



MCP Broker Project Final Report

Brokering migrants' cultural participation

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use, which may be made of the information contained therein.

MCP Broker Project Final Report

Brokering migrants' cultural participation

TABLE OF CONTENT

TABLE OF CONTENT.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
RESEARCH.....	4
Sweden.....	6
Belgium.....	7
Italy.....	8
Spain.....	9
Austria.....	9
THE LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS.....	12
Sweden.....	12
Italy.....	13
Spain.....	14
Belgium.....	16
Austria.....	20
PARTNERS CONCLUSIONS.....	21
PROPOSITION TO MIPEX.....	26
EPILOGUE.....	29

The Partners:



INTRODUCTION

Brokering migrants' cultural participation or simply MCP Broker was a two-year project (2013-2015) funded by the European Commission - Directorate General Home Affairs, and in the case of Sweden co-funded by the Swedish Arts Council.

The general and overall aim of the project was in short to enhance and stimulate the cultural participation of migrants by improving the capacity of their local Public Cultural Institutions* (PCIs) to interact with a diverse and culturally disparate local population through training. In doing so providing the PCIs' with the tools required improving their cultural diversity management. Public cultural institutions are here understood as part of the receiving society, which has to meet the challenge of managing increasing cultural diversity and ensuring intercultural dialogue on the path to a true integration of migrants into society. The enhancement of an intercultural capacity within the PCIs' through diversifying their staff and governance bodies is quite central to these tasks. In that perspective MCP Broker can be seen as a project that studies the role and importance of cultural institutions as actors in migrant-integrating societies. More specifically MCP Broker strives to take local action in order to promote the commitment of receiving communities when interacting with migrants, based on the mutual respect of their rights, obligations and different cultures. To a certain extend the project even touches on similarities between the cultural sector and other sectors introducing the importance of equal treatment and better diversity management in the work place, in public and private services, in education, media and other areas.

The project was framed around a set of specific objectives:

- a) to promote the engagement of the receiving communities in interacting with the migrants, based on the mutual respect of their rights, obligations and different cultures;
- b) to ensure equal treatment and improve diversity management in the public and private work places, service provision, educational systems, media and other important arenas.

MCP Broker was built on the assumption that public cultural institutions are "important arenas" in which to promote equal treatment and improve diversity management. As stated in the Open Method Cooperation Report on "The role of public arts and cultural institutions in promoting cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue" (2012- 2013)¹, the diversity of Europe, albeit powerfully enriching, comes with tensions and challenges. Challenges that all the public institutions need to address by going back to their main mission: promoting social cohesion.

As an initiative that was set to investigate the true impact of arts and cultural institutions in terms of integration of migrants MCP Broker was based on the idea that cultural institutions need to question, rethink and improve the way they adapt themselves to the new demographic composition of society, and to analyse the way they handle the reaction to new cultural and social flows.

The project partners were:

¹ http://ec.europa.eu/culture/library/reports/201405-omc-diversity-dialogue_en.pdf

- ❖ Interarts Foundation (Spain), Co-ordinator
- ❖ Intercult and Region Västerbotten (Sweden)
- ❖ EDUCULT (Austria)
- ❖ Eccom - European Centre for Cultural Organisation and Management (Italy)
- ❖ CAE - Culture Action Europe (Belgium)

The project was based on 4 phases:

1. Realisation and development of a benchmarking tool in order to analyse diversity management in cultural institutions;
2. A pilot research exercise in each of the 5 countries in order to analyse and assess the status of diversity management and the sector's needs on how to promote integration testing the benchmarking tool with 10 – 15 cultural institutions;
3. Setting up different types of learning partnerships (LPs) and/or workshops for public cultural institutions (PCIs) in order to equip the sector on how to promote and support integration measures: i.e. involving NGO's, educational sector and employment agencies;
4. Dissemination of the benchmarking tool and LPs outcomes to a wider circle for use and emulation of the project in this case through both an end conference in Barcelona in July 2015 and through the projects website.

This report is based on the national reports from each of the five participating countries as well as from the projects end conference, where the dissemination of the benchmarking tool and LPs outcomes were presented to a larger audience as well as the website for MCP Broker was presented. The report follows widely the same structural set up as the national partner reports.

Each partner have reported specifically referring to phases 1, 2 and 3 of the project, i.e. the pilot research activity, the use of the benchmarking tool and the learning partnerships realised in Austria, in Sweden (Skellefteå, Stockholm and Umeå), in Italy (Rome and Milan), in Spain (Barcelona) and in Belgium (Saint-Gilles, Bruxelles).

The Belgian partner underlined in their report that Belgium has a federal structure with 3 different official communities: the Flemish, the French and the German-speaking and three different Regions (the Flemish, the Walloon and the Brussels Capital Region). Each community has a different history and background, and has subsequently been influenced by its neighbouring country: France, Netherlands and Germany. Their cultural, migration, educational and employment policies have been differently shaped conceptually and so has their implementation. Consequently, cultural institutions from the 3 different communities are subject to policies put in place by their own community² rather than from a national level. In this respect, the second and third phases of the project were conducted differently in Belgium as a laboratory where PCIs and other actors of the social cohesion were questioned about interculturality.

² For more information on this subject see: Collection du Centre des Droits de l'Homme de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, « *Le droit et la diversité culturelle* », sous la direction de Julie Ringelheim, pp. 251-300 « *Une approche différenciée de la diversité? Les politiques d'intégration en Flandre, en Wallonie et à Bruxelles (1980-2006)* », Ilke Adam, 2006

RESEARCH

The research, here meaning the implementation, testing and adjustment of the benchmarking tool was absolutely essential to the projects progression in the sense that it formed the very core of the project partners point of reference in terms of methodology and indirectly even the way each partner designed the local collaborative setup.

The benchmarking tool used in the project was initially developed by Platform for Intercultural Europe³ together with the Migration Policy Group in Brussels in order to analyse diversity management in cultural institutions. From this the European partners in MCP Broker then developed a final version⁴ to become the prime tool in tracking the potential journey of a cultural institution from a basic level where the institutions recognise the need to reflect society's diversity by adapting rules and making statements, through two intermediate levels to an advanced level, where the cultural institutions as organisations fully reflects society's diversity and promotes participation. In short 4 levels were reported for each chapter; basic, lower intermediate, upper intermediate and advanced. In order to make the benchmarking tool work, some conditions were identified inside each chapter and each level to allow a certain degree of flexibility and adaptability during its use.

For each of these levels the benchmarks have been defined into seven different areas:

1. Institutional policy and vision
2. Audience/visitor relations
3. Programme/repertoire/collections
4. Partners/collaborators for programming and profiling
5. Employees
6. Board members
7. Suppliers

Each partner then identified 10-15 cultural institutions with a diversified cultural approach and thus forming a strong set of public cultural institutions in each of the participating countries that have had to face important challenges regarding the integration of Third Country Nationals. The goal was to include various types of cultural organizations (theatres, auditoriums, museums, libraries, etc.) of different size and with different levels of experience in the management of cultural diversity. Staff members with relevant key functions within the selected institutions have been interviewed in order to establish on which stage - or which level - these institutions have reached on their journey of diversity management, to establish the critical hurdles and to identify their needs. The participating institutions have then been ranked on the basis of the outcome of the pilot research.

Table 1. Results of the analysis according to the benchmarking tool

³ See <http://www.intercultural-europe.org/site/> for further information on the Platform for Intercultural Europe.

⁴ The initial benchmarking tool, prepared by the Platform for Intercultural Europe on the basis of previous work by the with Migration Policy Group, was further refined and adjusted with the aid of European professionals from cultural institutions and from migrants' self-organisations during a 2- day workshop held in Brussels at the end of 2013. The ensuing benchmarking tool is the actual output of the MCP Broker project and was used for the pilot research.

