

# COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS REPORT ON THE BASIS OF THE PEER REVIEW MEETINGS

**Leonardo Da Vinci Programme  
Università di Roma**

**Responsible author: Sapienza  
- CIDEM in cooperation with  
EURO INNOVANET srl**

**Project MU.-COM.–  
LLP-LDV-TOI-10-IT- 489**

**Printed on: 30/07/2011**

Project Partnership:

1. Sapienza University of Rome - CIDEM
2. Regional History Museum "Academician Jordan Ivanov" in Kyustendil
3. EURO INNOVANET SRL
4. Province of Ragusa
5. The International Museum of Ceramics in Faenza
6. The University Lucian Blaga, Sibiu
7. The Brukenthal National Museum
8. OAKE Associates

**TITLE: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS REPORT ON THE BASIS OF THE PEER REVIEW MEETINGS**

**Status**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Draft                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Public – for public use                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deliverable | <input type="checkbox"/> IST – for IST programme participants only |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Report                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Restricted                                |

## Premises

This research report has been pointed out in the frame of the project WP 3, and has been realised on the basis of the following documents/events:

- Comparative desk analysis report;
- Peer review national reports.

With regard to the first document, it is worth to note that it comes out from the comparison of all the national reports produced by the partners of the four countries involved in the Mu.Com. project (Italy, Bulgaria, Romania and United Kingdom). Such reports have been focused on the state of the art of museum communication in the countries concerned, on the professional figures similar to the “Museum Communicator”, on the related professional standards available on the national scenery as well as on the training offer in museum communication. The comparative report, in which a first professional standard of the “Museum Communicator” and a proposal of course have been pointed out, has been afterwards submitted to the evaluation and validation of all the project partners in the frame of several **peer review meetings**.

Therefore, in the frame of the peer review meetings that took place between the 10th of June and the 30th of July 2011 in Italy (Rome and Faenza), Bulgaria, Romania and United Kingdom, the project partners promoters of the meetings illustrated:

- The proposal for the “Museum Communicator” professional standard;
- The training path proposed for “Museum Communicator”.

Partners did great efforts to involve in the meetings as much potential users of the course as possible at a local level in their countries. So, a number of 102 people from the main project target groups (università students, museum operators as well as project staff) participated in the peer review meetings, plus several journalists (in Bulgaria); other 6 people (museum operators) have been interviewed face to face in the United Kingdom.

At the end of the meetings, participants have been requested to fill a grid (questions with open and closed answers) with the aim of evaluating and validating what proposed.

The outcomes of the evaluation available in the **peer review national reports** (see *Annex II* of this report) allowed the validation of the proposed professional standard for the “Museum Communicator” as well as the related training path, with only a few adjustments/recommendations, like the necessity to locally adapt the course Modules I and IV (related to some special topics, like the local history and traditions, or the national legislations about cultural heritage).

Furthermore, thanks to the peer review meetings it has been possible to validate the plan for the experimentation and transfer actions towards the project target organisations (see *Annex I “Action Report”*).

## 1. CONTEXT ANALYSIS ON MUSEUM COMMUNICATION TODAY: CHARACTERISTICS, EVOLUTION, POTENTIALS, CRITICALITIES AND NEEDS

The overview on the national situation in the countries involved in the Mu.Com. project shows, as expected, several differences but also some analogies among the countries. These act inside a general situation being different in history, dynamics and rhythms of evolution of the museums role in comparison to the cultural offer in each country; therefore, they can be a solid basis for the introduction of the new professional profile of the "Museum Communicator" and for the application of the related training path.

Inside the countries taken into consideration (Bulgaria, Italy, Romania, United Kingdom), both the public and the private museums, especially those of medium and middle dimensions, seem to suffer from the impact of the unfavorable economic conjuncture in the same moment in which -also in a problematic way- a new function of the museum is being pointed out: close to traditional roles such as the guardianship, the maintenance and the exposure of the objects, more and more important is becoming the concept of the museum as a public space, a place for the expression of the identity and for the cultural fruition, an attractive pole for a large audience. In synthesis, a process is taking place to overcome the dichotomy among *maintenance* on one hand, and *exploitation* of the patrimonies on the other hand. This is a crucial passage: if the new paradigm aims at a general development of the resources, including the cultural ones so as to create virtuous circuits among different actors, all the cultural institutions are facing today new chances and new challenges. As anticipated in the introduction, museums can also take part (somehow, they have to) not only in the dynamics of the local development, but also in order to answer to the new meanings of their own mission. This implicates a strategic communication and relational abilities as well as connections to the interests and the potentials of the territory with the aim of a common project of socio-cultural and economic development. It has to do with sparking a gradual and correct process in which the museums can practice new competences and cover new roles. But for doing that, it needs that strategies and competences are made available.

The transnational survey has highlighted that there is an agreement and a great interest on the new mission of museums, but also there is still a difficulty in realising it practically. Even if there are some differences among the countries involved in the project, it is possible to state that this is a shared perception. Even if it is possible to find, sometimes, good practices and relevant intuitions.

The didactics-educational key-action is, for instance, a tool that can enrich the mission of the institution, widen the offer to a diversified public, constitute a window for the same institution. Available in all the countries taken into consideration in particular as didactics for the schools and the students, it shows more innovative tendencies in Italy (where it is available a stable activity of "laboratories" with informal education for everybody) as well as in the United Kingdom, where similar experiences are taking place since 10-15 years. With analogous finalities of attraction and dialogue with the outside there are, then, the initiative-events (exhibitions, particular appointments such as recurrences, parties, promotional days etc. that are mentioned in the reports from Bulgaria, Italy and Romania):

they can be regarded as attractive moments for the public and as a huge exploitation of the external communication – with media of any type -, for contacts with the sponsors and for the fundraising in general. Nevertheless, they don't seem to be enough, by themselves, to affirm a major role of the museum inside the socio-economic and cultural dynamics neither they seem to succeed in guaranteeing stability in the increasing of the visitors number.

Concerning the relationship with the territory and with other actors, two tendency experiences are interesting. The first one, realised in the United Kingdom, crosses the activity of cultural promotion and the one devoted to the enlargement of the museum users with the educational activity: it consists of creating networks with the communities, the administrators and not for profit subjects to facilitate the social knowledge of the territorial cultural goods by disadvantaged groups (ethnic minorities, elderly people, young people in difficulty etc.) that usually do not use to visit museums. The second experience, realised recently in Italy, concerns the connection between the cultural and the landscape patrimonies with the tourist industry.

The Region Tuscany and, particularly, the Region Puglia are pushing for the creation of networks with the purpose to protect and to sustain the exploitation of local goods, the local cultural identity, the qualification of a cultural and aware tourism. These two experiences are characterised by taking direct contact with the needs and the expectations of the territory, by the construction of stable and continuous relationships with the other interested subjects. This is aimed at the communities well-being and the development.

In fact, this is the level at which greatest difficulties are diffusedly encountered. Also by rolling the following pages on the professional profiles as well as the training offer available in relation to the requirements of museums, it is possible to note that it has been made a path for the qualification/retraining of the personnel with reference to some museum organisations: in particular, we refer to the safety sector, to the visitors reception and accompaniment, and to the general services (including bookshop, merchandising, etc.). Furthermore, some professional figures have been improved, such as the ones related to the didactics-educational activities and the ones related to the exhibitions; other profiles for specific activities as the “fundraiser”, have been introduced. Profiles that are strategic for the internal improvement of the structure, for the standard correspondence of the international quality and for the communicative needs of the museum towards the outside, duties for which the public relations experts are in charge; other times, such duties are fragmented in other professional profiles. Also the increasing use of the ICTs and of the social-networks - that can be regarded as an evolution – do not seem to represent an enough strong support in order to sustain, with full effectiveness, the promotional activity of the museums.

The point is that museums actual chances and challenges, accepted and underlined by our project, are upstream the traditional communicative solutions. If the new opportunity offered by the Society of the Information and Knowledge mostly pertains to an active role

of the museum towards its public/publics, it is expounded through an increasing attention for the request of existing culture or to be solicited in agreement with other subjects, through a representation of itself as an active subject for the collective development and well-being.

