



**PLATFORM FOR
INTERCULTURAL EUROPE**

Programme Interculture

Enabling and Nourishing Dialogue

Report on the European Forum 24/25 May 2011

La Maison des Cultures & Centre Borschette,
Brussels, Belgium

Platform for Intercultural Europe

c/o Culture Action Europe - 10, rue de la Science – B-1000 Brussels – T +32 (0)2 534 40 02 – F +32 (0) 534 11 50
www.intercultural-europe.org - dialogue@intercultural-europe.org

Table of Contents

Summary	3
Introduction	3
1. Plenary session: Platform for Intercultural Europe’s activities in the spotlight	4
1.1 Introduction and warm-up exercise	4
1.2 Changing mindsets, practices and institutions: Practice Exchanges for intercultural capacity-building	5
1.3 Advancing intergovernmental cooperation on the intercultural opening of cultural institutions	8
2. Roundtables: Platform for Intercultural Europe’s members centre stage	11
2.1 Multiple parallel roundtable presentations and discussions: Platform members share their intercultural projects	11
2.2 ‘Diversophy’ – a game to develop and deepen cultural competence	16
3. Plenary Session: Dialogue with political partners	20
3.1 Intercultural Dialogue as an EU policy domain since the EYID 2008 and into the post 2014 programme period & Progressing Intercultural Dialogue through intergovernmental cooperation in the EU	20
3.2 Intercultural Dialogue as a domain of EU Integration Policy	23
General conclusion and next steps	25
<u>Annex: Summary of participants’ evaluation</u>	27

Summary

The Platform for Intercultural Europe's third European Forum featured its Practice Exchanges for Intercultural Capacity-Building, its advocacy work with the recently set up EU Council Expert Working Group on Accessible Culture and Intercultural Dialogue, and multiple, parallel roundtable presentations of Platform members' projects on various aspects of intercultural education. The Forum also offered discussion with the Platform's political partners in Commission Directorates-General for Education and Culture and for Home Affairs. The Platform's role as an interlocutor between political institutions and civil society were at issue, as well as the EU Commission's plans in the fields of intercultural dialogue and integration.

Introduction

The Platform for Intercultural Europe & its 3rd European Forum, May 2011

"By working with our members and stakeholders we want to underpin our advocacy with groundwork and encourage European policy thinking at the grass-roots... We want to pursue analytical clarity and connect practice and policy-thinking with academic expertise."

- Platform for Intercultural Europe Work Plan 2011

The Platform for Intercultural Europe was established in 2008 as a response to the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue. The Platform brings together grass-root practitioners, organisations, public bodies and European institutions with the aim to strengthen intercultural dialogue in Europe. It currently counts 43 members, ranging from arts organisations to policy-oriented bodies, within the cultural, education and integration fields.

From 24 to 25 May 2011 the third European Forum of the Platform was held in Brussels. The meeting was supported by the European Commission (EC) and brought together over 70 participants from various European countries. The first part of the Forum was held in "La Maison des Cultures" in the Brussels commune of Saint-Gilles, The second part brought together the Platform and EU officials and was followed by the Platform's General Assembly of Members in the afternoon of 25 May.

This report aims to summarise the key presentations and discussions of the European Forum. It does not present every detail of the discussions held, instead it intends to mirror the main points

highlighted and informal conclusions reached. It is a document, which serves future analysis and direction.

1. Plenary session: presentations and discussions



1.1 Introductions and warm-up exercise

Sabine Frank kicked off the European Forum by welcoming both old and new members as well as non-members of the Platform. She recalled the Platform's three motivations:

1. The vision of an intercultural society where diversity is valued and the future is conceived through intercultural development.
2. The idea that the European Union (EU) offers suitable fora and processes to promote this vision.
3. The conviction that intercultural development needs cross-sectoral collaboration.

She went on to explain the concept of the meeting – a stock-take of the Platform's performance – and outlined the various participation possibilities during the day.

Next, Juliette Roussel, Director of the Cultural Service of the Brussels district of Saint-Gilles welcomed the participants and highlighted the commonalities in the visions of the meeting venue, La Maison des Cultures, and the Platform. She pointed out that La Maison mirrors the commune's cultural diversity - 140 nationalities currently cohabitate in Saint-Gilles. She illustrated Saint-Gilles' commitment to the UNESCO Convention on cultural diversity and underlined the importance for people and organisations with the same goals to meet each other in order to enable diversity to flourish in European society.

At the subsequent warm-up exercise, participants partnered to discuss three questions:

1. What does interculturality mean to you?
2. What is the most important intercultural element of your work?
3. What role can the EU play in realising the vision of intercultural society?

The discussion after the exercise brought out in particular participants' expectations towards the EU institutions:

- To bring intercultural dialogue more to the foreground of EU activities.
- To make interculturality a cross-cutting issue, not only limited to cultural policy.
- To exercise political leadership in the face of nationalist tendencies in some Member States.
- To invest more in communicating its basic values of unity and diversity and linking this to citizenship issues such as languages and culture.



1.2 Changing mindsets, practices and institutions: Practice Exchanges for intercultural capacity-building

Introduction to Practice Exchanges

Moderator Chris Torch briefly introduced the Platform's Practice Exchanges and explained their background and purpose. Following the publication of the Rainbow Paper in 2008¹, members of the Platform wanted to explore the realities behind its Chapter II on Intercultural Capacity-Building in Organisations and inspire further good practice.

Chris Torch gave a brief overview of the first three Practice Exchanges (2009/10) in Malmö, Vienna and Rome. The first one, held in Sweden, focused on the exchange of methodologies in

¹ See <http://rainbowpaper.labforculture.org/signup/>

cultural institutions. The second one in Austria highlighted minority rights and social inclusion, whereas the third one in Italy focused on the responsibilities of trade unions and the role of the work place as an intercultural meeting space.