MCP Broker Project Final Report



NUMBER	NAME	TYOPOLOGY	BENCHMARKING LEVEL
<u>Sweden⁵</u>			
1.	Malmö Museer	City Museum	Lower intermediate/ Upper intermediate
2.	Bohusläns Museum	Regional museum	Lower intermediate
3.	Västerbottens Museum	Regional museum	Basic/Lower intermediate
4.	Riksteatern	National theatre	Lower intermediate
5.	Västerbottensteatern	Regional theatre	Basic
6.	Folkoperan	Opera house	Lower intermediate
7.	Vara Konserthus	City theatre	Basic
8.	Länsbiblioteket i Västerbotten	County library	Basic
9.	Finspångs Biblioteket	City library	Basic
10.	Botkyrka Kulturskola	Culture school	Lower intermediate
11.	Kulturhuset / Stadsteatern	City theatre	Basic
<u>Belgium⁶</u>			
1.	KVS	Flemish National Theatre - Brussels	Advanced
2.	t'Arseanaal	City Theatre - Mechelen	Upper Intermediate
3.	M HKA	Contemporary visual art Museum - Antwerp	Lower Intermediate
4.	MIAT	Museum for Industry, Labour and Textiles - Ghent	Lower Intermediate
5.	Beursschouwburg	Performing Arts Centre - Brussels	Lower Intermediate
6.	Cultuurcentrum Sint-Niklaas	Multidisciplinary Cultural Centre - Sint Niklaas	Lower Intermediate
7.	Bibliotheek Gent	Public Library - Ghent	Lower Intermediate
8.	BOZAR	Fine Arts Centre - Brussels	Lower Intermediate
9.	Wiels	Contemporary Visual Arts Centre - Brussels	Lower Intermediate
10.	WP Zimmer	Contemporary dance production space - Antwerp	Basic
11.	Erfgoedbibliotheek	Heritage Library - Antwerp	Basic
<u>Italy⁷</u>			
1.	Brera National Gallery, Milan	State owned museum	Lower intermediate
2.	Museum of Peoples and Cultures, Milan	Private museum	Lower intermediate
3.	MAXXI, Rome	Private/public museum	Basic/Lower intermediate
4.	City Museum of Zoology, Rome	City museum	Lower intermediate
5.	Museum of Natural History and Archaeology, Montebelluna (Treviso)	City museum	Upper intermediate
6.	Opera Theatre, Rome*	Theatre/Opera house	Basic
7.	Auditorium Music Park,	Theatre/Opera house	Basic

⁵ The selected cultural institutions in Sweden were 11 public-funded institutions from different parts of the country: museums, libraries and theatres/opera houses and a cultural school.

⁶ The application of the benchmarking tool to 11 cultural institutions in Belgium was carried out by the Platform for Intercultural Europe (PIE).

⁷ The Italian partner, Eccom – European Centre for Cultural Organisation and Management, has realised the research in Italy: the research team was directed by Cristina Da Milano and Simona Bodo in co-operation with Roberta Agnese and Maria Guida.



	Rome*		
8.	Teatro dell'Argine, S. Lazzaro di Savena (Bologna)	Theatre/Opera house	Upper intermediate
9.	City Libraries of Genoa	Library	Lower intermediate
10.	Libraries of Rome Institution	Library	Lower intermediate

Spain⁸

1.	Red de Bibliotecas de Andalucía	Library	Upper intermediate
2.	Conservatorio Municipal Barcelona	Concert hall	Basic
3.	Museo de América	Cultural historical Museum	Lower intermediate
4.	Museo Arqueológico de Badajoz	Cultural historical Museum	Basic
5.	Museo y Centro de Investigación de Altamira	Cultural historical Museum	Basic
6.	Museo Marítimo de Barcelona	Cultural historical Museum	Lower Intermediate
7.	Museo Etnológico de Barcelona	Cultural historical Museum	Upper Intermediate
8.	Museo de la Inmigración	Cultural historical Museum	Upper Intermediate
9.	Museo d'Historia de Barcelona	City museum	Lower Intermediate
10.	MACBA	Art museum	Basic
11.	Centro Dramático Nacional	Theatre	Basic

Austria⁹

1.	Wien Museum	City Museum	Upper Intermediate
2.	MUMOK	Art Museum	Basic
3.	Kunsthau Bregenz	Art Museum	Basic
4.	Bücherein Wien	Public libraries	Advanced
5.	WUK	Cultural House	Advanced

Sources: Intercult, Culture Action Europe & PIE, ECCOM, Interarts

**Analysis based only on available documents*

The results of the benchmarking and the analysis of the interviews in each country showed a number of interesting findings, which provided a more nuanced understanding of the tools and the context they were used in. The results reflected both the national circumstances as well as some over all more general tendencies:

Sweden

In Sweden none of the participating cultural institutions in the project has a consistent diversity perspective that concerns the overall organization and includes its different departments. The Swedish results showed that:

- The cultural institutions without defined policies or a concrete strategy cannot rise over basic level.
- Concerning programming, good initiatives embracing diversity and inclusion have been bound to the engagement of individuals or appointed to a specific department of the

⁸ Interarts has carried out the research in Spain. The team was directed by Mercedes Giovinazzo in co-operation with Julio Martínez.

⁹ The Austrian partner Educult choose a slightly different way of reporting the outcomes of the research.

organization, therefore the result is not visible in the whole organization and poorly communicated.

- The institutions' audience work is in general not strategic when it comes to involving migrant communities. Few institutions have mapped the migrant communities in their mission area.
- In Sweden they found the lowest levels of diversity within the staff composition, 9 out of 11 institutions reached the basic level and 2 reached the lower intermediate level.
- Most of the cultural institutions boards' in Sweden are politically elected therefore it's difficult to draw any conclusions, which is why the benchmark is not applicable.
- The cultural institutions in Sweden in general are bound to the municipality's rather complicated rules concerning subcontractors and they are therefore not entirely free to neither choose nor engage in this issue.
- The participating institutions articulated that there is a need for a tool like the MCP Broker benchmark that contributes with guidance.
- The self-perception of power and privileges is rather weak within most of the cultural institutions. There seem to be a risk with an increased influence of the Sweden Democrats that might jeopardize the current political vision of a culture for "all".

Belgium

The application of the benchmarking tool to 11 cultural institutions in Belgium showed that the management of cultural diversity is performed in very different ways. The Belgian team found that there are some interesting and innovating experiences; some public cultural institutions (PCIs) do not tackle the topic at all whereas a major range of PCIs in Belgium are interested in the topic: they have launched some initiatives but have had to discontinue them for different reasons (i.e. lack of long-term funds or arbitrary decisions).

The application of the benchmarking tool in Belgium was carried out by the Platform for Intercultural Europe (PIE). PIE identified some problems that are stated in the conclusions of the Pilot Study. These results highlighted the need for a refinement of the tool. The difficulties and the recommendations that arose are reported here as mentioned in the conclusions of the Pilot Study since they played a role for the interpretation and the following process in Belgium:

- Several benchmarks contain more than 1 condition. Following the initial agreement of the partners, all the conditions had to be met for a benchmark to be considered attained. This problem has been the most frequently found i.e. a PCI fulfilled one condition contained in a benchmark but did not receive any credit for it (examples are reported in the Belgian Pilot Study conducted by PIE).

***Recommendation:** the benchmarking needs to be reviewed to remove double conditions as much as possible, i.e. to split double condition benchmarks into 2 different benchmarks. In this way, PCIs achievements could better be credited.*

- Some advanced benchmarks are compatible with lower ones (« and » situation) others exclude lower ones (« either/or » situation). The application shows that it could skew the results.

***Recommendation:** Only 1 benchmark level from basic to advanced should be admissible in each subtheme.*

- The benchmark applies better to performing arts institutions than to libraries and museums.

Recommendation: benchmarks should all become neutral or create different sets of benchmarks for different types of cultural institutions.

- Benchmarks do not cover all of the efforts that a cultural institution might make with regard to MCP. For example, despite not applying/being able to apply diversity and equality principles to their staff recruitment procedures, some institutions participate in government-sponsored work placements of immigrants and provide them with training in this context.

Recommendation: review the benchmarks on the basis of new insights and /or allow for the award of « extra points » to the conditions not covered by the benchmarks.

- The benchmarks leave the size of an institution out of consideration. Many of the benchmarks describe practices, which would only be available to larger institutions with sizeable specialised departments. Smaller institutions can only live up to the spirit of such benchmarks through the informal efforts of their staff.

Recommendation: Correlate the benchmark evaluation to the size (in terms of budget and staff) of the institution being evaluated.

The conclusions of the Pilot Study underlined that the benchmarking tool due to its potential represents the key element in MCP Broker: its intention to raise standards and to lead the way to a transformation and renovation process allowing migrants improved access to cultural institutions. In this respect a general revision of the benchmarks has to be done taking into consideration a long-term perspective of the efforts that each cultural institution has undertaken during the process.

