https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-1-030049 Received Date | 2023-05-06 Accepted Date | 2023-10-23

A Brief Overview of the Development of European Landscape Architecture Study Programs in the Period of the Last Twenty Years

Davorin GAZVODA*

Department of Landscape Architecture, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana 1000, Slovenia

***CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**
Address: Department of Landscape Architecture, Biotechnical Faculty, Jamnikarjeva 101, Ljubljana 1000, Slovenia
Emails: davorin.gazvoda@bf.uni-lj.si

ABSTRACT

A development of the Landscape Architecture education process and profession itself in last twenty years in Europe is presented in the article from the teacher's perspective. It starts with a short description of the development of European schools of Landscape Architecture in different academic environments and a diversity of study programs. Then it briefly explains the efforts of the European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools to unify study programs in Landscape Architecture that culminates in an initiative for recognition of professional qualifications for landscape architects in Europe. The complexity of the study problems, the transition between scales, the ongoing formation of the planning process in the landscape design studio, and some other more practical issues are discussed at the end of the article.

KEYWORDS

Landscape Architecture Study Programs;
Curriculum;
European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools;
Professional Qualifications

HIGHLIGHTS

- Reviews the development of European Landscape Architecture study programs in the last twenty years
- Reviews the origins of landscape architecture schools in different academic environments
- Dissects recognition of professional qualifications for landscape architects in Europe
- Proposes that the complexity of study problems defines teaching process in landscape design studio

EDITED BY
Tina TIAN
TRANDLATED BY
Moying WANG, Tina TIAN, Dihua LI

1 Introduction

In the article entitled *Characteristics of Modern Landscape Architecture and Its Education*[1] published twenty years ago, the author pointed out the importance of the dual character of landscape architects, who, in their broad knowledge, must master both explicit and systematic research (scientific) methods and creativity in design, which is otherwise typical of more artistic professions. The author started from the assumption that a true landscape architect is a kind of dual personality: a creative

planner and a systematic, analytical artist (designer). The author also wrote that this dual character of landscape architecture—scientific (systematic analytical) and artistic (creative)—must also be reflected in the profile of the graduate, so school programs must be sufficiently broad (interdisciplinary) and flexible. In twenty years, the author still stands by this conclusion, especially because many European Landscape Architecture (LA) study programs have gone through quite a few structural and substantive renovations and through various accreditation processes, also with the aim of recognizing the LA profession as a regulated profession within the European Union (EU). This article tries to briefly shed light on the process of formal regulation of the profession and study programs, in the context of mandatory study areas that must be covered by LA studies.

2 Origins of European Landscape Architecture Schools in Different Academic Environments and a Diversity of Study Programs

The interdisciplinary character of LA is reflected in the variety of existing study programs, individual specializations, and a wide range of individual courses. Even a quick review of the curriculums of LA schools shows the differences in the range of individual courses. The differences are to a large extent conditioned by the faculties where the LA study programs were created. It is interesting how individual sets of spatial problems influenced the formation of study programs, depending on the faculties within which LA studies were established. For example, a focus on the design of open spaces around buildings, design of urban open spaces, emphasis on art, aesthetic issues, etc. often sponsor the formation of LA study programs at faculties of architecture or even within art academies. The design of garden art objects (gardens, parks, and other types of green spaces), with an emphasis on the knowledge and importance of plant materials, often led to the establishment of LA studies at agriculture and horticultural faculties, also at forestry schools with an emphasis on the cultivation and use of plants, gardening, arboriculture, and the like. Since the 1950s, the interest of LA in environmental problems with an emphasis on spatial (landscape) protective planning has led to the establishment of departments and study programs at faculties of natural sciences. Later, the programs began to be coordinated, and a consensus was formed on which core competencies graduates in LA must acquire. However, qualitative heterogeneity of the programs remains, which can also be a problem in certain formal and procedural issues.