Chris Torch pointed out that dialogue with public policy-makers had not formed part of the programme of past Practice Exchanges - despite some efforts made – and that in his opinion, exchanges with policy-makers would be an important addition to future Practice Exchanges. He also asserted that the political value of the Practice Exchanges lay in the capacity of the Platform to distil the experiences and communicate them.

Michael Walling: Outcomes and echoes of the 4th Practice Exchange in London, December 2010

Michael Walling of Border Crossings² presented the fourth Practice Exchange held in London in 2010³. He explained that it had focused on culture and the arts and (unsuccessfully) sought to involve policy-makers. He recounted the dominant view at the meeting that politicians and culture professional do not share the same language and that a sort of interpretation between them was necessary. He also highlighted that the meeting had explored the need for intercultural ‘negotiation’ rather than mere ‘dialogue’ because unequal power characterises the relationship between people of different cultural backgrounds.

Michael Walling furthermore recounted that a central theme at the meeting had been the role of gatekeepers, i.e. heads of art organisations, and the way in which cultural institutions can themselves be spaces of exclusion.

Michael concluded with some reflections on his own organisation’s learning as the host of the Practice Exchange:

1. That it could play the role of broker between policy-makers and civil society – Border Crossings went on to conceive of the Festival of First Nations (June/July 2011) on the basis of this insight.
2. That in cultural spaces there can more easily be equality of people with different backgrounds.
3. That one would need to “reach deeper into communities” for future events in order to engage speakers with a fuller interest in participating.

² www.bordercrossings.org.uk

³ Ref to report <http://www.intercultural-europe.org/template.php?page=pa-201012-london>

Anticipations: Practice Exchanges in Sofia, Ljubljana, Madrid and Berlin

Four representatives of Platform member organisations went on to provide tasters of further Practice Exchanges envisaged for the autumn of 2011 and spring 2012.

1. Tzvetana Platikanova (Child's Friend Association⁴) – Practice Exchange to be held in Sofia, Bulgaria, November 2011. This Practice Exchange is to be held in conjunction with the UN Day of Tolerance and will showcase socio-cultural work with children as well as their parents from different cultures – in particular Roma and non-Roma.
2. Drago Pintaric (Kud Pozitif⁵) - Practice Exchange in Ljubljana, Slovenia, December 2011. This Practice Exchange will evolve around the theme of interreligious dialogue and the Roma population.
3. Guillermo Ruiz and Dejan Marcovic (Amaro Drom⁶) - Practice Exchange in Berlin, Germany in 2012. This Practice Exchange would focus on the socio-economic and administrative barriers which Roma and Sinti face. The problems of young people will play a particular role. The central tenet will be that intercultural dialogue requires equal partners and equal access.
4. Mercedes Esteban (European Foundation Education and Society⁷) - Practice Exchange in Madrid, Spain in 2012. This Practice Exchange will focus on the links between social cohesion, citizenship and intercultural dialogue and highlight the special characteristics of the Mediterranean area.

Discussion on Practice Exchanges

Moderator Chris Torch explained that a fifth Practice Exchange - in Northern Ireland on the theme of conflict and intercultural dialogue – is under discussion.

He rounded the session off by asking participants what results they would want future Practice Exchanges to produce. The following expectations were raised:

- “Cultural street sense”, i.e. insights into ‘real-life’ experiences, possibly gained through site visits rather than through conference presentations
- Examples of ‘constructive failures’ in order to enable learning from other members’ mistakes

⁴ www.eufriend.eu

⁵ www.pozitiv.si

⁶ www.unioniamarodrom.org/eng/index.htm

⁷ www.sociedadeducacion.org

- Insights into creative ways of working with minorities.
- Tips for communication with the media in order to raise visibility of intercultural work
- Assessment of the impact of a Practice Exchange on the host organisation.



1.3 Advancing intergovernmental cooperation on the intercultural opening of cultural institutions

Engaging with the EU Culture Council Expert Working Group on Accessible Culture and Intercultural Dialogue

Moderator Tsveta Andreeva (European Cultural Foundation⁸) opened this session by testing participants' knowledge of the so-called Open Method of Coordination (OMC). Some members promptly displayed knowledge gained from reading the Platform's Newsbulletins: that the OMC is the EU Member States' intergovernmental way of working in fields without an explicit EU legal basis, and that information exchange, benchmarking and peer pressure are its principal mechanisms.

Sabine Frank then launched into an explanation of the state of play with the OMC in the field of cultural policy. The declared purpose of her presentation was to entice Platform members into taking an active interest in the OMC and to set the stage for their discussion with EU representative the next day.

Sabine revisited the milestones on the way to the setting up of an Expert Working Group in the EU Council on accessible and inclusive culture, cultural diversity, and intercultural dialogue under the Culture Council Work Plan for 2011-2014, and explained its working method, target output and current level of participation. She recalled that the creation of the OMC WG could be considered a success of the Platform's lobby for it since 2008, and explained that the Platform had an open invitation to participate in the OMC WG's meetings. Its key opportunity to influence the group's work would, however, only come in 2012 when the focus will shift from cultural

⁸ www.eurocult.org

access and the participation of children, the disabled, the elderly and socio-economically disadvantaged people, to cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue.

At the OMC WG's constitutive meeting in March 2011, Sabine offered on behalf of the Platform to:

- Carry out small research assignments
- Test outputs with the Platform's membership and wider network
- Assist with consulting civil society organisations at national level
- Developing the Platform's Practice Exchanges further with the input of the Working Group.

Moreover, Sabine explained that based on the Platform campaign paper for the establishment of a Council Working Group, she had suggested to the experts in the group to compare and advance policy-making with regard to:

- The adaptation of cultural institutions to greater population diversity
- Attaching conditions in favour of diversity and intercultural dialogue to public funding for culture and the public service remits of cultural institutions
- The promotion of intercultural competences and the role of arts and heritage in their acquisition and practice.