The Belgian partner concludes on the research that the adoption of the benchmarking as a self-assessment tool will help the public cultural institutions to analyse cultural diversity management within their own organisation, and help them identify obstacles and needs for a better intercultural integration.

Moreover, following the suggestion proposed in the Open Method Coordination Report (January 2014), the European Commission should follow the recommendation for the establishment of an “Intercultural Label Award”. The revised and adjusted benchmarking tool could be used to create a sense of competition in cultural institutions with regard to MCP Broker funds. Ranking the institutions will be necessary to decide which institution is granted with EU funds.

Italy

In Italy as in Sweden the selected cultural institutions - museums, libraries and theatres/opera houses - were all public-funded. The analysis showed that in Italy as well there are some interesting and innovative initiatives, which have been taken thanks to single departments or professional individuals. However, the majority of these initiatives are not supported by the institutional and political contexts. It is remarkable that very significant cultural institutions does not tackle the issue at all – neither as strategic goals nor in terms of dimensions and numbers of visitors/spectators.

In Italy some of the most common pitfalls identified during the research in terms of approach towards the issue of migrants participation are:

- The scarce involvement of the higher levels of the cultural institutions and of their political references in considering the issue as a priority;
- The lack of training of the cultural professionals, who very often feel themselves inadequate to tackle the issue;
- The low level of communication/dissemination of good practices, which is strongly required by cultural institutions, also in terms of sharing of methodologies and approaches.

Spain

In Spain the pilot research positioned 3 cultural institutions in the upper intermediate level, 3 in the lower intermediate level, and 5 institutions at a basic level. It is important to highlight that no institutions are positioned in the advanced level, thus showing that in Spain institutions need to work on their approach to migrant participation.

Moreover, the Spanish pilot research highlighted several needs and areas for improvement in the institutions' approaches to tackle the cultural participation of migrants:

- Strong lack of awareness in the institutions regarding vision and policy to enhance migrants' cultural participation.
- Funding of migrants' cultural participation is not based on separate funding lines, but provided by the institutions' general budget.
- Evaluation of migrants' participation programs is not carried out in all phases and the standards are improvable.
- No existence of a specific department within the cultural institutions to deal with diversity concerns and participation of migrants.
- In general, cultural institutions do not encourage project ownership or co-production, and visitors with migrant background are not included in the interpretation of works or repertoire. The approach and identification of migrants are perceived as separate domains from the institutions' policies.
- There is a deficiency in relation to migrant participation in staff, boards/governing bodies, and suppliers. This is due to the fact that public cultural institutions cannot influence these issues since the State stipulates the requirements regarding the contracting employees and companies (no provisions about migrant's participation). This issue needs to be tackled from a policy perspective and governmental policies should promote and support cultural diversity.

Austria

The Austrian partner Educult decided to report their findings in a different form, than the other partners. However, their findings and conclusions are very similar to the ones found in the other countries. In Austria the research has shown that migrant cultural participation is strongly linked to the socio-economic background. Relating to theoretical approaches, which emphasise the intersection of different forms of discrimination,¹⁰ the examination of migrant cultural participation in Austria by other actors has also shown that there is always a need to look at different factors influencing cultural participation of migrants.

¹⁰ I.e., such as the theory of intersectionality,

As such the yearly Austrian migration report has shown that 45% of Turkish and ex-Yugoslav migrants in Austria are employed in low-paid jobs (Arbeiter) whereas the percentage among employees without migrant background is at 23%. Although the professional position of second-generation migrants is converging towards the position of people with non-migrant background, this gap can also be witnessed in terms of education. People with migrant background have twice as often only the mandatory level of education (Pflichtschulabschluss) in comparison to Austrians without migrant background.¹¹ A detailed scientific report evaluating the perspectives of the cultural programme between 2010 and 2015 of the Viennese government in terms of migrant cultural participation has also pointed out that social challenges are also cultural ones.¹²

According to these findings, the Austrian interviewees from cultural institutions have emphasised that reaching out to people with migrant background is very often also a social question rather than a cultural one. This is furthermore reflected in the fact that staff from migrant background is often employed in customer service rather than in programming, education or the leadership of cultural institutions. Furthermore, a programme, which by the interviewees has been repeatedly mentioned in helping to increase migrant cultural participation, is the Austrian-wide programme of “Hunger auf Kunst und Kultur.” This unique programme guarantees free admission of socioeconomic weak audiences to cultural institutions. The findings therefore suggest that evaluating and improving migrant cultural participation always has to take into account intersections with other factors, such as the socioeconomic position as well as the level of education of persons with migrant backgrounds.

Definition of terms

In addition to factors of wealth and education other issues influence migrant cultural participation as well, especially age. Both the term diversity as well as the term diversity management inherently points at the variety of backgrounds, belongings and ascriptions of people. Therefore the Austrian partner concludes that fostering migrant cultural participation generally has to differentiate between stakeholders described by the term migrants. Arguably this is also reflected in the fact that no causality exists in the relationship of factors and intersections. That is to say that people with migrant background are not more limited by their economic means in consuming cultural goods than other Austrians, since an Austrian study has shown that expenditure on cultural goods is on average as high among migrants than among persons with Austrian citizenship.¹³ So no person with migrant background equals another person with migrant background. That puts into question migrant background as a sufficient indicator for education and participation in programmes of cultural institutions.

According to this question, the Austrian research has shown that the structure and programmes of education departments in museums are generally divided along the line of the age of visitors.

¹¹ Statistik Austria. *Migration und Integration* 2014

¹² Akbaba, Ülkü; Bratic, Ljubomir; Galehr, Sarah; Görg, Andreas; Pfeiffer, Gabriele C. *Kunst, Kultur und Theater für Alle! Impulse für eine transkulturelle Theateroffensive Studie zu Perspektiven der Kunst- und Kulturpolitik Wien 2010 – 2015 mit besonderem Fokus auf Migrationsrealität* Ein Projekt von IODO – Kunst, Kultur, Bildung und Wissenschaft. Wien, 2009

¹³ EDUCULT. *Kunst, Kultur und interkultureller Dialog*. Wien, 2008, S.65



Migrant background rather functions as a cross-sectional issue. The Wien Museum as well as the Mumok and Kunsthaus Bregenz have projects for adults on the one hand and projects for youngsters, kids and schools on the other hand. Obviously, this division interrelates with each other, since children's inclusion in a cultural institution can bring their parents to visit the establishment. As such children may function as multipliers in fostering cultural participation of their parents.

The influence of contemporary orientation

Fostering migrant cultural participation while taking into account other sections and factors such as age, socioeconomic position and level of education very much depends on the vision as well as on the character of an institution. That means that approaches of museums clearly differ from approaches of theatres. Furthermore, a contemporary orientation of an institution brings forth different content than more traditionally oriented houses. Examples can be found throughout almost all of the institutions under consideration.

For instance the cultural institutions that are very advanced in terms of cultural participation of migrants are for instance the Büchereien Wien (public libraries in Vienna) or the WUK (an open cultural house in Vienna). These institutions are, due to their character and self-understanding defined as institutions of exchange and dialogue. Libraries for instance, have the public mandate to educate and provide space for education and exchange. Fostering migrant cultural participation is therefore an inherent factor of the work of the library. Similarly, the WUK has, since its beginnings, been understood as a protected space for minorities. As such work and integration of migrant cultural initiatives have a long tradition in the house. Even inside a specific form of cultural institutions, challenges may differ. Museums such as the MUMOK – a museum for contemporary art – are confronted with different obstacles in reaching out to people with migrant background than for instance city museums such as the WIEN MUSEUM which is directly dedicated to the representation of city life and its changes. The Austrian research has shown that when discussing diversity measures the character of an institution, its history and specifically the art form, are factors that are crucial in identifying ways to include migrants as visitors, programmers or staff into the institution.

Relevance of leadership

In several of the examined Austrian institutions the attempts and efforts of diversity management and migrant cultural participation have changed with new leadership. For instance, the interviewees from the MUMOK have emphasised that the current director of the museums gives special attention to these topics. This can help to foster migrant cultural participation in view of obstacles such as the question of financing.

