

Inception Meeting

Date: October 8, 2020

Location: on-line

Present: Johan De Walsche (Universiteit Antwerpen), Dag Boutsen (KU Leuven), Mia Roth Cerina (Sveučilište U Zagrebu), Carla Sentieri Omarrementeria (Universitat Politècnica de València), Michela Barosio (Politecnico di Torino), Federica Vannucchi (Royal College of Art). Partial presence: Harriet Harriss (Royal College of Art).

Roberto Cavallo (Associate Professor Chair Architectural Design Crossovers Head of Section Theory & Territories Department of Architecture Faculty of Architecture & the Built Environment Delft University of Technology, Holland; EAAE Council member), Lynne Dearborn (Professor, Chair of Health and Wellbeing Illinois School of Architecture University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; President, Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture), Patrick Flynn (Head Of Learning Development, College of Engineering & Built Environment, Dublin, Ireland), David Gloster (Director of Education of Royal Institute of British Architects), Saverio Mecca (Chair of the Department of Architecture and Full Professor of Building Production at University of Florence, Italy), Anna-Maria Meister (Assistant Professor for Architecture Theory and Science at TU Darmstadt, Germany), Thomas Vonier (Secretary General of the International Union of Architects), Hrvoje Njirić (Professor of Architecture at the University of Split, Croatia; Founder of njiric+arhitekti, Zagreb, Croatia).

Program



ARCHITECTURE'S AFTERLIFE

Inception Meeting, October 8, 2020 (on-line) 2:00pm-4:30pm CET

2:00-2:20 Welcome and Presentation of Partners and Members of the Advisory Board (20 min)

2:20-2:35 Harriet Harriss (Royal College of Art): Introduction (15 min)

10 minutes questions

2:45-2:55 Dag Boutsen (KU Leuven) and Michela Barosio (Politecnico di Torino): Aims and Dissemination (10 min)

2:55-3:00 Carla Sentieri Omarrementeria (Universitat Politècnica de València): Bibliography (5 min)

10 minutes questions

3:10-3:20 Mia Roth Cerina (Sveučilište U Zagrebu): Launch of the Website (10 min)

3:20-3:40 Johan De Walsche (Universiteit Antwerpen) and Haydée De Loof (Universiteit Antwerpen): Launch of the Survey (20 min)

10 min break

3:50-4:25 Discussion (35 min)

4:25-4:30 Harriet Harriss (Royal College of Art): Final Remarks (5 min)

Harriet Harriss

Welcoming and Introduction

Architecture's Afterlife's principal aim is to identify the multi-sector impact of an architecture degree within the context of Europe and the extent to which skills taught to architecture students are needed in other sectors. Architecture's Afterlife seeks to understand the skills gaps and mismatches between (1) what is taught in architecture schools and what is needed by today's architecture practices (2) what is taught in architecture schools and what is needed by other professions, industries and sectors with the goal to identify opportunities for a multi-disciplinary and transdisciplinary curriculum that could more effectively serve student, labour market and societal needs. It responds to early-stage findings from a pre-application survey entitled "Architectural education: a progression inquiry" that elicited over 2500 responses from architecture graduates across the EU, and identified that on average, 40% of European Architecture graduates choose to work in the creative and cultural professions other than architecture. This study seeks to understand why this is. It will identify the push and pull factors facing graduates, the sectors to where its target group - architecture graduates - are gravitating, the skills that are lacking in these sectors and how this deficit is impacting upon sector growth.

The External Advisory Board members have been chosen because we think that you are either part of a very critical conversation about the future of architectural education already so that you have a sphere of influence and impact within your communities. We also recognize that you have what we would consider to be a vital understanding of what research can do in terms of the feedback loop to the architecture industry. You understand the implications of the study: if students are "architecting" but in other sectors should they not still be called architects? Should we don't allow them to attain that title, just because they're architects of something other than buildings? These are all questions, we will be asking ourselves, and will extrapolate from the data, as we start to accumulate more and more evidence. And we will involve you in these discussions and in order to frame what we will need to identify as the major ways that the study can impact both across industry—in terms of providing us with really important data about what architecture degrees can do as a value generator for economies both regional and international—and also how we define our qualifications and our titles across the regions and into what extent we should potentially reconsider and almost redefine what the value of an architectural education is if it's no longer just a vocational degree, which is how it's been categorized before that can only prepare people for one form of career.

