the messages it contains concerns us all. It implies a **collective** effort. And this starts with **you, your** family, **your** friends. Specialists' efforts are almost useless without **your** help and **your** support.

Let us protect our heritage TOGETHER

Youth version by Nicole Gesché and Gaël de Guichen

3. BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES

Are listed here some examples of good synergies between heritage and education not previously listed in the EU documents mentioned in this analysis.

- The **Best in Heritage** and **Europa Nostra** Awards to be strongly recommended for their wide range of museums and heritage sites awarded in the category "Education and Training Awareness".
- There are many examples to be taken from CECA members' activities (see: www.icom.museum/ceca/publications – *ICOM Education 20*)
- Examples gathered in the *Best Practice Tool 2011-2016* and *2017* from countries all over the world with a majority from European countries. The examples have been carefully chosen by heritage and museum experts, following clearly defined criteria making research and comparison available to all.
- **RE-ORG programme** of ICCROM in many museums worldwide: www.re-org.info Reorganisation of museum storages engaging all: from the curator to the custodian and cleaners, from the local communities to the politicians.
- **ICCROM**: www.iccrom.org - Many short and long-term training courses
- Take ideas from young people investing museums and heritage sites during the Museum Nights and the **Museo-mix** events: <http://museomix.org>
- See also the **Teen Group** in the Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn - <https://www.hdg.de/haus-der-geschichte/teengroup/>
- Special commendation to the **Prehistomuseum of Ramioul** (BE) for its general concept of the museum and site not only in terms of the heritage but engaging with the local communities, the region, the visitors who pay according to the time they have spent and where a group of four is considered a "clan" or a "tribe" and gets reduced entrance fee. The whole museum is thought as educational exploring all senses.
- **Hôpital Notre-Dame à la Rose** (BE): <http://www.notredamealarose.com> for its relation to the local community, the tourism industry and job creation.
- **National Museums Liverpool** (UK) for their social inclusion: <http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/about/vacancies/index.aspx>
- The Belgian association **Patrimoine à roulettes (Heritage on wheels)** ([http://www.facebook.com/patrimoine.aroulettes-](http://www.facebook.com/patrimoine.aroulettes) Accessed 3 July 2018) created twenty years ago, is active on all levels from local to regional, to European and worldwide. Its success lies in its founding team composed of teachers, educators and cultural heritage interpreters, all convinced of the necessity of integrating cultural heritage in education as a key factor of success.

By centering their activities on the human being whatever their social, economic and knowledge backgrounds, they have managed to develop integrated citizenship.

They are asked for their education and cultural heritage expertise not only in Europe but also as far as Asia.

They have initiated with the Museum of Ixelles the project *Un musée comme chez soi* (A museum like at home) launched end June 2018 (http://www.museumofixelles.irisnet.be/en/museum-in-progress/musee-comme-chez-soi?set_language=en - Accessed 3 July 2018).

For the Year of Cultural heritage, they have initiated the bottom-up approach of the call for projects of cultural heritage: *Le patrimoine c'est nous (We are the heritage)* (<http://patrimoine.brussels/news/le-patrimoine-cest-nous-> Accessed 3 July 2018).

After a résumé of basic definitions this work aims at recommending to the CULT committee how, in order to contribute to sustainable development, cultural heritage and education should be integrated into an inclusive, horizontal and lifelong learning approach. It is highly recommended having cultural heritage at the very core of education and not as a stopgap and seeing education more deeply rooted in cultural heritage through adequate and efficient mutual long-term partnership policies.

PE 617.486

IP/B/CULT/IC/2018-003

Print ISBN 978-92-846-3389-0 | doi:10.2861/457677 | QA- 02-18-903-EN-C

PDF ISBN 978-92-846-3390-6 | doi:10.2861/435194 | QA- 02-18-903-EN-N