The already mentioned scientific report evaluating the perspective of the 2010-2015 cultural programme in Vienna emphasised the need for leadership when implementing diversity concepts. This is of particular importance, since the diversity concept is a top-down approach, which tends to

reproduce established power relations in an institution. In order to be successful the leadership of a specific organization, institution or sphere therefore has to be committed to it.¹⁴

THE LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS

In the third phase, the MCP Broker partners should create opportunity for the organization of a series of Learning Partnerships (LPs) with the aim of promoting the integration of migrants, especially in view of overcoming the difficulties, which may arise from a low level of experience in the management of cultural diversity and intercultural processes. The experts involved in the Pilot Study and in the Learning Partnerships identified tensions and complexities related to interculturality. During the Pilot study, PCI's experts were involved in individual interviews where they were questioned about their institutions' experiences in the light of cultural diversity.

Though using the same basic methodologies each country and partner ended up having quite a varied outcome of the Learning Partnerships and the local design had to be adjusted to the local and national settings and preconditions.

Sweden

In Sweden the Learning Partnerships were organised by Intercult and Region Västerbotten and realised in three cities: Skellefteå, Stockholm and Umeå. A documentary film crew has accompanied the Learning partnerships and thus documented the process.

A set of different types of Learning Partnerships were designed and carried out between September 2014 and March 2015:

- a) Learning Partnership 1 (September): A two-day workshop on recruitment. Focusing on recruitment of new audiences and staff
- b) Learning Partnership 2 (October): A two-day workshop on Swedish migration history and on how cultural institutions can work for inclusion.
- c) Learning Partnership 3 (November): Participants attended the largest event on human rights in Europe, the Swedish Forum for Human Rights. The 2014 theme focused on human rights and culture. The participants attended seminars that dealt with issues concerning diversity, racism and discrimination in Swedish cultural life.
- d) Learning Partnership 4 (December-March): Two cultural visits with cultural institutions and NGO's rooted in migrant self-organisation.
- e) Sharing conference (8 December): Intercult and Region Västerbotten organised a one-day conference, "The future of Cultural Institutions in Europe: the right to culture irrespective of identity and background", that focused on diversity and cultural institutions.

¹⁴ Akbaba, Ülkü; Bratic, Ljubomir; Galehr, Sarah; Görg, Andreas; Pfeiffer, Gabriele C. *Kunst, Kultur und Theater für Alle! Impulse für eine transkulturelle Theateroffensive Studie zu Perspektiven der Kunst- und Kulturpolitik Wien 2010 – 2015 mit besonderem Fokus auf Migrationsrealität* Ein Projekt von IODO – Kunst, Kultur, Bildung und Wissenschaft. Wien, 2009, S.41

Italy

In Italy the Learning Partnerships were organized by ECCOM in partnerships with cultural institutions¹⁵ and took place in Rome and in Milan between November 2014 and February 2015. The choice of realising them in two different cities was linked to the need of involving not only the largest possible number of cultural professionals together with professionals from other sectors but also to open up the participation to people coming from different geographical areas of Italy.

Alongside the issues emerged in the feedback sessions at the end of each day, the participants defined some interesting **concepts, key words and outcomes** to be shared by the group in the final session:

- A new awareness of the nature and implications of integration processes.
- An enhanced knowledge and understanding of best practices in planning and implementing intercultural projects.
- «One audience made of different people» (i.e. the importance not to segregate audiences according to their ethnicity, but rather to address a diverse audience in which all are equal participants).
- Cultural inclusion and participation of migrants is built on concrete relationships, based on dialogue, reciprocity and the ability to listen.
- Key words: care, respect, sensitivity, welcoming attitude and dignity.
- The importance of shared practices, the ability to connect; «no one grows up alone”.
- «Self-confidence in one’s own work: to work with migrants by focussing not only on contents/knowledge, but also, and most importantly, on the development of relational competencies and attitudes, is possible, and this was confirmed by the many model case studies we learned about»
- The awareness that «passion is not enough, we need to develop a professional expertise on issues such as the analysis of migrants’ cultural needs and expectations, strategies for involvement (e.g. the issue of diaspora associations’ representativeness), participatory planning, impact evaluation».

During the discussion on the **strategies** to be adopted in order to promote effective activities addressed to migrants, the following issues emerged:

- The importance of emotional intelligence/competence;
- The sharing of values and emotions among human beings, which overcomes cultural diversity;
- The importance of the biological basis of social life, which implies care, solidarity and acceptance of diversity;
- The role of language and of its conceptual structures in creating separation and barriers and the need for linguistic mediation;
- The use of storytelling as a resource for intercultural communication, since it exists in all cultures and can be expressed in various artistic forms (theatre, dance, literature, music,

¹⁵ City Museum of Zoology of Rome; “Luigi Pigorini” National Prehistoric Ethnographic Museum; Museum of Peoples and Cultures – PIME.

visual arts). Accepting the different narrative forms is in itself a step forward towards intercultural.

- The need for interaction and not only for integration, for trust and listening, for welcoming and attention;
- The provision of the same opportunities and invitations to all individuals, in order to overcome social and cultural barriers;
- The integration of educational competences with the cultural ones.

In terms of **programming and implementing activities** with migrants, the Italian participants identified some key issues:

- to create a human relationship;
- to open up to diversity;
- to work with migrants and not for migrants;
- to make use of participative planning methods;
- to train staff (intercultural competences) and to open up positions for migrants within cultural organisations;
- to mainstream and institutionalize activities addressed to migrants;
- to include on a stable basis social activities within cultural institutions;
- to include migrants representatives within cultural institutions;
- to foster networking and partnerships among different sectors;
- to change the trans-missive communication models;
- to change the cultural offer.
- to have the opportunity to keep on working together as an inter-institutional group with a view to developing joint projects.

Spain

Interarts organized the Spanish LPs from 26 to 28 February 2015, in Barcelona (at CERC - Centre d'Estudis i Recursos Culturals) with three selected partnerships:

- a) Between PCIs (Public Cultural Institutions) that position themselves at an advanced level in their sector.
- b) Between PCIs and the employment agencies
- c) Between PCIs and schools with a high proportion of immigrant population.

The opening conference, by professor Carlos Giménez Romero¹⁶, focused on interculturality and its importance in today's society. The methodologies implemented after that and during the LPs were:

NETWORKING: through mini-meetings lasting two minutes each + elevator pinch. Beyond breaking the ice between the participants, the main goal of these meetings was to achieve maximum optimization of time in order to perform a full presentation through a synthesis which succeeded in capturing the other participants' attention and interest.

¹⁶ Carlos Giménez Romero, professor of Social Anthropology at the Madrid Autónoma University and Director of the University Institute of Research on Migration, Ethnicity and Social Development (IMEDES) and of the Migration and Multiculture of the UAM

SWOT: used to analyse reality and make the best possible decisions. Each group created a SWOT which was required to answer these questions:

- a) What are our **STRENGTHS** and how can they be improved?
- b) What are our **WEAKNESSES** and how can they be limited or removed?
- c) What **OPPORTUNITIES** does this environment provide and how can they be used?
- d) Which **THREATS** are there in the environment and how can they be avoided or removed?

The SWOTs dealt with the following issues:

- Cultural diversity promotion strategies in public cultural institutions. Establishing a cultural diversity management and institutional vision.
- Programs developed by cultural institutions and NGOs in support of cultural diversity, as well as the promotion of immigrant participation in the receiving society.
- Intercultural education. Human rights, active citizenship and respect strategies towards cultural diversity.

IDEA GENERATOR: The aim was to generate new ideas and to suggest possible solutions. The topics of the idea generator were:

- a) Innovation on strategies and programs in public cultural institutions. Visitors and perception of migrant collectives.
- b) Identification of challenges in the management of cultural diversity. Immigrant collective cultural needs and habits.
- c) Tools to support intercultural education.

CHALLENGES Future pretend year: The aim was to imagine a future positively, that is, to think about what would hypothetically be a successful situation for a project or company.

CHALLENGES 4x4x4: The goal was to generate ideas that enable building new projects, by achieving one final idea among the others previously rejected (firstly each person in each group presents 4 ideas; then each group rejects all ideas but four; and finally all groups present their four ideas and must reject all ideas but one).

INTERCOOPERATION A plenary session - Combining synergies: with the aim of generating compromise and real agreements between participants.

