

EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Anna Keune, Harper Staples (TUM)
Contributor(s)	Kemal Ahson (UH)
Version	1.1
Deliverable	D6.1 National and European COPs co-created
WP	WP6: Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	16 December 2025
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This deliverable provides a summary of the national and European Communities of Practice created in the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by
1.0	12/11/25	Submitted version	Anna Keune, Harper Staples
1.1	18/11/25	Adjust literature review	Anna Keune, Harper Staples

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme.



The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) only and do not reflect any collective opinion of the CLiViE consortium, nor do they reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the European Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information. All rights reserved. Attribution Unless otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). This means that reuse is allowed, provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Literature Review	3
2.1. Communities of Practice: A Traditional Approach.....	3
2.2. Landscapes of Practice.	4
2.3. Virtual Communities of Practice.....	5
2.4. Arts-based Communities of Practice.	6
2.5. Theorizing CLiViE Communities of Practice.	7
3. CLiViE CoP Groundwork & Data Collection	8
3.1. Review of Partner templates.	8
3.2. Common Objectives.....	8
3.3. National Distinctions	9
3.4. Intended Impacts.	9
3.5. Planned Measurement and Evaluation Strategies.	10
3.6. Challenges Identified.....	10
4. CoP Workshop with CLiViE Partners.....	10
References	13
Appendix A: CLiViE Starting Checklist	14
Appendix B: Partner Templates	16
Europe (<i>Technical University of Munich</i>).	16
Czech Republic (<i>Univerzita Karlova</i>).....	20
Finland (<i>University of Helsinki</i>).....	28
Germany (<i>Technical University of Munich</i>).	32
Italy (<i>Università degli Studi Milano Bicocca</i>).....	36
Latvia (<i>Rīga Stradiņš University</i>).	41
Lithuania (<i>Vytautas Magnus University</i>).	60
Poland (<i>Sinfonia Varsovia</i>).....	76

1. Introduction

Communities of Practice (CoPs) are important levers of socio-cultural, co-constructing methods to integrate meaningful arts-based approaches into educational institutions. In this project, we approach CoPs from diverse perspectives that highlight the close cooperation of educational partners with researchers, as well as developing meaningful relationships over longer periods of time, centering socially meaningful arts-based artifacts in the process.

As part of CLiViE's Work Package 6, each Partner created a national Community of Practice. These communities bring together educators, artists, policymakers, researchers and practitioners to share, discuss and help develop creative approaches in arts-based education that can support young people's learning, development and social participation. The seven CoPs will be important spaces for exchange where partners can share insights from the CLiViE project, members can learn from each other, and the two CLiViE toolkits, one for Educators (led by TUM) and one for Policy-makers (led by SGH), can be tested and refined. The CoPs will also provide opportunities to seek to sustain CLiViE's work beyond the end of the project in 2027. Additionally, we launch a European-wide Community of Practice, led by TUM, to extend our network beyond national borders, and to engage with organisations, educators, researchers and policy makers working at an international level.

This document details the theoretical background of the Community of Practice model, the theorisation of our CLiViE CoP approach, and the project Partners' ongoing work to co-create their national CoPs.

2. Literature Review

This literature review synthesizes key theoretical and empirical perspectives that inform the conceptualisation and design of the CLiViE CoPs. We begin by outlining foundational understandings of CoPs and their core components, before examining how these ideas evolve in models that address interconnected or networked communities, such as Landscapes of Practice. We then explore research on virtual and hybrid CoPs, highlighting factors that shape participation and sustainability in digitally mediated contexts. We also review emerging work on arts-based CoPs and frameworks that position creative making and youth voice as central to learning. These strands provide the conceptual grounding for CLiViE's model, which draws inspiration from traditional, virtual and arts-based approaches to support inclusive, arts-centred learning for young peoples' cultural literacy and social-emotional learning across diverse educational and cultural settings.

2.1. Communities of Practice: A Traditional Approach

Communities of Practice (CoPs) are defined broadly as groups of people who are “bound together by a common activity, shared expertise, a passion for a joint enterprise, and a desire to learn or improve their practice” (Nicolini et al., 2022, p.2). The term was first introduced as a concept to support situated learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991) to emphasize the interconnectedness between a particular practice and social structures in which it takes place (Nicolini et al., 2022). As the latter researchers emphasize, the concept of the CoP is subject to diverse interpretations across academic and professional fields, in part due to the breadth of definitions which can be attributed to the terms “community” and “practice”, and in part due to the diverse applications of the concept more generally (Nicolini et al., 2022), with published work demonstrating its use as, for example, an analytical framework to assess healthcare intervention success (Sadler et al., 2022), as a consulting technique in management contexts (Ramos, 2023), or as a professional development strategy in education (Bracken & Riley, 2025). We recognize the value of these diverse applications; however, given the scope and planned structure of the CLiViE CoP (a hybrid of online and offline engagement using creative and arts-based methods), our literature review will concentrate on the development and use of the CoP model in offline, virtual and arts-based contexts. This focus allows us to situate our conceptualisation within this specific body of work.

Traditionalist interpretations of the CoP build on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) original view that learning is a process of ‘*social becoming*’ rather than of simply acquiring abstract knowledge. In other words, learning is a ‘driver’ of practice (Pyrko et al., 2019). From this perspective, learning is embedded in everyday activities, rather than treated as a separate or abstract task. It is inherently social, taking shape through interactions with people, texts or tools. The authors posit that this type of learning also involves forming a new identity, as individuals invest time and effort to become participants in a particular practice (Wenger, 1998). Competence in a particular practice develops through an individual’s engagement with practitioners at different levels of expertise within their shared social context (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Importantly, Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner (2014, p.3) emphasize that “competence and experience are not a mere mirror-image of each other” but are rather “in dynamic interplay” and, as such, the *regime of competence* into which a newcomer is initiated will be subject to transformation and change over time, as both members and practices evolve.

At their core, CoPs share three fundamental elements: (a) Joint enterprise, including common purpose and goals; (b) mutual engagement, such as active interactions among members, through which they establish norms and relationships of mutuality that reflect

their shared enterprise; and (c) a shared repertoire, such as communal resources that the community develops and shares (Wenger, 1998).

The core elements of joint enterprise, mutual engagement, and a shared repertoire provide a useful foundation for shaping the CLiViE CoPs. In this context, the joint enterprise is defined by a shared commitment to creative, youth-centred arts learning; mutual engagement is fostered through sustained collaboration across educators, artists, community partners and young people; and the shared repertoire emerges through the co-creation of arts-based artefacts, practices and tools across the CLiViE partnerships. By grounding the project in these principles, CLiViE's CoPs are positioned not only to support individual and collective learning, but also to evolve dynamically as participants contribute new insights and practices.

2.2. Landscapes of Practice

As CLiViE is developing a model composed of multiple Communities of Practice (CoPs), each situated in distinct contexts and involving diverse stakeholders and art forms, it is important to situate this work within theories that address how communities relate to one another, beyond their local boundaries.

Traditional approaches to theorizing Communities of Practice are generally specifically concerned with the development of practice in a local, situated context. However, Wenger's (1998) work also offered a first conceptualisation as to how knowledge and practice might be shared across multiple CoPs, and the type of learning that can ensue. 'Landscapes of Practice' (LoPs) (Wenger, 1998) set out how different CoPs can "interact, depend on, and be accountable to one another's practice-based knowing" (Pyrko et al., 2019, p.483). LoPs are "looser" in structure than a CoP, and are constituted by the totality of members, practices and knowledge in each of the contributing CoPs, in other words, their "body of knowledge" (Pyrko et al., 2019, p.483). Key to this conceptualisation is the presence (and the value of) epistemic boundaries between communities. While Wenger-Trayner and Wenger-Trayner (2014) acknowledge that the possible lack of shared history between communities can lead to potential 'misunderstandings' to arise as boundary encounters occur, they nevertheless also stress the value of such meetings due to their potential for "unexpected learning", for example, via the sharing of new insights, disciplines or innovations (p.6). These boundaries also have implications for identification; just as a member's identity may shift through their membership of a particular local CoP, inclusion in a Landscape of Practice may produce identification along multiple scales, for example, a member feeling aligned with practitioners at both the regional and national level (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2014).

For CLiViE, the Landscapes of Practice perspective underscores the importance of intentionally creating spaces where our national CoPs can exchange knowledge and negotiate meaning across such ‘epistemic’ boundaries. By designing structured opportunities for cross-site dialogue, either through networked events, shared artefacts or collaborative creative processes, we hope to harness the productive potential of these encounters. In so doing, the project positions its multiple CoPs as an interconnected ‘landscape’ in which diverse expertise can strengthen our collective identity and deepen learning across local and national contexts.

2.3. Virtual Communities of Practice

CLiViE partners are working across in-person and virtual Communities of Practice settings. Both of these, as well as CoPs that bridge hybrid settings, come with their own sets of challenges and opportunities which have been theorized and documented in the broader CoP literature.

The shift of many organisations and activities to online settings, and especially during the Covid-19 period, naturally saw the transference of the Community of Practice model to virtual contexts, ‘VCoPs’ (González-Anta *et al.*, 2023). In line with Wenger’s (1998) view that the ‘locality’ of a Community of Practice depends on learning, rather than geographic proximity, research has indicated that the outcomes of online CoPs are generally consistent with offline Communities, namely, shared practice, identity development and mutual enterprise is achieved (Zhang & Watts, 2008). Relatedly, VCoPs are also subject to the same issues of sustainability as offline Communities as, whether in person or online, a Community of Practice is only maintained by decisions of individuals to remain part of the group, and to participate through his/her personal contributions (González-Anta *et al.*, 2023). The latter researchers conceptualize the success and ‘flourishing’ of a VCoP as contingent on three factors: firstly, personal (awareness of the member of the individual benefits obtained by being part of the CoP), technological (the technological ability of a member, and usability of the technology to access the VCoP), and finally, motivational (reciprocity of contribution and identification with the group) (González-Anta *et al.*, 2023, p.7). Their exploratory study suggests that motivation, and especially identification, with the VCoP is a key factor in ensuring ongoing participation (p.12), in this sense aligning with findings in CoP sustainability in offline settings (e.g. Fracchiolla *et al.*, 2020).

This research underscores that virtual, in-person and hybrid CoPs generally rely on the same foundational dynamics of sustained engagement, identification with the community and clear opportunities for members to contribute meaningfully. For CLiViE, these insights highlight the need to design hybrid structures that consider not only

technological access and usability, but also to the relational and motivational conditions that keep participants connected across modes. By fostering strong identification with the CLiViE mission and cultivating reciprocity through shared creative processes, the project aims to support participation across the different national and European CoP environments.

2.4. Arts-based Communities of Practice

Arts learning is deeply embodied, process-oriented, and shaped by relationships between learners, educators and creative materials, therefore, CoP theory offers a useful lens with which we can examine how knowledge and practice circulate within these environments. For CLiViE, research on Arts-based Community of Practice work offers valuable insights into how communities can organise themselves, share expertise and collectively respond to challenges, such as disciplinary diversity.

Arts-based organisations and researchers have recognized the value of the CoP model as a means to structure their organization, share best-practice and to address specific challenges in the field, such as access to arts resources or disciplinary diversity (Watson, 2024). While practical examples in this field are still sparse, one notable example of an Arts-based Community of Practice is the United Kingdom's *ArtsWorks Alliance*. They offer the 'Participatory Arts' framework, following Lave & Wenger's (1991) model, which they posit offers members "significant benefits" including meaningful learning, professional growth and knowledge creation (Watson, 2024, n.d.).

Research evidence suggests similar outcomes for participants involved. Maras *et al.* (2015), for example, in their meta-review of the barriers and enablers present in 13 school-based arts-focused CoPs, found that the most effective models grounded their practice on shared beliefs and agreement about mutual values between teachers and learners about the aims and outcomes of the artefacts being created, and centered student voices. This resulted in structures that provided students with "opportunities to experience art as a social and cultural practice, reinforcing a sense of belonging and self-worth" (p.12).

Shifting to out-of-school settings, Noble (2021) explored how an art museum could act as a CoP 'hub' for primary-level art and design teachers and gallery educators. Findings indicated the value of this model in permitting the acknowledging of "different levels of knowledge and expertise" in the emerging community, and therefore helping to challenge typical hierarchies around 'knowledge' in arts-based settings (p.627), and for supporting a more 'playful' and 'process' led approach, where students of the participants were empowered to follow their "own lines of enquiry through making" (p.626). Herne's 2006 study takes a Landscape of Practice view on a similar question, and explores the

interactions between gallery educators and art teachers in developing the art-educational identities of students. In this case, the author argues that the lack of shared discourse and practice between the two former parties can be ‘mediated’ by interactions at the boundaries of the CoPs, in which useful hybrid practices and shared expertise can be negotiated (p.16). Aligning with Maras *et al.*’s (2015), working around a shared value (here, the influence of students’ art-based identities) is essential in determining the success of the interaction between the diverse Communities.

In Constructionism, a perspective on learning that considers learning to happen best when learners manipulate digital or tangible tools and materials toward personally meaningful projects that they can present to and discuss with others (Papert, 1992), CoPs center around shared practice of producing domain-relevant projects. For instance, Papert (1980) presented Brazilian samba schools as self-motivated learning communities that act as hubs, where people learn complex skills and knowledge by participating and collaborating in shared cultural productions that are personally meaningful to individual participants. Samba schools serve as a model for a social apprenticeship model, where participants learn from each other through immersive co-presence and participation between experts and novices. Through positive participation, samba schools offer multiple ways to engage, in terms of cultural forms as well as building domain knowledge. This approach informs CLiViE’s Communities of Practice work in that they aim to build on everyone’s (Partners and participants) strengths, motivations and joys to co-produce a living community of shared artistic practice (through, for example, testing the Educator toolkit).

Uniting these varied approaches is the centering of the learner experience in the Community (for example, via their processes of making, exchanging, identification or voice). The Connected Arts Learning Framework (Wallace Foundation, 2023) operationalizes this recognition by placing ‘youth voice’ as a central pillar of practice. Drawing on Constructionist theory, the Connected Arts Learning Framework offers a reinterpretation of the Community of Practice for Arts-based settings, with a view to “achieve broader outcomes through the arts by building on youth interests and identities”, by “investing in strong relationships with adults, peers, and families”, and by “connecting youth to future opportunities” (Wallace Foundation, 2023, p.1). This framework emphasizes the role of producing artefacts, where young people use their art-making process to both “consider social issues and, conversely, consider the social issues connected to the arts” (p.5). The role of community members as gateways to both learning and to future opportunities is also central in this conceptualization. Effective arts learning is therefore understood to be embedded in social networks that include peers, family, local organisations and arts

educators, and it is these connections which can support learning both “within and beyond” a particular programme (p.13).

These studies highlight several principles that are directly relevant to the CLiViE approach (1) the importance of shared joyful values, (2) the centrality of youth voice and (3) the potential of creative processes to level hierarchies and create communal meaning among participants. They also reinforce the idea that arts learning thrives in relational networks that extend beyond individual classrooms or institutions. By grounding its CoPs in these insights, CLiViE positions its communities as dynamic, inclusive spaces where learners and practitioners can co-construct Arts-based knowledge in order to create meaningful impact.

2.5. Theorizing CLiViE Communities of Practice

The CLiViE Communities of Practice will draw insight from these intersecting bodies of work to develop a model that is situated, networked and creatively driven. Building on traditional CoP theory, CLiViE foregrounds learning as a socially embedded process in which participants develop shared learning and mutual engagement through sustained interaction around arts-based activities. Especially, the settings of educational environments, the resources and cultural artistic practices as driven by the materials within learning spaces, including the possibilities to arrange and re-arrange them, contributes to how learning opportunities and trajectories expand, especially with an eye on inclusivity (Keune & Peppler, 2019). At the same time, recognising that each CLiViE CoP will span diverse stakeholders, institutions, regions and modalities, we will acknowledge a *Landscape of Practice* perspective, in which we hope the diverse expertise from each of our national CoPs can be shared across Partners as valuable ‘boundary encounters’. Moreover, integrating principles from virtual CoP research, our approach will take into account the technological, motivational and identification-based factors that support sustained participation, especially within hybrid online/offline configurations, which are central in multiple CLiViE Partners’ plans for national CoP development. Finally, aligning with the Connected Arts Learning Framework (Wallace Foundation, 2023), CLiViE will centre creative making, youth voice and socially meaningful artefact production as the key drivers of cultural engagement, social-emotional and civic learning. Together, these theoretical strands inform a CoP structure that is therefore adaptive to context and ultimately oriented toward shared creativity and distributed knowledge-building about the value of Art- based education, for both recipients and facilitators.