Dag Boutsen and Michela Barosio

Aims and Dissemination

We talk about architecture in many ways: a domain, a scientific discipline (Bologna Process), a field, a profession. This presentation will speak about architecture as both as creative thinking and a professional practice.

The study seeks to understand **the skills gaps and mismatches** between:

- (1) what is taught in architecture schools and what is needed by today's architecture practices
- (2) what is taught in architecture schools and what is needed by other professions, industries and sectors

But also on a positive side:

- (3) which are the skills and personal traits that makes architecture graduates function well, even in other sectors, and how architectural education might have contributed to it

The goal is to identify opportunities for a multi-disciplinary and transdisciplinary curriculum that could more effectively serve student, labor market and societal needs.

In this presentation we will focus on skills.

Generally, there is a strong perception of what architecture is and what an architect is supposed to do.

This is a story of what happens after school and becoming a qualified architect: Architecture's Afterlife. Example of Pieterjan Ginckels. The profession is changing enormously, every day. Social changes, environment, pandemic, etc.

Its main objectives are to:

- (1) To map the extent to which architecture graduates are migrating into other creative and cultural sectors, across EU members-states and draw country-specific comparisons,
- (2) explore which industries architecture graduates are migrating towards, and to map their advancement levels within these sectors,
- (3) identify which skills are most transferable between different sectors, those that are most valuable, and in which sectors skills shortages are situated
- (4) assess the potential positive impact upon the architecture industry and upon the affected sectors,
- (5) assess the impact for the curricula, with a view to identifying key trans-disciplinary skills, and
- (6) to yield outcomes that benefit students, academe and industry.

The study wants to be the first large study on the matter.

Findings from the study will impact in several ways, including,

- (i) enabling higher education institutions to focus upon teaching more trans-sector, industry-relevant skills and in doing so increase the competitiveness of European Higher Education against other world-leading education institutions,
- (ii) providing recommendations for European directives and professional qualification frameworks that will increase trans-national mobility and knowledge exchange
- (iii) increase student confidence in the value and utility of their skills and qualifications, their preparedness for their professional lives and range of career options and,
- (iv) impact positively on employers by reconfiguring qualification curricula and categorization to better represent skills rather than disciplines that will improve task relevant recruitment and retention and, as a consequence, improve post-graduate employment prospects and pan-sector performance.

As we know there are two reasons why architecture is a special domain. First, in most countries it is a regulated profession, not in all countries. And secondly, because it's a regulated profession, everybody started talking about professional qualifications, this is not the case when you study history or social sciences or whatever. Europe prescribes 11 points that are helping schools to provide the necessary skills for professionals. Directive 2005/36/EC The first survey brought us many important points: the first one is resilience; people speak about architecture training in terms of endurance. Secondly, they talk about soft skills (ability to doubt, and surviving in difficult times). Thirdly, the word that comes out is teamwork. Fourth, is about creativity, that is different from the creativity of research, science, etc. It is also different from artistic creativity. We are talking about emotional intelligence. The future of cities (per Domus) recalls a lot of the skills just mentioned. Cities and skills seem to align. This architect's qualities seem to match the description of the world we want to live in.
The study is about: Where are the "architects"? What are they doing now? And why? What do they do well? What have they learned? How do they feel?

Carla Sentieri

Bibliography

This is a scientific study that is based on scientific sources. Our bibliography uses Mendeley. Some texts and articles that we consider foundational for this study are inside the discipline others are outside. We ask your collaboration in implementing the bibliography.