In Spain the Learning Partnerships ended with a round table of best practices. On the following day, a visit to the History of Immigration Museum of Catalunya as an example of good practices in Catalonia was organized.

The general feedback from the LPs held in Spain was very positive, as they were focused on facilitating the exchange of ideas between participants and, beyond that, on generating a favourable context for cooperation.

Belgium

The third phase of the project, was in Belgium composed of 24 Learning Partnerships as a moment of gatherings and dialogue between PCIs and other actors involved in the promotion of social cohesion: NGO's, the education and the employment sector. This was the occasion for the experts to confront their vision and to share experiences, good practices and difficulties about the management and implementation of interculturality.

All participating experts agreed in that to allow a comprehensive approach to interculturality, citizens need to regain ownership of the public space. In order to achieve this, a prerequisite is to create cohesion and overcome the underlying competition among actors. Indeed, the LPs highlighted a strong need and willingness to promote a better collaboration, should it be for sharing competencies, information, spaces or tools. This issue needs to be addressed together with the political authorities.

As a result of the implementation of the second and third phase in Belgium, some keys elements to allow a better management of cultural diversity emerged.

1. Inclusive programmes

Since the core mission of a PCI is to ensure the transfer of cultural heritage across generations, it is not only a moral obligation but also essential for their long-term survival, to become vehicles of social cohesion. It means that programmes, repertoires, collections and narratives have the duty to offer a lens through which the audiences can interpret their transformative society.

The identity of a PCI is defined by the territory itself and by the relations and policies that withstand from the willingness to create that particular cultural institution in that place. The production of a diversified programme should be shaped to reflect the hybrid surrounding society keeping at the same time, the specificity of each PCI's identity. It should therefore trend toward interculturality and integrate a significant component of hybridised cultural production. This is a key element to renew the identity of each cultural institution and ultimately to legitimate their existence.

Recommendation: In keeping alive their own identity, Cultural Institutions need to become activators of culture, places where knowledge is not only transmitted but co-produced, a place that creates and/or offer room for intercultural engagement.

2. Community development

Knowing its audience is crucial for cultural organisations to be able to propose a tailored program for their public but also to see who is out of the organisation's scope and how to reach this potential public. The Pilot Study and the interviews with different PCIs permitted to see that in the cases where data was available, public was considered as a whole and the analysis was mostly quantitative, living aside the qualitative side.

In addition, since there is a need to better understand the public's composition, it would be suitable to put in place new methods and strategies that take into account the territory and the neighbourhood and can provide with empirical knowledge. On one hand, this could help PCIs to

clarify their vision and develop their audiences; on the other hand, taking into account the audience's voice would help avoiding a biased perspective of the territory.

***Recommendation:** There is a need of accurate PCI audience's data as well as a demand for an in depth analysis of each PCI's community of reference. This will help to better target the publics (current and potential) and their wishes. It will allow putting in place a strategy enabling the publics to participate to the evaluation of the programmes. Adapted tools and training should also be developed in order to help PCIs to get acquainted with these methods.*

3. Strengthen the networks

During the LPs, experts have strongly insisted on the need for improved collaboration, communication and networking at 2 levels: between organisations and PCIs, and between PCIs and administrations. All the organisations involved in the LPs acknowledged the attempt to set up participatory processes but complained that most of the time the objectives were unattainable.

Recommendations:

- *There is a need for a more structured local democracy strategy in order to build trust between administrations, actors involved in interculturality and migrants' integration. As a pre requisite, local authorities should recognise the strength of a bottom-up approach in permitting and launching such processes to involve organisations but also citizens and foster all citizens' integration.*
- *Cultural institutions should play a key role in the hub where all actors involved in the social cohesion act, perform and collaborate. They should go towards participatory processes, for the definition of programmes and cultural activities.*

4. Human resources

The Pilot Study found out that PCIs' staff is often homogeneous and therefore not representative of a diversified society where it operates. The same goes for the Board of Directors of these organisations. The research shows that most cultural institutions struggle to have a diversified staff and Board. The reasons for this are different. If an institution is part of the city's administration, it might not be able to set the rules for its recruitments. On top of that, opportunities to create new posts in cultural institutions are scarce because of funding cuts, and most of the time the vacancies are filled through internal recruitment. Moreover, diversifying staff requires effort, because it involves ceding power, acknowledging that our societies have changed and that other people should have the opportunity to shape things.

However, a difference between publicly funded PCIs and financially more independent PCIs can be noticed. More independent structures have more power in their recruitment processes and can manage it differently. Some Brussels based cultural institutions have implemented the Actiris Diversity Plan¹⁷, the chart for diversity in companies, designed together with Actiris, the Brussels agency for employment.

¹⁷ For more information see: <http://www.diversite.irisnet.be>

This charter is an engagement from companies and other organisations to implement a plan for diversity and to make a commitment towards reflecting the composition of society in the organisation itself but also towards non-discrimination in recruiting, evaluating and managing staff members.

However, a timeframe for changes in staff and board has to be outlined. In the short-term diversifying the board should be a more easily achievable goal since the structure is less rigid, whereas for the staff, criteria for diversification and neutrality should be adopted in medium/ long term in recruitment processes.

It is clear that permanent staff and Board need to be as representative as possible of the whole society in all its diversity (gender, age, origins...). It is a social responsibility but beyond that, it creates a new alchemy in the organisation allowing the production of different projects and has its reflection in PCIs' programs.

***Recommendation:** Training and Guidelines focusing on neutral diversification's criteria should be adopted during recruitment processes at the federal level and for the 3 Belgian communities in order to raise awareness on diversified staff, making an unbiased selection and give more relevance to competencies.*

5. The education to interculturality

Education to interculturality is a life long learning process that has to be implemented at the earliest possible stage during children's education, raising awareness in order to create active citizenship around interculturality.

As the major civil institution in children's lives, schools have a de facto responsibility to guide their development. Thus, reinvent schools under the lens of interculturality allow to prepare students for a larger range of possibilities, students that will be able to compete for jobs that have not been invented yet.

In general the experts at the LPs identified a need for better coordination between all the actors (schools, political institutions, cultural institutions and associations) in order to build up actions that ensure continuity, allow more efficiency in the long run and lead to common projects.

Recommendations :

- *Schoolbooks should be reviewed and improved and material should be produced in order to include the intercultural message. For example: manuals, curricula, and textbooks both for the teachers and for their students.*
- *Foster the participation of the networks in the schools and local social systems: teachers and pupils cannot be the only actors. They need support to work on interculturality and that requires more staff and bigger budgets. There is a need to provide expertise to existing institutes on intercultural competences, to equip teachers with supportive content and relevant techniques that could prepare the students for life as active, responsible citizens in democratic societies.*

6. Intercultural competencies

The increasing diversity of our society makes them transformative and more dynamic demanding individuals to learn, re-learn and un-learn in order to meet social harmony. The ability to interpret others in a meaningful way helps to promote a pluralistic spirit, to overstep cultural boundaries, and produces self-cultural awareness.

Recommendations:

- *Incorporate intercultural competences at all levels of formal, and informal education systems to facilitate the learning of intercultural competences and to gain flexibility in interactions.*
- *Incorporate the teaching of intercultural competences in programmes and initiatives devoted to a wide range of professions involved in the process of social cohesion and public services. Training and information sessions on interculturality to develop deeper knowledge on the reality on the field should be put in place.*

7. Employment in the cultural sector

In this context, the cultural sector offers a possible career path for many people. Schools could be the starting point of a long-term programme to introduce the cultural sector as an option for employment and prepare pupils to work in the cultural sector. Experts at the LPs identified a real need for coaching and training on career opportunities and obstacles in the short/medium-term. One of the main difficulties is for instance taking into consideration people arriving from other countries with another academic background in any kind of arts or “self-made” artists who developed their artistic skills on their own. This is the reason why experts asked for more transparency, more coherence and clearer dialogues with actors, and a better knowledge of the reality on the field, in order to adapt policies to social cultural and economic realities.