3. CLiViE CoP Groundwork and Data Collection

CLiViE Partners were encouraged to begin their Community of Practice work by identifying their CoP's objectives, scope, potential members and the first practical and organizational steps to take. To help with this task, in September 2025 we provided a short checklist of actions to consider (please see appendix A), as well as a CoP initiation template for partners to record their plans for developing their communities. While situating our CLiViE CoP work theoretically in the intersections of the work above, it was nevertheless emphasized to CLiViE Partners that there is no 'one right model' for building a CoP, as this is specific to each community and its members, and Partners were given space to interpret this work as made sense to them and their community. The templates were reviewed by the team at the Technical University of Munich, and key trends, divergences and outcomes for each Partners' CoP plans were recorded and shared with Partners at the CLiViE 2025 General Assembly in Kaunas, Lithuania, in October 2025. The completed templates, including plans for the European CoP, are included in this document as appendix B.

3.1. Review of Partner Templates

Below, we overview the key themes, trends and distinctions in Partners' CoP plans, and offer some final thoughts on areas for ongoing discussion as the work continues into 2026-2027. This document also contains the Partners' completed templates as an appendix (B).

3.2. Common Objectives

All templates aligned and emphasized the following aspects as objectives in their Communities of Practice, signalling alignment across the project with the overarching aims of CLiViE and comprehension of the key tasks to be achieved via the CoP:

- Build sustainable learning networks linking educators, artists, policymakers, and communities.
- Promote cultural literacy as inclusion, democracy, and social cohesion.
- Test and refine the CLiViE educator and commissioner toolkits.
- Support arts-based and participatory pedagogies.
- Embed CLiViE outcomes in policy and professional training.

The following key themes also emerged across Partners' responses:

Cultural Literacy as Social Value	<i>All CoPs connect cultural learning with civic participation, empathy, and tolerance.</i>
Co-creation & Collaboration	<i>Teachers, students, artists and policymakers involved in co-design of, e.g. tools, workshops, and Maps of Meaning.</i>
Inclusion & Accessibility	<i>Addressing barriers of geography, economics, and digital access; empowering youth and marginalized voices.</i>
Policy Influence & Sustainability	<i>Creating bridges between grassroots practice and systemic educational change.</i>
Digital & Interdisciplinary Innovation	<i>Using hybrid spaces, innovative approaches (i.e. STEAM), and digital tools to expand participation.</i>

3.3. National Distinctions

In line with our emphasis that each Partner's Community of Practice should be seen as a process and structure free for interpretation in a way that makes sense in each context, some differences and distinctions in CoP plans emerged. These are listed below:

Partner	Distinctions
Czech Republic	<i>Strong art education networks; museum and gallery partnerships; national and international focus, co-created Maps of Meaning activities a key output, strong connections between practitioners and research.</i>
Germany	<i>Structured peer-learning; toolkit testing; emphasis on educator confidence and creative pedagogy, first focus is urban (Munich).</i>
Latvia	<i>Deep co-creation with youth; Maps of Meaning work a key output; increasing awareness of less traditional Latvian culture and art work; strong policy focus.</i>
Poland	<i>Music-centered CoP; inclusion through accessible art forms; strong institutional leadership in the early stages; particular focus on case study outcomes and D2.2 report, first focus is urban (Warsaw)</i>
Finland	<i>Empowering educators to make business case for arts funding (SROI); connects formal and non-formal education, focus on both urban (Helsinki) and rural (Lapland)</i>

Italy	<i>Arts-based education as structured advocacy network; focus on urban inclusion; build on existing arts networks; reduce ‘fragmentation’ in policy/practice landscape</i>
Lithuania	<i>Breadth of art forms integrated: Arts, sport and technology. Seeks wide-ranging impact across multiple agendas; promotes reflective practices and enhanced media/technology literacy.</i>

3.4. Intended Impacts

Below we have listed the key impacts Partners identified as areas of focus in their Community of Practice work. These were broadly consistent, again indicating Partners’ alignment/comprehension of the purpose of the CLiViE CoP work.

- Empowered educators who see themselves as co-creators.
- Greater visibility of arts as drivers of social cohesion.
- Institutional alignment between universities, schools and cultural organizations.
- Cross-sector partnerships becoming long-term collaborations.
- Policy recognition beginning to take shape.

3.5. Planned Measurement and Evaluation Strategies

There was greater variation in the ways in which Partners intend to measure the ultimate impact and success of their Community of Practice (listed below). In line with our view that this work should be individual and determined by each Partner, we agreed that this aspect of the work should remain at the Partner’s discretion, and not aligned across the project.

- Qualitative reflection and documentation.
- Theory of Change and SROI frameworks.
- Participation and engagement metrics.

3.6. Challenges Identified

Several identified challenges emerged from the review of the templates:

- Sustainability/Balancing co-creation with coordination: How to continue after project funding ends.
- Time and resource constraints for educators.
- Geographical inequalities: Urban–rural divide.
- Digital access and literacy gaps.
- Interdisciplinarity: How to manage diverse stakeholder expectations.
- Policy/institution inertia: Ensuring creative education is valued institutionally.

- “Talking vs. doing”.

While not necessarily new, these challenges represent a collection of experienced and imagined issues that are grounded in local and national contexts related to arts-based approaches within community settings. We consider these highly important to further drive our work within the CLiViE CoP work and that our shared work may contribute to illuminating these challenges from a pan-European and arts-centered perspective.

4. CoP Workshop with CLiViE Partners

We discussed the identified challenges in depth with partners through two activities at the CLiViE General Assembly in October 2025, to gauge the depth and breadth of each challenge, and to start a collaborative process to find solutions. Firstly, we led a ‘voting’ session, where each Partner institution received 6 stickers (their “votes”): 3 for ‘exciting’ (yellow) and 3 for ‘difficult’ (green). Partners were asked to select which challenges they found most exciting and most difficult to address, placing their stickers directly onto printed versions of each challenge. Stickers could be distributed in any way, for example, all 3 on a single challenge or 1 each on six different ones. ‘Interdisciplinarity’ and ‘time and resource constraints’ emerged as the two challenges concurrently most exciting and challenging for Partners to address.

This voting formed the basis of a second discussion in which Partners worked with colleagues to define their chosen challenges more precisely (see the examples in Figure 1), and to propose initial solutions or approaches to address them, which were recorded on Padlet and shared with the group (Figure 2). The activity enabled us to identify which issues generated the most energy and which posed the greatest barriers, while also beginning to shape a shared understanding of possible ways forward. In response, we agreed to continue sharing best practices, insights, and practical advice collectively as the work moves forward, ensuring that solutions to challenges in the context of arts-based CoPs are developed collaboratively and consistently across the partnership.

We also recognize the value of the reflections and lessons emerging from this shared process for other researchers/practitioners in creating arts-based Communities of Practice, and intend to use these to serve as the foundation for a collaborative publication, capturing the challenges, responses and best practice that emerges across the consortium.

Challenge	Definition	Example	Solution
-----------	------------	---------	----------

<i>Time & Resource Constraints</i>	Limited funds from government and bureaucratic processes in the implementation of activities. An overload of work of stakeholders with limited financial resources.	To activate a position supporting an Arts-based activity there are a lot of requests from the State. Being overloaded with work.	Anticipate possible delays in advance. Different organisation of work. Work life balance or additional funds.
<i>"Talking vs Doing"</i>	An Italian popular saying is "between saying and doing there is the sea".	Long lasting meeting without a final decision.	More frequent checks of the working progress.
<i>Interdisciplinarity (how to address different stakeholders)</i>	Different stakeholders (researchers, educators, policy-makers) have different perspectives.	Limited contacts between different stakeholders preventing connections.	Run events allowing stakeholders to meet and share viewpoints.

Figure 1: Partners' definitions, examples and proposed solutions to some of the identified challenges

CLIVIE Communities of Practice: Challenges, Definitions & Examples

Harper Staples
14 days ago

Challenge: Sustainability/Balancing co-creation with coordination
(Add your definition, an example in practice from your context, and proposed solution here)

Team finland - Suomi
13 days ago

Importance of sustainability depends on the type of organisation. For example, NGOs, the sustainability of the results may affect their own sustainability as a tool of evidencing of their own existence and their own funding process. For university, it's not that crucial

Team finland - Suomi
13 days ago

SROI is a toolkit for NGO work

Add comment

Harper Staples
14 days ago

Challenge: Time and resource constraints
(Add your definition, an example in practice from your context, and proposed solution here)

Italy
13 days ago

IT-Definition: limited funds from government and bureaucratic processes in the implementation of activities. Example: to activate a position supporting an arts-based activity there are a lot of requests from the State. Solution: to anticipate possible delays in advance.

Sleepy Deer
13 days ago

Definition - overload of work of stakeholders with limited financial resources. Example: overload of work. Solutions: different organisation of work. Work life balance. Additional funds.

Czech team
13 days ago

As it was already discussed today, municipalities, nor ministries view this as a priority, there can be some negotiations on our local level, however the hard truth is that the national funding budgets are being cut

Add comment

Harper Staples
14 days ago

Challenge: Geographical inequalities
(Add your definition, an example in practice from your context, and proposed solution here)

Groovy Panther
13 days ago

It is easier to reach big cities and their communities, but smaller and rural areas receive not varied and no so diverse cultural education. It is easier to make events or programmes in bigger cities because it has better access for range of people.

Solutions: To create programme, initiatives which would address the lack of access diverse cultural experiences and activities in the rural areas. Create long term processes with partner from organisation from a rural area. Create conditions for people to meet, for instance artists, creative practitioners and local people (communities, students etc.) in creative learning processes. Where artistic practices that would be intertwined with educational or community building processes.

Team finland - Suomi
13 days ago

In Finland, geography is a challenge as there are some areas well served (Uusimaa). And there are some areas which we tend to forget. Even within the Uusimaa area there are some disparities in local areas.

Team finland - Suomi
13 days ago

A solution. Might be to allocate more resources to those areas

Add comment

Harper Staples
14 days ago

Digital access & literacy gaps
(Add your definition, an example in practice from your context, and proposed solution here)

Add comment

Harper Staples
14 days ago

Challenge: "Talking vs. Doing"
(Add your definition, an example in practice from your context, and proposed solution here)

Italy
13 days ago

Italy Definition: an Italian popular said "between saying and doing there is the sea". Example: long lasting meeting without a final decision. Solution: more frequent checks of the working progress

Add comment

Harper Staples
14 days ago

Challenge: Interdisciplinarity (how to address different stakeholders)
(Add your definition, an example in practice from your context, and proposed solution here)

Sleepy Deer
13 days ago

Definition - different stakeholders have a different perspectives

Sleepy Deer
13 days ago

Possible solutions - events connecting various stakeholders/ eg museonica project by SV

Czech team
13 days ago

Czech team: we have good contacts with the Czech Ministry of Education and our University staff regularly works for the ministry, therefore it is somewhat easy to reach out to the stakeholders that way.

Add comment

Harper Staples
14 days ago

Challenge: Policy/institution inertia
(Add your definition, an example in practice from your context, and proposed solution here)

Italy
13 days ago

Definition: high amount of laws and rules, sometimes in contradiction among them. Ex: recruitment of suitable experts/personnel for the role. Solution: identify the professional who can guide you to the legislative confusion.

Add comment

Figure 2: Partners' definitions and preliminary solutions to the identified challenges

References

- Bracken, S., & Riley, M. (2025, July 16). *Communities of practice: Professional learning for educators, by educators*. Childhood Education International.
<https://ceinternational1892.org/article/communities-of-practice/>
- Fracchiolla, C., Prefontaine, B., & Hinko, K. (2020). Community of practice approach for understanding identity development within informal physics programs. *Physical Review Physics Education Research*, 16, 020115.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.16.020115>
- González-Anta, B., Pérez de la Fuente, I., Zornoza, A. & Orengo, V. (2023). Building Sustainable Virtual Communities of Practice: A Study of the Antecedents of Intention to Continue Participating. *Sustainability*. 15, 15657. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115657>
- Herne, S. (2006). Communities of practice in art and design and museum and gallery education. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 14(1), 1–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681360500487512>
- Keune, A. & Peppler, K. (2019). Materials-to-develop-with: The making of a makerspace. *The British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(1), 280-293.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12702>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicolini, D., Pyrko, I., Omidvar, O., & Spanellis, A. (2022). Understanding communities of practice: Taking stock and moving forward. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 16(2).
<https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0330>
- Noble, K. (2021). 'Getting Hands On with Other Creative Minds': Establishing a Community of Practice around Primary Art and Design at the Art Museum. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 40 (3), 615-629. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jade.12371>
- Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms: Children, Computers and Powerful Ideas*. New York: Basic Books.
- Papert, S. (1992). *The Children's Machine: Rethinking School in the Age of the Computer*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc.
- Pyrko, I., Dörfler, V., & Eden, C. (2019). Communities of practice in landscapes of practice. *Management Learning*, 50(4), 482-499. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507619860854>
- Ramos, S. (2023, June 7). *Community of practice explained*. Management 3.0.
<https://management30.com/blog/community-of-practice-explained/>
- Sahay, A., Mittman, B. S., Gholami, P., Lin, S., & Heidenreich, P. A. (2022). How successful was the use of a community of practice for the implementation of evidence-based practices for heart failure within the United States Department of Veterans Affairs:

- Insights from a formative evaluation. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 20, 79.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-022-00880-9>
- Watson, R. (2024, February 4). *Participatory Arts as Community of Practice*. ArtWorks Alliance. <https://artworksalliance.uk/participatory-arts-as-community-of-practice/artworksalliance.uk>
- Wenger-Trayner, E., & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2014). *Learning in a landscape of practice: A framework*. In E. Wenger-Trayner, M. Fenton-O'Creevy, S. Hutchinson, C. Kubiak, & B. Wenger-Trayner (Eds.), *Learning in landscapes of practice: Boundaries, identity, and knowledgeability in practice-based learning* (1st ed., pp. 13–29). Routledge.
- Zhang, W., & Watts Sussman, S. (2008). *Online communities as communities of practice: A case study*. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 12(4), 55–71.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270810884255>

Appendix A

WP6: Creating CLiViE Communities of Practice

Introduction

As part of CLiViE's Work Package 6, each Partner will set up a national Community of Practice (CoP). These communities will bring together educators, artists, policymakers, researchers and practitioners to share, discuss and help develop creative approaches in arts-based education that can support young people's learning, development and social participation. The seven CoPs will be important spaces for exchange where partners can share insights from the CLiViE project, members can learn from each other, and the two CLiViE toolkits – one for Educators (led by TUM) and one for Policy-makers (led by SGH) - can be tested and refined. The CoPs will also provide a way to sustain CLiViE's work beyond the end of the project in 2027.

There is no 'one right model' for building a CoP, as this will be specific to each community and its members. However, Partners are encouraged to begin by identifying their CoP's objectives, scope, potential members, and the first practical and organizational steps to take. To help, we have provided a short checklist of actions below. A template will be shared in September 2025 for partners to record their plans for developing their CoPs, and the outcomes from this will be shared at the October 2025 CLiViE General Assembly.

All CLiViE Partners must ensure that the use of CoP members' data is ethical and transparent. This includes:

- Handling personal data in line with the **EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)**, relevant national laws and your institution's data policies.
- Only collecting the information you truly need (e.g. name, email and role).
- Being clear with CoP members about how and why their data will be used, and who it will be shared with. The information that must be given to members when providing their data is listed [here](#).
- Storing all data securely (password-protected files, institutional systems).
- Giving members the right to update or request deletion of their data at any time.

For further guidance, please see https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-topic/data-protection_en

Please feel free to reach out to TUM (harper.staples@tum.de) for any preliminary questions or clarifications.