Regardless of differences in the origins of LA studies, the profession and study programs relatively quickly began to be organized around two poles: landscape design and landscape planning. There are many definitions of landscape planning and landscape design, which are supplemented and developed throughout the history of the profession. We return to them again and again, they are still a frequent topic of professional conferences①[2]. The wide range of schools that provide a formal framework for the emergence of the study of LA around the world certainly contributes to these definitions, since it is a matter of different understanding of basic professional concepts, let alone fields of study or areas of work of landscape architects. This is influenced by a number of factors, among others also by the tradition of spatial planning in each country and the legal regulation of planning②[3].

Landscape design, a part of LA that historically originated from garden art, eventually went beyond the design of private gardens. Centuries ago the design of gardens and parks followed the client's requirements, even the whims of royal clients. With the appearance of the first public urban parks, landscape design focused on the design of urban open spaces in general, especially public open spaces. The design of public green areas with diverse groups of end-users of the space and the technological development of cities required complex approaches and detailed knowledge of the structure and functioning of cities. In addition to established aspects of garden design, landscape architects had to deal with the demographic and sociological characteristics of users of public urban open spaces. At the same time, they also had to master a design of complex infrastructure systems (e.g., traffic, energy, communal) to a certain extent, both functionally and technically. There are still relatively narrowly focused design and horticultural study programs available to students, which offer enough knowledge for a more "traditional" approach to landscape design. However, in the period after the Second World War, landscape design went far beyond horticultural frameworks, to which many studies around the world, not only in Europe, adapted. If we add to this awareness of environmental problems and, in the 21st century, key questions about sustainable development and design to reduce

① In his article about the characteristics of landscape planning and design, Richard Stiles said from the outset that a unified profession makes sense because "the theoretical basis of landscape planning and design have more similarities than differences" (source: Ref. [2]).

② Stiles writes, together with co-authors, in another article about "invisible infrastructure," that a wide societal context in which professions, especially LA, are developing and positioned (source: Ref. [3]).

climate problems, modern landscape design includes methods and knowledge typical of landscape planning and requires the mastery of many specific skills from sciences related to LA and work in interdisciplinary teams.

Complex environmental problems thus contributed to the creation of courses, modules, and independent master programs in landscape planning from the 1960s onwards. One part of the study programs that train for work in the field of landscape planning was developed at "planning schools" with well-established planning approaches typical of broader spatial and regional planning and with a strong emphasis on geography, planning methods, demography, spatial policies, etc. The second part of the programs was formed as a more specialized study of landscape planning within already established schools of LA or as completely independent programs.

It should be pointed out that the aforementioned diversification of study programs was also encouraged by the organization of a five-year study of LA according to the three-year undergraduate program and two-year master program (so-called "3 + 2" organization of studies). This division of studies, which has been carried out in the USA and some countries in Western Europe for decades, has supported the accreditation of various, even very specific, master studies within schools of LA. Many historic European universities, which had homogenous five- or four-year undergraduate programs and otherwise updated them on the fly, experienced major changes in the last 25 years with the Bologna Process③ in the EU, which, in addition to ensuring the comparability of standards and the quality of higher education qualifications, also influenced the restructuring of the study vertically. A result was that most of European countries switching to the "3 + 2" organization of studies. In this place, the author would not analyze the advantages and disadvantages of the introduced structural changes, but briefly reflect on what happened to the study of LA in this process. The mentioned structural changes formally enabled having bachelor studies and developing specialized master programs even under different, narrower oriented title. Namely, in accordance with the Bologna Process, the schools of LA have to fulfill two requirements: one is that the graduates of the first degree are employable and that it is possible to transfer between master programs, and the other is to enable the enrollment of other first-degree graduates to LA master programs under certain conditions. This further increased the interdisciplinarity of masters in LA, who can, after their previous first-level education, hold, for example, a diploma in Biology, Forestry, Agronomy, Geography or Urban Planning (all examples at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia). In many European countries with the old rigid university education, this leap in mentality and acceptance of the diversity of pre-education was a welcome change.