Mia Roth

Website

Identity of the website. It comes from Harriet's diagram of the epistemological DNA of architecture showing the multitude of aspects which Dag was talking about. The graphic representation of the project actually starts to capture the multi directional nature of an architectural degree we are researching here and it acts, both as a framework but also functions as a way to indicate the branching out of architecture. The word type comes from an identical font family which contains both serif and sans-serif to imply the traditional and the universal, the ever changing in the contemporary which is also part of this research. The programming is made by Artur Šilić and the design by Sven Sorić.

Description of the website.

Johan De Walsche

Survey

I will start with the results of the old survey and then I will go to the new one.

In the old one we had a structure with different flows: we distinguished between master and bachelor.

Later, different flows for the different carriers. 12 languages. And you see the result in relation to countries.

Different ages. Bologna tends to unify the degree in architecture, but same titles within different countries might mean different qualifications. 2660 responses in total for this survey.

The majority of the respondents are architects. More than 80% stays in architecture, but this data might be also the result of what kind of channels we have used to reach these people. Rate of people who left architecture and why.

We analyzed the old survey and we made a new one. We included other terms and meaning beside "competences."

We considered how a person transforms while going through the architectural training. Personal traits. We analyzed a much broader understanding of competences: knowledge skills, presentation and communication competences, cooperation competences, employability, systematic competences (processing information), personal competences, diversity competences. And those are arranged in 3 categories: knowing, doing, being.

DISCUSSION:

Thomas Vonier

I detected some tension about what this project really intends to do and I heard two different versions, one from Dag and the second from the other presentations. There is certainly in North America and possibly in Europe now a sort of constituency that celebrates people who have graduated in architecture, but have not pursued a career in architecture and you find this in books and seminars and events. Is there a constituency that stresses the value of being an architect and staying with the profession and is that constituency part of this research enterprise? So this study poses two questions: what are the demands of the workplace in architecture today and how well are the schools doing to meet those? The other one I heard is what is the value of an education in architecture in other fields? Maybe those are both valid questions to try to respond to. But there's a certain lack of clarity. I noticed that Ursula von der Leyen, the President of the European Union, has called for a new Bauhaus and she has sort of reaffirmed the fundamental value of building, and building well and who but architects are at the center of that? If I were doing a study of this nature, there were certain basic first questions I would want to know, or at least try to answer. How many people are studying architecture today? Let's say within the 27 Member States. How many have become architects after having studied the field? How many have stayed with it for 10 years, or perhaps more. But more importantly, and I don't know how you get at this question, how many architects are really needed in this environment and what skills and what knowledge are most critical? And then for your study, how can you validate the results? How do you know that the sample, whether it's 2500 or 5000 is valid and represents a valid element of the profession?

I saw a certain lack of clarity, at the outset about objectives, but then a great deal of precision in the survey instrument and I'm just wondering how those two things get reconciled. It's a very interesting set of questions and very happy to be involved, but these are my observations. After hearing the first presentation.

Johan De Walsche

I can say a few things to respond. First of all, I think you will recognize that the survey in itself is quite neutral and can reach as many graduates. In the survey, the people answering the questions split up in flows and to a certain extent they answer the same questions and some questions are specific for the flow. They follow through, whether they are still in architecture or not. This is neutral. This is only an instrument for mapping and collecting data. There are also open questions afterwards that are connected to the objectives of the research.

But the work packages will follow different flows: one of the work packages really goes to people that are related to a completely other sector, while there is an automatic package that analyzes the studies of the flow of those who stayed fully in architecture. We will have some specialization within our consortium about analyzing some flows, but they are still neutral towards the flows that we have.

Then there is another level, not only the quantification, but also we use this survey to detect, let's say, interesting, extreme cases. So it's also our intention to go to identify very specific answers we can go and look into individual cases. So these are again two brands: we have specific, extreme cases, and more representational cases or quantitative analysis.