CLiViE Communities of Practice: Starting Checklist

Purpose

- ☐ Define the main objectives of the CoP.
- ☐ Identify the benefits members will have from joining the CoP.
(e.g. *what skills, knowledge or experiences will members gain?*)
- ☐ Clarify the scope of the CoP.

People

- ☐ Decide who is responsible for leading the setup and coordinating the CoP, and make sure their roles and responsibilities are defined.
- ☐ Identify the membership group (who will be included/not included), and set a reasonable target number of members for the first 6-12 months.
- ☐ Ensure plans include both educators and policymakers/commissioners.
- ☐ Plan for inclusive CoP membership by identifying possible barriers to accessibility, and proposing solutions (e.g. *youth participation, accommodating diverse art and cultural forms*).

Practical Setup

- ☐ Decide on the CoP's approach to data handling and protection.
- ☐ Decide the process for how members will join the CoP (*open sign-up, via invitation or nomination?*)
- ☐ Explore communication and meeting platforms/tools to use.
- ☐ Plan ways for members to showcase their own work and practice within the CoP.
- ☐ Consider methods to encourage both collaborative and reflective work in the CoP.
- ☐ Identify practical barriers to CoP participation (e.g. *technology, travel*), and provide ideas for solutions.
- ☐ Select two or three simple ways to track CoP progress (e.g. *activities held, feedback from members collected*).
- ☐ Clarify expectations for minimum CoP member contributions and engagement (e.g. *attendance at meetings, contributions to discussions, sharing resources?*).

Communication, Outreach & Early Activities

- ☐ Identify any relevant events or networks for connecting with potential CoP members.
- ☐ Plan two or three achievable activities for the first 6-12 months.
- ☐ Prepare a short communication message about CLiViE and the CoP for potential members.

Connections to CLiViE Work

- ☐ Explore ideas for using the CLiViE pop-up exhibition and the project's 'Maps of Meaning' in the CoP's work.
- ☐ Include the CLiViE website in CoP plans as a tool for sharing and connecting with members.

CoP Sustainability (Early Thinking)

- ☐ Think about initial ideas for keeping the CoP active after CLiViE project funding has finished.
- ☐ Consider ways to measure the longer-term success of the CoP, beyond member participation (e.g. *recording impact on members' practice, the number of collaborations started.*

Appendix B



EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Anna Keune, Harper Staples
Contributor(s)	
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This template documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by
1	10/10/25	Adjusting phrasing of responses, including more specific examples	Anna Keune, Harper Staples



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Europe-wide
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	CLiViE partners plus trans-European organisations and networks working in arts-based education, SEL, culture, youth work and social inclusion (e.g., ENSEL, EYF, EUN)
Who is the lead partner?	TUM
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	Educators, artists, researchers, policymakers and young people, via the existing networks we connect with.
What are the main objectives of the COP?	Strengthen the work of national CoPs through transnational collaboration; critically examine the effects of arts-based education on young people; share best practices; refine innovative pedagogical approaches that promote social development and inclusion; act as a bridge across diverse European networks.
Describe the main learning outputs for the COP	A pan-European CoP; mapped relevant networks; joint events and knowledge-sharing activities; integration/pilots using the CLiViE toolkit; regular online meetings and documented exchanges of best practice.
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	Refined pedagogical approaches in arts-based education; improved cross-disciplinary understanding and practice across arts/SEL/youth/social inclusion; enhanced capacity of national CoPs via transnational exchange.
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	Stronger European community around arts-based education; amplified effects of national CoPs; progress toward young people's social development and inclusion through improved practice.
Describe the main features of the COP	Systematic linking with existing European networks; monthly online partner meetings; horizontal exchange between national CoPs.
How many people are you targeting?	TBD
Describe how the COP is being created and managed	Co-creation with CLiViE partners; identify and map relevant existing EU networks; select potential partners with shared values and

	complementary expertise; establish contact via existing connections/introductions; explore integration of the CLiViE toolkit and CoP structures; plan for contextual/institutional/resource differences; embed CLiViE in partners' activities through joint events, knowledge sharing and pilot projects; possibly bi-monthly online meetings enable collaboration and exchange.
Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created	The seven national CoPs are co-created with CLiViE partners; input from partners is actively sought for the pan-European strand and for selecting/integrating external networks.
Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	Existing European platforms, alliances and initiatives in arts education, youth development, SEL and social cohesion (examples: ENSEL, EYF, EUN)
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	Included: educators, artists, researchers, policymakers and young people across partner locations. Exclusions: not explicitly stated, we aim to be inclusive for all for whom work is relevant and interesting
Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	Anticipated differences in contexts, institutional priorities and resource constraints.
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP are being captured and stored	Shared meeting notes and/or recordings will be used to capture discussions and materials. We will store these securely at TUM until a time at which they can be shared via the CLiViE website
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders	We will connect with both target groups via identifying relevant existing networks that work with educators/artists and policy makers. A key focus of our work with the EU CoP will be to facilitate bridging opportunities between these two groups
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them	Pan-European approach naturally has implications to consider (geographical, linguistic, varying institutional policies, limited time and/or resources). As existing European networks already mitigate these issues, we will seek guidance as to how best to manage this work
Describe any challenges related to different art/cultural forms covered in the project	The diversity of art forms and educational traditions may require flexible frameworks for collaboration. The CoP will focus on shared principles (arts-based learning, inclusion, creativity) while respecting national and disciplinary diversity.
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project?	Position CLiViE as a bridge across sectors; integrates and shares the CLiViE toolkit via joint activities and pilots; will advertise any project

	activities within the CoP. The CoP should underpin and connect all project activities.
How will you measure the success of the COP?	Level of active participation and engagement. Quantity and quality of shared practices and resources. Feedback from participants. Evidence of adoption of new pedagogical approaches. Long-term continuation of networks and collaborations after the project.
How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	Advertise as a tool for engagement and dissemination within CoP activities, i.e. to showcase outcomes, stimulate dialogue, and connect practitioners across national CoPs.
How will you use the 'maps of meaning' from the case studies?	To inform CoP discussions, helping participants understand contextual differences and identify transferable insights for arts-based learning practices. We will also ask participants to create their own to show the CoP work as a living 'dossier'
How will you use the CLiViE website?	As the first point of contact/information when sharing information about CLiViE, central online hub for documentation, communication, resource sharing and public dissemination of CoP activities, events and outcomes
How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	To be determined as work progresses.
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	Bridging diverse networks and disciplines; aligning differing contexts and institutional priorities while ensuring mutual value.
Other comments	The model ensures both transnational (European-level) and horizontal (national CoP ↔ national CoP) exchange, with partners' active input and existing networks used to accelerate integration and visibility.



EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Marie Fulková, Lothar Rudorfer
Contributor(s)	Vendula Fremlová, Magdalena Novotná, Lucie Jakubcová, Pavla Gajdošíková
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract

This template documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by
	25.8.		Vendula Fremlová, Marie Fulková, Lucie Jakubcová, Magdalena Novotná

1	15. 9.		Marie Fulková
2	29. 9.	COPs negotiated, established with students, artists, communities, etc.	Marie Fulková
3	15. 10.		Lothar Rudorfer
4	16. 10.		Marie Fulková
5	17. 10.		Marie Fulková, Lothar Rudorfer, Michaela Kuřiková



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Czech Republic
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	The Department of Art Education at the Faculty of Education, Charles University (PedF UK) leads the COP development in collaboration with local educators, museum educators, NGOs, and independent artists.
Who is the lead partner?	Department of Art Education, PedF UK (Charles University)
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	<p>These include local art educators, student teachers, cultural organizations (e.g. galleries (state governed and independent/alternative, community art centres), and policy advisors in the area of arts education. Departments of Art education, Faculties of Education, faculties of Art and Design and curatorial studies: Masaryk University in Brno; Faculty of Art and Design, Jan Evangelista Purkyně in Ústí nad Labem; University of West Bohemia in Pilsen; University Hradec Králové; University of Ostrava, University of South Bohemia, Palacky University in Olomouc. UMPRUM Prague/Academy of Arts, Architecture & Design in Prague; Academy of Fine Arts in Prague.</p> <p>NGP – National Gallery Prague, Museum of Decorative Arts in Prague, CAMP Prague Institute of Planning and Development, Ales South</p>

	Bohemian Gallery, NZDM Mixér/Low threshold center, Předlice, Ústí nad Labem; Via Cordis /Society for the support of families with children with autism and other neurodevelopmental disorders; Společnost pro kreativitu ve vzdělávání/Association for creativity in education. ATLAS atelier (part of the NGP).
What are the main objectives of the COP?	To develop a sustainable community of practice around arts pedagogy and cultural literacy; to co-create new pedagogical tools and approaches that reflect the values of cultural literacies; and to bridge theory and practice through collaboration between academic staff, students, and external educators.
Describe the main learning outputs for the COP	Co-designed learning activities based on the “Maps of Meaning” framework; documented lesson plans and reflective journals from student teachers; visual outputs from workshops (e.g., participatory art pieces, mapping outcomes); and policy recommendation summaries.
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	Increased understanding of cultural literacy as a pedagogical, civil and democratic concept; improved skills in co-creation and participatory art-based learning; and stronger links between teacher training and real-world classroom practices. Learning social cohesion skills and improving self-awareness during art-based classes; a contribution to the development of creativity, respect for others, open thinking through an open art form. Application of emancipatory effects of art making and its reflection as parts of autonomous learning.
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	Empowered educators with a critical lens on culture and inclusion; integration of CLiViE methodologies in teacher training curricula; and a more connected and practice-informed academic environment for students and teachers.
Describe the main features of the COP	Hybrid format (in-person and online workshops and discussions); monthly meetups hosted at PedF UK; use of collaborative platforms (e.g., shared drives, discussion forums); and co-facilitation by university staff and external partners. Open and collaborative platforms for student teachers, artist and educational specialist.

	Spaces of meetings: ATLAS in the National gallery, local spots, schools. Circulating spots.
How many people are you targeting?	Approx. 80 - 90 active participants including educators, student teachers, artists, curators and cultural stakeholders. The number is increasingly and exponentially larger if we take into account all the local schools and municipalities that participate on educational art programmes and exhibitions with educational programmes.
Describe how the COP is being created and managed	The COP is led by PedF UK staff and co-managed with a rotating steering group of practitioners. It is shaped through workshops, participative planning meetings, and feedback loops. NGP has its own group that collaborates with our COP on regular basis, together we strive for maximal impact.
Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created	<p>If we consider COP as a community that has common interests, goals and shares a regular communication space, then co-creation is a basic form of work.</p> <p>The main aspects of co-creation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing new pedagogical tools and approaches that reflect the values of cultural literacies; Focusing on co-creation methods in arts pedagogy; Joint modeling of artistic and didactic structures; Linking artistic, curatorial and pedagogical work; Focusing on consistent application of open communication; Focusing on cultivating trust; Developing better communication of the social functions of art and culture literacies; Connecting the artistic and non-artistic segments of society. <p>Young people will participate equally in all these activities - especially through the workshops, gallery and museum creative mediation of art, studio work, school projects, low threshold centres activities, etc.</p> <p>Contact details will be shared via the Department of Art Education, which maintains the database of INSET and ongoing practice (The Resort of Practice) and the database of cooperating artists and educators.</p>

Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	<p>Network connections:</p> <p>1. Local, national:</p> <p>Educational and artistic networks for teacher and educator preparation (see part on other stakeholders), Gallery and museum networks, educational networks (e.g. Open, Partnersví pro vzdělávání 2030+/Partnership for Education 2030+), ARTAMA network etc.</p> <p>2. International:</p> <p>COP will connect to the existing cooperation with linguistically and culturally related countries, such as Slovakia or Slovenia and their sister institutions of education and culture. These collaborative liaisons have already been established (Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Education of Comenius University in Bratislava, City Gallery of Bratislava, University of Maribor).</p>
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	We see no reason to exclude anyone from the COP, except for demonstrably extremist groups. We put emphasis on inclusion and building trust between participants.
Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	Barriers could be characterized by economic and time inhibitions. We are currently not aware of any such among COP members.
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP are being captured and stored	<p>Contact details will be shared via the Department of Art Education, which maintains the database of INSET and ongoing practice (The Resort of Practice) and the database of cooperating artists and educators.</p> <p>Participants will be asked for their consent (or assent – for children not legally able to provide full informed consent, such as a child or an individual with limited capacity), and no personal information will be shared or disseminated without their consent (GDPR).</p> <p>The Department of art education will establish a secure, access-enabled repository. Only some edited parts will be published through the networks mentioned above and with the consent of the authors.</p>
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders	Educators will actively communicate and share their practical experience (meetings, informal groups, workshops). The second group is much more difficult to communicate and take a proactive approach. Experience from other projects shows that PMs are a variable component of projects and depend on their temporary

	<p>political or work placement. They will be invited to all events and meetings.</p> <p>Specific sessions on Toolkit/guide will be offered.</p>
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them	<p>We do not see a problem in terms of transport availability. Online meetings can be organized easily. As far as we know, no group of participants reports a connection or technical device problem. If necessary, we will take care of the technical equipment and help in organizing the meeting so that it takes place.</p>
Describe any challenges related to different art/cultural forms covered in the project	<p>The project primarily covers forms of visual and performative art (Visual Arts and Crafts), as well as Cultural and Natural Heritage, Performance and Celebration and Design and Creative Services. We do not deal with Tourism, Sports and Recreation forms. We deal with all mentioned forms at the level of artistic creation and at the level of education. Artistic creation (Studios, school and gallery workshops, low-threshold groups studios) is a regular part of all case study activities and their continuation. The only challenge is their sustainability in the future and their firm anchoring in the education system. This is a real problem considering the current revision of the educational system of the Czech Republic, the marginalization of cultural education and the imminent change in the political composition of the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Culture in the Czech Republic. We would call this a real risk.</p>
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project?	<p>Production of D2.2 toolkits, case study material, policy brief, website of the Department of Art Education linked with sites of collaborating institutions. Publications:</p> <p>V. Fremlova (Ed.) „Co všechno jsou Předlice“/What is Předlice Co-authors: Martina Kárová, Tereza Květoňová, Laura Hejtmánková. The book for teachers, children and educators was submitted to the PedF UK edition plan for 2026.</p> <p>M. Fulková (Ed.) Čtyři případy mluví pro výtvarnou výchovu/Four cases speak for Art Education. Co authors: Magdalena Novotná, Lucie Jakubcová, Jan Pfeiffer, Pavla Gajdošíková, Vendula Fremlová, Laura Hejtmánková. The book for teachers, children and educators was submitted to the pedf PedF UK edition plan for 2026.</p>

How will you measure the success of the COP?	<p>SROI, feedback in the community, feedback from the wider public</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>Innovation/pilot nature of the project (e.g. introduction of new ideas in the cultural institution or at school)</p> <p>Feedback/Questionnaires, reviews and comments from participants</p> <p>Necessity/Assessing whether the project responds to the real needs of the target group and the given location, as supported by data.</p> <p>Evidence-based reports.</p>
How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	<p>The pop-up exhibition will travel to the places where the case study took place. It will be an important event for participants, their families and their communities. It will be installed in the specific ATLAS creative space, the National Gallery, in an alternative low-threshold space in Predlice, in several schools, or in the UK campus.</p>
How will you use the 'maps of meaning' from the case studies?	<p>They will be included in the toolkit for educators, but they may also play an additional/illustrative role at a national level. They will be part of pop-up exhibitions. In addition, the maps will be made freely available as open-access materials via the PedF UK project website, supporting further use in teacher education, student research, and public outreach. This accessibility will allow educators across the Czech Republic (and potentially beyond) to adapt and implement the visual methodologies developed within the CLiViE project.</p>
How will you use the CLiViE website?	<p>Visual reports, photo-voice, short videos, perex, links to other websites will be produced and placed on the project website. They will serve as teaching material to students, the public and the community, as samples of good practice for policy-makers, etc. The website will also function as a living archive of COP activity, showcasing key outcomes, co-created content, and reflective documentation from national and international communities. As the project evolves, the website will integrate case studies, event summaries, and interactive tools (e.g. visual maps, feedback forms) to foster peer learning and cross-cultural exchange.</p> <p>After the project ends, the CLiViE website will remain a publicly accessible legacy platform, enabling continued use of open educational resources (OER), inspiring new initiatives in arts education and cultural literacy, and supporting future collaborations across Europe.</p>