Let us return to the renewed and newly created, some very specific master studies, which no longer even use the title of "Master of Landscape Architecture" for their graduates. In my opinion, three groups of study programs in LA can be identified.

1) More "general" LA study programs, which are aware of the interdisciplinary nature of the profession and the breadth of necessary knowledge, and try to equip students with a broad knowledge of the landscape. They can still formally divide subjects into more design and planning courses, but they combine methods in solving spatial problems and blur the boundaries between planning and design. Graduates still boast the title of "Master of Landscape Architecture."

2) Study programs that are recognizable more for "design" or "planning" and can move away from complex LA landscape in their specialization. Master's degrees can still be called "Landscape Architecture," but there are also other professional titles obtained from these studies (e.g., Master of Landscape Planning).

And 3) new study programs that could hardly be described as "Landscape Architecture." Some still retain this title for the profession, but most graduates are named according to the narrower specialization obtained during their studies.

The much larger number of narrowly specialized study programs is one of the first differences compared with the situation the author described in the article twenty years ago. Namely, the development of the profession and new study programs within schools of LA increase interdisciplinarity and create new specializations, including new academic titles. The creation of new master programs should not be seen as a weakness, as it means the maturity of the profession. These, however, can at some point become so extensive and demanding that they require their own independent study. It is important that the competencies of the graduates of these study programs are clearly defined and that the relevant institutions respond to them. Everything depends on the organization and involvement of the profession by professional associations in individual countries (according to which the acquired competencies will be sufficient to practice the profession of LA).

③ The Bologna Process seeks to bring more coherence to higher education systems across Europe.

3 Efforts of the European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools to Unify Study Programs in LA

The mentioned three types of programs can be found among the members of the European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools (ECLAS). ECLAS is an association of schools based on the voluntary membership of institutions and individuals, and since its founding in 1991 it has followed the philosophy of strengthening the profession of LA by including also "marginal" studies in its organization. Membership was certainly welcome for the emerging programs and helped to establish LA as a profession in many European countries. ECLAS enabled the development and additional education of colleagues from countries where the profession was not yet well positioned or even established and the study of LA had not yet been formed.

The implementation of LE:NOTRE④ projects such as the LE:NOTRE thematic network in 2002 and then the continuation into the LE:NOTRE Plus, LE:NOTRE TWO, LE:NOTRE Mundus, LE:NOTRE TWO+, and Le:NOTRE III projects enabled the realization of the ECLAS set objectives: "giving Landscape Architecture a clear European identity and a voice in European policy making; positioning Landscape Architecture as a strong and active partner in relationships with neighboring disciplines and providing legitimacy for conducting exchanges with practice-based stakeholder organizations"[4].

In 2006, ECLAS also launched its academic journal—*Journal of Landscape Architecture*, which, in addition to broad landscape architectural topics, deals with various aspects of pedagogical work in the field of LA and, together with the annual ECLAS conferences, and offers a broad platform for the exchange of pedagogical experiences.

The focal point of ECLAS efforts was the so-called "Tuning Project." "In the framework of the Tuning Project, a methodology has been designed to understand curricula and to make them comparable. " Also, five lines of approach have been distinguished to organize the discussion in areas of 1) generic competencies of transferable skills, 2) subject-specific competencies, 3) the role of ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) as an accumulation system, 4) approaches to learning, teaching, and assessment, and 5) the role of quality enhancement in the educational process.[5]

The Tuning Project was also a reaction to the transformation of European study programs in accordance with the Bologna Process, which sought to unify all university European study programs into five-year programs, with a clear division into undergraduate and postgraduate programs. The most frequently used approach, also at ECLAS schools, was to reorganize the study of LA according to the already mentioned "3+2" formula⑤. The Tuning Project assumed that the first cycle program must contain "all core competencies in the field of landscape architecture, while a 2nd cycle program may be more specialized... [with] focus on developing research skills or professional development"[5]. Reorganization of study programs within the EU, including compliance with the aforementioned recommendation, but above all the development of the profession and the need for new skills, all together led to the formation of completely independent study programs, which, however, move away from LA, at least in name, partly also in terms of content. Some individual specializations were expected, and their naming is also understandable. Such are, for example, master in Landscape Management⑥, Landscape Development, even master program in Landscape and Well-being⑦[6]. It is important to point out that these are programs at universities where there are otherwise high-quality and established studies in LA, and these master's degrees actually represent a specialization within our profession.