Regarding the question about representativity. This is a difficult one and we have already discussed the problem within the consortium. But one of the things is that we trace the origin of the channel, through which it is disseminated as much as possible. We can identify smaller tracks of our clusters of answers for instance from one school or within one country and compare it within one year of graduation and have an indication of the percentage of that number of graduates in total in the country regarding to how many have answered. So it is possible afterwards to distinguish groups that are more representative than others and make more robust analysis on this reduced group. For instance, in our pilot survey Spain was quite strongly represented but closer analysis showed that one school was very proficient in answering because they had a very good alumni office while this was not the case for other schools. But we could identify it. And so we can take it into account when analyzing our answers or we can even exclude this number of answers in our analysis as they are not representative or the school is not a very representative school compared to the national school of architecture in Spain. We trace the origins and ways of dissemination as much as possible.

Thomas Vonier

I would just add two remarks.

One that I don't know how you correlate the responses, and even the rate of response with the level of economic activity and growth in a country because there must be a correlation between people who stay in the profession and the opportunities in the profession. I don't know how you reconcile those two.

The second is that I think Doug at the beginning mentioned the European directives and the 11 areas that are covered by the directives. I asked myself, when you did that, whether you intend to address those or somehow tackle them or come back to them, and if so, to what end.

I detect a certain interest in proving that an architecture degree is useful for other disciplines and that may be a valid, interesting and true point. But is that the purpose of this research or is the purpose of the research to understand how well curricula are addressing the needs of people who practice architecture.

Those are two different questions, it seems to me, two different areas of interest and I am unclear as to what is driving this research at the moment.

Dag Boutsen

Regarding the European directives, I think implicitly in the study, we want to prove that actually there is something really wrong with recognition of diplomas of architects regulated by European directives aiming at only these professional qualities, while in the same world, thank to Bologna, architecture has to become a scientific discipline.

Now the other question about the relation with the economic situation, for instance, in the different countries is a very difficult one because it's not only sometimes countries with enormous financial crisis and building industry collapsing, it's not only about the different cultures. But it's also about different regulations concerning, for instance, the responsibilities of architects. The responsibility of a Belgium architect is much higher than in our surrounding countries. This means that the job of an architect is less interesting to some people. The differences in the compulsory internships in the different countries is also an aspect that is really important to look into. Also, 60% of the students are female in Europe, but this is not reflected after 10 years in the practice. And there you have another topic.

Michela Barosio

I want to add some things about the two fields of interest that Thomas mentioned: if we are interested in architectural education as fitting the need of architectural practice, or we are interested in understanding if architectural education is providing interesting skills for other sectors. I think that those two fields of interest are complementary and we discussed them in the consortium.

In some countries in Europe, you need a license after the graduation in architecture because in these countries architectural education is not enough to become an architect. But in other countries, it is different.

I think that it's really important to understand what is the focus of architectural education: is it strictly related to architectural profession to become an architect or do we want to give more broad and general skills and competencies that made those kinds of graduates able to fulfill the needs of other sectors?

The two questions are not opposite. They are complementary to understand which focus we want to give to architectural education.

Mia Roth

I was just going to agree with Michaela because it's defining this area of the mismatch, which comes from both directions, either from within practice or from gaining something which can be used elsewhere. So through the research and talking to different industries. I think that both will be answered.

But the question is how we're going to reach all the alumni and we can compare the total number of graduates from a school with a number of those who have answered to see whether the segment of people is relevant or not to be used. And I think the only proper way to continue is to go through the alumni offices and through the universities, because in the first survey, it was quite obvious that we are branching through the channels used by professional associations, personal contacts and so forth. So we kind of stayed within practice. But if we go through the alumni offices, we can reach people who do not follow these channels anymore, and yet our architecture graduates.

Lynne Dearborn

I wanted to say you know the friction between an education that supports primarily a professional track and one that is broader is a think of a more overarching kind of set of frictions that exists, not just in the countries that you all are focused on, but very clearly it is an issue in the United States, and I would imagine in many other places.