How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	<p>Regarding sustainability, we rely on students - future teachers and cultural service.</p> <p>COP will continue as a sustainable network of educators, pedagogues, artists and cultural workers and the public. Considering the participation of current students, it can be assumed that COP will continue to operate in the future and will support communication, quality of cultural education and the exchange of good practice.</p>
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	<p>COP is a relatively challenging project - challenging not to establish, but to maintain. Its lively communication will require care and mutual support. We see the problem in the institutional background: socio-political and economic conditions are always reflected here.</p> <p>A fragmented society is now losing cohesion; it may happen that individual participants will give priority to personal interests and existential interests. Under this pressure, they will not be able to maintain a vibrant community on a volunteer basis. Another problem is the typical gender issue at the core of cultural and pedagogical projects. Culture and education are typical feminized areas with weak negotiating power. The gender and socio-economic background here is typically fluid and uncertain. Thus, it is not a matter of conceptual problems, but of political and economic problems.</p>
Other comments	Hold it till you make it! Otherwise N/A 😊

EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Kemal Ahson, Aino Aarnio
Contributor(s)	
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This template documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by
1.0	17 October 2025		



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Finland
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	University of Helsinki, YMCA
Who is the lead partner?	University of Helsinki
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	No
What are the main objectives of the COP?	To disseminate the main findings of the project covering D2.2 and share the two toolkits being created. In addition, to use it as a platform to encourage a greater appreciation of arts-based education and cultural activities.
Describe the main learning outputs for the COP	Workshops and networking events with educators and commissioners. We are also planning on two national events on 2 December 2025 and 14 April 2026 targeting the range of stakeholders working in arts-based education and cultural activities.
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	Raising awareness of ToC, SROI and how to value arts-based education and cultural activities. In addition, to ensure that funders understand the value of what is being delivered.
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	Greater commitment towards arts-based education at a national level and an ability for educators to make a business case for funding. In addition, to recognise the importance of non-formal spaces for supporting the arts and cultural activities. Critically, it is very easy to lose sight of the rationale of the CLiViE project – namely to address issues of social exclusion and improve and enhance tolerance. Here we believe it is important to go beyond the straightjacket of thinking of cultural literacies only in terms of didactics and pedagogy.
Describe the main features of the COP	Network, clusters and information sharing
How many people are you targeting?	500

Describe how the COP is being created and managed	Currently database of key contacts (from public sources) being created. In addition, developing list of events to piggyback on.
Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created	At this stage it is with key stakeholders. However, once we start delivering activities we will endeavour to co-create aspects as this will be essential for ensuring the value and sustainability of the COP. We also want to think about engaging with stakeholders that tackle some of the wider issues around equality and inclusion.
Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	Building on teacher training initiatives at the University of Helsinki., and the cultural support staff of the YMCA. Also links with national art educating organisations, such as Annantalo which is a building in the centre of Helsinki dedicated to art education and children's culture.
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	At this stage it is <i>ad hoc</i> and the focus is on trying to identify relevant stakeholders. We are also trying to be sensitive to different art and cultural forms although at this stage we are unsure how we will enforce this.
Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	Geography. There is recognition that the majority of our focus is going to be on the Uusimaa (Helsinki-Espoo-Vantaa) area. However, we are also seeking to deliver training and information events in Lapland. In addition, there is a danger that non-formal stakeholders get drowned out by formal stakeholders and spaces, such as schools. There also is some recognition of the barriers of language around SROI and that contextual many people are not used to this discussion in Finland.
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP are being captured and stored	Information is being stored in Excel. This will also highlight conversations and networks. More detailed understanding of how we will use this has yet to be decided.
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders	Use two separate databases. The educators will be the primary focus of our work. However, we do not want to lose sight of the work we need to do with commissioners and funders.
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them	As mentioned above Uusimaa (Helsinki-Espoo-Vantaa). However, there is also the issue of the spatial significance of equality and inclusion.
Describe any challenges related to different	Given we are initially taking a scattergun approach to building a database we recognise that there will be gaps. However, we will cross reference with UNESCO categories we have used in the

art/cultural forms covered in the project	proposal and identify and address any areas where there is not adequate coverage.
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project?	It is the main dissemination arm of the project. It will also link to the Professional Development Programme for educators. The role of the pop-up exhibition may also play a role, especially working with wider groups of stakeholders and to ensure we work across formal and in/non formal education spaces. However, it is not an end in itself and should be integrated into other networks to encourage positive change.
How will you measure the success of the COP?	Number of participants as a starting point. But also think about the learning outputs. Importantly, the creation of the COP is not an end in itself.
How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	See above
How will you use the 'maps of meaning' from the case studies?	These will be included as part of the national tailoring of the PDP. They can also act a tool to raise awareness of some of the deeper issues in the project, namely to address social exclusion and promote tolerance.
How will you use the CLiViE website?	For signposting materials and generate interest.
How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	At this stage there are no obvious ways in which it will be maintained. There is some commitment from the university to carry the work on
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	COPs are one of many types of learning networks and have a distinctly US corporate feel to them. Other frameworks, such as PLCs also need to be considered.
Other comments	This is work in progress.



EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Anna Keune, Harper Staples
Contributor(s)	
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This template documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Germany
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	TUM CLiViE Team
Who is the lead partner?	TUM
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	TUM Department of Educational Technologies – Research Deutsches Museum - Facilitators/Practitioners TUM HPF (Thinktank) - Policy
What are the main objectives of the COP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To promote and embed arts-based learning approaches within formal and non-formal education in 1. Munich and 2. Germany. ● To create a channel of exchange to trial and refine the toolkit. ● To create a professional learning community where educators share practice, reflect, and co-develop new pedagogies. ● To connect policy makers and practitioners, ensuring that creative education is recognized in educational policy. ● To sustain and expand the outcomes of the CLiViE project beyond its formal funding period.
Describe the main learning outputs for the COP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A series of seminars and peer-learning sessions. ● Additional reflection/use of shared resource material [toolkit] and examples of the work in practice [below] ● Documented case studies showcasing more examples of creative practice in schools and community settings.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recorded online discussions or transcripts that could be made available via the toolkit website
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants develop greater confidence in using creative and arts-based methods in their teaching or facilitation. Increased collaboration between educators and artists. A shared understanding of how creative practices support inclusion, wellbeing, and engagement for young people in the local and national context. Supporting the emergence of new cross-sector partnerships between education and culture.
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhanced quality and creativity of teaching and learning. Policy recognition of the importance of arts-based learning. Sustained professional networks that continue to innovate after the project. Empowerment of educators and young people to co-create learning experiences.
Describe the main features of the COP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-person and online gatherings (TUM Thinktank/Department of Educational Technologies) Mentoring and peer exchange opportunities. Newsletter or other means of exchange for connection
How many people are you targeting?	Initially 20 active members, with wider reach through online engagement and events.
Describe how the COP is being created and managed	The TUM CLiViE team is leading the creation and management of the COP, providing overall coordination, facilitation and strategic direction in the early stages (months 1 -12). We will then review as to how we can sustain momentum without active input ongoing.
Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created	We will connect with the partners and stakeholders mentioned above (Deutsches Museum, TUM HpF etc), to gather their insights and ideas about the direction and priorities of the COP. Feedback will be sought from members in an iterative and participatory way, ensuring that their perspectives are fully integrated into the evolving structure and activities of the community.
Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	<p>We plan to engage with some existing networks to support this work, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LMU arts education teacher training course BKJ - Bundesvereinigung Kulturelle Kinder- und Jugendbildung e. V.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youthbridge Munich
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	<p>Included: educators, youth workers, artists, policy makers, researchers, and cultural institutions.</p> <p>Excluded: there are no formal exclusions, but participation may be limited by language (German/English) or access to digital tools.</p>
Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	<p>Limited time and workload of educators.</p> <p>Digital access or regional disparities in infrastructure.</p> <p>Funding for travel or materials for any in-person sessions.</p> <p>Institutional barriers where creative learning is undervalued.</p>
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP are being captured and stored	<p>Documentation will maintained through meeting notes, shared drives, video recordings, and shared reflections (especially for the toolkit). We will use our TUM secure drive to store and share these documents</p>
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Practitioners (teachers, educators, artists): Supported through opportunities for exchange with peers and practical workshops/meetings. 2. Policy makers and institutional leaders: Engaged through policy dialogues and evidence-based briefings, for example (D2.2).
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them	<p>Germany's federal structure means education policy varies regionally. We will work with national networks (i.e. BKJ) to mitigate this.</p>
Describe any challenges related to different art/cultural forms covered in the project	<p>We will embrace interdisciplinarity, encouraging cross-art-form learning while recognizing the expertise within each discipline.</p>
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project?	<p>It will serve as the professional learning and dissemination of the CLiViE toolkit. We will encourage members to engage with other outputs from CLiViE as and when possible (i.e. the pop up exhibition)</p>
How will you measure the success of the COP?	<p>Participant feedback and reflections</p> <p>Number and diversity of active participants</p> <p>Quality and quantity of shared resources and collaborations</p>

How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	We will reflect on this ongoing as the CoP develops
How will you use the 'maps of meaning' from the case studies?	We will share these as an important learning resource, and encourage members to also do the same with their learners. We could also integrate creating our own emotional cartographies in CoP meetings.
How will you use the CLiViE website?	TBD – currently, as the hub for storing the toolkit.
How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	We will reflect on this question ongoing
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	Balancing openness and focus, ensuring diversity without losing coherence. Managing differing expectations between artists, educators, and policy makers.
Other comments	



EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Silvia Tarassi, Zenia Simonella, Barbara Pizzetti, Ilenya Camozzi
Contributor(s)	
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	17 October 2025
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This template documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by
1	17 October 2025		



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Italy
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Universities and Researches (eg. CIT Centro Iniziative Teatrali "Mario Apollonio" - Università Cattolica di Milano, Officine Creative - Università di Pavia, Università Roma Tre -Hip-hop Education Programme, Università di Cagliari) Schools (eg. Istituto Comprensivo Statale Francesco Cappelli in Milan). Cultural organizations as selected museums (e.g. MUDEC), libraries, and social cooperatives (eg. Alchemilla, FormattArt, Spazio Pontano, Milano Mediterraneo).
Who is the lead partner?	The CoP will be coordinated by representatives of the CLiViE project (Università degli Studi Milano Bicocca, in collaboration with other Italian universities and cultural and educational organizations). Coordination will ensure the alignment between research, practice, and policy engagement.
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public bodies and policy makers (eg. Comune di Milano) Funders and Philanthropic organizations (eg. Fondazione per il sud or Fondazione Cariplo) Young people involved in arts-based education initiatives

	(eg. young people involved in Rap workshop of FormattArt)
What are the main objectives of the COP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Analyze best practices to construct a CoP for arts-based education following the already established Italian CoP model for digital transition in schools, which is regulated by law (D.M. 66/2023) as a community of teachers and schools who collaborate to share best practices to develop digital skills in schools. ● Share and discuss the findings of the CLiViE project, including case studies and policy mapping. ● Consolidate and disseminate best practices in arts-based education across different sectors and populations (youth, adult learning, second generation, disability, migration, prisons, mental health). ● Create structured dialogue and collaboration between educators, cultural operators, policymakers, and funders, reducing the fragmented landscape of operators and organizations working in the educational and cultural field. ● Strengthen advocacy and recognition of arts-based education as a key educational mean for social inclusion and holistic learning.
Describe the main learning outputs for the COP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● n. Workshop ● n. meeting ● online platform
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sharing information ● Sharing best practices ● Training arts-based educators
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	<p>Increased collaboration and network among schools, organizations and educators</p> <p>Increased in the recognition and adoption of arts-based education</p> <p>Increased professionalization of educators</p>
Describe the main features of the COP ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Initially at local or national (in Italy) but in view of building European collaboration among the other CLiViE partners. The CoP will first gather pioneer institutions, associations, schools and educators with established experience in arts-

¹ Think in practical terms, such as a database, newsletter, workshops. Also remember that the COP will be the main delivery vehicle for D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative developed and implemented). Also consider the different art and cultural forms you will be working with.

	<p>based education, later expanding to include emerging actors and educators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
How many people are you targeting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10-15
Describe how the COP is being created and managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1: Invitation of recognized pioneer institutions. Phase 2: Open applications through the CLiViE platform, with peer nomination options. •
Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The COP will be created through a participation process involving in its creations all stakeholders and organizations.
Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no networks already established in the field of arts-based education apart from those in the digital education
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of organizations will come from major cities. • Especially among the initial pioneers only those already working on arts-based education will be included
Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrier: Travel costs. Solution: Hybrid meeting formats through online workspace. • Barrier: Missing communication. Solution: Hybrid meeting formats through online workspace. • Barrier: Technological gaps. Solution: Training sessions and shared digital resources.
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP are being captured and stored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online workspace for regular exchanges. • Periodic updates via the CLiViE website. • Dedicated CoP webpage in CLiViE platform.
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initially they will be divided and then they will share their needs and will confront each other
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them	Travel costs in joining the Cop meetings

² Also think about if young people will be involved.

Describe any challenges related to different art/cultural forms covered in the project	Each art sector will have different education models, funding schemes, and organizational structures.
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project?	In the COP the results of the CLiViE project will be presented
How will you measure the success of the COP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 project created by organizations knowing each other through the Cop • Activities being organized through the Cop
How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CLiViE pop-up exhibition will be present in during member activities or training sessions
How will you use the 'maps of meaning' from the case studies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Maps of Meaning will serve as resources for reflection and training within the CoP.
How will you use the CLiViE website?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CLiViE website will host a dedicated CoP section, acting as a repository for events, publications, and collaborative tools.
How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased recognition and adoption of arts-based education. • Evidence of collaboration between operations and organizations working in arts-based education
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	Italian cultural and educational organisations generally find it difficult to collaborate with public bodies.
Other comments	



EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Alnis Stakle, Ilva Skulte
Contributor(s)	Alīna Romanovska, Ingmars Kreišmanis
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	17.10.2025
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract

This documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

This deliverable documents the comprehensive design and implementation plan for Latvia's national Community of Practice (COP), developed under Work Package 6 of the CLiViE project. The Latvia COP acts as a collaborative platform that unites educators, policymakers, cultural sector workers, researchers, and young people to enhance cultural literacy education and foster social cohesion.

The COP aims to engage 30 active core members in its first year, with an extended reach to hundreds of arts and culture professionals across Latvia's eight UNESCO cultural domains. Its main objectives include spreading and testing CLiViE's educator and commissioner toolkits, establishing a shared understanding of cultural literacies as adaptable and context-dependent practices, promoting cultural resilience among young people, building capacity across various cultural domains, and creating a self-sustaining network that extends beyond 2027.

Delivery mechanisms comprise a podcast series addressing current challenges in arts education, a digital platform hosted on Riga Stradiņš University's website, quarterly newsletters, and an annual conference. The COP integrates multiple CLiViE components, including Maps of Meaning methodology, Theory of Change and SROI frameworks, case study findings, and a pop-up exhibition.