In countries and universities with strongly positioned LA, narrow specializations are not problematic. The author personally sees a bigger problem in those countries where LA as an independent study is not sufficiently strong and widespread and is too tied to the study of Architecture, for example, which is also reflected in the names of the programs: Master in Architecture and Creative Practices for the City and Landscape, Master in Land Landscape Heritage, and Master in Garden Design⑧. The problem

④ LE:NOTRE stands for the thematic network project named Landscape Education: New Opportunities for Teaching and Research in Europe.

⑤ The Bologna Process somehow preferes a three-year first cycle (BSc) program of 180 ECTS credits and a two-year second cycle (MSc) program of 120 ECTS credits, though also "4 + 1" and even "5 + 0" are possible.

⑥ Almost every year, several specializations or independent master programs in Landscape Management are created. Ultimately, ECLAS understands the division of Landscape Architecture into Landscape Planning, Landscape Design, and Landscape Management.

⑦ The Keystone Master Studies platform offers a good overview of many master programs in the field of LA in one place, with brief descriptions and links to specific websites. In the list you can also find the studies mentioned in the article, here are their official names and the schools that offer these programs: Master in Landscape Management (University of Sheffield, UK), Advanced Landscape Planning and Management Program (Newcastle University, UK), Landscape Development MSc (Dresden University of Applied Sciences, Germany), Landscape and Wellbeing MSc (The University of Edinburgh, UK), and the completely specialized Garden and Landscape History program (University of London, UK) (source: Ref. [6]).

⑧ Among them are many Italian master studies such as: Master in Architecture and Creative Practices for the City and Landscape (University of Bologna, Italy), MSc in Landscape Architecture–Land Landscape Heritage (Politecnico di Milano, Italy), and Master in Garden Design (Instituto Superiore di Architettura e Design, Milan, Italy).

is that these programs are a kind of "substitute" for a complex and high-quality study of LA.

It is interesting to note that too much dependence on the "host school" still occurs even in completely new study programs. In this context, the author's attention was drawn to the Master of Science in Synthetic Landscapes, an American program at the Southern California Institute of Architecture (Los Angeles). A decision was brought within the School of Architecture to establish a new study of LA, which they named with this rather unusual name. It is a one-year, three-semester program focused on advancing knowledge and developing expertise in the emerging topics of LA. It is difficult to judge the quality of the program because the author is limited by the information available on the school's official website. Their starting point of the program reads interestingly: "In contrast to traditional landscape design programs that focus on the stewardship of nature and traditional western cultural values associated with picturesque or sublime images of nature, this program emphasizes a global perspective where the coevolution of natural and artificial systems is shaping an ever more synthetic world." On the other hand, their presentation of the curriculum is quite ordinary (traditional) for LA: "… the curriculum will incorporate the development of skills and technical knowledge integral to a landscape architecture practice today. Traditional fields of knowledge such as botany, horticulture, soil engineering, and land use policy will be studied in conjunction with new areas of expertise such as geographic information systems, data analysis, and advanced representational technologies"[7]. In their presentation film, individual problems of the modern world are highlighted, from climate change to specific landscape problems, which they want to solve through the newly created program. Of course, each school has its own development strategy, and consideration of the need for a "new" study that would educate graduates to solve such problems. It is interesting, however, that these are problems that we deal with on a daily basis in established studies of LA, at least for the last fifty years. The vocabulary used today by all of us who are connected in one way or another with spatial planning in the broadest sense of the word includes terms such as: sustainability, sustainable development, global warming, climate changes, ecological awareness and concern, green design, green architecture, green infrastructure, New European Bauhaus, and the like⑨[8]. Obviously, new and even marginal programs are better established in terms of public relations and know how to market themselves better. Therefore, it is necessary to constantly present LA, underscore the competencies of landscape architects, highlight examples of good practice, and ultimately even participate in the political activities, both through the political programs of parties and within civil initiatives, to clearly present what our profession has to offer.