And to compile policies or institutional practices with the aim of:

- Distilling the principles of policies and the conditions of their successful implementation
- Providing a guide for affecting change (e.g. a series of questions or alternative choices that people concerned can apply to map their path).

Sabine Frank suggested the following questions for the subsequent discussion, moderated by Tsveta Andreeva:

- 1) How does the Platform prepare for the best possible input to the OMC Group on the intercultural opening of cultural institutions across Europe?
- 2) How good a place is the OMC Group to invest the Platform's energies? How important is it to the Platform's mission of "Influencing policy to improve support for the work of practitioners in the field and to make all relevant public policies take due account of cultural diversity?"

Participants initially requested further clarifications and then offered the following opinions:

- That the policy view of arts and heritage is terribly narrow and that the work on interculturality at Council level should ideally become a collaboration between experts and civil servants from several relevant policy fields.
- That the Platform's interaction with the OMC group should take account of the fact that very little democratic legitimacy was invested in it. From this perspective more engagement with the European Parliament would be desirable.
- That national experts in EU capitals often lack knowledge and up-to-date information on what is going on at EU level. The Platform could thus play a role in establishing a link between national civil servants and EU officials.

In responding to these suggestions, Sabine Frank highlighted how difficult it is to achieve cooperation across departments in EU institutions, but that the Platform did not only play a recognised role in the EU culture policy domain, but also in EU integration policy – the Platform has been taking part in the bi-annual Integration Forums since 2010.

Three Platform members came forward with the proposal to constitute an advisory group to assist the Secretary General with policy work in relation to the Council Expert Working Group, and to help establish links with the national experts. Other interested members were invited to come forward.



2. Roundtables: Platform for Intercultural Europe's members centre stage

2.1 Multiple parallel roundtable presentations and discussions: Platform members sharing their intercultural projects

Introduction

A good part of the afternoon was dedicated to showcasing Platform members' work. Eight projects were presented three times to changing small groups. The aim was to share learning and solicit responses for further development. All projects presented concerned work in the field of education. The following questions served as guidance for the presentations:

- What problem related to diversity are you trying to resolve?
- What intercultural change are you trying to bring about?
- How/do you know your project achieves what you mean it to achieve?

Project 1: Hope. Vocational Training for the inclusion of young refugees from Somalia in the Italian labour market⁹ / Italian Trade Union Confederation CGIL Roma & Lazio (Presenter: Salvatore Marra)

This project's aims are:

1. To empower young Somalis, who have either recently arrived as refugees in Italy – and the Lazio region in particular – or are second generation refugee immigrants, by providing them with the opportunity to participate in the vocational training system.

⁹ www.lazio.cgil.it/romacentro/img/convegni/Hope_4_settembre_2010/Hope_4settembre2010.htm

2. To include those young Somali into the Italian labour market as a consequence.

Salvatore Marra presented the various activities undertaken in partnership by the CGIL Roma Centro and the Somali association AISCIA:

- Language classes in Italian
- Inclusion of the participants, according to their interests and skills, into the public education system with the aim of obtaining the middle school diploma.
- In a last phase participants are given the possibility to become a paid trainee in various organisations.

The project started in 2010 with around 120 participants. It sets a good practice example for public administrations. The key challenges the project grapples with are motivating Somali migrants, countering their stigmatisation and making connections between Italians and Somali in Rome.

Project 2: Thalia. Drama in intercultural primary education¹⁰ / Cyprus Centre of the International Theatre Institute (Presenter: Angela Christofidou)

This project offers intercultural art education as a means to enhance the inclusion of children of a migration background in a selection of primary schools in six European countries.

While exploring and reinforcing the acting talents of children, social diversity and tolerance are being taught. The project emphasises parent inclusion. All the performances are going to be part of a joint festival, the Thalia Festival of Intercultural Mythopoeia. The projects runs from 2012 to 2014 and is financed by the EU Culture Programme.

Project 3: PINOKIO. Pupils for Innovation as a Key to Intercultural and Social Inclusion¹¹ / Carlo Collodi Foundation, Italy (Presenter: Cinzia Laurelli)

This project stimulates intercultural dialogue between migrant and native Italian children of pre-primary and primary age - and their parents - on the basis of fairy tales from different cultures. The development of dedicated ICT tools and a new teaching methodology are at the centre of the project. These will be tested during Creativity Labs and Intercultural Workshops. The project intends to narrow the educational gap between Italian and non-Italian children. It is expected that the new tools and methodology will help develop five of the eight key competences in the

¹⁰ <http://www.cyprus-theatre-iti.org/thaliaEn.html>

¹¹ <http://www.pinokioproject.eu/>

pupils in order to secure their personal development, social inclusion and future employment skills.

During the discussion ideas were exchanged how stereotypes among young people can be dismantled and how children can learn to take initiatives for solving problems with the help of children's literature. It was remarked that it can be rather difficult to involve migrant families in school activities especially in peripheral areas and small towns. Migrant parents' knowledge of the receiving country's language was pointed out as an important factors for involving them in community actions.



Project 4: APREME. Advancing Participation and Representation of Ethnic Minority Groups in Education¹² / Network of Education Policy Centres (Presenter: Jeronim Dorotic)

This project is about the participation of ethnic minority parents in the governance of schools. In a first phase five national surveys were carried out, which mapped the opinions of parents and other community members on the subject, and collected examples of good practices in participating countries (Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo and Serbia). In a second phase, APREME supported 30 school initiatives for the improvement of ethnic minority parent participation and carried out advocacy activities in order to influence education policy.