Recommendations:

- *Institutions should cooperate closely with PCI's, employment agencies and grass-root NGO's in order to help both cultural workers and people arrived from other countries, through the codes and rules in place for artists (administrative process, grants and careers opportunities).*
- *Institutions and schools should recognise new art forms.*
- *Schools should improve the understanding of cultural industries and their role in the society as well as the working possibilities that cultural world gives to people.*

8. Funding

The application of the benchmarking tool and the development of the LPs outlined a general lack of long-term vision of the politics in the PCIs and consequently a lack of financial continuity throughout the process. Culture is a key element to foster integration of migrants into society and for local communities to discover other cultures. Interculturality should therefore not be used as a variable for adjustment in the PCIs' budgets.

Recommendation:



- *For a more efficient PCIs' work and to avoid the scattering of financial resources allocated to this issue, interculturalism and migrants' cultural participation should be a base's condition to get access to funds.*
- *Explore the possibilities of putting in place funding schemes for non-legal entities in order to allow access to more informal organisations that are present on the field.*

9. Operational administrative framework

One important statement made by the LPs participants, both PCIs and the rest of involved actors, is that the operational framework is not adapted to the reality on the ground. For instance, administrations are often still organised in silo. This type of organisational scheme brings in added difficulty: it cannot easily integrate cross-sectorial and transversal projects. Moreover, the high level of complexity of calls for projects launched by local authorities is not adapted to the reality of the actors working on interculturality. Indeed, they are often small, frequently with very small teams, which are most of the time working both on the administrative arrangements as well as on the social/cultural activities and sometimes are not qualified enough to deal with the complex processes and rigid operational administrative framework required.

Recommendations:

- *Overstep the rigidity of the administration's organisational scheme towards the promotion of cross-sectorial and transversal projects.*
- *There is a strong need for both providing training to interculturality practitioners, and to adapt the operational framework to the specificities of interculturality. This would allow a more efficient and accurate work.*

Austria

The first Austrian MCP Broker Learning Partnership¹⁸ focussed on the perspective and experience of migrants and migrant self-organisation towards cultural institutions. The aim of the Learning Partnership was to clarify what expectations the target group itself can formulate. EDUCULT invited representatives of migrant cultural initiatives as well as migrant artists to identify challenges as well as needs and requirements for migrant cultural participation. In a round table following participants discussed a range of relevant topics. Participants from this LP also participated in the next LPs. The conclusions drawn from the first LP furthermore provided the basis for the debates in the next LPs.

Research on migrant cultural participation in Austria has shown that participation very much depends on the form or art in which it is happening. The second workshop¹⁹ looked specifically into the area of museums. The following questions led the debate: What does cultural participation in museums mean and how does it influence the offers, form of exhibition and mediation in museums? What role does the economic background of the audience and the artists as well as mediators play? In which way can diversity be best integrated in the strategic planning of museums?

¹⁸ Migrant Participation in Public Cultural Institution – the Perspective of the Target Group, Round Table Discussion, 17.02.2015, Vienna

¹⁹ Migrant Cultural Participation in Museums – From the Exhibition to Involvement?, Workshop, 24.02.2015, Vienna

As mentioned above the research study of the project has shown that migrant cultural participation very much depends on the art form in which it is happening. That means that migrant cultural participation in theatres is challenged by other factors than participation in other cultural areas. Therefore, LP 3 focussed on the specificities of migrant cultural participation in theatre²⁰. The questions leading the workshop debate were: What does cultural participation in theatres mean and how does it influence the repertoire, the content of plays, the form of acting and the choice of actors as well as the whole organisation of a theatre? What advantages and disadvantages in terms of migrant cultural participation can be detected comparing the institutionalized scene versus the independent theatre scene? What role does the socio-economic background play and in which way can diversity as a goal be integrated in the strategic management of theatres the best?

Categories of difference and the participation of minorities do not seem to play an important role in the cultural and arts educational institutions in Austria. This is specifically surprising considering the international setting of these institutions, such as the high number of international students and tutors. The final round table²¹ discussion therefore broached the issues of how educational institutions in the arts sector open up to migrant cultural participation by promoting diversity approaches in organisation, curricula, etc. Questions that were discussed with experts from music schools as well as from an arts university and with researchers in the field were: How can increased sensibility for migrant cultural participation be reflected in arts educational offers? What new forms of migrant cultural participation are there on student level? What forms of research can support the increase of educational offers in this area?

PARTNERS CONCLUSIONS

Each of the five partners have in their conclusions underpinned the importance of the tools provided, the process and the mutual learning between the different art forms and types of institutions, between the different layers of political power and decision making, between the different local and national realities. There is no doubt that the exchange of experiences in terms of brokering migrant's cultural participation through dialogue and collaboration between the institutions as well as within the institutions themselves is an outcome all five partners have pointed out.

In Italy and Spain where cultural institutions are not strategically addressing the issue of migrants participating and using cultural institutions, with the exceptions of few, the MCP Broker project has helped in highlighting the current situation and thus creating an awareness among both cultural institutions and policy makers regarding putting the management of diversity in the cultural sector more clearly on the agenda. Both the Italian and the Spanish partners emphasised that the MCP Broker project partially represented an answer to the issues as an embryo in terms of raising awareness at a higher institutional and political level as well as a chance of knowing and sharing good practices through the learning partnerships and the dissemination of the research report.

²⁰ Acting Migrant Background? Migrant Cultural Participation in Austrian Theatres, Workshop 25.02.2015, Vienna

²¹ Educating Participation? Migrant Access to Cultural and Arts Education, Round Table Discussion 12.03.2015, Vienna



In Spain the cultural sector acknowledges the importance of diversity management and of tackling the issue of providing for accessible programs and activities, also to these segments of the population. The challenge however, is to get the question fully integrated into the mission of the public cultural institutions.

Despite the relatively challenging and complex context in Belgium, with the presence of 3 different communities and 3 different regions all rather autonomous on implementing cultural, social and economic policies, most of the findings there matched the findings in the other countries. The experts involved have warmly welcomed the management of cultural diversity anchoring it in the Benelux regions historically high mobility. Over the last 3 decades Belgium has become a country of permanent settlement for many different types of migrants. Thus, interculturality – in all the aspects that it involves - is at the core of the many grass-rooted organisations that are engaged in a continuous promotion of MCP. Reflecting its own demographic and cultural composition with the 3 regions and the 3 communities needing to collaborate and cooperate on a daily basis, Belgium could be seen as an ‘interculturality incubator’ and a constant laboratory for negotiation.

A similar notion of the relevance of MCP and sensitisation in terms of migrant cultural participation can be recognised in cultural institutions in Austria as well as in Sweden. As such, a debate about the topic has been witnessed for instance in the museums and has found its way to mission statements of cultural institutions. Still few and still relatively insecure the institutions there understand the integration and participation of migrants as the next phase of opening cultural institutions, after the focus has been on other minorities, such as women and social classes in the past. Development phases locally and institutionally are supported by different terms, from multi-culture, to interculturalism on to diversity.

One way of creating that opening of the cultural institutions is by opening up for new kinds of partnerships and co-creative initiatives, where the institutions engage with e.g. migrant groups own organisations. In most of the participating countries migrants’ self-organisations are very active and more than willing to establish active sustainable partnerships with the cultural sector. Here the MCP Broker project has provided useful tools and valuable practice exchange for future collaborative initiatives. The tools and methodologies applied have proven to be adequate and can, surely, be applied to a wider range of organizations than the ones that have participated in the project.

From the perspective of migrant self-organisation mediating institutions still seem to be necessary in order to promote migrant cultural participation. One specific demand expressed in Austria is the formation of an ombudsman-alike institution that can also help in terms of financing and coordination. Such institutions are crucial in terms of providing a network of initiatives, possibilities and opportunities for migrants in terms of cultural participation.

Both the Austrian partner and some of the Swedish and Belgian participants pointed at the crucial importance of the interconnection between the educational system and cultural institutions in supporting migrant cultural participation. As such, it has been shown that big parts of the migrant youth is not informed at all about possibilities for working and studying in the cultural field. There

seems to be a gap in the educational system concerning information about cultural opportunities for the youth. There is clearly a need for structural partnerships with both the education sector and migrants' own organizations. In all five countries there were a strong request from the professionals involved in the research phase and in the learning partnerships for continuity and sustainability of the activities, since they all felt the need of continuous sharing and brainstorming on these issues, as well as of implementing transversal cultural activities to test new possible models. Therefore it is of importance keeping on gathering data and examples of good practices from initiatives and policies all over Europe and in doing that connecting and cross-fertilizing with social and educational institutions and sectors.