If the author returns to the review of study programs and the assessment of the quality of a whole range of diverse studies that want to be LA, one must check their curricula and the content of individual course (syllabus). Still, the only real mirror of the graduates' profile is the review of student works and their achievements. Therefore, presentations of student projects are welcome in traditional "year books," individual reports, overview exhibitions, or via the websites of studies⑩[9]. From the description of the problems, work methods, and graphic presentations of individual project phases, and above all from the results (final maps, models, and descriptions of the solutions), we can fairly well judge the basic orientation of the program as well as its quality.

4 Recognition of Professional Qualifications for Landscape Architects in Europe

The heterogeneity of study programs can be an advantage, especially if we understand it from the perspective of interdisciplinarity (switching between programs) and mobility (fulfilling part of the study obligations abroad). Then why the need for greater unification of programs, and which was also the purpose of the aforementioned Tuning Project? The answer to these is simple: more unified programs become important criteria in formal procedures, especially in international accreditation of the study of LA, and in procedures for the recognition of previously acquired education either for continuing studies at another university or for the needs of pursuing a profession in another country. Most often this happens in three cases: 1) in the accreditation process of LA studies in individual country; 2) in the process of obtaining any of the international accreditations; and 3) in procedures for professional recognition (at least inside Europe).

National accreditations of LA studies are in principle not a problem. The procedures are subject to national legislation in the field of higher education and formal requirements as determined by

⑨ Ellen Fetzer points out LA education needs to respond to sustainable development and the global sustainability goals and compares existing educational frameworks for LA with UNESCO learning objectives for Sustainability Development Goal 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities Sustainable Development Goal (source: Ref. [8]).

⑩ For example, a recent yearbook of the Department of Landscape Architecture in Ljubljana includes, in addition to a graphic overview of all design studios, the presentation of award-winning student projects from international student competitions and the research and design achievements of the employees (source: Ref. [9]).

the relevant ministries or national agencies in the chosen country. Naturally, the definition of the profession, the definition of the field of work, and the requirements for competences that future graduates of LA must acquire come to the fore. Nowadays, it is difficult to put together a study program without starting from the experience of similar programs abroad. In the accreditation process of the "Bologna study" of LA in Slovenia, for example, the national agency required a comparison with three similar foreign programs. In doing so, the alignment of the reformed program with the already mentioned Tuning Project which played a constructive and positive role, was also highlighted. It offered the reference to the already agreed common starting points of the study, as defined by ECLAS, and brought the expected results—easier and faster accreditation of the study program.

Obtaining international accreditation should not be problematic either. Anyone who wants to obtain any of international accreditations simply has to fulfill the prescribed requirements set by the chosen institution whose accreditation he/she wants. For example, the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) offers accreditation to LA degree programs that must meet very clear requirements. Schools must submit a rather complex package of required documents. Among other things, the knowledge and skills of the graduates must be clearly described, a list of individual subjects (courses) must be provided, and the number of ECTS must also be determined for each one. In this case, the accreditation at the IFLA organization of the BSc and MSc LA programs of Ljubljana University is also taken as an example. Since the beginning of the studies fifty years ago, Ljubljana University tried to form the program in a similar way as it was arranged at the best European schools, and followed the ECLAS Tuning Project⑪[10] to renovate the programs in accordance with the Bologna document. In this process, the author was surprised by a fact that only 14 European countries have so far obtained IFLA accreditation for their 20 programs[11]. The number is surprisingly low, especially if we know that there are 25 EU members and a total of 73 schools in them, which have 132 BSc and MSc programs in LA[12]. If we add to this 13 schools from the United Kingdom and three Swiss schools, together with their 36 programs, we get over 160 study programs, of which only 20 are accredited by IFLA. The reason for such a low number of IFLA-accredited European programs is not a possible failure to meet the requirements for accreditation, but the simple fact that many countries in which landscape architecture is a recognized and valued profession (e.g., Great Britain, most Scandinavian countries) do not see any need for additional international accreditations.