The discussion of the project highlighted the scope of small-scale projects to promote open, democratic, multicultural and pluralistic society. It was remarked that the project encouraged participants such as school directors to make multiple small improvements within the margins of their authority

¹² www.apreme.net

Project 5: Religious Diversity and Anti-discrimination Training Programme¹³ /

CEJI – A Jewish Contribution to an Inclusive Europe (Presenter: Melissa Sonnino)

This project offers training to educators in a wide range of domains to enable them to promote positive discourses on issues concerning the diversity of religion and belief. The project entails preparations for a new training module on “Reconciling religion, gender and sexual orientation” and aims to help individuals and organisations to relate positively to these issues at the intersection of diversity. The training encourages greater understanding of the underlying complex notions of the self, the interpersonal, community and society. The training takes participants’ own personal experiences as a starting point.

The discussion explored additional tools to facilitate the process of empathising with people of different identities, in particular how to include artistic means, e.g. theatre pedagogy, into the training process.

Project 6: Impact of Intercultural Leadership Training / Intercultural Communication and Leadership School (ICLS)¹⁴ (Presenter: Guido Orlandini)

This project tackles the evaluation of the long-term impact which participants in ICLS’ trainings for ethnic/cultural conflict reduction have had on their local communities. The trainees had been young adults with leadership profiles from various communities, religions, races and cultures in the city of Bradford. Approximately 300 young people had been trained in 20 seminars.

The discussion focused on what questions should be addressed to training participants and would best illicit information on changes in their behaviour and/or mindsets as a result of the training, as well as on the change the participants effected at the level of their family, community or neighbourhood. A key recommendation was to involve the police forces, city authorities and ethno-religious communities in the impact assessment.

Project 7: Kid’s Guernica¹⁵ / Poiein kai Prattein, Greece (Presenter: Hatto Fischer)

Kids' Guernica lets children and young adults paint together on a canvas equal to the size of Pablo Picasso’s ‘Guernica’ (7,8 x 3,5 m). While they depict their understanding of war, they seek

¹³ www.ceji.org

¹⁴ www.intercivilization.net

¹⁵ www.kids-guernica.org, www.poieinkaiprattein.org/kids-guernica

to find out what it takes to bring about peace. It is a worldwide project which started in Japan in 1995; local organisers have full autonomy. Poiein kai Prattein has organised several Kid' Guernica projects in different locations of Europe in collaboration with local communities, police authorities, or universities. The initiative is intended to create conditions for mutual understanding and peace on the basis of friendship and trust gained through an informal collaborative learning process. A cultural action becomes a community wide process and serves as a model of dialogue between children from different cultural backgrounds such as from the Greek-Turkish divide in Cyprus.

The discussion centred on the conviction that intercultural integration begins with young people, but that adults need to be included so that their imagination too is fed and they can develop empathy for others as a result. The project presentation raised interest in some participants to host a future Kids' Guernica project in their location.



*Project 8: Coloured Glasses¹⁶ / European Educational Exchanges – Youth for Understanding
(Presenter: Annina Hiryonen)*

This project sends students taking part in the European Voluntary Service Programme into secondary schools of their host country. There they carry out workshops on intercultural learning based on a manual, which sets out interactive non-formal education methods. The aim is to make pupils explore values, identities, cultural differences and stereotypes, as well as to learn about verbal and non-verbal communication.

Participants in the discussion took a particular interest in the training of the students and the effect the workshops have in raising pupil's interest in exchange studies and cross-border volunteering. The presenter appreciated suggestions for extending the workshop offer to sports clubs and youth clubs.

¹⁶ www.eee-yfu.org



Summary of Roundtables

All eight projects presented make a contribution to intercultural change in the field of education – from primary school age to young adulthood, and from school education to vocational education and non-formal education. In the wrap-up session after the roundtables, it was suggested that Platform members interested in education issues form a sub-group and that the secretariat create the means for them to be in informal exchange.

As regards the questions which guided the roundtables, the following can be concluded: Project leaders do not all follow an explicit problem solving approach – and in some cases the ‘problems’ to be solved are not based on their own analysis, but are pre-defined by the programmes under which project finance is available. They tend to be motivated by an intuition, if not an empirically based conviction, that their project methods can affect change. These projects are predominantly intended to achieve changes in attitude to diversity. However, in some case minority inclusion indicators could also be applied (e.g. uptake of vocational training by immigrants, their labour market integration, ethnic minority parent representation in school councils etc). Except for the ICLS project, impact assessment did/does not form a dedicated part of the projects presented.

2.2 ‘Diversophy’ – a game to develop and deepen cultural competence

The first day was rounded off with the game ‘Diversophy’¹⁷ – an opportunity for participants to check their cultural competence and to get to know a tool, which they might want to adapt for

¹⁷ <http://www.diversophy.com/>

their own work. First, the creator, George Simons, introduced the game's development history and how it works:

- The game targets newcomers, host community and intercultural facilitators in any given country. So far 60 different national versions of the game exist. Games targeted at particular professional groups are also available.
- It contains five types of different cards with questions or instruction. Points are won individually or collectively for giving correct answers or carrying out instructions. The aim is to gain a maximum of points.
- Players are assumed to be foreigners in the country they live in or workers in multicultural organisations.
- The games in the series exist in different media – as traditional paper games and as electronic games.

Forum participants played the game in groups of around 5 with an assortment of 50 cards each. No group got through their entire card pack in the time given as each card provoked very animated discussion – quite as expected since much of the learning from the game comes from the exchanges between players. Here an overview of the questions or instructions and participants' reactions to them as they emerged during the game and in the wrap-up session afterwards:



diversiSHARE cards

These are cards, which pose open questions to encourage thinking about and sharing of the positive sides of diversity or positive ways of responding to the challenges of diversity.

Example: "How would you draw the line between tolerating words or behaviours that you dislike and cowardice in confronting such things?"

These questions were mostly perceived as interesting and stimulating.

diversiRISK cards

These are cards with open questions, which encourage the sharing of personal experiences with diversity situations.