Co-creation is central to this approach, especially regarding youth participation in developing indicators and Maps of Meaning. The document discusses key challenges such as urban-rural disparities, power dynamics among stakeholder groups, breadth across cultural domains, and sustainability planning. Success will be assessed through quantitative metrics, qualitative indicators, and impact measures aligned with UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education framework, with a particular focus on socio-emotional learning outcomes.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by
1	15.10.2025		Alnis Stakle



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Latvia
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	Riga Stradiņš University, Daugavpils University

Who is the lead partner?	Riga Stradiņš University
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	No.
What are the main objectives of the COP?	<p>Dissemination and Testing: To share key findings from the CLiViE project and offer a collaborative space for testing and refining the two CLiViE toolkits.</p> <p>Cultural Literacy Learning: To establish a lasting forum where stakeholders can develop a shared understanding of cultural literacy as more than just knowledge—serving as a means to encode and unravel fixed meanings, identities, and boundaries. The CoP will acknowledge that young people possess multiple, fluid cultural literacies that can be contradictory depending on context and time.</p> <p>Cultural Resilience: To promote cultural resilience by moving beyond merely conserving the past to supporting young people's agency in shaping their futures. This includes addressing how digitalisation is transforming cultural literacy practices and what it means to be tolerant in the digital age.</p> <p>Capacity Building: To improve members' skills across the eight UNESCO cultural domains (Cultural and Natural Heritage, Performance and Celebration, Visual Arts and Crafts, Books and Press, Audio-visual Media, Design and Creative Services, Tourism, and Sports and Recreation), paying particular attention to how different art forms may uniquely impact diverse young people.</p> <p>Sustainability and Impact: To create a self-sustaining network that extends beyond 2027, embedding arts-based education within both formal and informal learning environments, and fostering social cohesion through evidence-based practices grounded in Social Return on Investment (SROI) methodology.</p>
Describe the main learning outputs for the COP	<p>Contextualised toolkits: Latvian-adapted versions of both educator and commissioner toolkits with locally relevant case studies, demonstrating application across diverse cultural domains and learning environments (formal/informal).</p> <p>Maps of Meaning: Adaptations and local examples of the CLiViE 'maps of meaning' methodology, documenting emotional cartography and the felt geography of cultural literacies in Latvian contexts.</p> <p>Quarterly newsletters featuring member contributions and practical resources organised by cultural domain.</p>

	<p>Art education conference materials demonstrating arts-based pedagogies that support socio-emotional learning.</p> <p>Podcast, video recordings, and written materials summaries.</p> <p>Evidence-based policy recommendations addressing systemic barriers, informed by the Theory of Change methodology.</p> <p>Co-created impact indicators and SROI frameworks developed with young people following the principle of 'measuring what matters.'</p>
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	<p>Through active participation, members will achieve learning outcomes aligned with UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education framework, focusing particularly on the socio-emotional domain:</p> <p>Cognitive Domain:</p> <p>Develop a deeper understanding of cultural literacies as fluid, context-dependent practices rather than fixed knowledge sets.</p> <p>Gain knowledge of evidence-based approaches across the eight UNESCO cultural domains.</p> <p>Understand the Theory of Change and SROI methodologies for evaluating arts-based education.</p> <p>Socio-Emotional Domain (Primary Focus):</p> <p>Experience a sense of belonging to a common humanity while respecting diverse cultural identities.</p> <p>Develop attitudes of empathy, solidarity, and respect for differences across age groups (ISCED 2: ages 10-13; ISCED 3: ages 15-18).</p> <p>Cultivate and manage multiple identities, relationships, and feelings of belonging.</p> <p>Build emotional resilience and positive attitudes towards cultural diversity.</p> <p>Behavioural Domain:</p> <p>Acquire practical skills in implementing arts-based pedagogies that support young people's creativity, critical thinking, and social engagement.</p> <p>Build capacity to navigate spatial dimensions of learning (formal/informal environments, digital/physical spaces).</p> <p>Develop reflective practice skills using arts-based research methods.</p> <p>Establish collaborative partnerships across educational sectors and cultural domains.</p> <p>Advocate effectively for policy changes supporting inclusive, culturally responsive arts education.</p>
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	<p>The CoP aims to deliver broader impacts aligned with CLiViE's goal of fostering social cohesion through cultural literacy:</p>

	<p>Improved social cohesion and tolerance: Enhances the quality and consistency of arts education across Latvia, with tangible effects on young people's sense of belonging, empathy, and respect for diversity.</p> <p>Cultural resilience: Equips young people to better navigate their evolving social reality and to envision improved 'imagined futures' through exposure to diverse perspectives and participatory creative practices.</p> <p>Reduced geographical disparities: Enhances access to quality arts education in underserved regions, addressing Latvia's urban-rural divide.</p> <p>Evidence-based policy influence: Increases recognition among policymakers of the measurable value of arts education through SROI methodology, leading to stronger policy support and resource allocation.</p> <p>Cross-sector collaboration: Breaks down silos between formal and informal education sectors, fostering more holistic learning ecosystems.</p> <p>Digital inclusion: Deepens understanding of how digitalisation transforms cultural literacy practices and redefines tolerance in the digital age.</p> <p>Youth agency: Empowers young people to act as co-researchers and co-creators in defining and assessing what matters in arts education.</p> <p>Sustainable innovation: Embeds culturally responsive, evidence-based arts education practices for the long term, extending beyond project funding periods.</p>
Describe the main features of the COP	<p>The Latvia CoP integrates multiple delivery mechanisms to support diverse learning needs and contexts:</p> <p>Podcast Series for Arts and Culture Sector Workers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Funding changes for arts and culture education in times when military and internal security issues are prioritised socially and politically. 2. Interdisciplinarity in arts and culture education and the integration of arts and culture education ideas and methods in the development of other sectors. Cultural studies and arts ideas and teaching methods in STEM and life sciences. 3. Sensitive and taboo topics in arts education (gender issues, sexuality). Art and culture for aesthetic consumption vs art and culture as socially active phenomena, strengthening democratization processes and the rule of law.

	<p>4. History rewriting issues in arts education and cultural education. Colonial, postcolonial, and decolonial matters in the development of artistic and arts history in civic democratic societies.</p> <p>5. Cultural journalism poses challenges to the audience and sustainability risks.</p> <p>6. Photography and cinema are among the most widely consumed forms of visual culture. However, is it sufficiently explored and included in general education?</p> <p>7. A podcast for secondary school-aged youth, aged 16–18, focusing on art and cultural content priorities in their daily lives.</p> <p>Digital Platform Infrastructure: Dedicated section on Riga Stradiņš University website featuring discussion recordings, podcast series, conference materials, and online lectures for art and culture educators.</p> <p>Quarterly information letter to network members</p> <p>Conference on contemporary states of Art Education: Bringing together educators and policymakers/commissioners to discuss evidence from SROI analysis, address systemic barriers, and develop evidence-based recommendations. Explicit focus on managing power dynamics between stakeholder groups.</p>
How many people are you targeting?	<p>We aim to have 30 active members (academy administrators and educators, museum directors, school administrators, cultural organisation leaders, local government representatives) in the first year (by October 2026). Still, most of our network members are directors or department heads at various art and cultural institutions. Some institutions, such as academies, employ more than one hundred staff members, which will help disseminate information about project outcomes and activities to many hundreds of people involved in Latvia's culture and creative sector. We strive for geographical diversity with representatives from regions outside Riga. Within the educator group, we seek balanced representation across the eight UNESCO cultural domains, recognising that traditional arts might be over-represented compared to emerging forms.</p>
Describe how the COP is being created and managed	<p>Before creating the member information database, consultations with the Ethics Committee were conducted. Member information is stored in a secure, GDPR-compliant database accessible only to Riga Stradiņš University and Daugavpils University project team members. All members complete consent forms detailing data use, with</p>

	<p>particular attention to protecting young people's data. Members can request removal at any time.</p> <p>RSU team members remain in contact with COP. The exchange of information and updates to COP is organised by the RSU project team, which has previously agreed collectively on whether the changes and updates align with the COP vision and sustainability.</p>
Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created	<p>Co-creation is central to our approach, reflecting CLiViE's principle that those being assessed should have a voice in shaping categories and measurements:</p> <p>Activity Design and Development: Iterative adjustments based on member feedback about what works in their particular contexts.</p> <p>Youth Participation (Article 13, Convention on the Rights of the Child): Young people as co-researchers in developing 'maps of meaning' using emotional cartography. Youth involvement in co-creating indicators for measuring what matters, ensuring their voices influence how success is defined.</p> <p>Resource Development: Peer review system ensuring quality while maintaining diverse perspectives. Collaborative development of Latvia-specific 'maps of meaning' illustrating cultural literacies within local contexts.</p> <p>Toolkit Adaptation and Testing: Both educator and commissioner toolkits were tested and refined through iterative feedback cycles. Members identifying which UNESCO GCE framework elements are most relevant to Latvian contexts. Co-creating contextual adaptations to ensure materials work across diverse cultural domains and educational settings.</p> <p>Policy Recommendations: Incorporation of diverse stakeholder voices (educators, policymakers, artists, young people). Grounding recommendations in SROI evidence co-created with young people.</p> <p>Measuring What Matters: Co-creation of indicators with young people, recognising that measurement processes reflect power relations.</p>

	<p>Development of proxies for SROI calculations that members find meaningful and authentic.</p> <p>Balancing advocacy, monitoring, and social science research within the evaluation framework.</p>
Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	COP includes members from various academic networks, cultural sector networks, art education networks and NGOs.
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	<p>Inclusion Criteria (Intentionally Broad):</p> <p>We welcome: educators and administrators working in both formal and informal settings working across UNESCO cultural domains; policymakers and commissioners at local and national levels; researchers exploring cultural literacy, arts education, or social cohesion; artists operating within educational contexts; staff of cultural organisations; school administrators; young people aged 16+ interested in arts education; and anyone genuinely interested in promoting cultural literacy for social cohesion.</p> <p>Intentional Boundaries (With Rationale):</p> <p>Youth participation age limit (16+).</p> <p>Power and Positionality Considerations:</p> <p>We recognise decisions on inclusion/exclusion reflect power relations. Educators and policymakers sit differently within educational hierarchies, requiring careful facilitation so educators feel safe sharing their challenges. Likewise, young people's participation must be meaningful, not tokenistic. The CoP will address power dynamics through facilitation training and reflection on speaking, hearing, and valuing knowledge.</p>
Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	<p>Time Constraints:</p> <p>Teachers and practitioners face limited time during school terms. Solutions include scheduling activities during holidays, offering online options, and recording sessions for asynchronous access.</p> <p>Digital Access and Literacy:</p> <p>Digital access, information, and media literacy basics are required to participate and engage with networks and shared content.</p> <p>Language:</p> <p>Latvian is the primary language, but some content is in English.</p> <p>Institutional Support:</p> <p>Some lack employer backing and view arts education as peripheral.</p>

	<p>Solutions include issuing certificates, engaging school leaders, demonstrating professional benefits through SROI, and advocating for release time.</p>
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP are being captured and stored	<p>Our documentation strategy balances comprehensive recording with GDPR compliance, recognising that documentation processes themselves reflect core values:</p> <p>Meeting Documentation:</p> <p>Meeting minutes stored in shared SharePoint organised by date, theme (cultural domain, ISCED level, formal/informal).</p> <p>Video recordings of online sessions, podcasts, conferences and discussions.</p> <p>Photos of activities (with consent), including formal presentations and informal interactions, organised by event and date.</p> <p>Digital Platform Content:</p> <p>Archived discussions, conference content, and podcasts are searchable by cultural domain.</p> <p>Activity logs track member contributions and engagement patterns across CoP spaces.</p> <p>Arts-Based Documentation:</p> <p>Visual documentation of arts-based practices used in research and advocacy.</p> <p>Meaning maps created by CoP members and youth, with notes</p> <p>Documentation of both products (artefacts) and processes (creation methods).</p> <p>Data Protection and Ethics:</p> <p>All documentation complies with GDPR. Members consent to specific data uses, with added safeguards for young people's info. Members can request removal anytime. We acknowledge that documenting processes reflect power dynamics, so we strive for transparency and democratisation.</p> <p>Accessibility and Sharing:</p> <p>Documentation is organised to support different user needs, such as practitioners browsing by cultural domain, policymakers accessing SROI evidence, and researchers examining methodologies. Clear organisation and search functionality balance thoroughness with usability.</p>
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders	<p>Shared Activities (Building Common Ground):</p> <p>Public and remote discussion about art and culture education</p>

	<p>Conference showcasing educator innovations and young people's maps of meaning to policymakers.</p> <p>Podcast series.</p> <p>Online lectures for Art and Culture educators.</p> <p>Policymaker Activities:</p> <p>Evidence briefings on SROI, Theory of Change, and impact data across cultural domains.</p> <p>Policy dialogues on systemic barriers found via spatial analysis of learning environments.</p> <p>Visits to arts education programs demonstrating impacts.</p> <p>Engagement with young people's maps of meaning as learning evidence.</p> <p>Managing Power Dynamics:</p> <p>We acknowledge power asymmetries between educators and policymakers. Strategies include:</p> <p>Creating separate spaces for educators to share challenges without hierarchical observers.</p> <p>Providing facilitation training to ensure joint sessions foster genuine dialogue.</p> <p>Recognising young people's voices as legitimate expertise, not just stakeholder input.</p> <p>Regularly reflecting on who speaks, is heard, and whose knowledge is valued in CoP spaces.</p> <p>Using SROI evidence to support educator advocacy rather than impose top-down accountability.</p> <p>Communication Strategy:</p> <p>Newsletter sections tailored to each group's interests (pedagogical strategies vs. policy implications) while maintaining shared content on co-created impacts.</p> <p>Different framings of the same evidence (classroom applications vs. system-level implications) without distorting findings.</p> <p>Regular check-ins with representatives from each group to ensure needs are met and power dynamics remain balanced.</p>
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them	<p>Latvia's geography and spatial dynamics present specific challenges requiring a nuanced understanding of space as socially constructed:</p> <p>Urban-Rural Divide: Riga dominates Latvia's cultural and educational scene, creating resource hubs and marginalization. To address this, we alternate major workshops between Riga and Daugavpils, sometimes hosting in smaller towns like Liepāja and Jelgava, and establish</p>

	<p>regional hubs with local coordinators for smaller meetups. Some learning spaces are more accessible than others.</p> <p>Travel Logistics and Accessibility: Long distances and limited rural transport hinder participation. Solutions include travel subsidies, shared transport from key locations, same-day return schedules, and strong online options that treat digital space as a legitimate learning environment.</p> <p>Digital Infrastructure and Space: Internet connectivity varies, but most cities and schools in rural Latvia have good internet speeds.</p> <p>Formal/Informal Learning Spaces: Border crossings between formal (schools) and informal (community centres, museums) learning environments require explicit attention. Some practices work well in one space but not another. We document how spatial context affects the effectiveness of arts-based education, recognising space as a realm of practice rather than a static container.</p> <p>Scale Balance (Local/Regional/National): We operate across multiple scales: national-level activities foster cohesion and share Latvia-wide insights; regional activities focus on specific geographic contexts; local activities minimise travel requirements and acknowledge place-specific meanings. Working groups can function at any scale depending on their focus. Maps of meaning will illustrate how cultural literacies manifest differently across these scales.</p> <p>Spatial Justice Considerations: We recognise that some learning environments foster social cohesion more effectively than others, and this can be influenced by geographic and emotional factors. Instead of assuming all spaces are equally neutral, we explore the power and purpose embedded in various locations. CoP activities strive to transform spaces rather than merely occupy them, viewing space as a 'verb' rather than a 'noun.'</p>
Describe any challenges related to different art/cultural forms covered in the project	<p>The CLiViE project's wide scope across UNESCO's eight cultural domains offers both opportunities and challenges:</p> <p>Breadth vs. Depth Challenge:</p> <p>Covering diverse cultural and creative fields is ambitious. Strategies include ensuring diverse CoP members, domain-specific groups, rotating themes, and exploring intersections like digital media transforming heritage.</p> <p>Unequal Resources:</p> <p>Latvia supports traditional arts more than emerging forms like digital media. Solutions involve showcasing low-resource approaches,</p>

	<p>partnering for support, advocating fair resource distribution, and documenting impacts on youth.</p> <p>Expertise Gaps:</p> <p>Not all educators are familiar with every domain. Solutions include peer learning, guest experts, accessible resources, encouraging experimentation, and viewing diverse forms as strengths.</p> <p>Cultural Context:</p> <p>Latvian cultural forms hold specific importance, but some are universally understood. We aim to balance celebrating Latvian heritage with openness to modern and diverse forms, recognising youth as consumers and producers.</p> <p>Effects on Youth:</p> <p>Art impacts vary by gender, age, background, and ability. Documenting these through analysis guides targeted, equitable approaches.</p> <p>Digital Transformation:</p> <p>Digital media is transforming engagement across all cultural domains- heritage, performances, and social interactions- requiring a redefinition of cultural literacy and tolerance.</p> <p>Avoiding Homogenisation:</p> <p>Arts have different mechanisms and outcomes. Using UNESCO frameworks and analysis, we focus on specificities and shared principles to understand what works, for whom, in which contexts.</p>
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project?	<p>Toolkits (D6.2 & D5.4) - PRACTICE:</p> <p>The CoP serves as the primary testing ground for both the educator toolkit (TUM-led, D6.2) and the commissioner toolkit (SGH-led, D5.4). Members provide iterative feedback on their applicability across UNESCO cultural domains, ISCED levels, and both formal and informal contexts. They pilot toolkit activities, contribute case studies, and ensure the materials are suitable for diverse Latvian settings. Testing assesses whether these tools effectively support socio-emotional learning outcomes outlined in the UNESCO GCE framework.</p> <p>Case Studies (D2.2) and Maps of Meaning (D4.2) - MAP & EVALUATE:</p> <p>Findings from CLiViE's 28 case studies, including 'Maps of Meaning' created through emotional cartography, are shared and discussed within the CoP. These illustrate how cultural literacies develop over space and time in various contexts (formal/informal, physical/digital, across ISCED levels). The CoP may develop Latvia-specific maps of meaning, documenting the felt geography of cultural literacies.</p>