The unification of study programs and the determination of the common competencies of graduates become crucial in the efforts of ECLAS and IFLA for the recognition of Professional Qualifications Directive (PQD) for landscape architects in Europe in the last five or six years. The final goal of the regulation of the profession is that the study programs would be equalized to the extent that graduates could transfer between countries without the additional verification of their competences to practise the profession. This does not mean that certain requirements depending on the regulation of the profession in the individual country, for example, obtaining a design license would be eliminated, but the overall process should be much simpler and faster.

For this, a concept of the Common Training Framework (CTF) for LA is needed in order to set standards for professional qualification⑫[12][13]. In fact, it all started with the activities of IFLA thirty years ago and then ECLAS joined in efforts in 2010⑬[14]~[17]. In more recent times, it is worth highlighting the EU-LAND21 project[18], which determined how LA study programs should be designed to achieve common criteria for recognition of the profession five years ago. It is important here that three specializations/fields of work of landscape architects have been recognized: "To be recognized as a component of professional recognition, landscape architecture programs delivered by university-level institutions must teach competence in the core area of the discipline, which is landscape planning, design and management"[18].

The aim of recognition process can also be presented by referring to specific objectives of the InnoLAND Project, a project that was further conceived to support the process with appropriate documents, considerations, and proposals. Specific objectives of the InnoLAND project were: "implementing Professional Qualifications Directive requirements to foster automatic recognition of LA profession in Europe; establishing pan-European quality standards for LA study programs and homogenizing LA education in Europe;

⑪ ECLAS list of members consists of 91 member schools, including some from Turkey, Russia, and even one from China (source: Ref. [10]).

⑫ More details can be found in the reports of the InnoLAND Project and the article summarizing the main activities and findings of the InnoLAND Project until 2021 (source: Refs. [12][13]).

⑬ A comprehensive history of efforts to recognize the profession can be seen from the overview of relevant documents, some of them already 15 years old such as Robert Holden's article *Europe-wide Recognition of Landscape Architecture Degrees and Professional Qualifications* and Stiles' article *European Cooperation Between Educators and Landscape Architecture Schools*, or IFLA recognition efforts in the last four or five years as published by ECLAS (source: Refs. [14]~[17]).

developing an exemplary master study program framework in line with the European Common Training Framework"⑭[12].

The core of the CTF for LA follows the logic that was implemented by the Bologna Process, which clearly introduced the use of professional language in terms of presenting required knowledge through defining competencies and skills. When it gets to competencies, the same three groups of competencies (as in Bologna Process) are described: core competencies, subject specific competencies, and generic competencies (more specifically transformative, instrumental, interpersonal, and systemic competencies). The last version of the CTF for LA proposed by the partners of InnoLAND was sent for verification to the LA European schools on October 28, 2022. In the chapter *Fields of knowledge, understanding and skills* it specified the following:

> *"Landscape architecture projects, programs and strategies need to be both feasible and sustainable. They should grow out of and fit into their social, environmental, economic and cultural context, with the participation of all relevant actors. For this, landscape architecture study programmes must result in acquiring competencies in landscape planning, landscape design and construction, landscape management as established by the guidance documents of the European landscape architecture organisations for higher education and professional practice:*
>
> *a. Landscape Planning for developing plans, strategies, scenarios, and visions for sustainable urban and rural landscapes;*
>
> *b. Landscape Design for the creation of sustainable, functional, meaningful landscapes of an outstanding design quality;*
>
> *c. Landscape Management for developing ecological-based tactical, strategical, and operational landscape management plans."*[19]