In general increased information about cultural offers and possibilities, supporting networks and educational initiatives is necessary in all the participating countries, recognising the main challenge to migrant cultural participation as social code and being outside the prioritised mainstream. Social code here meaning the knowledge of behaviour, discourses and processes in the cultural field. Migrants often do not possess these social prerequisites to support their own cultural participation.

As pointed out by both the Belgian, Swedish and Austrian partners, new forms of cultural production have to be applied in order to break the traditional setting of Austrian cultural institutions and open them up to new publics or audiences. In many traditional cultural institutions the usage of unusual formats (such as festivals, community theatre, workshops, youth clubs, etc.) helps to foster migrant cultural participation. By these means it is easier to communicate and represent new narratives, forms of participation and engagement to the public. However, the importance of unusual formats to promote migrant cultural participation also reflects on the fact that migrant participation is not yet an inherent part in programming and management of cultural institutions in any of the five countries. Those kind of rather unusual cultural formats are often characterized as the result of cooperation with migrant self-organisations and other external experts.

It is notable, that quite many of the public cultural institutions involved in the project, despite diversity in their size and their typology, do not consider migrants' cultural participation as a key element in their institutional policies – or for that sake as their responsibility. However on a more individual level, there is an increasing awareness and interest in implementing transversal relations that could lead to the creation of negotiating spaces for new encounters and new audiences or participants.

A general recommendation that many experts involved in this project outlined, is the fact that both the organisations and the administrations should get out of their comfort zones and take more risks in collaborating and financing the 'less visible' and 'less spectacular' allowing an accessibility to funds to a larger range of organisations. One way of doing that is through partnering with other competences and fields, e.g. social housing associations, education, etc. The cooperation with external actors and experts in the field of diversity and migrant participation is often vital in order to change the modus operandi in how institutions traditionally work.



Many of the participants in the learning partnerships in all five countries have emphasised the need “to go out” of the buildings in order to open their institutions to migrant cultural participation. Meet the people in question in an equal field. Therefore, unusual formats also refer to projects with migrant communities or schools and youth clubs that attempt to go to the people and cooperate with them rather than bring them as passive users into the institutions.

Leaving the buildings and reaching out for new groups underlines the institutions needs for developing adequate participatory approaches. In order to understand why cultural participation of migrants does not work, initiatives have to apply a bottom up approach when analysing and promoting migrant cultural participation. Furthermore, community curators are understood as helpful in reaching out to migrant communities. That means that mediators who have a migrant background themselves or are able to devote their time specifically to working on this issue can provide strong support in fostering migrant cultural participation.

In Austria the LP's stated that the relevance of mediators – such as theatre pedagogues and other institutional staff devoted to the communication with users – has become still more recognized and acknowledged as an important game changer in the process. In both Sweden, Belgium and Austria there seem to be an increasing interest from people with migrant, multilingual, multicultural background to work in the field. However, in Austria mediators criticize the reduction of migrant cultural participation to their field of work. That means that the inclusion of migrants into cultural institutions is mainly reduced to audience development, without being reflected in other parts of the organisation.

As mentioned above, the pilot research has pointed at the fact that migrant cultural participation in cultural institutions is very much a matter of leadership decisions. Only a clear support and a profound interest from the management can ensure qualitative implementation of migrants' cultural participation. This finding has been supported and underlined by the debates during the learning partnerships in most of the participating countries, where the participants debated how a change in leadership strongly could foster the commitment towards migrant cultural participation.

Leadership is, as précised by the Austrian partner, a prerequisite for structural embedment of efforts to promote migrant cultural participation. That means that only through leadership decisions efforts to promote migrant cultural participation can be included in different departments of an institution. Thus institutional management becomes in many ways a clear indicator of an institutions ability to promote the necessary institutional change. Or as it was summed up by the Swedish partner: On an institutional level it is important to keep in mind that:

- Clear and articulated policy documents and/or concrete strategies on how to work with diversity and inclusion that are anchored within the board and the management are crucial for success.
- The cultural institutions should regard development in competence in diversity and inclusion as part of the overall organisational development
- The management should be prepared to give room for changes. It might lead to internal



discussions when it comes to how power is organised within the institution.

- Set up teams with internal and strategic partners in order to secure engagement and sustainability for diversity and inclusion.
- Each cultural institution should collect data and map the migrant communities in their mission area in order to picture their potential audiences and understand their target groups.
- All new recruitments need to have a clear diversity target and should be regarded with special attention and affirmative action. Diversity and intercultural competence need to be the leading perspectives. A competence based recruitment process in this field alongside others is needed.
- Subcontracting is difficult and time-consuming. Better to team up with other cultural institutions in the municipality together with the municipality's procurement office aiming in including diversity and intercultural competence in the offers.

In Sweden as in Austria it turned out that best practice examples of institutions in which migrant cultural participation is developing well are characterized by an institutional embedment of efforts to foster migrant cultural participation. In museums, for instance, efforts are not only reflected in multilingual guides through the exhibitions and specific formats in the framework program, but through the cooperation of mediators and curators already in the development of exhibitions. Furthermore, museums as very object-oriented cultural institutions can also change the presentation and collection of objects in order to foster migrant cultural participation. In theatres for instance, this means that not only theatre pedagogues develop new formats in which they work with migrants, but that efforts to decrease the threshold of participating in the theatre is also reflected through ticket prizes, through new narratives in the repertoire etc. In this light cultural managers should understand migrant cultural participation as a cross-sectional issue in all departments of the cultural institutions, including programming and communications.

Due to the aftermath of the economic crisis in 2008 and the financial and social struggles it has left a number of European countries with, it is no surprise that participants in the learning partnerships in most of the five countries reported an opening up of their institutions to different audiences due to an increased economic pressure. Not only is that an indication of how economic considerations can support efforts to open up to new audiences it is also an indicator of a very instrumental approach, where audience development in it's traditional marketing format as a prime instrument of migrant cultural participation can be perceived as fostering a stereotyping of target groups.

Another issue most participants share is the fact that the culture sector always is in an economic crisis and under economic pressure. During times of crisis culture will be the first to be cut financially. At the same time culture is a policy area in which difficult issues such as "integration" are likely to be shifted to. Therefore, policies motivated economically and socially always need to be reflected critically in the cultural field.

Finally, the issue of fostering migrant cultural participation is clearly rather a social issue, than an issue of ethnic and cultural belonging. Although issues of language and ethnicity are relevant in fostering migrant cultural participation, crucial factors derive from social prerequisites. Many of the

European public cultural institutions are still very elitist institutions that generally have to open up in order to legitimize their high subsidisation.

The Swedish partners identified a set of policy and political recommendations for local and national authorities and political structures to reflect:

- Support a sector overall usage of the benchmark as a tool for development of diversity and inclusion
- Continue to emphasise diversity and inclusion for all inhabitants in Sweden as a highly prioritised goal for publicly funded cultural institutions.
- Use the benchmark tool (or other similar tools) in order to evaluate the institutions work with diversity and inclusion, and articulate this perspective much stronger in evaluations and feedbacks.
- Public funding should be measured towards its results and its work with diversity and inclusion of migrants. Public bodies should work much more proactively with funding as a steering tool.

But the journey begins with the individual and in all five countries it has been an educational journey through the participants own ability to act within or influence the development of their institutions in the scope of fostering migrants' cultural participation.

“Reflect on your role as a gatekeeper and work with norm critical and postcolonial perspectives” as it was put by the Swedish partner as a recommendation to the individual culture workers.

PROPOSITION TO MIPEX

“Cultural diversity, in all its forms, is posing a profound challenge to traditional formulations for cultural policy, and to our understanding of the public interests served by this policy. In most countries the artistic and cultural landscape has not evolved to reflect the realities of a changed social landscape. The rift threatens to undermine the legitimacy of cultural institutions and the public policy that supports them. The shift from homogeneity to diversity as the new social norm requires a rethinking of the processes, mechanisms, and relationships necessary for democratic policy developments in diverse societies.”²²

Tony Bennett

Based on the MCP Broker pilot and the outcomes of the process in the five participating countries, there is but little doubt, that a proposition to the Migrant Integration Policy Index – MIPEX²³ should include a recommendation to include cultural policy indicators as a valid and important addition to the existing 167 policy indicators on migrant integration already included in the MIPEX. Taking into

²² Bennett, T. 2006, 'Culture and Differences: The Challenges of Multiculturalism', in, Boda, S. & Cifarelli, M. R. (eds), When Culture Makes the Difference: Heritage, Arts and Media in Multicultural Society, Rome: Meltemi Editore, pp 21–37.