It is therefore clear that communication, differently from what is happening today, can be strategic above all if it can create links and exchanges with diverse interlocutors (both public and private) with the aim of creating synergies and relationships. The support to the knowledge and the tourism sector are two of the other possible synergies to be created, but they appear as the ones that just today can be implemented and/or explored.

The professional profiles that are today in charge for the information about the museums inside the countries partner of the project seem not to have the *skills* necessary for covering the delicate role of interface and link between institutions and territory, and between institutions and mass media. There is, therefore, space and need for the introduction of a new figure, the "Museum Communicator", not only as synthesis of competences being today fragmented, as we just said, but also as the setting of a new professional figure. So, this profile can have wide employment possibilities in the countries involved in the project, aside from the obvious differences of the national contexts and the evolution of the statute of museums in each country.

Finally, it is believed that the proposal can be adapted both to the retraining of the already employed operators and to young unemployed people. Besides, and in coherence with, the new figure can belong to the internal staff of the museum or s/he can work in an autonomous way.

## **2. DISTINCTIVE COMPETENCES OF THE "MUSEUM COMMUNICATOR" AND SIMILAR/RELATED FIGURES IN THE PARTNER COUNTRIES**

As emerging from the comparison of the desk analyses carried out in the countries partner of the Mu.Com. project, it is possible to state that currently the figure of the "Museum Communicator" is not existing there, even if many are the professional profiles that can be considered as contiguous to it. The profile of the "Museum Communicator" conjugates, in fact, competences being on the border between various professionalisms specifically devoted to the communication in museums - of whatever nature are the contents that a museum intends to communicate.

If the professional profile which we are referring to is innovative in the terms of classification and certificability, it is worth, however, to underline what emerges from the comparison of the reports written by all the partners of the project: the specific duties of the "Museum Communicator" are variedly present in the museums, although:

- They can't be regarded as strategic communicational functions;
- They are parcelled out in several profiles;

- They need, therefore, to be developed according to the new requests coming from the European museums at the light of the challenges of which they are more and more protagonists.

Keeping into consideration the fact that today it is missing also a shared regulation, referable to this peculiar figure and that the similar profiles are very specific, the professional standard of the “Museum Communicator” will be built on the matching of competence units of similar profiles, even if that standard can’t be regarded as a simple sum of their skills.

## **2.1. Peculiar features of the profile**

The profile of the “Museum Communicator” has to be regarded as original in the measure in which s/he will be not only that person who, communicating to the outside the products, the contents as well as the initiatives of the museum exploits techniques and tools for a tailored communication, as just the expert of Public Relations or the Press Officer do. S/he will be also and above all a *mediator* between the cultural patrimony and the users community, a figure that succeeds in involving many and diverse users mobilising in a wider and deeper way a network of contacts with different subjects, in special way with the territorial actors that are so important for the promotion of culture and knowledge on a specific territory.

At the same time, the characteristics and the development of the territorial communicative network of which our professional is part, become tools for the planning of interventions also in favour of the local socio-economic development.

In order to sustain the ability of museum communicational and co-projectual inter-connection, the “Museum Communicator” will have and will exploit competences aimed at pointing out the possible exploitation of the patrimony, its development opportunities, its links to the socio-environmental features and the cultural heritage, in a wide sense, of the territory.

Closely related to this specific function is the fact that in order to succeed in effectively involving that network of local subjects, the “Museum Communicator” has to take part in the elaboration of strategies specifically tailored for the communication, mostly external, of such products, contents and initiatives, strategies and communicational tools that will be from time to time tailored for the diverse target of users. In it, this professional figure assumes the competences of a *Communicational Expert*.

In conclusion, the duties of the “Museum Communicator” imply competences in the field of the Communication Sciences, nevertheless the possession of such competences doesn't exhaust the range of the abilities and knowledge that the “Museum Communicator” will have. In fact, this figure will work inside a team of museum experts, in charge for pointing out specific training needs of the museum users; consequently and coherently with them, s/he will be in charge for planning specific interventions, on the basis of which a precise communicational strategy will be pointed out. Furthermore, always in connection with the

museum team, the “Museum Communicator” will have to guarantee in–and-out communicational flows with the surrounding territory, being functional to the programs and the projects of common interest.

### **3. THE REGULATION ABOUT THE PROFILE CONCERNED AND RELATED PROFESSIONALS: ANALYSIS OF THE EXISTING REPERTORIES AND PROFILES AVAILABLE IN THE PARTNER COUNTRIES**

The comparative analysis of the laws and regulations and the professional standards related to the professional profiles operating inside the museums of the countries involved in the project has shown some analogies concerning the lack of a figure like the “Museum Communicator” is.

Generally speaking, it is possible to state that the museum professions are rich and multifaceted in the concerned countries, nevertheless they are also very “traditional”: it has been confirmed the absence of such a figure, gathering and assuming on itself the assignments for the promotion and the exploitation of tourist-cultural products that of course exist, but that are differently available in many profiles similar to our figure.

This chapter will describe the profiles of the museum professionals pointed out in the countries involved in the Mu.Com. project. Some of them have duties being relevant for the “Museum Communicator”.

In **Italy** it is confirmed the primacy of traditional professions, nevertheless a vast range of parallel and similar figures exists, with duties and skills similar to the ones that a “Museum Communicator” should have.

These “border professions”, useful for the construction of the “Museum Communicator” professional standard, are:

- The *Technician for the organisation of touristic-cultural events*, figure in charge for the planning and the development of the events, according to the target groups and to the kind of event to be organised, assuring the right location and the efficacy of the working plan;
- The *Territorial Communicator*, in charge for: taking care of the ideation and the realisation of strategies, tools, materials as well as information and promotional events for the tourist sector; collaborating to the commercial promotion of the touristic product, interacting with the person responsible for the tourist marketing, with the tourist activities planners or with the agents of touristic development, with the representatives of the public and private local bodies, and finally with the press and the media;
- The *Communication Expert for the Cultural Goods*, that belongs to the area of the cultural patrimony fruition. As written in the profession describer, s/he “*works as a mediator between the cultural patrimony and the community of the users. The popularisation of the artistic patrimony, meant as educational resource at the service of the society and its development, is a task that asks for the ability to get in touch, in*

*harmonic relationship, the scientific culture with its specialist language and the plurality and difference of the public demand”;*

- The *Responsible for the management, the maintenance, the exploitation and the promotion of museums*, that is responsible for the museum management towards the titular administration, the citizens and the organism devoted to the heritage protection;
- The *Technician for the museum educational services*, a profile able to elaborate educational interventions addressed to different kind of beneficiaries, to take care of its contents and to divulge them through specific communicational tools.

Other relevant professionals concerned are the *Museum Educational Responsible, The Public Relation Expert, the Analyst of the communicational strategy and the texts*.

In **Bulgaria**, it has been pointed out only a figure useful to define the standard of the “Museum Communicator”: the *Public Relation Expert*.

This professional takes care of:

- Planning and organising public campaigns and communication strategies;
- Advising managers on the public presentation of their policies, developing programs and good practices and monitoring issues related to press releases;
- Assigning and implementing surveys on public opinion, analysing the outcomes and planning promotional campaigns and public relations campaigns;
- Organising special events, seminars, entertainments, competitions and public activities to publicly promote the favorable image of the organisation;
- Representing the organisation and organising interviews with public media;
- Participating in different social events aiming at promoting museums;
- Evaluating and selecting materials provided by writers, photographers, illustrators and others to achieve publicity for their presentation.

In **Romania**, there are two important regulations related to the museum professions: the COR and the CNFPA.

- The “COR” (*Code of occupations in Romania*) has been created on the basis of the International Standard Classification of Occupations – ISCO of the European Union. It includes the figures of the *Museographer*, who has the same duties of the Curator, and the *Public Relation Expert*. The latter is in charge for the planning and the coordination of programmes for the promotion and the valorisation of museum image near the public.

Other profiles included are:

- The *Marketing Specialist*;
  - The *Protocol and Ceremonial Specialist*;
  - The *Spokesman*;
  - The *Brand Manager*.
- The CNFPA (the *National Council for Professional Training of Adults*) is in charge for the elaboration of professional standards at the national level; however, up to now for the museum sector only a few professions have gained professional standards; these are:
    - The *Museographer*;
    - The *Conservator*;
    - The *Restorer*.