Example: “You just can’t take it any more! Ignorance, negative attitudes, little insults about your cultural identity have built up to the point where you feel rejected, dismissed and so frustrated that you feel like angrily attacking the people around you. Instead, you withdraw and no longer contribute actively to your work team. *Think this over and share your thoughts ...*”

In this card category, participants found the majority of the described situations or questions contained some flaw in the way they were formulated. They perceived some questions as patronising in their pedagogical approach. Such reactions are however clues for Diversophy facilitators in troubleshooting or debriefing the game.

diversiCHOICE cards

These are cards with multiple-choice or true/false questions about succeeding in intercultural situations or environments.

Example: “We are often told to be tolerant. Which of these behaviors is the least useful when exercising or learning tolerance? A. “Putting up” with things that annoy you. B. Avoiding words and behaviors that give offense to others. C. Refusing to take offense when the words or behaviors of others are difficult to accept or understand.”

In this card category, participants considered that about half the cards were interesting and that the other half either contained flaws in their formulations, or perceived the wrong choices as too obvious.

diversiSMARTS cards

These are cards with multiple-choice or true/false questions about the practical meaning of cultural competence.

Example: “The shortest road to cultural competence is knowledge of other cultures.”

The majority of the answers to these questions were too obvious to the participants.

diversiGUIDE cards

These are cards with quotations from famous or ordinary people about diversity. Players have to comment on whether they add useful insights to their cultural competence.

Example: “Human beings seem to like to give themselves a sense of security by forming simplistic notions about the culture of other countries.” Masakazu Yamazaki, contemporary Japanese philosopher.

Participants found the quotations mostly thought provoking and a good basis for group discussion.

Summary of Diversophy game

Participants identified problems in three of the five game question categories and some were therefore quick to dismiss the game experience. However, the problem with the perceived patronising nature of the questions can be seen as a sign that the general level of cultural competence of the participants is too high for the game. With hindsight, the deck of cards could have been stacked differently, i.e. cards more suitable for the purposes of training the participants or for challenging them could have been chosen. On the other hand, participants could have seen this game more from the perspective of how they might use it with groups where cultural competence levels are still lower. Either way, the need to adapt the game to each respective target group emerged clearly. The game developer George Simons declared his openness to collaborate on customising the content of the game for new user types.



3. Plenary Session: Dialogue with political partners

3.1. Intercultural Dialogue as an EU policy domain since the EYID 2008 and into the post 2014 programme period & Progressing intercultural Dialogue through intergovernmental cooperation in the EU

Vladimir Šucha, Director, Culture and Media, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, European Commission (Moderator: Sabine Frank)

Mercedes Esteban and Niels Righolt gave a short summary of the previous day. Sabine Frank then introduced the next session and welcomed Vladimir Šucha.

Intercultural Dialogue for Roma inclusion

Vladimir Šucha first spoke on Intercultural Dialogue from his first hand experience with Roma issues in Slovakia. He said there was a “phenomenal problem of Roma integration” in particular in the education system – this was, however, at heart a “problem of the majority”. In this sense, there was, he said, “nothing more important than Intercultural dialogue”. He went on to praise the Platform’s work and recommended that the Platform strengthen it in countries with large Roma populations in order to stimulate civil society engagement there.

The contribution of the EU Culture Programme to Intercultural Dialogue

Vladimir Šucha then talked about the achievements of the EU Culture Programme with regard to promoting intercultural dialogue. He said that unfortunately the impact of the programme in this

field could not be demonstrated with figures. He also expressed regret that the programme does not offer micro-finance for small-scale arts projects, which in his experience can have a profound impact on the mindsets of their participants: “Twenty minutes of theatre can change lives.”

He said that the EU Culture Programme would remain limited in this way: Micro-finance would mean the evaluation of a larger number of projects and was incompatible with the demand on the European Commission to reduce the administrative burden associated with funding programmes. Moreover, he said, it was the Member States’ responsibility to facilitate change at local level.

He called upon the Platform to lobby Member States to this effect. With regard to the next edition of the programme, he expressed his scepticism that its budget – currently “the size of that of a medium-sized opera house” – would grow. Crucially, however, support to the audio-visual sector was likely to become integrated into a single “Creative Europe” programme. Intercultural Dialogue would remain a theme of the programme.

Intercultural Dialogue in the collaboration of EU Member States

When moving on to the topic of the EU Council Expert Working Group on Accessible Culture and Intercultural Dialogue, he acknowledged that the Platform’s lobby efforts had been instrumental in its creation. He said that civil society needed to continue to push the process along under the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). With reference to the Platform’s Practice Exchanges for Intercultural Capacity-Building he said that the principle of peer learning which already works well in education, should be extended in the intercultural dialogue field. He felt the Platform had a clear scope to further build on its activities in the Member States.

Discussion

Sabine Frank thanked Vladimír Šucha and confirmed the Platform’s interest in the Roma issue. During the subsequent discussion, the following points were made:

- Guido Orlandini encouraged the European Commission to set up funds for micro-projects initiated by young people to encourage them to feel a sense of belonging. He also recalled the potential of intercultural dialogue to reduce costly conflicts. Moreover, he suggested to target policy-makers themselves with intercultural dialogue actions.
- Niels Righolt criticised administrative structures that can be barriers to grassroots intercultural actions and cross-fertilisation between sectors.
- Chris Torch acknowledged that it was not in the power of Directorate-General for Education and Culture to devise a funding programme which offers small grants. He

wondered though whether a principle of onward distribution could be built into grants. He also suggested that the Commission engages researchers to accompany funded project with analysis. Chris furthermore demanded that interculturality be made central to the EU Culture programme. With regard to the Open Method of Coordination, he wondered whether the work of national governments was not being by-passed by cities' network as well as by regionalisation. Would work at European level on the intercultural opening of institutions such as under the OMC not need to include additional actors?

- Tarafa Baghajati raised the issue of school curricula and books and called upon the Commission to initiate work on common intercultural criteria for the presentation of subjects. He said it was a pity the EU had not yet taken up important work in this domain by the OSCE and ODHIR.
- Mercedes Esteban wondered how the Commission might bestow civil society organisations with some kind of formal recognition that could facilitate their work with national governments.
- Likewise, Angela Christofidou asked whether the Commission could offer more ways to help the Platform's members to connect with national ministries.
- Elisa Briga asked how the Lifelong Learning programme would be taken into account in the overhaul of the Culture programme.