You have a set of professional criteria but is that all that education should be doing and how do we know or what guides us in those other areas and are those things looking to contemporary practice, rather than what needs to happen over the next 50 years? To what extent does education support graduates over the lifetime of their professional careers in whatever direction? That's the first point I wanted to make.

But I think the second one which might also go toward Tom's points is it would be helpful to hear or to see the breath of hypotheses that sort of backup so that you gave us one hypothesis that is what's driving you, it's kind of your focus based on your experience and perhaps to better understand the series of those hypotheses could help us see how you see these different parts of your different questions as being linked together via as you were pointing out.

Anna-Maria Meister

I just have a few questions. In a similar direction, which some of you said are foundational. I was not quite sure how you define leaving the profession. Is that defined through licensing, through jobs as what kind of job counts as architecture and which doesn't. Because you mentioned at some point, continued education was understood as leaving. But let's say, for example, I'm still a licensed architect, but I left in other ways. That wasn't totally clear but it points to the main question which is what is an architect outside of let's say legal definition? That is of course different in different countries. In Germany, we do need to get a license and the degree is not really enough. So there's those differences, but then it seems that our discipline has still quite clear, or at least quite defined understanding of what an architect is or should be. And then, so I wonder if that is also what informs the survey in terms of what does it mean leaving architecture. This is important because I think one potential that the survey has is to really figure out if architectural education is really a training for a practice. Because if it turns out that a lot of the people who study architecture don't practice architects, then maybe the whole model of our education is running after this wrong horse in a way which then could provide a sort of freedom away from this kind of professionalization and think about: How do we educate architects toward a practice as we wanted and not as it needs us? There's, I think, a kind of projective element that often goes lost in these discussions. If the problem is to furnish students with a set of skills for a profession that a large part of the students don't even go into (the classical understanding of being an architect) then, what happens to our educational model that's modeled very tightly after a kind of design architect?

And I'm speaking mostly for Germany here, but also generally. So the question is, what is an architect and what does it mean to be an architect and to stay an architect outside of kind of legal definitions?

The other question is that of licensing. I think in general in the US, there's been discussions of abolishing licensing and accreditation but others want to keep it. And this links to the discussion of what is the task of the university in training architects and what are we training them for.

Another question is how we can make sure that things like economical background, class backgrounds, migration backgrounds, gender backgrounds, age, whatever are taken into consideration. To account for reasons why somebody would leave if we find out how to define leaving in a productive way. Because I also think there's still a lot of distortion.

Also, I am wondering why in these European countries and both consortiums and societies or groups, Germany, Switzerland and Austria is often missing. I wonder why that is. Both in terms of engagement missing, but also in terms of representation. I'm just curious because we have all the same discussions like, do we teach skills, do we train architects, do we rethink practice or do we run after practice.

David Gloster

We're actually talking about some extremely interesting questions about the title of being an architect and the majority of us are working in territories where the title of architect is protected. I know architects who say, well, I don't actually care whether I'm called an architect or not because my client has come to me because of the quality of the service. And I think this is underlying all these discussions. There's a question, if the title wasn't of any interest to architects, although I suspect it always will be. What the implications of that for architectural education and the whole descriptor of architecture. Actually, the reality is the title is minimally protected in virtually every territory. It's subject to all kinds of semantic ethnological abuses.

My second point is that there actually is a massive professional elephant sitting in the virtual room here. The professional elephant in the virtual room was that the fact that the majority of graduates, after having spent a huge amount of intellectual effort, amount of time and massive amounts of money and considerable expenditure of nervousness, application and concentration dip their toes into the profession for up to 10 years and then left, whatever our definition of leaving is this is a hugely powerful body of evidence. Yes, we know the issues around gender, disability, ethnicity, our IPO Commission's a significant amount of research into all these issues. As factors contributing to people leaving the profession that there is something over and beyond these issues, which means that somehow the nature of the profession is not necessarily meeting graduates' expectations.