In the case of the Public Relation Expert, the Marketing specialists, the Spokesmen and the Brand Manager, no occupational standard is currently available.

It has to be stressed that the Romanian *Museographer* has some tasks relevant for the “Museum Communicator” profession, such as:

- offering services to the public;
- establishing the objectives of the promotion campaigns;
- establishing the budget of the promotion campaigns;
- choosing the promotional strategy and techniques;
- organising promotional campaigns.

Also in the **United Kingdom** some traditional profiles are available. Nothing similar to the “Museum Communicator” seems to exist.

In particular, the professionals available on the national scene are:

- The *Curator*;
- The *Conservator* ;
- The *Education Worker*;
- The *Outreach Worker*;
- The *Collections Manager*;
- The *Visitor Services*;
- The *Registrar*;

- The *Documentation Officer*;
- The *Exhibitions Officer*;
- The *Museum/gallery Assistant*;
- The *Photographer*;
- The *Fundraiser* .

Of great importance are the duties of the *Outreach Worker*, who works just with the outside, with the purpose of creating relationships and networks with special groups and local communities, included the ethnic minority groups, older people, disaffected young people and other social groups that do not often visit museums. Among the tasks of that figure there is the setting up of community exhibitions or designing and developing learning materials.

#### **4. THE TRAINING OFFER AVAILABLE FOR THE “MUSEUM COMMUNICATOR” AND SIMILAR PROFESSIONAL FIGURES AT A EUROPEAN LEVEL**

The compared analysis carried out by the partners of the Mu.Com. Project (Italia, Bulgaria, Romania, United Kingdom) on the training offer currently available for the “Museum Communicator” highlighted the lack of specific and high-level training paths, able to provide the necessary competences. If this result of course confirms the effectiveness of the Mu.Com. project, it is also interesting to investigate which are, in each partner country, the training offers more close to the project focus.

In **Italy** seven Regions have been taken into consideration; inside them, the courses including, in the last year, subjects close to Museum Communication have been selected.

The analysis shows that in the Lazio Region it is available a *Master in Aesthetic and Museum Communication* (CEM) at the University Tor Vergata and at the Iad School as well as a *Master in Exhibition and Museum Events* organised by the I.R.I.S.FOR.M. (Institute of Social Researches and Training Management). Also the Region Emilia Romagna is offering two Masters, one taking place in Bologna, *Master Museum: creating-planning-communicating exhibition spaces*, and the other one in Ferrara, *Planning and managing Events and Cultural Paths*, organised by the Faculty of Literature and Philosophy of the University. Tuscany appears to be the most active Region in this field, with a wide training offer distributed on all its territory: the University of Florence is organising a *Master in Communication of the Cultural Patrimony*; the Siena University, with the aid of the Foundation for the Museums of Siena, has organised a training course in *Museum Communication and marketing Promotion* as well as a first level Master in *Protection and Management of Museums and Collections of Naturalistic, and Historical-Scientific Goods*. In Pisa the Normale School, with the contribution of the Pisa Province and the City of Volterra, has activated for the year 2010 a course, *Projecting the Museum. An international perspective*, in cooperation with the European Museum Academy; finally, the Artedata School in Florence has organised a miniMaster in *Museum Setting and Exhibition* and one in *Communication and Marketing for Cultural Goods*, both in e-learning.

Also in Sicily it is available a varied offer: the University of Palermo has activated - for the third year - a first-level Master in *Communication of Museum Cultural Goods and of the Territory*; the Institute for the Archaeological and Monumental Goods of the Catania CNR (National Centre for Research), with the support of the Region Sicily, has activated a high-level professional training in *Museum Didactics and Cultural Communication for Museums* while Server, a certified training centre, has organised in 2011 two courses in Palermo, one for *Museum Didactics Expert* and one devoted to the *Museum Technician*.

In the contrary, Puglia and Campania are the Regions with a less rich offer: the first one is offering a Master in Bari, *New Technologies for the Exploitation of Cultural and Museum Patrimony* organised by the Universus-Csei, a University consortium for the training and the innovation, while the University Federico the 2<sup>nd</sup> (Faculty of Literature and Philosophy) of Naples has activated a first-level Master in *Multimedia Environments for Cultural Goods*.

In Abruzzo the telematic University Leonardo da Vinci in Chieti is organising a first-level Master for *Technician of Museum fruition* articulated into four professional sectors, a professional training course for *Auxiliary for Museum Fruition*, conceived just with the aim of answering to the demands of museums, but in which it is missing any specific subject on Museum Communication.

In conclusion, the Emilia-Romagna Region is proposing a distance Master in *Projection and Management of Events and Cultural Paths*, promoted by the Faculty of Literature and Philosophy of the Ferrara University, and in Bologna by the Pole Michelangelo – Art and Design, the Master *Museum: creating-projecting-communicating exhibition spaces* whose objectives are putting together the competences of the planner and curator of Museum events with the ones of the graphic and the designer.

In **Bulgaria** seven of the 33 Universities available in the country propose the study of some disciplines similar to the Museum Communication; 19 are the professional training courses available for the figure of the “Museum Communicator”: some of these include subjects such as Public Communication, Mass Media and Journalism, Cultural Management, Museum Sciences. The most popular course, however, is the “Public Relations” one, through which it is possible to get a Bachelor and a Master. The courses proposed by the University of Library Science and Information Technology are focused on diverse sectors: *Printing Communications, Information Funds of Cultures Historical Heritage and Tourist Information Resources* for what concerns the Bachelor degree and *Library and Information Communication, Media Information and Advertisement* for the Master degree.

The oldest and the biggest state university in Bulgaria – the Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, offers Master Degree educational programmes in Museum Science and Public Communication, and Bachelor one in Public Relations. Its Faculty of Pre-School and Primary School Education offers a lecture course *Mediating of Cultural and Historical Heritage* in the frame of the Pedagogy of Mass and Artistic Communication bachelor's degree programme. This course educates knowledge in the field of the media's connections with the cultural and historical heritage.

The subjects of Media and Society for 21st Century as a high-level professional training are offered by the New Bulgarian University in Sofia, which is the most popular among the private universities in the country. One also can get a Bachelor degree in Mass Communication – Public Relations by graduating it.

Also in **Romania**, the training offer is rather heterogeneous: in fact, some subjects related to the “Museum Communicator” are placed inside professional courses devoted, above all, to the Public Relations and to the Marketing. In particular, six courses have been pointed out: two at the Lucian Blaga University in Sibiu, for the semester devoted to Museology (in that frame, a Master *in Protecting the valuing of Cultural Heritage* is available) and in *Social Communication*. At the Bucarest University it is possible to find an e-learning course in *Public Relation*, in the frame of a Master in *Artefact Management Cultural and Tourism*. Out of the Universities, two courses, one in *Public Relation inside the Cultural Organisations* and one in *Communication in Cultural Organisations*, are offered by an institutional body dependent on the Ministry for Cultural and National Patrimony, the Professional Training Centre in Cultures (CPPC), in which the personnel of many museums is usually trained.

Finally, an e-learning course in *Culture, Communication and European Integration* has been organised in the frame of a Leonardo da Vinci project by the National School for Political and Administrative Studies in Bucarest.

In the **United Kingdom**, in order to work inside museums it is necessary to have a degree or a post-graduate diploma, to gain access to graduate programmes at University academic qualifications obtained whilst at school or Further education colleges are required. This equates to those studying at ages 16-18 (GCSEs at 16 and “A” levels at 18 years of age). It also seems to be very important to get a specific professional qualification in Belle Arti or Social History. The course in *Ars Policy and Management*, for example, is available just inside a module devoted to who is interested to *Arts Marketing Communications* in Birbeck, at the University in London; therefore, this is meant for people wanting to undertake a career in the Arts management and that already has a solid training basis in these subjects.