In his summary response, Vladimir Šucha reiterated that the key role of the European Commission is to help transfer knowledge within the EU, and to encourage capacity-building across borders. He also underlined that the Commission is keen to encourage partnerships among cultural institutions in Europe.

As regards small grants, he remained adamant that the EC would not be able to offer them. Moreover, given the limited EU culture budget, he recommended that cultural actors try to access the EU Structural Funds.

Sabine Frank closed the discussion by pointing out that advocacy work with EU member governments through its members was on the Platform's agenda – in fact it had been decided only the day before to create a membership sub-group which would help complement the OMC process with civic dialogue at national level.



3.2. Intercultural Dialogue as a domain of EU Integration Policy

Giulia Amaducci, Directorate-General for Home Affairs, Immigration and Integration Unit, European Commission - Moderator: Tarafa Baghajati

Tarafa Baghajati introduced Giulia Amaducci and provided some background information on the Platform's involvement in EU integration policy-making: The Platform is a member of the European Integration Forum (EIF) and has contributed to all of its meetings to date. The last EIF meeting – just one day ahead of the Platform's Forum – was dedicated to the topic of "integration through local action" and covered the following issues: diversity management, political participation, disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and EU support at regional and local levels.

Tarafa Baghajati reported that as the Platform's representative in the EIF, he had insisted at the last meeting that the term 'migrant' should no longer be applied to be people once they obtain permanent residency in an EU country – they should then be referred to as 'minorities'. He had also called for a distinction between values and lifestyles and for the acknowledgement of people's multifaceted identities. He had moreover pointed out that integration issues needed to be de-coupled from security issues – as a first step by not having them dealt with within one and the same ministries. Tarafa had also suggested that it be made much clearer how the realisation of the EU 2020 strategy for 'smart, sustainable and inclusive growth' also depends on a successful EU integration policy.

Giulia Amaducci then described the milestones and key elements of the EU's integration policy: The first EU Agenda for the Integration of Migrants was adopted in 2005. The second Agenda for the Integration of Migrants is imminent – its publication just postponed because of member States' current preoccupation with strengthening external border controls and with restricting free movement within the EU. EU integration policy uses the following instrument: National Contact Points, who meet five times per year, the EU website on integration, the European Integration Fund, and the European Integration Forum

The forthcoming Second EU Agenda for the Integration of Migrants will set policy goals for:

- Participation in all domains – political, associative and cultural - as a tool for immigrant integration
- Local level integration measures
- Mainstreaming integration in other policy fields
- Involving countries of origin in integration measures.

The discussion consisted of the following contributions:

- Ahmed Akim welcomed the fact that the new Agenda for Migrant Integration would establish a link between integration and culture. Integration – of immigrants and of Roma – was impeded by “mindscapes of fear”. Artists as “professionals of dreaming” were ideal for inspiring a shift from fear to positive visions.
- Guillermo Ruiz pointed out that Roma face the same problems as migrants. Roma should therefore also be represented in the European Integration Forum.
- Hatto Fischer stated that Europe hadn't succeeded in handling its own diversity and therefore wasn't equipped to deal with a new influx of migrants. He said the “enemy pictures” within people's heads could only be dissolved through the cultivation of dialogues.
- Mercedes Esteban touched upon the role of the media in shaping attitudes to immigration and wondered whether the Platform could look into making a contribution to the intercultural training of journalists.
- Angie Cotte (Roberto Cimetta Fund) made a plea to accommodate professional mobility within EU immigration policy, i.e. visa policy. She said that professional mobility was largely “a return trip” and contributed to local development in non-EU countries.

Giulia Amaducci responded to the comments made by agreeing that migration was mostly portrayed negatively, yet the Commission could not do much about the instrumentalisation of migration issues by political leaders for their own internal agendas. Talking from her 15 years of experience in Directorate-General for Research, she added that the aim of 'evidence-based policy-making', e.g. policy-making that would take the reality of trans-nationalism and the benefits of migration into account, was not yet realised.

Tarafa Baghajati closed the forum with due thanks to all participants.

General conclusion and next steps

The third European Forum of the Platform for Intercultural Europe served the purpose of bringing the Platform's members and wider constituency closer to the activities carried out by its secretariat, and to enhance the Platform's network and community function. Therefore both highly specialised work featured in the programme, such as the Platform's engagement as a 'Structured Dialogue' partner in the Open Method of Coordination in the field of Culture, as well as presentations on members' work. In terms of the Platform's goal of 'enabling dialogue – contributing through members and stakeholders' (see its 2011 work plan), it was significant that the meeting generated interest in the setting up of memberships sub-groups: an advisory group on the OMC process and an exchange group on intercultural education - appropriate means of communication will have to be set up to facilitate these groups. Moreover, the fact that the Platform "gets people out of their silos", e.g. allows people from youth organisations to test their ideas with people from cultural organisations or gets the latter into touch with Roma organisations, was explicitly acknowledged as one of its assets.

The exchanges with EU officials were helpful in affirming the Platform's formalised role in two EU policy domains: culture policy and integration policy. Platform members received first hand information on the state of play with EU processes. The institutional representatives on the other hand got a fresh sense of who their civic interlocutors are and what expectations they level against them. As ever, it became clear that it is a big stretch between the micro advances in specialist EU policy niches and big picture thinking about trends and needed policy responses. Forum participants exhibited their patience with the former, but also their expectation of courageous and progressive policy-making on matters of inclusion and interculturality - in line with their belief in European integration, which the current economic and political crisis of the European project only makes more vehement.

This report was written by Roxane Schwandt and Sabine Frank.



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.