I spent 40 years hearing the profession, offering a critique of architectural education and I urge the profession to turn the telescope around the other way. And say, what is it about the profession that can improve to retain the skills of

our graduates. Everywhere in the world because we graduate highly skilled people asking significant and important questions about the future of architecture. And the nature of architecture and the nature and role of architects and somehow the survey suggested to me have a very significant body of disappointment. With the profession, into which they graduated I'm being slightly deliberately provocative because it's always good to get a conversation going.

Patrick Flynn

There is a question we often think about learning skills. And I think that if you teach towards a set of professional skills, they might become obsolete because you're only dealing with what the profession is at the current moment in time. And in profession, you have to make a profit: what we do to survive. We need it to be pretty much based in the here and now. Then we need to think about what's going to happen in 50 years, it's not just about the present but about what is the future. What is needed in schools is to prepare the students for lifelong learning. Even develop the skill sets that they needed to do something else.

The reason why a person leaves the profession can be for “good” reasons or “bad” reasons. A student might leave architecture simply because when he chose it she was too young, and then it becomes only a stage of her personal development. This is a “good” reason. What we should also clearly focus on are the negative reasons which are going to be touched on the gender imbalance ethnicity. Also, long term prospects and that work life balance that quite often is skewed in many practices of architecture.

Also, it would be important to compare these data of leaving the profession to other disciplines of the built environment like landscape architecture or planning or maybe engineering. What is the relation with them?

If we look the way around: what are the skills used by other disciplines that are taught in architecture schools? What do we know and how does that tie to the world?

I would like at the end of the study we end up with a lot more questions. We have some answers but also further questions will rise that tell us that we need to dig deeper into what's this word.

Roberto Cavallo

As Patrick just said: let's look the other way around. What are the skills that architects have and are important for other professions and position them back in the way we like to express it in our curricula. How do we do, what do they really mean?

What I've been experiencing in Holland is that since January 1, 2015, two years of professional apprenticeship was kind of made compulsory and we observed that for three or four years, architects didn't follow that prescription but nothing collapsed in the sector. That means that they found the way to operate, even without being registered and that is something also that triggered a new way of organizing stuff because architecture and architects are flexible, conjunctural.

Therefore, I am really interested if you really stick to the official definitions and rehabs that are entitled to fall under the responsibility of the architect because that is changing in almost every European country. In some countries, you don't have a distinction between landscape architects and architects, here in the Netherlands, we have that.

I also think the other way around is also very interesting: what are the things that you can learn from other sectors?

Particularly, the one being outside architecture per se but still in the environment. We have to incorporate more skills and open to other issues and ways of approaching a much larger understanding of the environment in our programs. At the same time, we can not just pile up requirements, we need to understand what is more important (related to this lifelong learning).

Saverio Mecca

The question is to look at today as much as the future. Which skills are important for the people in architecture and also leaving architecture? And I would like to stress the importance of the future, and how to train architects of the next generation.

Anna-Maria Meister

What counts for leaving. For some people entering architectural schools to be architects might be a transitory stage. But also, this might be something to do with the very structure of our profession. If we think of the structure of an office it is pyramidal also in regard to age. Then we go back to the question: what are we trading students for? The question might be whether they leave because they are disappointed, or because “being an architect” (a designer in an office) is deliberately a transitory state before making more money in an industrial job or getting more security in a public job - but then again that needs to be questioned whether those examples would be “leaving”, for example. meaning if we look into the classic design offices that often serve as models for “architects” there is a pyramid with a lot less work force at the top (above 45, for example); so there’s a structural redistribution going on, as well I think it will be crucial to find out more about these questions in the survey also to debunk certain myths within education; who are we really educating and what for? Is it really about professional skills, or is it a specific form of thinking and shaping and problem-solving? Meaning, if we have more information about our graduates and where they go and want to go (short and long term) we can find new directions for education, as well. As Patrick said, if we try to teach students the skills for the current profession, by definition we’ll be running behind. and also to find out (or define) what counts as “being an architect” (again, both from within and from without)

Mia Roth

exactly. What is ‘leaving’ is a question, and is covered through the various paths which Johan explained. also ‘doing something else’ - it is about leaving as much as broadening or questioning the definition of practice

Anna-Maria Meister

yes, and maybe you are still “an architect” when working elsewhere - and not to be too metaphysical here, there are clear definitions of what an “architect” is; but I for example am still a licensed architect despite not having signed off on a plan in more than 12 years. And I very much understand myself as being an architect still.