## **5. TRAINING NEEDS OF THE PROJECT TARGET GROUPS**

The training needs analysis is at the basis of the definition of the training objectives and it aims at filling the gap between what is currently existing and the Mu.Com. project. The reference context is the comparative analysis made by the project partner countries. It is necessary, however, to underline the difficulty to compare the training offer available in such different European contexts, thinking also to the difference of the school and the University system: for instance, in Italy the word “Master” is used both to indicate a training path proposed by the Universities after the first and second level graduate degree, and a course proposed by a private body, accessible also to not graduated people; while in the United Kingdom the Master Degree is usually gained at the end of the postgraduate studies and can't be used in other contexts. The choice to include in the analysis all the training

offer (both public and private, University and professional) makes even more complex the elaboration of common guidelines.

Having made this premise, six are the main points that have emerged:

1. The necessity to focus on communication, on the modalities and on the tools exploited inside museums, with particular reference to the traditional mass media, to the new tools and to the new practices offered by the network technologies. Too often, in fact, the communication analysis remain far from the museum sector, to be encompassed in disciplines such as Marketing and Public Relations;
2. The necessity to introduce training subjects, that are aimed at acquiring core technical competences, with particular regard on those subjects related to computer science allowing people to effectively manage the communicational, marketing and publicity tools;
3. The necessity to make more evident the link between the “Museum Communicator” competences and the touristic dynamics. Few are, in fact, the courses that foresee subjects related to tourism and the changes actually investing the sector, in which a new role of museums can be included. With respect to the traditional idea of the museum as a “conservation place” there is today a new concept of it as “tool for communication”, addressed to a more and more wide public;
4. The necessity to offer an international (at least European) recognition to the title gained at the end of the course: art, museums and tourism are, for definition, *transnational*. The museum, place of collective memory and guardian of treasures of art and history, can recover today a strong identity vocation, deeply linked to the territory, that has its reason for existing in the global and post-industrial dynamics. In that sense, the museum is changing its own role so as to redefine the museum geography itself. It appears, therefore, evident the necessity to train professional figures able to operate on the international scene;
5. The necessity to put the English language as an obligatory subject of training. Closely connected to the previous point, a professional path aiming not only at offering spendable competences at the national level can't prescind from foreseeing a medium-high level of knowledge of the more popular vehicular language. This also includes the insertion of a dictionary closely related to that specific sector;
6. The necessity to foresee a work experience at the end of the training period, in order to offer the possibility to test *on the field* the competences and the knowledge acquired during the training, and in order to allow a link with the working world, thus facilitating a future professional integration.

## **6. THE TRAINING CURRICULUM FOR THE “MUSEUM COMMUNICATOR”: LEARNING AREAS, MODULES AND COMPETENC UNITS**

The training needs analysis at the light of the training offer and the professional standards available, at present time, in the partner countries, together with the study on the state of the art of Museum Communication led us to point out the key-competences of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path, like a High Level Professional Training.

So, the contents of the “Museum Communicator” training path will be articulated into four learning areas/ training modules, that are:

**I – Preparatory disciplines**

**II – Planning and management of educational and touristic-cultural interventions**

**III – Promotion and valorisation of touristic-cultural goods/products**

**IV – Museum legislation**

The training Curriculum for the “Museum Communicator” has been pointed out on the basis of the national reports from Bulgaria, Italy, Romania and United Kingdom; it will be articulated into learning areas, competence units and contents as detailed in the following schema.

**SELF-LEARNING COURSE FOR THE MUSEUM COMMUNICATOR**

<b>TRAINING MODULES</b>	<b>COMPETENCE UNITS</b>	<b>DIDACTIC UNITS</b>	<b>LEARNING OBJECTS</b>
<b>I – PREPARATORY DISCIPLINES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to master the general context of reference in which the Museum Communicator is operating</li> </ul>	1	General History and local History in order to valorise the Museum contents from an historical and geographical point of view
		2	Cultural, Environmental and Religious local aspects
		3	Museology
		4	Techniques of Institutional Communication to promote the image of the Museum
		5	Techniques of Social Communication
		6	Elements of Economy of Culture
		7	Elements of Sociology of Consumption
<b>II – PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND TOURISTIC-CULTURAL INTERVENTIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to analyse the potentials of the socio-cultural and economic territorial system</li> <li>Ability to evaluate the potentials of the existing Cultural Heritage inside the territory</li> <li>Ability to establish cooperative relationships for initiatives and projects with the territorial actors (public, private, no profit)</li> <li>Ability to cooperate with the Museum staff for the definition of projects and cultural initiatives aimed at valorising the Museum inside its territory (Tourism)</li> </ul>	1	Elements of Methodology for Social Research (methods for Quali-Quantitative Research)
		2	Techniques for Planning Activities
		3	Techniques of Project Management
		4	Strategies for Lobbying
		5	Techniques for Monitoring Activities
		6	Methodologies and Educational Tools
<b>III – PROMOTION AND VALORISATION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to participate into</li> </ul>	1	Elements of Theory of Communication: protocol and

<b>OF TOURISTIC-CULTURAL GOODS/PRODUCTS</b>	<p>the planning, the design and the development of the Museum through promotional activities in cooperation with the social, economic and touristic territorial actors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to point out specific projects and cultural initiatives aimed at valorising the Museum contents</li> <li>• Ability to point out strategies for an ample Communication</li> <li>• Ability to master the elements of Cultural Marketing in order to promote the Museum</li> <li>• Ability to use the Communication techniques for promoting both the ordinary and the extraordinary activity of the Museum with the large audience</li> </ul>		diplomacy. Public speaking
		2	Principles of Communicating through the New Technologies
		3	Principles of Communicating through the Media
		4	Techniques of interpersonal Communication
		5	Techniques of Writing and Communicating with the Public
		6	Techniques of Public Relations
		7	Techniques of Cultural, Operational and Territorial Marketing
		8	Techniques of Advertising Communication
		9	Elements of ITC and techniques of Journalism (writing techniques; use of tools for the planning of activities; techniques for creating mailing list; use of softwares for the text editing)
		10	Diverse kind of Communications for the Events
<b>IV – MUSEUM LEGISLATION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to master the rules for the valorisation of the territory as well as of the environmental and Cultural Goods</li> </ul>	1	Laws and Legislation of Cultural Goods and Activities (National and International)
		2	National and regional Laws and Legislation for valorising the Cultural and Territorial Resources
		3	Laws and Legislation of Show and of Events in public spaces

## **ANNEX I**

### **ACTION REPORT**

#### **1. HYPOTHESIS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE INTRODUCTION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNICATOR INSIDE MUSEUMS**

As stated in the beginning, the goal of the Mu.Com. project consists of transferring the F-MU.S.EU.M training Model. The focus is on the Model's ability to answer to the increasing need of new professional competences within the museum sector, addressed to the planning and the management of innovative modalities to present the cultural heritage through a mix of culture-art-technology-economy.

With regard to this, the first step will be getting **a stronger training for a strategic professional chain** (communication) within museums, towards the rapid evolution that the organisational and technological innovations are imposing to the promotion of the cultural heritage near a more and more ample and diversified audience.

With a view to the introduction and the implementation of the "Museum Communicator" it is necessary, as first, to create favorable conditions for the adoption of an effective Model for museums communication and promotion. This has to be done also starting from the acquisition of competences by the staff employed inside the involved Institutions, or through the updating and retraining of the human resources already working inside the concerned museums.

As an alternative, it could be useful to have recourse to an external expertise. The professional figure of the "Museum Communicator" can be, therefore, an independent professionalism, working inside Associations and Cooperative Associations that are more and more taking care of the museums additional services (such as the didacticss, the Press office, the Exhibition office, etc.), or s/he can work under a single Institution or consortium of Associations, that can take on the hiring of such figure. S/he can also work for several museums.

For a stronger professional training of the "Museum Communicator", the Learning Model that has to be pointed out will start from:

1. The elaboration of an innovative Learning Model including the new professional figure of "Museum Communicator";
2. The realisation of new educational tools, technically advanced, tailored for the acquisition of new validated competences;
3. The setting and the validation of the Model through experimental local laboratories and project works;
4. The exploitation of the innovation within the daily activities of the target museums.