²³ <http://www.mipex.eu/>

consideration that these have been designed to benchmark current laws and policies against the highest standards through consultations with top scholars and institutions using and conducting comparative research in their area of expertise.

As the five partners in the MCP Broker project learned during the process of developing and using the benchmarking tool, cultural participation of migrants not only could but also should be perceived as a key factor for the success of integration policies and inclusive practices within cultural institutions. It would make sense to develop the MCP Broker benchmarking tool to fit to the overall demands of MIPEX and to add cultural participation to the existing 8 policy areas; labour market mobility, family reunion, education, health, political participation, permanent residence, access to nationality, anti-discrimination. In doing so cultural participation will be recognised as an operational and strategic important field of interest in terms of both integration and not least democratic equality within the 38 countries using MIPEX as their prime measurement tool to investigate how the countries promote integration in all societies both in social and civic terms.

The shared understanding among the five partners in MCP Broker that cultural participation helps migrants to feel secure, confident and welcome and makes them able to invest in their new country of residence and thus make valued contributions to the society is also anchored in the earlier mentioned declaration of Human Rights and the UNESCO convention. If the overall intention is to give all citizens mutual rights and responsibilities on the basis of equality and provide them with the opportunity to fully integrate, cultural participation and the right to produce and conceive cultural products is crucial for succeeding.

As described in the previous chapters, tradition and an understanding of culture focusing almost exclusively on the arts still largely dominate the cultural practices and policies in all five countries. The setup and gearing of the institutions aim at normative functions such as creation, dissemination, conservation and education, leaving almost no space for participation of people and narratives outside the norm. The MCP Broker project shows that recognition of cultural diversity and the need of new competencies within the arts institutions are vital for the needed diversification of excellence, quality and recognition and eventually allowing new narratives and new forms of artistic expression to enter and influence the cultural institutions.

The MCP Broker project showed that there is a need to address the right to cultural participation on both a national political level as well as on the level of the gatekeepers and decision makers within the culture sector itself; artistic directors, heads of institutions etc. It is widely agreed that social cohesion is a major transversal issue with high impact on citizens' democratic and societal rights. Cultural policy should therefore be seen as subject to that, even though cultural policies aims should be more complex and seek for fostering freedom and the right to express oneself, and equality of access to all means of expression. It becomes a matter of facing the challenges of cultural democracy and engaging in a cultural construction, which must be intercultural and inclusive in order to be up-to-date, relevant and creative.

Based on the outcomes and processes of the MCP Broker project, it is possible to formulate some overall recommendations to MIPEX for an inclusion of cultural participation into the index:

From a democratic perspective MIPEX should map the countries ability to:

- Make use of UNESCO's convention on protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions.
- Recognize diversity and cultural complexity as an essential and indispensable part of the European community.
- Set a new standard among European organizations and institutions where diversity naturally is part of the structure concerning allocation of contributions, recruitment, information and anti-discrimination.
- Support the ability to create intercultural meeting places (festivals, seminars, workshops, centers) which in their design and the content reflects the complexity of the society.

From a cultural perspective MIPEX should map the countries ability to:

- Establish a number of cultural policy objectives, which emphasizes acceptance of cultural diversity as an important human resource and emphasizes its participatory potential.
- Check how well the overall cultural policy objectives are met among the most important cultural institutions at national and European level.
- Invest risk capital in the potential talent in the creative sector, who work with diversity as a key concept.
- Make use of European and transnational platforms in the development of new forms of intercultural exchanges, including new forms of cultural expression
- Reshape the existing supporting structures so that most of the key players in the cultural sector are engaged with a clear cross-cultural orientation.
- Initiate an international cultural exchange programs that supports intercultural projects taking place internationally and on a local level. These programs should be continuously documented and evaluated.
- Encourage increased support for the culture sector to exchange information and cooperate

From a research and educational perspective MIPEX should map the countries ability to:

- Develop research based policy formulations, principles of intercultural meeting places, and increased availability. The research should connect closely to the venues and cultural organizations at a regional, national and trans-national level.
- Support the establishment of a number of relevant indicators to measure progress in the field based on an intercultural basis.
- Support the exchange of experiences between individuals and networks.
- Promote the development of broader recruitment to higher education by looking at the barriers that exist today and how they can be eliminated.

In terms of useful and relatively easy indicators to implement the MCP Broker could point to:

Indicators on cultural diverse politics at a national level:



- The size of the public funding of cultural minority organizations
- The number of established organizations
- The number of events addressing a diverse audience
- The variety of artistic expressions represented
- Audience Development and the effect of the institutions reach out for new audiences

Indicators on integration/social inclusion:

- In the arts and cultural education
- Among the number of artists and cultural professionals in the cultural institutions
- Among the audiences
- Among the boards and managements of cultural institutions and organizations

There is of course a need for a fundamental and detailed preliminary study and adaptation to MIPEX before actual indicators can be formulated fully. This in the respect that simple indicators could lead to a gross simplification of an area, which is really in need of a far more nuanced understanding. Therefore, MCP Broker recommends the establishment of some crosscutting indicators that can ensure these nuances.

EPILOGUE

It is fair to say, that the MCP Broker project indeed set out to become a frontrunner initiative - engaging 5 European cultural organizations in 5 different European countries in an issue of the utmost importance. The civil wars in Syria and Iraq, the crisis in Afghanistan and many of the Maghreb countries have changed the notion of importance and relevance in all political areas. Expectedly Europe will receive more than 3 million refugees over a one-year period and all parts of our infrastructure will be forced to meet the challenges of the present migration. At the same time urbanisation in most of the European countries is increasing rapidly in a way not seen since the time of industrialisation. The urban environments in Europe are becoming still more heterogeneous and most of the migrants are living in and around Europe's major cities.

In that light initiatives like the MCP Broker project that actively seek to provide knowledge and applicable tools for the institutions in order to be able to foster migrants' cultural participation is highly needed. During the end conference of the project in Barcelona in July 2015, it was one of the more crucial questions addressed, how European institutions and cultural organisations can develop a more nuanced picture and understanding of the complex cultural identities and patterns on the other side of the Mediterranean sea, both to the benefit of cultural exchange and possible collaboration between partners on both sides but also as way into the European reality for the presumably thousands and thousands of people wanting to flee the animosities and horrors taking place in Syria, Iraq and elsewhere in the region.

Another key issue addressed at the conference was how to ensure the benchmarking tool as a reflector of the needs of the institutions using it. The tool and its use still need to be adjusted with

further parameters related to the everyday reality of the culture institutions in order to become truly relevant for the cultural institutions at large as a strategic tool for change and increased participation. However, many of the participants in the debate stated that it still has worked quite well as a process facilitation initiator creating awareness on standards, way of thinking, institutional practices, 'blind spots', new approaches etc. And in the form adjusted and refined by Intercult, the tool has found a form that reflects and connects to the DNA of most cultural organisations. After the adjustments there were a more coherent balance between the self-image of the institutions and their actual performance according to the benchmarks.

The institutions difficulty to navigate between their own missions and artistic agendas, the representational politics and supportive structures and how to deal with and ensure a higher diverse presence from their potential users is the very core of the challenges lying ahead. A possible follow up on the MCP Broker project should focus on how institutions could meet and deal with these challenges in their programming practice, recruitment policies, choice of partners and transversal collaboration with other sectors, just to mention some of the points given. The repetitiveness of the cultural institutions in their everyday administrative practice seems to be one major obstacle that has to be addressed both on a national level as well as from the stakeholders as a whole.

During Culture Action Europe's annual "Beyond the Obvious" conference on October 15 – 17, this year in Gothenburg the intercultural aspect was outlined in both a workshop as well as integrated in the program during talks and debates. Amongst the partners of the MCP Broker project it has been agreed to let Culture Action Europe investigate the possibility of letting a complex initiative like MCP Broker find new partners and spread in new ways into the culture sectors many diverse levels extending the participating countries from the present five. This process is already running!

Niels Righolt

October 28, 2015