	<p>Members learn the methodology for creating maps with young people.</p> <p>Theory of Change and SROI (D1.3, D1.4, D5.2) - VALUE:</p> <p>Discussions within the CoP inform the development of policy recommendations grounded in ToC methodology and SROI evidence. Policymaker members offer insights on feasibility and implementation. Members learn to apply ToC thinking to their practice, understanding relationships between inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. The co-creation of indicators with young people exemplifies the 'measuring what matters' approach, acknowledging that quantification reflects power relations.</p> <p>Policy Briefs and Reports (D2.4, D2.5):</p> <p>Discussions within the CoP contribute to policy analysis, with policymaker members testing the feasibility of recommendations. Evidence from Latvian CoP experiences informs European-level policy synthesis, examining synergies and funding mechanisms.</p> <p>CLiViE Website:</p> <p>The website hosts the CoP's digital platform, resource library organised according to the UNESCO Framework, and member profiles. It connects Latvia's CoP with similar CoPs in other countries, enabling cross-national learning about different contexts, policy environments, and cultural priorities.</p> <p>Pop-up Exhibition (D7.3):</p> <p>Exhibition tours at CoP events act both as dissemination tools and prompts for reflection on arts education impacts. Members document how young people and educators engage with the exhibition, capturing insights about elements that resonate. It represents embodied, spatial engagement with cultural literacy concepts.</p> <p>Cross-Border Initiative (D6.3):</p> <p>The CoP serves as the primary vehicle for Latvia's contribution to the cross-border cultural literacies initiative, facilitating exchanges with other national CoPs. This addresses how cultural literacy practices travel (or not) across borders and explores the meaning of 'common humanity' while respecting diversity.</p> <p>Literature Review and Conceptual Framework (D1.1):</p> <p>The CoP operationalises key concepts from CLiViE's conceptual framework: viewing cultural literacies as fluid rather than fixed; recognising multiple literacies among young people; understanding the space and time dimensions of learning; applying arts-based</p>
--	---

	practices as both research and advocacy tools; fostering cultural resilience; and adopting co-creation approaches that democratise measurement.
How will you measure the success of the COP?	<p>We measure success using multiple indicators guided by CLiViE's 'measuring what matters' approach, recognising that measurement reflects values and power relations:</p> <p>Quantitative Metrics (Monitoring):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership numbers and retention rates (target: 50% year-over-year retention) • Participation rates in activities (target: 50% average attendance) • Geographic distribution (target: 30% from outside Riga) • Representation across UNESCO cultural domains and ISCED levels • Usage of resource library (downloads, views) by domain and toolkit • Number of collaborative projects or partnerships initiated • Website engagement metrics <p>Qualitative Indicators (Social Science):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual reflection interviews exploring changes in practice, understanding of cultural literacy, and attitudes towards diversity • Case studies documenting how CoP participation has influenced members' work across various cultural domains and learning spaces • Evidence of knowledge exchange (members building on each other's contributions) • Quality and relevance of toolkit feedback. • Maps of meaning were produced documenting the emotional geography of participation <p>Impact Measures (Advocacy):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in members' pedagogical approaches (self-reported and observed) aligned with the socio-emotional learning domain • Policy influence (recommendations adopted, changes in resource allocation, citations in policy documents) • Reach beyond direct membership (resources shared externally, presentations given, media coverage)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of improved social cohesion and tolerance in members' practice contexts (using indicators co-created with young people) • Sustainability indicators (member-initiated activities, external funding secured, institutional commitments beyond CLiViE) • Application of SROI methodology by members in their own contexts <p>Critical Evaluation Questions:</p> <p>Beyond metrics, we consider whose voices are heard, management of power between educators and policymakers, young people's influence on CoP, cultural representation balance, rural/urban disparities, insights from meaning maps, and whether measurement aids advocacy or adds accountability.</p>
How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	<p>Workshop Integration (Space as Learning Environment):</p> <p>Exhibition tours to each quarterly workshop location, arriving 1-2 days before events. Allows members to explore before workshops begin and reference during discussions. Treats exhibition space as a learning environment itself, examining how physical arrangement shapes engagement.</p> <p>School Partnerships (Extending Impact):</p> <p>Between CoP events, exhibition visits 4-6 partner schools annually (balancing ISCED 2 and ISCED 3 levels), accompanied by educator CoP members, facilitating discussions with students and teachers. Extends CoP impact beyond direct membership while providing members with practice in facilitation across different spaces.</p> <p>Policy Event Integration (Evidence for Advocacy):</p> <p>Exhibition displayed at policy dialogue sessions, providing concrete examples of cultural literacies in action. Helps policymakers understand embodied dimensions of learning that may not be captured in SROI numbers alone, complementing quantitative evidence with experiential understanding.</p> <p>Documentation and Learning (Research Method):</p> <p>CoP members document how young people and educators engage with the exhibition, capturing insights about resonances across different cultural domains. Observations feed into toolkit development, CoP discussions, and understanding of how arts-based education creates meaning. Attention to both what people say and embodied engagement (what they do, where they pause, how they interact).</p>

	<p>Adaptation and Co-Creation: CoP explores ways to adapt or supplement the exhibition with Latvia-specific content, potentially developing complementary materials reflecting local cultural contexts. Members may create their own 'satellite' exhibitions documenting their practices across different cultural domains. Exhibition becomes a prompt for co-creation rather than just consumption.</p> <p>Emotional Geography Exploration: Exhibition engagement is documented through emotional cartography methods, creating maps of how people feel in different parts of the exhibition space. This model provides members with a way to use in their own practice for understanding young people's emotional connections to learning environments and cultural content.</p>
How will you use the 'maps of meaning' from the case studies?	<p>'Maps of Meaning' from CLiViE case studies serve multiple purposes, functioning both as methodology and as knowledge artefacts:</p> <p>Educator Toolkit Integration (Pedagogical Tool): Maps are a key feature in the TUM-led educator toolkit (D6.2). CoP workshops include guided activities that help members understand and apply emotional cartography methodology to their own practice..</p> <p>Practice Reflection (Self-Evaluation): Educators use maps as frameworks for analysing their own practice, visualising meaning-making processes in classrooms or workshops, and identifying opportunities to improve cultural literacy across various domains. Maps show where learning takes place (formal/informal spaces) and when (across ISCED levels).</p> <p>Policymaker Communication (Evidence Translation): The visual aspect of maps makes them powerful tools for conveying complex ideas to policymakers. They are used in briefings to demonstrate nuanced processes behind effective arts education, supporting SROI quantitative evidence with spatial and emotional aspects. Maps help policymakers grasp the importance of learning environments</p> <p>Methodological Learning (Arts-Based Research): Creating maps is itself a learning opportunity, demonstrating arts-based practices as both a research method and an advocacy tool. Members learn emotional cartography as an alternative to traditional GIS approaches that often overlook subjective aspects of experience. This aligns with CLiViE's recognition that maps are socially constructed</p>

	<p>and reflect power relations—who gets to define what goes on the map matters.</p> <p>Youth Voice and Agency: Creating maps with young people positions them as knowledge producers rather than mere research subjects. Their felt geography of cultural literacies becomes recognised expertise, shaping the CoP’s understanding. Maps document emotional connections to people, places, and times—addressing how young people experience social cohesion and tolerance spatially and temporally.</p>
How will you use the CLiViE website?	<p>The CLiViE website functions as digital infrastructure supporting various CoP activities:</p> <p>Primary Platform (Digital Learning Space): A dedicated Latvia CoP hosts an online platform featuring a member directory classified by cultural expertise, themed discussion forums, an event calendar, and a resource library. It offers a virtual home for the community, viewing the online space as a legitimate learning environment rather than a substitute for face-to-face interaction.</p> <p>Resource Hub (Knowledge Repository): Members access and contribute resources organised according to the UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics (covering eight domains) and ISCED categories. Materials are tagged by type—such as lesson plans, policy briefs, case studies, maps of meaning, SROI evidence, and research summaries. Version control and peer review ensure quality and support iterative improvements.</p> <p>Communication Channel (Asynchronous Dialogue): Hosts a monthly newsletter archive with updates on CoP activities aligned with CLiViE phases (map-evaluate-value-practice), facilitating continuous communication between face-to-face events, especially for members facing time or geographic barriers.</p> <p>Cross-National Connection (European Learning): Fosters connections with parallel CoPs in other CLiViE countries, enabling resource exchange, discussions on national policies, and collaborative projects on cultural literacy practices across borders. Supports D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative).</p> <p>Public Profile (Dissemination and Recruitment): The website shares publicly available information about the CoP’s activities, enhancing visibility and attracting new members. It highlights Latvia’s role in the CLiViE project and showcases the application of Theory of Change and SROI methods locally.</p>

	<p>Documentation Archive (Institutional Memory): Materials, recordings, maps of meaning, SROI case studies, and progress reports are archived on the website. They record the CoP's development and achievements, promoting sustainability by sharing knowledge with future members and stakeholders.</p> <p>Accessibility Considerations: A platform designed for low-bandwidth environments in Latvia, with mobile-friendly access supporting phone users over computers. Multiple languages (primarily Latvian, with English as a secondary language) enhance accessibility—straightforward navigation and search functions assist users with varying levels of digital literacy.</p>
How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	<p>Sustainability strategy guided by CLiViE's recognition that cultural and heritage sectors must foster cultural resilience for the future:</p> <p>Institutional Anchoring (Infrastructure): Both Riga Stradiņš University and Daugavpils University commit to maintaining CoP coordination as part of ongoing professional development and community engagement.</p> <p>Distributed Leadership (Community Ownership): By the end of the project (2027), establish a leadership team of 6-8 active members sharing coordination responsibilities across different cultural domains and stakeholder groups. Reduces dependence on any single institution or individual, fostering community ownership. Members assume specific roles (cultural domain coordinators, regional hub coordinators, platform moderators) and distribute work sustainably.</p> <p>Strategic Partnerships (Resource Sharing): CoP fosters relationships with organisations sharing goals. Explore opportunities for joint activities, shared resources, and mutual support. Partner organisations may host events or provide in-kind contributions, extending reach while sharing costs.</p> <p>Value Demonstration (Advocacy for Support): Throughout the funded period, document impact using SROI methodology and communicate value to stakeholders, building the case for continued support. Showcase member achievements, demonstrate policy influence, and measure improvements in educational practice across cultural domains. SROI evidence offers a compelling argument for institutional investment in CoP sustainability, framing it as social infrastructure rather than a project expense.</p>

	<p>Knowledge Infrastructure (Intellectual Capital):</p> <p>By the end of the project, CoP will have created substantial knowledge infrastructure: tested toolkits, documented practices across cultural domains, established SROI methodology, developed Latvia-specific maps of meaning, built a resource library, and created cross-national connections. This intellectual capital has lasting value independent of funding, supporting members' ongoing work even if CoP activities diminish. Resources remain accessible via the CLiViE website as public assets.</p> <p>Cultural Resilience Framework:</p> <p>Sustainability strategy embodies CLiViE's concept of cultural resilience—not simply preserving current activities but building adaptive capacity for the future. CoP is designed to evolve with changing needs, respond to emerging cultural forms and digital transformations, while maintaining a core commitment to cultural literacy for social cohesion. Resilience signifies flexibility and adaptation, not rigid maintenance of the original structure.</p>
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	<p>Several conceptual challenges shape our approach, grounded in CLiViE's theoretical framework:</p> <p>Practice versus Discussion (Doing versus Talking):</p> <p>CoPs should focus on shared practice through action like trying pedagogies, creating resources, testing approaches, and developing meaning maps, rather than just discussing. This requires careful design and skilled facilitation. Arts-based practices serve as knowledge production and advocacy, not just discussion topics.</p> <p>Power Dynamics (Voice and Authority):</p> <p>Including educators, policymakers, and youth involves power asymmetries. It's crucial to create spaces where educators feel safe sharing challenges, policymakers listen genuinely, and young people's knowledge is valued. Power relations affect whose voices and knowledge are heard, and managing these dynamics is ongoing work, not a one-time fix.</p> <p>Research versus Practice (Academic versus Applied):</p> <p>As part of the research project, CoP must support CLiViE objectives—testing toolkits, developing SROI evidence, creating maps of meaning—while staying true to members' needs. Ensure member voices guide CoP, maintain transparency, and seek alignment. Recognise potential epistemological tensions between artists and researchers, avoiding</p>

	<p>strict divides between 'scientific' and 'artistic' methods while respecting diverse approaches knowing.</p> <p>Scale and Intimacy (Size versus Trust):</p> <p>CoPs benefit from intimacy and trust but aim for 60-70 members. The approach includes forming smaller sub-groups and teams for deeper bonds, while larger gatherings support exchange and cohesion. Different spaces serve various functions—trust-building, knowledge exchange, and more advocacy.</p> <p>Measuring Impact (Quantification Politics):</p> <p>The impact of CoPs is often subtle and long-term—shifts in thinking, practice changes, and new collaborations. We must develop meaningful indicators that capture nuanced outcomes without reducing social learning to simple metrics. Quantification isn't value-free; measurement reflects power. Co-creating indicators with young people democratises what is measured and valued. Balance advocacy, monitoring, and social science research purposes.</p> <p>Cultural Domains (Breadth versus Depth):</p> <p>Covering eight UNESCO cultural domains is ambitious and risks superficiality. Form domain-specific working groups for depth, with shared activities for cross-domain learning. Recognise that different cultural forms may affect young people differently—avoid homogenising 'the arts' but identify shared aspects and principles.</p>
Other comments	-



EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Leta Dromantienė, Lina Kaminskienė, Saulė Norkutė, Agnė Liucilė Grickevičė
Contributor(s)	Ilona Tandzegolskienė-Bielaglovė, Milda Laužikaitė, Natalija Mažeikienė
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	17 October 2025
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This template documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Lithuania
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	<p>Kūrybinės jungtys https://www.kurybinesjungtys.lt/en/contact-info/; Milda Laužikaitė- Head of the Kūrybinės jungtys association Email: milda@kurybinesjungtys.lt, Saulė Norkutė, saule@kurybinesjungtys.lt</p> <p>Vytautas Magnus University, Education Academy Agnė Liucilė Grickevičė, email: agne.grickevice@vdu.lt</p>
Who is the lead partner?	The leadership in Lithuania is shared between Vytautas Magnus University and Kūrybinės jungtys.
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	Ministry of Education, Science and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania https://smsm.lrv.lt/en/ ; Senior Specialist, Information Systems and Personal Services Unit Inga Masiukienė; phone +370 666 44 100; Email: Inga.Masiukiene@smsm.lt
What are the main objectives of the COP?	<p>COP seeks to provide the best arts-based education performing activities that lead to achieving the best and deepest learning outcomes; have the biggest impact on children's and young people's personal development; that involve famous artists, public and private institutions, emerging new organizations and businesses for art education, leading to the change of organizational culture of institutions. The main objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To promote inclusion, wellbeing and social skills through art education activities. Use arts, sport and media/technology to increase participation (including children with fewer opportunities), support socio-emotional learning, and develop teamwork, empathy and self-expression. ● Raise media literacy and critical digital competencies. Build children's ability to consume, evaluate and create media safely and responsibly (critical thinking about information, digital citizenship, content production skills). ● Drive digital transformation & meaningful EdTech adoption. Evaluate, pilot and recommend digital tools and learning