## 2. MARGINS FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY, THE ADAPTATION AND THE TRANSFERABILITY OF THE LEARNING MODEL DEVELOPED IN THE FRAME OF THE F-MU.S.EU.M. PROJECT

According to the results of the National reports provided by all the Mu.Com. partners from Italy, Bulgaria, Romania and the United Kingdom, it is mandatory to make a reflection about the margins for the sustainability, adaptation and transferability of the learning Model from which the Mu.Com. project was born and, as it is worth to remember one more time, whose aim is enlarging the focus of the “Virtual Museums Communicator” pointed out in the frame of the F-MU.S.EU.M. project.

Therefore, in this chapter we will try to highlight the main branches on which the implementation and the transfer of the F.MU.S.EU.M. project outcomes will take place.

As for first, the actions to be carried out will articulate on three main branches:

- The promotion of the museum in its territory: the “Museum Communicator” trained in the frame of the MU.-COM.project will create links with the other museums as well as with the territorial actors;
- The communication with the media: with regard to this, the new professional figure pointed out will act as an *interface* with the media
- The communication as a wide-range communication: the “Museum Communicator” will take care of the communicational strategies in order to reach and valorise as much as possible the image and the contents of the museums to a wider public.

As for second, the training action will regard not only the staff of the involved museums, e.g. the employed adults that are the project main target group, but also the young people accessing the labour market, that are the project second target group.

Again, taking into consideration the specific link of the “Museum Communicator” actions with the territory and the tourism, the transfer and the implementation will involve not only historical-archaeological museums, but also artistic, ethnological, naturalistic and scientific museums.

The adaptation and transfer of the Model pointed out will involve also organisations belonging to the private and no-profit sectors. The inclusion of private museums within the project network is aimed at the institution of a paradigmatic and cooperative comparison between private and public museums that must answer to parameters of *Quality Management* focused on the efficiency and the satisfaction of the customers.

Again and in conclusion, the adaptation and the transfer of the F-MU.S.EU.M. learning Model will involve organisations of local importance and of medium-small dimension, as a privileged field for an effective intervention on the territory by the “Museum Communicator”. This will be done because such museums-enterprises have specific

needs-commitments-potentialities that will find adequate answers in the Mu.Com. training Curriculum.

### **3. BENEFICIARY MUSEUMS OF THE TRANSFER ACTION**

The beneficiary museums of the Mu.Com. training actions have been pointed out since the project working phase n. 2. These museums are different in nature and size, coherently with the fact that as already said, the “Museum Communicator” has to be able to work in museums of different kind, from the archaeological museums to the historic-artistic, scientific and naturalistic ones.

**In Italy**, the beneficiary museums pointed out are:

- Superintendence for the archaeological Goods – Province of Trento
- Archaeological Museums Finale Chiostrì, Santa Caterina
- Italian Association “Città della Ceramica” (AICC)
- Palazzo Milzetti- Museo età neoclassica ([www.palazzomilzetti.jimdo.com](http://www.palazzomilzetti.jimdo.com))
- Museo Carlo Zauli ([www.museozauli.it](http://www.museozauli.it))
- Fondazione Ravenna Antica ([www.ravennantica.it](http://www.ravennantica.it))
- MAR Ravenna
- AICC Comune di Faenza
- Proloco Faenza, guide turistiche ([www.prolocofaenza.it](http://www.prolocofaenza.it))
- Soprintendenza BAC Bologna

**In Bulgaria**, the museums to be involved in the transfer action are:

- The Vladimir Dimitrov-the Master Art Gallery – the town of Kyustendil
- The Regional History Museum in the town of Blagoevgrad
- The History Museum in the town of Dupnitsa
- The History Museum in the town of Gotse Delchev
- The History Museum in the town of Petrich
- The Archaeology Museum in the town of Sandanski

**In Romania**, the following beneficiary museums have been pointed out:

- Museum Castelul Corvinilor Hunedoara
- Museum Țării Făgărașului
- Museum Banatului din Timișoara
- National Museum al Unirii Alba Iulia
- National Museum of Transilvanian History
- Complexul Național Muzeal Moldova
- Complexul Național Muzeal Astra
- Museum Bisericii Evanghelice C.A. din România
- Museum Județean de Istorie Vâlcea
- Museum Olteniei Craiova
- Museum Castelul Corvinilor Hunedoara
- Museum Țării Făgărașului
- Museum Județean Valcea
- Museum Viticulturii si Pomiculturii Golesti
- Museum Banatului din Timișoara
- Museum Național al Unirii Alba Iulia
- Museum județean Teleorman din Alexandria
- Museum Dunarii de Jos, Oltenita
- Museum Casa Muresenilor Brasov
- Museum Municipal Medias
- Museum Vasile Parvan din Barlad
- Museo Carpatilor Rasariteni din Sfantul Gheorghe
- Museum Județean Satu Mare
- Museum Valea Hartibaciului Agnita
- ARCA / Dumbraveni
- Museum Județean Satu Mare

Finally, in the **United Kingdom** four museums have been chosen:

- The Black Country Museum
- The Glass Museum
- The Iron Bridge Museum
- The Walsall Leather Museum

#### **4. EXPERIMENTATION AND TRASFER ACTIONS TOWARD THE TARGET GROUPS**

The transfer activity will be realised at not less than 2/3 Organisms in each National context, representatives of the main project target groups (museums and Universities) and will be addressed to a whole number of about 78 beneficiaries, articulated as follows:

- 12 Museum operators in Italy, Romania and Bulgaria (total: 36 people);
- 14 Museum operators and students in the United Kingdom (total: 14 people);
- 14 university students in Italy and Romania (total: 28 people).

The articulation of the intervention will include the realisation of:

*A. Preparatory informative sessions*

*B. Self-learning training*

##### **A. Preparatory informative sessions**

In conformity to a common protocol and to the related informative support materials, the national partners will realise a one-day meeting at each beneficiary Organism, during which the learners will be informed on:

- Aims of the project;
- Learning objectives;
- Educational contents;
- Modalities, tools, materials and articulation of the “laboratorial” self-learning;
- Procedure for the access and use of the web-based platform.

The meetings will be aimed at scheduling the activities with the beneficiaries and with the related structures: starting and conclusion, exchange and intermediate evaluation meetings with the project partners, modalities and tools for the distance coaching.

## ***B. Self-learning training***

Through the online platform, the beneficiaries will be able to consult the contents and the materials that will be elaborated starting from the project WP4. The contents will be enjoyable into the native language with the English as a vehicular language and they will be articulated into **Competence Units, Training Modules, Didactics Units (DU) and Learning Objects (LO)**.

At the end of every Module, learners will be able to appraise their own preparation through a verification test. The self-learning activity will be supported by a distance coaching. It will be realised through the creation of dedicated e-mail addresses through which it will be possible to send, directly from the platform, questions to the partnership experts who will answer in a short time.

Furthermore, it is necessary to realise some evaluation/validation meetings during the intermediate and final phase. Learners will be requested – at around the half of the training path- to:

- a) Compile an evaluation grid related to the experience done, that will be used for possible adaptations to the learning path (in terms of contents and technology);
- b) Participate to a one-day meeting with the partnership representatives, with the purpose to share the results and discuss/resolve possible criticalities.

The same procedure will be repeated at the end of the six-months training. The evaluation questionnaires filled by the students will be analysed by the partnership. The main aspects will be synthesised into a single report - in form of indications and suggestions – with respect to which the changes and/or integrations (technological and/or of contents), necessary to validate the final version of the Model, will be done.

At the end of the self-learning training cycle, 2 Project Works will be realised (in Italy and Romania). Their aim will be double: on one side, verifying the level of learning and strengthening it respect to the competences which the path is focused on; on the other side, creating the premises for the more wide diffusion of the project results. Such Project Works will concern the ideation, organisation and development of 2 events for the valorisation of the museum as representative of culture, resources and wealth (not only in artistic-historical terms, but also in environmental and productive terms) of the national, regional and local reference context. It is necessary to underline that the laboratorial activity will have to be developed in such a way to pursue the objectives subtending the project.

Again, it is worth to underline that the Project Works will have to be conceived so as to answer to two main *macro finalities*:

- Strengthening the ability of the territory to promote itself;

- Strengthening the value of the territory as a tourist destination, thus giving museums a relevant role inside a process of information, communication and valorisation aimed at promoting museums and their surrounding context.