David Gloster

this is a key point, I think we would all agree. But irrespective of us understanding the term 'to leave' better than we do now, the fact remains that life in the traditional profession isn't compelling for many. I won't delve into my tired post-Marxist clichés to discuss this further, but new, more ethical models for practice (rather than education) are surely almost criminally overdue.

Hannah Vowles

Is Architecture education good for architecture? Is it good for architecture practice? Is it good for the discipline of architecture? What is architecture education good for? Class - who become architects? Architecture education as transformative of practice. The role of part time study where those in practice also study - what contribution does that make to practice? Practice changes all the time. Anna-Maria's question "what is leaving?" is central.

Hrvoje Njiric

Important to have a large body of people taking the survey: 10 thousand.

I would like to add 3 remarks:

First the overproduction of architects (Italy but also Croatia) the number of people really needed in the profession vs the ones graduating should be part of the survey. Second, relate to the economy of the country. Third, related to organizations, such as chambers of architects. In certain countries like Croatia the chamber of architects is very badly organized and might demotivate the architect/student.

Is it too ambitious to expect that the survey would give a kind of single profiles, recipe or guideline for architectural schools to change or are we speaking about several documents related to different parts of the Europe with very specific surrounding for the architects to be educated and so my remark actually would go into this direction to make a kind of a document that has these relation to each country, and especially if we expect the students somehow to acquire this document and to follow the certain data project produced in the document and to implement it into the new curriculum of the school.

Hannah Vowles

what's fascinated me for a long time, is the idea that architecture education has a value in and of itself, regardless of practice and it's transformative, and it is a very, very wide field and I've been very interested in the difference between practice, profession, discipline, training, education, all these different ways of looking at what it is that we're doing in this activity, known as architecture education.

I'm really pleased to have had Anna Maria's questions. I think she's uncovered a lot of quite nuanced issues in what she was saying. And I think that for me. There's also a very big question around who gets to enter this fascinating field. And I think architecture will forever be very, very narrow unless we look very hard, who is able to come into through the door in the first place and benefit from what I see is a very rich practice, long wrong niche practice, of architecture education and where I teach, we have some different modes, one of which is part time. And so we have students who are in practice, who come into be to take part in architecture education and it's getting very difficult in the UK to do anything at all without tearing your hair out. It's really a very peculiar kind of country at the moment but and some of the benefits of this form of study have faded because there's such pressure on fees and so on so forth both in the academy and in practice, but traditionally there's been a possibility of people coming in who wouldn't normally get into architecture education. And they have been able to transform practice through what they do in a kind of process. So they are working in the two fields together, in practice, and in the academy together. And this has been incredibly rich and we've had. We've had students who have really transformed what their practice does because they are bringing what they learn into practice immediately.

Mia Roth

I mean, there's a really interesting discussion going on in parallel in the chat and because of it. I think that it would be great if we could somehow distribute the working version of the survey to the board and everyone here because some of the questions that were raised regarding the definition of leaving are actually already implied through the path that Johan showed in the diagram. Maybe it wasn't quite clear, but there are different nuances here that are already somehow implied in the survey and also are regarding the question of reaching out to different industries or bodies.

Perhaps it would also be good, this is a note to the consortium and myself, to put a condensed version of the project that we actually won a year ago and all the activities that were planned as a kind of an announcement or at least the skeletal structure of the course. Because it has already addressed various contexts planned both geographically and economically, because this is a very important question. And also addressing the various professional bodies and creative industries in education at various events so it was quite difficult to plan or stick to the schedule that we had originally envisioned because of the situation we found ourselves in. Without putting any dates to these events that would be great to somehow share the plan of the intellectual outputs and the multiplier events that are planned within the project with you to see what would need to be added to make it more to make the impact more significant.