Annex: Summary of participants' evaluation



Annual European Forum

Evaluation by participants

20 evaluation forms were returned (stated as members: 15). Additional comments received by e-mail were included.

Participants' reasons for attending this event

- New member interested in getting acquainted with other members, see how PIE functions and what the benefits of membership are.
- Platform commitment and goals in harmony with personal beliefs and goals.
- Looking for authentic information on experiences from other organisations (countries) - Exchange of opinions, dialogue and friendship.
- A need for exchange of ideas and practices on an issue of mutual interest. Getting to know people and organisations engaged in the same ideas and perspective.
- Was invited: curiosity about the development of PIE.
- Contributing to the future of the Platform networking. Learning new lessons.
- Curiosity to learn more about the members of the Platform. Interest in current activities in the field of ICD; Wish to support the work of PIE.

How participants found out about this event

Invitation: **15** Platform website: **1** EU Culture Sector Platforms communications: **3**

Word of mouth: **0** Other: **0**

Overall rating of the event –from 1 (poor) to 5 (very good).

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Overall rating of the event			2	10	12
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Well organised and good thoughts on how to involve members.</p> <p>Very inspiring (specific comments below).</p> <p>Very well organised, taking into account past experiences. Obvious effort was taken to give members a more active role.</p> <p>Well organised and useful event. Well-structured timetable and meaningful discussions.</p> <p>The event was very useful and informative. Speakers were competent and brought clarity to problems from their point of view. There was a good possibility for discussion and exchange of opinions.</p> <p>Very good 2 day format.</p> <p>Moving between two sites didn't facilitate the meeting.</p> <p>A 2 day conference is probably too much. I would suggest a 1 ½ day conference. This would lead to more participation and cheaper (...) costs. There were very few of us left at the end of day 2.</p> <p>The room was not ideal, because of its bad acoustic and the fact that we were not sitting in a circle but in a theatre seating arrangement.</p> <p>I am very happy about the outcome of the conference and GA in Brussels. I have also had the chance to talk to people attending the other platforms meetings and have the impression that the PIE is really doing a great job, notwithstanding the little resources at economic and human level. So, congratulations for all your efforts and engagement for the cause of interculturalism in Europe.</p> <p>As rank newcomers to the group, we found the events of the day that we were there took place in a somewhat rarefied atmosphere, much more of a "telling" and "judging" climate than a learning one. We were told quite dismissively a couple of times during the day that "art is a universal language" and is above cultural difference. While we value highly the exchange of cultural expression whether performance, educational or artisanal as a way of creating understanding, we found the high level of rejection of the reality of cultural difference quite bizarre. It would be interesting for the group to examine its own culture, values, beliefs and rules using cultural analysis tools.</p> <p>I found all parts of the event very interesting, both the practical examples and the expectations of Platform members, as well as the discussion with the European Commission. A rather technical matter, but one which affects the gains in terms of content: Unfortunately some people speak very fast and don't articulate well or the microphone distorts their voice. It would be good if in future the moderators could keep reminding people, especially non-native English speakers, to speak slowly and clearly.</p>					

Work sessions – Forum 24th May Ratings from 1 (poor) to 5 (very good).

Programme	1	2	3	4	5
Warm-up exercise for participants		2	4	4	8
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Good start, mind be good more active introduction ?</p> <p>It would have been nice to interact with more than just one person.</p> <p>Prepared members for conference to follow.</p> <p>It is good to remind yourself and exchange with other your notions and thoughts on ICD.</p> <p>Very helpful for enabling interpersonal communication.</p> <p>Very useful and ice-breaking.</p> <p>Interesting ice-breaker, useful; well-done!</p> <p>Useful to get things going.</p> <p>It would be nice to have the chance to talk with more than 1 person during the warm-up.</p> <p>What if we give the opportunity to member organisations to display their leaflets / material during the coffee breaks?</p>					
Changing mindsets, practices and institutions - Practice Exchanges for Intercultural Capacity-Building			2	8	6
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Strong presentation + good moderation.</p> <p>Just an overview. No space for discussion.</p> <p>The time for presentations of future PE should be kept short and on key issues, e.g. Powerpoint with 3 or 4 slides with the same questions answered by everyone.</p>					
Advancing intergovernmental cooperation on intercultural opening of cultural institutions - Engaging with the EU Culture Council expert working group on accessible culture and intercultural dialogue		1	2	11	5
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Interesting. Informative, motivating.</p> <p>Very interesting and important.</p> <p>A bit more detail on OMC needed.</p>					
Multiple parallel roundtable presentations and discussions – AS A WHOLE				11	8
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>The best part of the whole event. Very inspiring.</p> <p>Rewarding, democratic.</p>					

<p>Very good to have an opportunity to hear deeper on a few projects.</p> <p>Very useful – gave an opportunity to reflect about own projects as well, compare and exchange concepts and ideas.</p> <p>An excellent exercise which should be repeated.</p> <p>I suggest being always included in European Forum.</p> <p>As a presenter, I couldn't attend any of the presentations, but I have the feeling that the idea was successful.</p>					
Hope. Vocational Training for the inclusion of young refugees from Somalia in the Italian labour market / Italian Trade Union Confederation CGIL Roma & Lazio (Salvatore Marra)			1	3	6
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Very interesting.</p> <p>Impressive project and great energy of all participants. Good practice and great partnership to follow.</p> <p>Fascinating.</p>					
Thalia. Drama in intercultural primary education / Cyprus Centre of the International Theatre Institute (Angela Christofidou)			4	1	
<p><i>Comments</i></p>					
PINOKIO. Pupils for Innovation as a Key to Intercultural and Social Inclusion / Carlo Collodi Foundation, Italy (Cinzia Laurelli)				1	1
<p><i>Comments</i></p>					
APREME. Advancing Participation and Representation of Ethnic Minority Groups in Education / Network of Education Policy Centres (Jeronim Dorotic)				2	2
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Very inspiring.</p> <p>I was presenting and therefore couldn't attend the other roundtables.</p>					
Religious Diversity and Anti-Discrimination Training Programme / CEJI – A Jewish Contribution to an Inclusive Europe (Melissa Sonnino)				7	
<p><i>Comments</i></p>					
Impact of Intercultural Leadership Training / Intercultural Communication and Leadership School (ICLS) (Guido Orlandini)				2	4
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Extremely inspiring and impressive.</p> <p>Would be happy to implement this project in my country.</p>					
Kid's Guernica / Poiein kai Prattein, Greece (Hatto Fischer)				2	2
<p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>Very simple and very strong. I know some kids who will be interested.</p>					