## **ANNEX II**

### **NATIONAL PEER REVIEW REPORTS (FROM ITALY, BULGARIA, ROMANIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM)**

#### **A. PEER REVIEW REPORT – ITALY**

##### ***Introduction to the peer review seminars***

On the 10 and the 15th of June 2011 two peer review seminars took place respectively in Rome and in Faenza (Italy). They have been devoted to the professional figure of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path pointed out in the frame of the Work package 4 of the “Mu.Com.” project.

In Rome, the seminar took place at the seat of the Sapienza University – CIDEM, Vetriere Sciarra, while in Faenza the Seminar has been hosted by the International Museum of Ceramics.

In Rome, the target of the meeting has been made mainly of University final year students (the students involved have been 17; they were attending the Course in Tourism Sciences).

Other participants were:

- The representatives of CIDEM (Nicola Boccella, Patrizia Laurano, Irene Salerno)
- The representatives of EURO INNOVANET srl (Marco Merlini, Mirella Lattanzi)
- The representatives of the University Suor Orsola Benincasa (Paola Villani, Maria D’Ambrosio)
- The representatives of the Society “Studio Staff”
- The representatives of the International Museum of Ceramics in Faenza
- The representatives of the Ragusa Province
- The representative of the Naturalistic Archaeological Museum in Vicenza

In Faenza, the museum operators, the university representatives as well as the representatives of local territorial actors, interested in attending the Course for “Museum Communicator”, participated in the Meeting.

Among the Institutions represented, there were:

- The Palazzo Milzetti Museum
- The Zauli Museum
- The Art Museum of the Ravenna City

- The ISIA – Institute for Artistic Industries. Design & Communication
- University of Ravenna – Faculty of Preservation of Cultural Goods
- The “Proloco” (local office which organises cultural and athletic events) of Faenza – Tourist guides
- The Ravenna Antica Foundation
- The AICC - City of Faenza

## ***Report***

In both the meetings, the results of the research activity carried out at the national and the international level in the frame of the project WP 3-4, have been introduced.

The focus was on:

- The state of the art of the museum communication in Italy and in the foreign countries;
- The training offer for the “Museum Communicator”, available at the national and the international level;
- The professional standard of the “Museum Communicator”
- The draft Course for the “Museum Communicator”.

## ***Evaluation of the professional standard and of the Course***

At the end of the presentations devoted to the above mentioned topics, participants have been requested to fill in an evaluation grid, focused on the “Museum Communicator” professional standard and on the draft Course presented.

The 24 questionnaires collected in Rome and the 11 questionnaires collected in Faenza gave very positive feedbacks, especially with regard to the innovativeness of the professional profile pointed out and on the occupational possibilities offered by this figure.

Therefore, the professional standard of the “Museum Communicator” as well as the related declination in competence units and competence indicators **have been validated**.

More in detail, the questionnaires have underlined what follows:

- **Concerning the evaluation of the proposed professional figure:**
  - The museum operators have regarded the proposed figure as fundamental in order to anchor the museum in its territory, in small and middle centres, to enrich its mission and to help the touristic development of the territory in which the museum is operating;

- The students have regarded the figure proposed as extremely useful also from the point of view of the occupational possibilities. Perhaps because of their training, students have paid special attention to the possibilities of development for the local tourism, offered by the “Museum Communicator”. S/he has been regarded, besides, as a *mediator* between museums and their public, in cooperation with the local bodies.

- **Concerning the competences of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path**, both the museum operators and the students wrote that the competences that the training path is introducing are coherent, complete and well distributed, with rare discordant opinions; these have concerned the necessity to foresee competences in the internal communication (not being the focus of the project, according to the results of the researches carried out at the national and the international level) and in archaeological and historical-artistic disciplines. The training offer has been considered as sufficiently articulated (*“enough complete and able to offer knowledge on the various aspects of the sector, but at the same time very specific”*). The possibility to attend the Course in on-line modality has been evaluated in a very positive way. It has been suggested the insertion of a subject such as “Sociology or Semiotics of the arts”.

- **Criticalities:**

- Someone has expressed perplexities about the intensity of the Course, hoping that the time to be trained can really be enough to guarantee the achievement of the proposed competences. Another student stated that *“it is necessary to take care of the training on the potentialities of the territory and the public relationships, that I think can be the most complicated part”*, also wishing *“a major attention to the economic-touristic dynamics of the territory”*.

- **Recommendations from the museum operators:**

- The “Museum Communicator” should be trained *on the field* (*“stages and direct experiences are vital because museums are connoted by typological diversities that it is necessary to know deeply”*);
- Giving more space to the study of the museum: *“I would give more space to the study of the museum as an Institute devoted to help the knowledge and the competences necessary to a deep understanding of the study and working objects”*; *“more space to the relationships with the cultural tourism operators, not only to the association, but also to the tour operators, to the centres for tourist information and to anything can attract tourists on less frequented places”*.
- Adapting some of the course modules and the related educational contents (above all, the ones related to the local traditions and history, to the protocol to be used on the occasion of the official, public communication as well as the National regulations concerning cultural goods) to the National, local frames of all the countries involved in the course development.

▪ **Recommendations from the students:**

- To unite theory with practice, therefore to accompany the theoretical training with the elaboration of concrete project works or stages;
- The “Museum Communicator” has to know how to work outside the museum, if necessary, therefore really and directly *on the territory*;
- The “Museum Communicator” has to know how to reach diverse cultural areas;
- Meetings with experienced communication experts completing the training offer have been recommended;
- Placing the English language (middle-high level) and if possible, another foreign language, among the subjects of the Course.

**B. PEER REVIEW REPORT – BULGARIA**

***Introduction to the peer review seminars***

On the 14<sup>th</sup> of June 2011 a peer review seminar took place in Kyustendil, Bulgaria. It has been devoted to the professional figure of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path pointed out in the frame of the Work package 4 of the “Mu.Com.” project.

The seminar took place at the Conference hall of the Regional History Museum “Academician Jordan Ivanov” in Kyustendil. It was attended by the representatives of the beneficiary museums in Bulgaria and of the local media. In particular, the participants were:

- The representative of National Polytechnic Museum in Sofia, (Ekaterina Tsekova)
- The representatives of the Regional History Museum in the town of Blagoevgrad (Galina Milenkova and Silvia Domozetska)
- The representative of the History Museum in the town of Dupnitsa (Aneliya Gerenska)
- The representative of the History Museum in the town of Petrich (Sotir Ivanov)
- The representatives of the Archaeological Museum in the town of Sandanski (Vladimir Petkov and Aneta Donchovska)
- The representative of the Philosophy Institute at the Bulgarian Academy of Science in Sofia (Tsena Zhelyazkova)
- The representatives of the Regional History Museum in Kyustendil
- The representatives of the local media: the “Nablyudatel” Newspaper, the “Zapad” Cable TV, the “Colour” Cable TV, the “Kuberpress” Information Agency, the “Vyara” Newspaper, The “Darik Radio” Information Agency.

***Report***

At the meeting, the results of the research activity carried out at the national and the international level in the frame of the project WP 3-4, have been introduced by the Project team members. In particular,

- Valentin Debochichki, the Museum Director and the Project Manager, greeted the participants and presented the objectives of the Peer Review Seminar and of the Project in general;
- Miroslava Taskova, Project expert, presented “The Professional Standard of the “Museum Communicator”: Repertories and Similar Professional Figures Available in Bulgarian and European Museums” and “The Draft Course for the “Museum Communicator”.
- PhD Ekaterina Tsekova, Director of the National Polytechnic Museum in Sofia, in her capacity of the “Mu.Com” Project expert and of an expert with a great experience in the field of museum communication, who has defended a doctor dissertation on the same subject theme, presented “Museum Communicator Functions – Actuality and Perspectives of the Museum Communication in Bulgaria”.

The focus of the seminar and the discussions were on:

- The state of the art of the museum communication in Bulgaria and in the foreign countries;
- The training offer for the “Museum Communicator”, available at the national and the international level;
- The professional standard of the “Museum Communicator”
- The draft Course for the “Museum Communicator”.