Michela Barosio

I think that some good remarks have been done about the scientific character of the project and the number of people that has to be reached.

Others have mentioned the fact of having an economic context that can rebalance some answers in the survey. I am still very concerned about those aspects.

One other crucial point is to have a meaningful survey is how many people we are able to reach, in a sense of a number, but also countries and to the different fields. So I ask all the advisory board members if they can help us this way. If they can suggest us some services or some alumni or some subject that they think can help us in spreading our survey. I think that this might be the weak point of our project not to be able to reach all these subjects that we are willing to address for the survey.

Johan De Walsche

My opinion of this meeting is that it went farther than I could have expected. It was very deep and very critical. Many of our discussions that we had internally and I have to admit that we have to clear it out.

I think this is a good thing with our project. Today we only showed the survey because this was our point of attention, so to say. But the project really is bigger than this, I refer to several work packages and we have a kind of mission. Each of the partners will investigate one of these different flows. So I think this is one thing that we didn't clarify enough and maybe next meeting of the external board could be to clarify the project as a whole and how its structured, but also the outcomes, the kind of audience that we wanted to reach is defined in our project. And we distinguish between the kind of feedback that we want to offer at the level of the institutions, but also at the level of countries and maybe European higher education policy, because I think that Europe is less harmonized. I think it's good to use this richness, but it's very bad to remain in very generic terms while we know that there are differences. I think we also should put policy makers in great responsibility, whether they choose to provide higher education in this way or not. So for this reason, we need some more precision in. What kind of education, we are offering. So this dichotomy, or whether it is professional or academic. I think all these categories may exist, but we should be aware of what it is that we offer and how this connects to the intentions of the institution or have a certain policy. And I think we need this kind of precision and this kind of knowledge and insights in what we actually are doing. Our main concern to collect enough material to clarify, to be more precise and to provide this at different levels. Both sectors and education and policymakers and this is extremely ambitious. So I think that Patrick was completely right, he said that we will be able to construct many, many questions. We already selected some in this project, but there are many other questions that will pop up and that we are able, maybe to formalize our hypothesis and that will lead to.

Thomas Vonier

As you continue to frame the study and its eventual reports, please consider potential *outcomes* in a very pragmatic way: Who are the potential audiences for the results? What do we want them to do with the results? What evidence must we present to support our case? Several distinct groups come to mind immediately:

-- European Union politicians, bureaucrats and officials who budget, administer, and control the funding and regulations that affect education and professional practice.

-- Senior officials and administrators in academic institutions with programmes in architecture, and others who allocate resources and set priorities within the institutions of higher education.

-- Leadership and management in the key professional and academic associations in Europe and beyond (all of the Member State national bodies, such as RIBA, CNOA, CNAPPC, COAC, CSCAE, BAK, and so forth, plus the regional organisations, such as EAAE and ACE).

-- Faculty and students in schools of architecture, especially those who can influence curricula (it was interesting to see preliminary findings about what respondents see as key ingredients for professional success, relatively few of which now figure in academic curricula).

It is important to identify key objectives for the *outcomes* of the study, and to formulate specific, separate reports targeted at the groups who can actually implement recommendations, or act upon findings.

Recognise that not all constituencies will have interest in all aspects of the study, or its details and methodology, and that many will have short or narrow attention spans.

For example, if the intention is to re-shape the European Union Directive on Architecture, then data and arguments will likely be needed along the lines we began to discuss: How many students are now studying architecture? How many architects will probably be needed in Europe, say for the next two decades? What skills will be required to

build a stronger, more equitable, economically stable, and healthier Europe? What weaknesses in education need to be addressed? A report intended to influence the EU would be very different from one intended to inform or interest educators.