Coloured Glasses / European Educational Exchanges – Youth for Understanding (EEE-YFU) (Annina Hiryonen)				4	5
<i>Comments</i>					
'Diversophy' – a game to develop and deepen cultural competence	3	3	2	4	1
<i>Comments</i>					
Good discussion, but unsure on how they can be used and by whom.					
Good because we had an opportunity to discuss a lot, but found it a bit problematic and simplified.					
Interesting and useful game to reflect upon our visions on intercultural dialogue.					
Not on the level of the other events. Very under-developed and naïve.					
A waste of time and energy.					
Too much time spent on this. Game is boring and not so productive.					
Bad questions.					
Sharing the roundtable and game experience		3	7	1	5
<i>Comments</i>					
(... unreadable) had answers calling for more problematic questions.					
Opportunity for discussion, even if one disagreed with some questions.					

Work sessions – Forum 25th May

Program	1	2	3	4	5
Dialogue with our political partners (overall rating)			6	7	6
<i>Comments</i>					
Need more political analysis.					
Very interesting, but there was <u>too short time</u> for our political partner to answer the questions. There could have been one question – one answer, instead of gathering all the answers in the end.					
Members were given the chance to voice some of their questions / opinions. Time was limited.					
Useful as a forum of PIE's advocacy and visibility.					
Very important, though at times a bit condescending on their part. But (...) moderated.					
At least it was a frank discussion.					
It would have been interesting to know a bit more about the interaction (or not) between the DGs dealing with the topics related to intercultural dialogue and cultural diversity in Europe (DGEAC, DG Home Affairs, DG Com, DG Regio, DG Social Affairs, etc.)					
Good but a bit disappointed regarding the fact that Mr Šucha did not mention non formal learning, even after I expressly asked about its role connected to the culture programme, asking the interactions with					

Via. Suggestion for future: send to policy-makers a report of the questions they have been asked.					
Intercultural Dialogue as an EU policy domain since the EYID 2008 and into the post 2014 programme period Progressing Intercultural Dialogue through intergovernmental cooperation in the EU		1	6	6	8
<i>Comments</i> EU position focus on Roma is not a comprehensive enough position. Very helpful. Good meeting with Director, promise of future cooperation with DGEAC. The exchange with Vladimir Šucha was interesting. A pity nevertheless that no OMC member could be present.					
Intercultural Dialogue as a domain of EU Integration Policy		1	9	4	6
<i>Comments</i> The concept of intercultural dialogue is too problematic. I found her hard to follow. Useful introduction to the potential of PIE in the area of security. Time too short. Giulia Amaducci spoke too quickly -> hard to follow. It did not become clear to me whether DG Home is involved in the Structured Dialogue and / or the OMC processes.					

Logistics

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Overall rating of logistics			4	7	8
<i>Comments</i> Recommendations need to be (... unreadable) to decision making process and communication practice. Good food, coffee, snacks. Time management should have been more strict! St Gilles Cultural Centre friendly and informal – To be avoided in summer as very hot. The room is no good for discussion, what about a semi-circle?					
Registration by Teamwork agency (on behalf of the European Commission)		2	2	4	8
<i>Comments</i> <u>Very late.</u> Clearer mention of cost participation (lunch of Tuesday)					
Travel arrangement support by Teamwork agency (on behalf of the European Commission)	1	2	1	3	7

<i>Comments</i>					
Late !!					
Again, very late + this travel problem.					
Tickets bought directly much cheaper than those purchased through Commission service. Reimbursement may be delayed.					
Very bad, very late, very expensive.					
Material and communication was rather late.					
Venues		2	3	3	6
Maison des Cultures de Saint-Gilles					
Borschette EU Commission Building			1	4	12
<i>Comments</i>					
Bad air in Maison des Cultures.					
Maison was great because background, but dark and without fresh air - Borschette was full of light but without soul 😊					
Bad air circulation and bad acoustic at Maison des Cultures.					
Catering		1	3	4	9
Lunch at Maison des Cultures de Saint-Gilles					
Dinner at the Bla Bla Gallery				3	6
Lunch at the Borschette			3	4	11
<i>Comments</i>					
Good food in general.					
Needs of vegetarians should never predominate on the food requirements of mainstream.					
Dinner too expensive, better would be to leave a choice for what one would like to eat.					
Assistance during the event			2	4	11
<i>Comments</i>					
Very good, but too many flashes of photo camera.					
Networking opportunities			2	7	10
<i>Comments</i>					
I met a lot of potential partners with whom it would be possible to cooperate in the future.					

Participants observation or thought on intercultural issues you would like our next forum to address

- **Need for communication with members.**
- **How to work more strategic with attracting new members.**
- **More roundtables and discussions in smaller groups will bring more exchanges and collaboration. More on education and cross-sectoral collaboration.**
- **Bigger enrolment of PIE in EU Educational policy – Organisational issues on what specific topics should PIE focus in order not to lose its focus – Formation of PIE's working groups for: a) cultural policy issues and b) educational policy – Creation of concrete proposal to the EC with PIE's vision on how intercultural issues (and which ones) should be adopted in current EU policies.**
- **More focus on OMC and the possibility of creating national platforms and include the education ministry in the OMC (not only Ministry of Culture).**