	<p>designs (blended learning for arts/PE, maker-spaces, coding clubs), supporting systemic adoption of EdTech while avoiding tech-for-tech's-sake.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Integrate STEAM (cross-disciplinary work). Encourage connections across Science-Technology-Engineering-Arts-Maths (e.g., creative coding, sports science projects, media storytelling + data literacy) to make learning more relevant and engaging. ● Improve teachers' and facilitators' professional competence. Help schoolteachers, coaches and non-formal educators share methods, co-develop curricula and upskill (e.g., inclusive art pedagogy, modern physical-education pedagogy, media-literacy teaching, EdTech use). ● Share and scale effective pedagogy and best practices. Document, pilot and spread practical lesson models, activity formats and assessment tools (arts workshops, after-school sport programmes, media-literacy modules, maker/robotics activities) so successful approaches move from one school/club to many. ● Build local networks and community engagement. Connect schools, municipal services, cultural institutions (children's art schools), sports clubs and NGOs, individual artists so children's programmes are sustained, contextually relevant and supported by local partners. ● Develop accessible resources and assessment approaches. Create open lesson plans, rubrics, toolkits and low-cost activity designs (so smaller or rural providers can adopt them) and define outcomes beyond test scores (creativity, participation, media literacy, motor skills). ● Advocate for policy alignment and funding. Use evidence and joint voice to influence municipal and national education policy (curriculum content, teacher training, facility investments, sports infrastructure and digital resources) and to secure sustainable funding. ● Promote research-practice feedback loops. Collect data from pilots, reflect as a group, and feed findings into research and teacher-education programmes so practice and theory continually improve (e.g., inclusive arts outcomes; PE motivation studies).
--	---

<p>Describe the main learning outputs for the COP</p>	<p>Learning outputs describe what participants (teachers, educators, children, institutions) actually learn, produce, and internalize through COP participation. The main learning outputs observed and targeted in Lithuanian COPs are focused on school students' education in art, sport, media, and technologies.</p> <p>Enhanced professional knowledge and teaching competence. Educators and practitioners develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated knowledge of contemporary pedagogy (active learning, inclusive education, formative assessment). • Improved ability to integrate digital tools into arts, sport, and media education. • Skills for interdisciplinary STEAM teaching (linking technology and creativity). <p>Example: Teachers learn to use visual programming or digital art tools to engage children in cross-curricular projects.</p> <p>Shared pedagogical resources and teaching materials. COPs produce:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans, workshop formats, and digital toolkits for creative, media, and physical education. • Open-access materials shared nationally (via "Emokykla", "EdTech Lithuania", or municipal education centres). • Adapted resources for inclusive education and rural schools. <p>Example: A COP on art and technology develops a set of "STEAM-through-Art" lesson prototypes available to schools across Lithuania.</p> <p>Increased reflective and collaborative practice. Participants learn to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in peer observation, feedback, and mentoring. • Conduct self-evaluation and reflective teaching cycles. • Facilitate communities through collaborative online platforms (MS Teams, Moodle, etc.). <p>Example: PE teachers analyse video recordings of each other's lessons to discuss student motivation strategies.</p> <p>Improved ability to design inclusive and engaging learning environments. Educators learn to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adapt content for diverse learners, including children with special educational needs or from different socio-economic backgrounds. • Use art, sport, and media as tools for emotional development and social inclusion.
---	--

	<p>Example: COPs pilot inclusive dance and movement programs integrating children with disabilities.</p> <p>Development of media and digital literacy (for educators and learners). Both educators and students show learning in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical media analysis and ethical content creation. • Safe online communication and digital citizenship. • Using technology creatively (video editing, animation, coding, robotics). <p>Example: Media-education COPs train teachers to help pupils produce podcasts and short films on social issues.</p> <p>Strengthened cross-sector and interdisciplinary collaboration. COPs learn to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate across schools, cultural centres, universities, NGOs, and local governments. • Co-create interdisciplinary events, exhibitions, or hackathons combining arts, sport, and technology. <p>Example: An art-school and local IT club run a “Creative Coding Week” together.</p> <p>Local and national networking outcomes. Participants gain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills in community building and partnership management. • Awareness of funding mechanisms and policy contexts (Erasmus+, municipal grants). • Capacity to sustain initiatives beyond one-off projects. <p>Example: CoP leaders learn to write joint project proposals and report on outcomes using EU frameworks.</p> <p>Evidence-based and reflective decision-making. Educators develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills to collect and analyse data on learning outcomes. • The ability to use research to improve teaching practice (“teacher-as-researcher” mindset). <p>Example: A COP uses student feedback and observation logs to refine its art-integration methodology.</p> <p>Institutional learning and sustainability capacity. Schools and organizations learn to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embed COP findings into strategic development plans.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement internal professional-learning communities (mini-COPs). • Maintain digital repositories of shared practice.
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	<p>The main learning outcomes for members of the CoP are addressed to innovation, collaboration, inclusion, and sustainability in teaching.</p> <p>Professional growth and pedagogical mastery. Participants demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to design, implement, and evaluate innovative, learner-centred teaching practices. • Increased capacity to adapt teaching to diverse learners (inclusion, differentiation, multicultural awareness). • Confidence in using arts, sports, media, and technology to promote creativity, physical literacy, and critical thinking. <p>Example: Teachers integrate digital storytelling, robotics, or creative movement into lessons and can explain why these methods improve engagement.</p> <p>Enhanced digital and media literacy. Participants can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply digital technologies in pedagogically meaningful ways (not just technically). • Teach and model critical media literacy to children (ethical media use, source evaluation, responsible online behavior). • Use digital collaboration tools to share and co-create materials with colleagues. <p>Example: A media education COP leads teachers to create and assess student-produced videos or podcasts using clear literacy criteria.</p> <p>Collaborative and reflective practice. Participants develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills in peer learning, mentoring, and professional dialogue. • The ability to reflect critically on their own teaching and use feedback to improve. • A shared professional identity as co-learners and innovators. <p>Example: Educators conduct peer observations and jointly analyse teaching videos, identifying effective engagement strategies.</p>

	<p>Interdisciplinary and creative teaching competence. Participants demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capacity to connect artistic, technological, and scientific domains. • The ability to guide students through project-based, experiential learning. • Creative problem-solving in lesson design and classroom management. <p>Example: Teachers co-develop a unit combining coding with visual art to build both computational and creative skills.</p> <p>Inclusive and socially responsible practice. Participants are able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create inclusive learning environments that support children with diverse needs. • Use art, sport, and media to foster social-emotional learning, cooperation, and empathy. • Integrate wellbeing and equality principles into everyday teaching. <p>Example: PE teachers develop adapted physical activities for children with disabilities, improving participation rates.</p> <p>Research-informed and data-driven decision-making. Participants can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect and analyse classroom data or feedback to inform improvement. • Use educational research findings to justify and refine their teaching approaches. • Disseminate results of practice-based inquiry through local or national networks. <p>Example: A CoP evaluates the impact of digital art projects on creativity using student reflections and surveys.</p> <p>Leadership and community engagement. Participants demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills to lead professional learning within their schools or municipalities. • Ability to mobilize networks, organize workshops, and mentor peers. • Capacity to link school-based practice with local communities, NGOs, or cultural institutions.
--	---

	<p>Example: A COP leader organizes a regional showcase where teachers and students exhibit collaborative media projects.</p> <p>Sustainability and policy literacy. Participants gain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of national education priorities and how to align practice with them. • Awareness of funding frameworks (Erasmus+, national grants, municipal projects). • Skills to sustain CoP activity through institutional support and resource management. <p>Example: COP members develop a proposal for continued funding through the NŠA innovation fund.</p>
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	<p>Improved quality and innovation in teaching and learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained pedagogical renewal: CoPs help embed creative, inquiry-based, and student-centred teaching across Lithuanian schools. • Integration of art, sport, media, and technology: Learning becomes more engaging, relevant, and interdisciplinary (STEAM culture). • Evidence of impact: National Agency for Education (NŠA) reviews show COPs have raised the methodological quality of lessons and student engagement. <p>Impact example: Schools adopting COP (developed STEAM; Art-based lessons) report higher student motivation and creativity scores.</p> <p>Increased teacher professionalism and lifelong learning culture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shift in teacher identity: Educators increasingly see themselves as reflective practitioners and co-learners rather than isolated instructors. • Culture of collaboration: Continuous professional learning becomes embedded in school practice. • National alignment: This impact directly supports the Teacher Professional Development Strategy 2021–2025 goal of professional communities as engines of change. <p>Impact example: Teachers sustain local “micro-COPs” in schools even after national projects end, continuing joint lesson planning and reflection.</p> <p>Enhanced inclusion and equity in education:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved access and participation: COP-led initiatives promote inclusion of children with special needs, those from rural areas, and minority groups. • Social-emotional benefits: Art, sport, and media-based approaches foster empathy, cooperation, and resilience in children. • Policy resonance: These impacts align with Lithuania’s Inclusive Education Roadmap (2022–2030). <p>Impact example: A COP of PE and art teachers creates inclusive workshops integrating movement and creative expression, improving participation among diverse children.</p> <p>Strengthened digital transformation and media literacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System-wide digital competence: Teachers across subjects gain confidence in using digital tools effectively and ethically. • Broader societal impact: Students become digitally and media literate citizens, capable of critical thinking and safe online participation. • Alignment: Supports EdTech Lietuva and Digital Education Transformation Programme (2022–2027). <p>Impact example: Schools in COPs report measurable improvements in both teachers’ and students’ digital competence indices.</p> <p>Cross-sector collaboration and stronger educational ecosystems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable partnerships: Schools, universities, cultural centres, NGOs, and municipalities continue collaborating after COP projects end. • Knowledge flow: Best practices move between formal and non-formal education sectors. • Local development: COPs contribute to municipal education strategies and community engagement. <p>Impact example: A municipality integrates COP methodologies into its local education action plan, ensuring continuity of practice-sharing.</p> <p>Empowered children with transferable 21st-century skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creative confidence and self-expression (arts). • Teamwork, leadership, and wellbeing (sports). • Critical thinking and digital citizenship (media/tech). • Problem-solving and innovation (STEAM). <p>These competencies prepare Lithuanian youth for active participation in society and the future labour market.</p>
--	---

	<p>Impact example: Students from COP-participating schools show higher initiative and collaboration scores in national “PUPA” and PISA-style assessments.</p> <p>Evidence-based policy and institutional improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data-informed decisions: Lessons learned from CoPs inform teacher-training programmes and Ministry of Education policies. • Scaling mechanisms: Successful COPs are replicated across municipalities (e.g., in NŠA innovation schools). • Systemic learning: Education institutions become adaptive and research-oriented. <p>Impact example: Insights from COPs feed into national frameworks for digital literacy and creative education policy.</p>
Describe the main features of the COP ³	The main feature of the COP is that it is closely linked to educational institutions which is due to the experience of the VMU and Kūrybinės jungtys to work with educational community.
How many people are you targeting?	At the moment the COP is targeting around 100 persons, however, later this number should increase.
Describe how the COP is being created and managed ⁴	The COP will be managed by the joint team from Vytautas Magnus University and Kūrybinės jungtys. Both partners will share specific responsibilities such as conducting research, organise joint events and sharing best practices.
Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created ⁵	The COP will involve young people of different age in various educational activities, engaging university researchers, artists, teachers and educators.
Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	KJ Creative practitioners network (121 creative practitioners who are working or have worked on various KJ programmes). This network is based on a more than 15 years of experience working in the field of arts-based education.
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	The COP included educational and cultural organisations which are involved in educational activities. This was the main inclusion criterion.

³ Think in practical terms, such as a database, newsletter, workshops. Also remember that the COP will be the main delivery vehicle for D6.3 (Cultural literacies across borders initiative developed and implemented). Also consider the different art and cultural forms you will be working with.

⁴ Consider how contact details will be stored and development of the COP over time.

⁵ Also think about if young people will be involved.

Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	The main barriers to participating in the COP is the motivation of its members and resources (mainly human and time) which are needed to be actively engaged in the COP.
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP are being captured and stored	It is agreed that the information is shared among the COP members through various communication channels. The consents for this have been received.
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders ⁶	The COP involves also policymakers (Ministry of Education, Science and Sports) and other institutions which are strong players in the field of cultural education.
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them ⁷	<p>In Lithuania geographical and spatial disparities significantly affect how COPs in education can form, collaborate, and sustain themselves. The main practical strategies to address the local and national challenges are based on Lithuanian educational research, municipal reports, and national COP development programmes (e.g., NŠA Community Practices, EdTech Lietuva, and Millenium School Programme).</p> <p>Challenges:</p> <p>1. Urban–rural divide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lithuania has strong educational and cultural concentration in urban centres (Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipėda). • Rural schools and cultural institutions face smaller teaching staffs, limited infrastructure, and weaker access to professional networks. • As a result, educators in remote areas often feel <i>isolated</i> and <i>excluded</i> from national COP initiatives. <p>Ways to address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing regional COP hubs linked to national networks (e.g., county-based coordinators or resource centres). • Supporting digital inclusion (improved internet infrastructure, equipment grants for rural schools). • Encouraging “<i>twinning</i>” <i>partnerships</i> — pairing urban and rural schools to share expertise and host joint projects. <p>2. Unequal access to technology and digital platforms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While Lithuania is highly digitalised nationally, disparities remain in small towns and rural schools: poor internet speed,

⁶ The two groups are educators and policy-makers/commissioners. D6.2 (Toolkit/guide for arts-based educators) will target the first group. Its development is being led by TUM. D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners) will target the second group. Its development is being led by SGH.

⁷ Thinks about different scales, such as local vs national

	<p>older hardware, limited digital training.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This creates uneven participation in online COPs and digital collaboration platforms. <p>Ways to address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investing in targeted digital infrastructure upgrades for rural and low-resource schools. • Providing training for digital collaboration tools (MS Teams, Moodle, Padlet, etc.). • Using hybrid CoP models — mix local face-to-face clusters with national online exchanges. • Including <i>digital mentors</i> within each CoP to support less tech-confident members. <p>3. Geographic dispersion and travel distances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lithuania’s dispersed settlement pattern makes regular in-person COP meetings difficult, especially when schools are 50–100 km apart. • Time and cost of travel can discourage participation from smaller institutions. <p>Ways to address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using rotating meeting formats — COP meetings hosted by different municipalities to share travel burden. • Developing “local learning circles” (mini-COPs) within municipalities that link virtually to the national COP. • Offering micro-grants for travel and substitution so teachers can participate during work hours. <p>4. Language and cultural micro-regional differences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In regions with Polish- or Russian-speaking minorities (e.g., Vilnius region), language differences can affect full inclusion in national COPs. • Some educators may lack Lithuanian-language proficiency to engage confidently in national discussions or share outputs. <p>Ways to address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing bilingual COP materials and facilitation in regions with linguistic minorities. • Encouraging intercultural projects showcasing diversity as an educational strength. • Building inclusive CoPs that value multiple cultural identities and teaching traditions. <p>5. Limited visibility and networking between sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COPs often remain sector-specific (e.g., art schools work
--	---

	<p>separately from general schools or sports institutions).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical separation between schools, cultural centres, and NGOs reduces awareness of potential collaboration. <p>Ways to address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating multi-sector regional clusters combining schools, museums, sports clubs, and technology hubs. Encouraging joint events (e.g., STEAM festivals, art–sport–tech camps). Mapping COP activity across the country and create an interactive national COP directory. <p>6. “Peripheral” identity and motivation barriers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educators in remote municipalities sometimes perceive COPs as “big-city projects.” This can lead to low motivation or a sense that participation offers little local relevance. <p>Ways to address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighting local success stories and case studies from rural CoPs. Celebrating regional champions through national awards or showcases. Ensuring national COP strategies visibly include rural voices in decision-making and communication materials.
Describe any challenges related to different art/cultural forms covered in the project	The main challenge is related to ensuring a balance of different forms of arts (not only music and fine arts) to be represented in the COP.
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project?	The COP will contribute to the piloting and sustaining the tools developed during CLiViE project.
How will you measure the success of the COP?	<p>We will measure the success of the COP by qualitative and quantitative indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of events the COP organised. Number of COP members. At least 75% of positive feedback about COP activities
How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	It is not yet fully defined.
How will you use the ‘maps of meaning’ from the case studies?	They will be used as a tool for the COP members as well as the methodological guideline for further educational activities and research.