### ***Evaluation of the professional standard and of the Course***

At the end of the presentations devoted to the above mentioned topics, there was a discussion focused on the similarities between *Museum Education* and *Museum Communication* and was paid attention to the fact that in Bulgaria there has already existed the professional figure of the *Museum Educator*, nevertheless it hasn't been included in the list of the National Classification of Occupations in Bulgaria. Having in mind the significance of the Education/Pedagogy and the Communication for the museums' development in the modern society's conditions, as well as on the base of the collected 7 feedbacks from the participants, who were asked to fill a questionnaire focused on the “Museum Communicator” professional standard and on the draft Course presented, the following conclusions are made:

- **Concerning the evaluation of the proposed professional figure of the Museum Communicator:**

The proposed figure is regarded as: completely developed with potentiality to be improved and developed on the national level; a key figure in protecting and promoting of cultural and historical heritage, quite necessary for the better work of the modern

museum and of extremely importance for its development as a cultural institution increasing the society interest to it.

- **Concerning the competences of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path**, they are evaluated as practical, effective and useful with a future positive outcome. It will answer to the needs of the museums’ staffs regarding the museums’ outer communication and valorization. It includes the necessary elements and details that will be quite useful for the training of *Museum Communicator*. The training offer has been considered as sufficiently articulated but at the same time it has been suggested the insertion of subjects such as “Protocol and Diplomacy”, “Public Speech” and “Cultural and Historical Heritage”, as well as some practical exercises.

As a whole, the training of the *Museum Communicator* that will be developed within the project is evaluated as necessary and as means for dissemination and transfer of know-how and innovations between the project partners and the project’s target groups.

- **Criticalities:**

During the discussions it was concluded that some of the Museum Communicator’s functions overlap the Museum Educator’s ones in terms of appropriately presenting the cultural heritage to the respective audience, bringing a "second life" to the exhibits. Both of them put the old values (spiritual and material) in a new context that can be easily understood and perceived by the common public.

In regard to this, as well as having in mind the proposed profile of the Museum Communicator, the museum operators concluded that the figure of the Museum Communicator is a very wealthy one possessing a variety of skills.

- **Recommendations from the museum operators:**

In regards to the above mentioned conclusions, the museum operators suggested the general profile of the Museum Communicator to be specified in two main directions:

- *Museum Communication and Museum Education* aiming at training in direct communication with various audiences including subjects, such as *Speech Communication, Protocol and Ethical Behaviour, Stage Presence and Stage Behavior*, how to work with volunteers, etc.
- *Museum Communication and Museum Marketing* aiming at educating in the field of e-technologies, e-media, branding, advertising, etc.

The two directions of the Museum Communicator’s profile will be determined by the specific conditions of the territory and each of them can be applied more or less according to the opportunities and priorities for the development of the respective museum and its region.

## **C. PEER REVIEW REPORT – ROMANIA**

### ***Introduction to the peer review seminars***

On the 25<sup>th</sup> of June 2011 a peer review seminar took place in Sibiu, Romania. It has been devoted to the professional figure of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path pointed out in the frame of the Work package 4 of the “Museum Communicator” (Mu.Com.) project.

The seminar took place in one of the Multimedia Halls of the Brukenthal National Museum and was attended by the representatives of the beneficiary museums in Romania, students of the Lucian Blaga University, teachers, journalists, representatives of tourism agencies (31 people). In particular, the participants were:

- County Museum of History Rm. Vâlcea
- Astra Museum in Sibiu
- Corvin Castle Museum, Hunedoara
- Museum of Eastern Carpathian, Sf. Gheorghe
- Nongovernmental Renasterea asociation, Turistic agency and an IT developer (Gitscom SRL)
- 15 students of the Lucian Blaga University, Faculty of History and Patrimony
- One representative of mass-media

### ***Report***

At the meeting, the results of the research activity carried out at the national and the international level in the frame of the project WP 3-4, have been introduced by the Project team members (Prof.dr. Sabin Adrian Luca, Dr. Suciuc Cosmin, Dr. Dana Roxana Hrib, Dr. Raluca Teodorescu, Adriana Nicu, Anamaria Tudorie).

The focus of the seminar and the discussions were on:

- The state of the art of the museum communication in Bulgaria and in the foreign countries;
- The training offer for the “Museum Communicator”, available at the national and the international level;
- The professional standard of the “Museum Communicator”
- The draft Course for the “Museum Communicator”.

## ***Evaluation of the professional standard and of the Course***

At the end of the presentations devoted to the above mentioned topics, there was a discussion focused on how museums in Romania understand to communicate with the general public and why there are big discrepancies between museums in which concerns exhibitions, but also the way in which the museums interact with the target groups. Is it all about money or there is a problem of strategies and understanding the mission of the museums. One of the questions was related to the target groups and the ways the public affect the communication strategies. The “Museum Communicator” is not a spokesman, nor a museum educator or public relation specialist. It involves a large amount of skills and abilities, but also a large amount of knowledge.

Having in mind the significance of the Museum Communication for the museums’ development in the modern society’s conditions, as well as on the base of the collected 40 feedbacks from the participants, who were asked to fill a questionnaire focused on the “Museum Communicator” professional standard and on the draft Course presented, the following conclusions are made:

- **Concerning the evaluation of the proposed professional figure of the “Museum Communicator”:**

The proposed figure is regarded as: “a very necessary figure for museums in Romania given the fact that museums are evaluated given the impact they have on public”, “a key figure in protecting and promoting of cultural and historical heritage”, Together with the renovation of the museum education, the role of communication is therefore strategically important to allow the museum to enter the ranks of full-on modern cultural activities and grant opportunities for self sustenance, if necessary.

- **Concerning the competences of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path,** they are evaluated as a balance between theory and practice. It will answer to the needs of museums to improve their image on one hand and the role of museums in local collectivities. It includes the necessary elements and details that will be quite useful for the training of The “Museum Communicator” (the subject “strategies of lobbying” has been highly appreciated). The training offer has been considered as sufficiently articulated but students suggested the insertion of more practical exercises (playing roles, interacting with tourists, organising educational activities for different target groups, organising events etc).

As a whole, the training of the The “Museum Communicator” that will be developed within the project is evaluated as a very good start in creating a highly needed professional figure, which connects the museum with its public.

- **Criticalities:**

One student suggested that the modules, even though very well structured could not reach its goal, because of the large amount of information given the short time of the trainings. Museum operators indicated that it will be hard to change the general perception in

Romania that the museographer – as in curator – is the responsible in doing everything, including museum communication.

- **Recommendations from the museum operators:**

The course should be organized in concordance with the national and regional legislation, combining a fair amount of practice and theory. There should be a full time collaboration between all actors involved in working with the public – museums, tourism agencies, universities. The “Museum Communicator” should do only communication inside and outside the museum and should not be involved in other scientific activities.

- **Recommendations from students:**

The “Museum Communicator” is the person in charge with changing the image that museums are all boring and fade. There should be a lot of games and role playing to stimulate the creativity and imagination of the trainees. There should be meetings organised with museum personal and national or international specialists in communication, not necessarily people coming from museums.

- **Recommendations from tourism agencies**

There should be a permanent contact between museums and tourism operators who could indicate the changes in tourism visions and strategies, based on their experiences and studies developed every year.

- **Recommendations from mass-media**

The “Museum Communicator” should know the most important things: how to write a text in order to attract the media and the general public. It should be trained to develop communicational strategies depending on target groups and the local specificities.

## ***C. PEER REVIEW REPORT – UNITED KINGDOM***

### ***Introduction to the peer review seminars***

In determining the most effective way to achieve Mu.Com. project outcomes via the peer reviews in consultation with our partners, participating Museums and Stakeholders we concluded that we would collate the responses through a mixture of one to one sessions and questionnaire returns . This reflected the wide geographic and organisational nature of the peer review research base in the UK.

As a consequence during June and July 2011 staff from OAKE Associates undertook a number of interviews and received feedback from participants which forms the content of this report

Those organisations involved in the peer review were:

- Sheffield Museums, Sheffield, South Yorkshire

- Woodend Studios, Scarborough, North Yorkshire
- UK advisers to the UK's Arts, Heritage and Cultural Enterprises.
- Rotherham Open Arts Renaissance
- Cupola Gallery, Sheffield
- Yorkshire Museums Trust, York, North Yorkshire
- Manchester Science and Technology Museum
- Ironbridge Museums - Coalbrookdale Museum of Iron, Darby House, Museum of the Gorge, Blists Hill Victorian Town, Coalport China Museum, Jackfield Tile Museum, Enginuity, The Iron Bridge and Tollhouse, Broseley Pipe Works, Tar Tunnel

This provided a wide ranging set of responses from Public Private and Independent perspectives designed to maximise the potential scope of the Mu.Com. programme.

### ***Report***

In all the discussions and meetings the results of the research activity carried out at the national and the international level in the frame of the project WP 3-4, have been introduced to participants. Background information to the Mu Com project was presented and participants were briefed upon remaining actions in the project

The focus was on:

- The current situation facing Museums across the UK and Europe
- The need to explore the development of the role of the "Museum Communicator" role in the UK and across the EU
- The potential training offer for the "Museum Communicator", available at the national and the international level
- The professional standard of the "Museum Communicator"
- The draft Course for the "Museum Communicator"

### ***Evaluation of the professional standard and of the Course***

The discussions were wide ranging and explored the topics in a variety of ways due to the particular backgrounds of the participants. We worked with Chief Executive Officers, Development Officers, Professional Advisers and Museum Owners. At the end of the discussions devoted to the above mentioned topics, participants were requested to fill in an evaluation grid, focused on the "Museum Communicator" professional standard and on the draft Course presented. They in turn completed the questionnaires together with additional staff in different roles across their organisations.

The seventeen responses collected gave very positive feedbacks, especially with regard to the innovativeness of the professional profile pointed out and on the occupational possibilities offered by this figure.

***General Themes that emerged were:***

- Communication was seen to be essential to Museums in driving its ethos, goals and mission and differentiation in the types of communications required to fulfil certain roles is important;
- There is an expectation that Museums are outward facing working with schools and the wider community. However this is currently becoming more problematic as the expectation is these are "free" or at a significantly reduced entry fee. The expectation is make this up in either grant funding programmes and/or in "spend" on food/drinks/small purchases;
- The role of Museum Communicator was well received especially with a transnational bias. Many museums are currently struggling to maintain budgets and staff so a focus on re-skilling and training people to build their confidence and skill base is valuable;
- There needs to be clarification as to how "far reaching" the post will be particularly for the more local museum/cultural provider .The full programme possibly has more relevance within the public sectors and or those in high tourist destinations or with collections that have wider relevance. Smaller Museums may be better served via a " Modular " approach to pick and choose topics to meet their particular requirements;
- Learning needs to respond to new technologies , have a trans-national dimension and be work related practical " on the job";
- Marketing to smaller Museums needs to address relevance and focus to meet their needs . The main market seems to be with larger institutions;
- The Professional standard of the "Museum Communicator" is seen as relevant to future needs. Respondents whilst endorsing the competence units and competence indicators are keen to see more detail.

In analysing the responses we would highlight the following:

▪ **Concerning the evaluation of the proposed professional figure( Question1)**

One respondent commented that the role is similar to Corporate Development Managers in the US but with a higher level of ICT. Those from the larger museums saw the role as an essential aspect of any museum and should form part of the core staffing functions. There was recognition that private museums have been doing this for a long time and now the "public" museums are going to have to follow this path if they are going to survive. The Yorkshire Museums Trust already has a similar figure – the Media Co-ordinator and plays

a significant role in increasing visitor numbers through targeted attractions and designing “offers” such as an Annual Pass.

Respondents highlighted the requirement to give people these skills, for example “to know their audiences , what they want in terms of communication styles.” There was a recurring theme of the importance of communication, its pivotal role both internally and externally.

Respondents identified that for the smaller museum/cultural provider this role is one usually undertaken by a senior manager possibly with specialist support in marketing. They currently work in partnership with the local authority including tourist information at a local and regional level to ensure their offer is clear and this includes a full programme of displays around a great many themes.

One respondent explored how the role would work in the context of the UK’s smaller museums, “ the post offers an avenue to bring together a variety of business strands addressing culture-art-technology-economy to benefit the outcomes and outputs of the museum/cultural provider. However will it merely add a further layer of management to enterprises and costs, or will it enhance performance and how can this be measured? So for example a “shared” “Museum Communicator” could act on behalf of a cluster of museums/cultural enterprises across media, communications, local to global links.”

The respondents from the smaller museums had some difficulty in understanding the role and how it would be funded. For example one responded stated “ it’s a confusing role in the context of smaller English museums and cultural provision”.

#### ▪ **Skill Articulation and Duties of the Museum communicator (Questions 2,3)**

There was a mixed response to endorsing the current articulation of the skill levels and duties. Respondents however recognised that it may be a developmental issue and perhaps one of translation. Others felt it gave a reasonable overview. There was a positive response to suggestions to identify other duties and skills regarding the the range of competences, for example:

- The need to differentiate between the different types of media written spoken , new media including social media, and different audiences;
- Identifying the primary and different communication skills required by the staff in current museum roles e.g a room steward and curator require different skill sets;
- Specialist areas for example dealing with the media TV and radio, public speaking;
- Maintaining and growing overall corporate giving and sponsorship primarily through strategic cultivation, solicitation and stewardship of prospects, donors and sponsors including generating solicitation and renewal letters, proposals and reports for corporate donors (Business Partners), sponsors, and prospects; identifying and qualifying Business Partner prospects; building and maintaining relationships; and delivering sponsorship benefits;

- That the role of the “Museum Communicator” is elevated to play a leadership role in a single museum or cluster of museums and management of all media and communication resources;
- Articulating the skills of the “Museum Communicator” to include project management, marketing skills and fundraising;
- Other attributes to include strategic thinking and commercial acumen;
- The concept of “marketing” amongst target segments, such as launched by the Arts Council may assist in making the post more successful but will only be relevant to museums and cultural providers who are pursuing a particular wider course of educational benefit or sales. Why and what are we communicating and to whom are some basic questions that any communicator needs to answer;
- The ability to develop communications utilising the new media as an important skill that the “Museum Communicator” requires. “Unfortunately most people do not understand at this moment in time.”

▪ **Concerning the competences of the “Museum Communicator” and the related training path areas for improvement ( Questions 4,5)**

The responses focused on a number of practical issues for “Museum Communicator” to address, accreditation, a practice led learning structure and transferability all evident in the replies.

- What is the duration of the course - Is the proposed training path to be a full-time course over what period of time?
- Can it be done via distance learning across the EU?
- Will it be recognised by employers as a part of an individual’s professional competence?
- How will it be structured? For example applicants with museum communication experience is one level (internal), another are applicants not working in the sector (aspiring) or independent applicants who may work in consultancy roles, in local authorities (but not employed in the sector)
- How much “on the job” evaluation versus “classroom” evaluation will be part of the course. Our experience is “hands-on” is valuable rather than having lots of certificate
- Would the use of mentors to support learners benefit the project ?
- Link it to related job activity for example fund raising and dealing with volunteers
- It will have to be localised to allow for local people to input their ideas and energies.
- The use of specialists to run short courses / modules e.g dealing with the media

## ▪ **Recommendations and Comments ( Questions 6,7)**

This section had a variety of replies, reflecting perhaps differences between those respondents from larger museums and those from smaller establishments and the current levels of understanding as to how training in communication can improve museums. Examples of this are :

- Perhaps, but our focus is on “sustainability” so raising cash/income is at the forefront of our minds – its not just the numbers coming through;
- No, our activity is too small and too localised to benefit. It may be more appropriate for larger City-based museums and cultural providers;
- Yes, but only after gaining UK recognition as a valuable qualification to support the sector;
- Significant work will be required to demonstrate to potential employers how the role and training will boost performance, especially for smaller enterprises;
- Yes but this will always depend on the skills of the Chief executive the management and staff of the museum;
- A useful addition for our team especially with York’s transnational links;
- The course could answer a great deal of induction needs for new staff ... and should be happening when staff start their roles;
- It will help develop staff and give them a broader remit;
- The transnational nature of the project is a huge plus as museums have much to learn from each other;
- Any partnership with European professionals would be valuable exploring the similarities and differences and sharing conclusions.