How will you use the CLiViE website?	The Lithuanian COP will regularly share news available on the CLiViE website through newsletters or emails. The COP will also update the CLiViE website about the news about arts-based education activities and their created cultural value.
How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	After the project ends, the COP will be mainly sustained through joint efforts of Vytautas Magnus University and Kūrybinės jungtys.
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	The main conceptual challenge is related to the identification of the mission and vision of the national COP.
Other comments	<p>Partners of the COP (not all confirmed their participation yet):</p> <p>1. The schools that offer specialised art-based education curriculum alongside general secondary education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Music education: Kaunas Juozas Naujalis Music Gymnasium; Kaunas Juozas Grušas Music Conservatoire; • Klaipėda Stasys Šimkus Conservatoire; • Vilnius Juozas Tallat-Kepša Conservatoire; • Fine arts education is part of the specialized curriculum: Kaunas Fine Art Gymnasium. • The schools where Fine arts or Music education makes part of the specialized curriculum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Klaipėda Eduardas Balsys Arts Gymnasium, • Panevėžys Vytautas Mikalauskas Arts Gymnasium and • Šiauliai Saulius Sondeckis Arts Gymnasium. • National Mikalojus Konstantinas Čiurlionis School of Arts where Arts education makes part of the specialized curriculum (fine arts; music; ballet). • Sports gymnasiums: Panevėžys Raimundas Sargūnas Sports Gymnasium, • Šiauliai Sports Gymnasium and • Vilnius Ozo Gymnasium, where Sport education makes part of the specialized curriculum. • Engineering education as a part of the specialised curriculum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Engineering Lyceum of Vilnius Gediminas Technical University; Joachim Lelevelis Engineering School in Vilnius; • Engineering Lyceum of Kaunas University of Technology. <p>2. Specialized non-formal schools (music, sports, fine arts): 121 schools related to the Arts (49 Music schools, 60 Arts schools, 10 Schools of Fine Arts, 2 Choreography schools).</p>

	<p>3. School “Gifted” for support and development of gifted children, established by Vytautas Magnus University in collaboration with Ron Vardi Centre (Israel).</p> <p>4. EDU Vilnius Bloomberg project "Vilnius city is a School" in Vilnius.</p> <p>5. The Robotics Academy: Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipėda and other cities.</p> <p>6. Kaunas National Drama Theatre.</p> <p>7. Schools and gymnasiums such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Paluknys Meideina Gymnasium, Trakai district. ● Vilnius Municipality Grigiškės Gymnasium. ● Vilnius Municipality Šviesos Gymnasium. ● Rumšiškės Antanas Baranauskas Gymnasium. ● Vilnius Saulėtekis School – Multifunctional Center. ● Pagiriai Gymnasium. ● Rūdiškės Gymnasium, Trakai District. ● Stulpino Pro-Gymnasium, Klaipėda. ● Stupino Pro-Gymnasium, Klaipėda. ● Gabija Pro-Gymnasium, Klaipėda. ● Raseiniai Šaltinis Lower Secondary School. ● Musninkai Gymnasium, Širvintos district. ● Vytautas the Great School, Jurbarkas. ● Sofija Kovalevskaja Lower Secondary School, Vilnius. ● Simonas Stanevičius Lower Secondary School, Vilnius. ● Vilnius Laisvės Gymnasium. ● Vilnius kindergarten school Vilija. ● Vasilijus Kačialovas Gymnasium, Vilnius. <p>8. Educators of Lithuanian Museums (network of 33 educators, participants of one of KJ programme)</p> <p>9. Cultural organisations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rumšiškės Cultural Centre. ● Ignalina District Municipal Public Library. ● Vilnius City Central Library, Grigiškės Branch. ● Trakai Culture and Arts Center. ● Nalšia Museum. ● Zarasai District Municipal Public Library. ● Lithuanian Ethnographic Museum. ● Lithuanian Folk Life Museum. ● Tauragės cultural centre. ● Liudvika and Stanislovas Didžiulis Public Library of Anykščiai District Municipality.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gabrielė Petkevičaitė-Bitė Public Library of Panevėžys County. • Kaunas Artists' House. • Klaipėda City Municipality Cultural Center Fishermen's Hall. • Lithuanian National Museum. (with 12 branches) • Lithuanian National Museum of Art. (with nine branches) • MO Museum • Lithuanian National Commission for Unesco. • Klaipėda Culture Communication Center. • Šiauliai Aušros Museum. • Šeduva Jewish Memorial Fund Museum The Lost Shtetl. • Skelvija Cinema Centre. • STASYS Museum. • Vilnius City Museum. (with 4 branches). • Trakų Vokė Manor Farmstead. • Trakai District Municipal Public Library. • Meno Avilys – Media Education and Research Center. • Lazdijai Cultural Center. • Art Agency Artscape. • Vilnius Short Film festival Filmschortlt. • Center of Art, Residencies and Education, Rupert. • Lithuanian National Archives. • Vilkaviškis Cultural Centre. • Vilnius University Cultural Centre. • Contemporary Art Centre. • Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania. • Dance School and Theatre Low Air • Lithuanian Neighbouring Rights Association representing performers and music producers Agata. • Lithuanian Dance Information Center. • New Baltic Dance. • Lithuanian Council for Culture. • Lazdijai Cultural Centre. • Day Centre for Children and Young People from Roma. background “Padėk pritapti”. • Open Lithuanian Foundation. • Grigiškių Council, Vilnius Municipality • Vilnius University Student Council. <p>10. KJ Creative practitioners’ network (121 creative practitioners who is working or have work on various KJ programmes)</p>
--	---

	<p>11. Participant of Museum Competence Development Programme Marta (34 educators)</p> <p>12. Other organisations (that KJ have worked or partnered on various projects and KJ programme)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vilnius University. • Education Agency of Vilnius Municipality. • DUKU camp and educational centre for children, youth and adults. • Open Lithuanian Foundation. • Vilnius University Student Council. • Marta Network
--	---

EU Grant Agreement number: 101132285

Project acronym: CLiViE

Project title: Cultural Literacies' Value in Europe

Author(s)	Katarzyna Sadowy, Maciej Czeredys, Natalia Daca, Karolina Sajniak, Wiktoria Bloch
Contributor(s)	Ewa Wajda, Grzegorz Maśloch
Version	1.0
Deliverable	D6.1
WP	WP6 Pedagogy practices in arts education
Due date	31 October 2025
Submission date	
Dissemination level	PU

Abstract
This template documents the main features of the national (and European) communities of practice (COP) being developed as part of WP6. The primary aim of the COPs is to disseminate the key findings of the CLiViE project.

Document history

Version	Date	Comments	Modified by



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe's programme

Country of the COP	Poland
Who are the partners involved in developing the COP?	Sinfonia Varsovia, SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Julian Cochran Foundation
Who is the lead partner?	Sinfonia Varsovia
Are there any other stakeholders involved in the creation of the COP?	It is planned to consult some ideas with focus groups (please, see below), but first phase of work will be the responsibility of the three partners. Other stakeholders will be involved in further stages, when the tools and goals are more specific (also regarding the international cooperation and involvement of other partners). SV has consulted the stakeholders of WP 3 and WP 4 regarding the toolkit (survey in April 2025).
What are the main objectives of the COP?	Possibility to use tools and recommendations created within the project and further – to exchange of knowledge regarding good practices as well as challenges and bottlenecks between broader community. Support for the educators who want to introduce social responsibility and inclusion in their pedagogical practices.
Describe the main learning outputs for the COP	Good practices, case study, methods learnt through COP. Contacts between organizations/institutions developed thanks to the COP.
Describe the main learning outcomes for the COP	A sense of belonging to a larger community of educators and other stakeholders involved in educational practices (and possibly policies?). This should lead to the sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, based on human rights, specifically practices through arts-based education.
Describe the main learning impacts for the COP	Improved methods of learning and improved culture-related curriculum. Improved young people agency leading to more inclusive communities and societies.

Describe the main features of the COP	<p>Toolbox (booklet), newsletter, workshops</p> <p>Representatives of the cultural institutions surveyed in April 2025 opted for (1) attractive and user-friendly booklet (bilingual Polish/English) and/or (2) interactive website. Due to the limitations of the project booklet seems more manageable and also more practical for users.</p>
How many people are you targeting?	To be decided, but the range of the artists, educators and youth engaged in many ways with JFC and SV is very broad.
Describe how the COP is being created and managed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cooperation in WP3 and WP4 (including semi-structured interviews and focus groups) 2. Further meetings of focus groups 3. Advisory Board (max. 5 persons): the list is to be based on the focus groups participants who are (1) involved in music-related practices or practices which may be relevant to music-oriented education); (2) experienced in education practices or policy making relevant for the COP creation; (3) willing to be involved at least for the duration of the project and – if possible – beyond as the ambassadors of the COPs. 4. We will seek support from well-established structure (e.g. Cultural Bureau in City of Warsaw or other municipal organization, or possibly NGO). We will explore the possibility of SV to become a hub for music-related part of the COPs. 5. Foreseen involved stakeholders (tbc): Liceum Artes Liberales, Edison International School, Music Hub, and Music Place; artists who collaborate with JCF and JCF scholarship holders who work in public and private music schools. Their feedback will be continuously integrated to ensure that the toolkit is practical, user-friendly, and relevant to diverse educational contexts. 6. Contacts and organisations data will be either (1) known to the organisation which works as a long-term platform or (2) stored on the platform which requires registration and login. This solution we see as possibly common for the consortium, as international aspect of COPs has been strongly underlined by our stakeholders. 7. We suggest organisation of COPs into groups related to specific areas, e. g. music or visual arts.

Describe any aspects of the COP that are being co-created	The whole process (in Poland) will involve Advisory Board (AB). Possibility to invite young people from the organisations represented by the AB to consult or participate in survey or interviews will be discussed with the AB.
Describe any local or national networks the COP is being built on	<p>SV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders from the various educational programmes in which SV participated), e. g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizations: Muzyka jest dla Wszystkich Foundation, Ogrody Muzyczne Foundation Educators involved in SV programmes and ventures, including https://www.sinfoniavarsovia.org/edukacja/moje-cialo-moja-muzyka/ Partners from the international EU funded project Musethica 1000+ <p>SGH:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner universities Partner organizations and business from SGH Partner Club Associations of local governments <p>JCF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Edison International School (https://szkola-edison.pl/) Music Hub Music Place Artists involved in educational programmes organized by JCF (private music schools, music teachers) Warszawskie Obserwatorium Kultury Narodowe Centrum Kultury Cultural influencers
Describe who is being included/excluded in the COP	Focus on music and music-related forms of education due to the specific character of SV and JCF. Music is also considered to be one of the most accessible and almost instinctive form of human creation and activity. At the same time societal barriers emerged which bar people from it. The goal of SV i JCF is lower this threshold.
Describe any barriers to participating in the COP?	Time and funds
Describe how information, conversations and developments in the COP	Minutes from focus groups and AB meetings stored at the server of SV. Each institution (SV, JCF, SGH) has their own regulations regarding data storage which will be followed accordingly.

are being captured and stored	
Describe how will you manage the two target groups of stakeholders ⁸	<p>For now we propose mailing and targeting existing networks. To be more specific when the toolkits form is known.</p> <p>Strong advise: materials should be prepared in national language (preferably bilingual to allow to know the original version of the CLiViE work but in national language to make it more usable and inclusive. Workshop and “instruction of use” can be successful methods.</p> <p>We will manage the two target groups of stakeholders through tailored engagement and communication strategies adapted to their specific needs and roles.</p> <p>For educators, we will collaborate closely with schools, cultural institutions, and arts-based practitioners.</p> <p>For policy-makers and commissioners, we will engage them through targeted roundtables, policy dialogues, and consultation sessions in the process of developing D5.4</p>
Describe any geographical/spatial challenges that you may face and how you will address them ⁹	<p>At first, we plan to focus on Warsaw (including various districts and different cultural and educational environment). From there the national level could be developed.</p>
Describe any challenges related to different art/cultural forms covered in the project ¹⁰	<p>Challenges specific to music:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social perception: perceived as elitist - Financial: High costs of some forms of performance or practice (e. g. costs of the instruments). - Spatial and technological: Various spaces pose challenges to proper performance and listening (acoustic aspects) - Psychological: fear associated with not knowing the rules of conduct at classical music concerts

⁸ The two groups are educators and policy-makers/commissioners. D6.2 (Toolkit/guide for arts-based educators) will target the first group. Its development is being led by TUM. D5.4 (Toolkit/guide for commissioners) will target the second group. Its development is being led by SGH.

⁹ Thinks about different scales, such as local vs national

¹⁰ The eight cultural domains are as follows: Cultural and Natural Heritage, Performance and Celebration, Visual Arts and Crafts, Books and Press, Audio-visual and Interactive Media, Design and Creative Services, Tourism, and Sports and Recreation. These correspond to the UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accessibility barriers - some art forms require specific venues, equipment (instrument), or materials that are not easily accessible to all participants. - Cultural representation - risk of underrepresenting certain cultural expressions or local traditions within a European or cross-cultural framework. - Translation and interpretation issues - difficulties in translating artistic concepts, performances, or metaphors across languages and cultures. - Audience engagement - challenges in reaching younger or non-traditional audiences who may perceive certain art forms as outdated or inaccessible. - Artistic autonomy vs. educational goals - tension between respecting artistic expression and aligning with structured educational or policy objectives. - Time and rehearsal demands - performing arts often require extended preparation, rehearsals, or coordination between multiple artists. - Funding limitations - unequal distribution of financial resources across disciplines, with some forms (e.g. classical music or theatre) requiring higher budgets. - Cross-sectional: there are significant barriers to entry for both players and listeners.
How will the COP relate to other aspects of work in the project? ¹¹	It will draw strongly from the lessons learnt through the case studies. Desk research (current state of art in related social sciences).
How will you measure the success of the COP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of members involved; • Level of the international cooperation; • Satisfaction of the COP members (self-evaluated).
How will you use the CLiViE pop-up exhibition?	It is planned to invite educators - the main target group for Polish COP - to the opening of the CLiViE pop-up exhibition in Warsaw. The event will serve as an opportunity for them to learn more about the CLiViE project, explore its results, and become inspired to engage with its activities and resources in their own educational work. The same approach to all partner institutions hosting the exhibition in their countries is strongly recommended, encouraging them to use it as a platform for direct engagement with educators.

¹¹ For example, D2.2, toolkits, case study material, policy briefs, website. Also see questions below.

How will you use the ‘maps of meaning’ from the case studies? ¹²	They will illustrate the lessons from the case studies during the focus groups and workshops.
How will you use the CLiViE website?	<p>CLiViE website will function as a central hub for dissemination and visibility of all project outputs. A dedicated section for educators will be created, providing easy access to the Toolkit for arts-based educators (D6.2) and related resources.</p> <p>In addition, the website will feature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● An interactive space where educators can download materials. ● A section for policy-makers and commissioners, linking to the D5.4 Toolkit and policy recommendations. ● News and updates on pilot activities, workshops, and examples of implementation from different countries. ● Multimedia content (videos, infographics, case studies) to make the results more engaging and accessible to a wider audience. <p>All materials will be easy to navigate, downloadable, and available in multiple languages to ensure broad usability across Europe.</p>
How will the COP be maintained after project funding has ended?	<p>To be further discussed with other partners.</p> <p>Sharing the methods and knowledge will constitute the common ground.</p> <p>If the networking during the project is successful members will keep in touch via various channels they usually use (social media, mailing etc.).</p>
Describe any conceptual challenges with creating a COP	The general level of stakeholders being overwhelmed by information and ongoing creation of novelty. The goal is rather to create space (in broad meaning) than to add to a general “clutter” of methods and ideas.
Other comments	

¹² They will be included in the toolkit for educators but they may also play an additional/illustrative role at a national level.