The document further defines individual competencies that should be included in the study program of LA (BSc + MSc). However, the idea behind EU accreditation or recognition of profession is to keep the requirements as simple as possible—only 12 main fields written on one page. Such broadly defined conditions should enable the inclusion of a wide range of schools of LA. This would continue the tradition of broad (and numerous) membership of various interdisciplinary programs to be included in ECLAS. The author's personal opinion, though, is that the requirements for automatic recognition of the profession are thereby too generalized, although must admit that the mentioned wide range of knowledge covers both the field of landscape planning and design. There is a problem in the procedures that will follow in individual countries, where detailed decisions will be made. However, with a constructive and positive understanding of the list, the result should be successful.

The required level of knowledge is in accordance with level 7 of the European Qualification Framework—the level of master's degrees. The IFLA Europe recognition standards now define a training of at least four years. In some countries, a diploma course or bachelor level can give admission to the register of the National Association or the Chamber. Since the CTF does not overrule national regulations and landscape architects need to be on the same level of competence as other disciplines (e.g., architects), a master level is essential and does not compromise the national context. Here we can have a problem with those masters in LA who hold BSc degree in other discipline and have completed only a two-year master's degree with a one-year transition or preparation year (in total: three years of LA training only). Are their acquired competencies sufficient? One argument in support of these graduates is, that masters with different BSc degrees will further increase the interdisciplinary nature of LA. A second argument is, the relevance of acquired knowledge, or competencies of those masters of LA with less than five years' education, who want to practice the profession of landscape architects will be regulated by the chamber system through professional exams and obtained authorizations (licenses). Nevertheless, the author thinks that landscape architects with a five-year degree in LA still have a bit more knowledge and experience in the profession at least when we talk about young graduates with no practical experience yet. For that reason, it is crucial, that after successful graduation of a master an additional professional traineeship under supervision of a qualified landscape architect is required. The organisation and recognition process of this traineeship must be defined by the competent national bodies.

It is interesting that the CTF document does not provide specializations, although this article pointed out many of them. The authors of the document make an explanation: "There are no

⑭ Professional Qualifications Directive (the *Directive 2005/36/EC*) increases a mobility of professionals inside EU by regulating issues of skilled workers who wish to practice their profession outside their home country or the country they received their education from.

specialisations for LA programmes defined in the CTF. Some argue for mentioning landscape planning and landscape design. As long as landscape architecture programmes meet the standards of the CTF, programmes can have different focuses in the content or HEIs [higher education institutions] can have courses with different specialisations. There might be confusion if two specialisations are mentioned because this would call for a specification of the standards and competencies for each specialisation"[13].

The whole idea of regulation is quite broad. The structure and length of LA programs is not included in the CTF. Given the diversity of the programs, the author still thinks that a requirement in the number of ECTS (per year and in total) would be welcome. The acquisition of missing or additional competencies will be left to the candidates (students). It works in study systems that are largely implemented with many elective courses, and above all with a flexible schedule of courses (as, for example, at most universities in the USA). However, that in the relatively rigid European universities, taking additional courses will be tied to fairly rigid schedules and the organization of the school calendar, which can prolong studies. This may discourage candidates from taking the necessary additional courses. Further advice on the content of programs, conversion masters, and the acknowledgment of previously acquired competencies can be included in the ECLAS guidance.

In case of required practical work, the author agrees with the idea that the issue of mandatory practice should remain in the domain of national regulators. In small countries (such as Slovenia), there are relatively few suitable LA bureaus where students could do practice as part of their regular study obligations. Therefore, it is better to leave the requirement to complete a two-year internship for the time after graduation and before taking the professional exam.

5 The Complexity of the Study Problems, the Transition Between Scales, and the Ongoing Formation of the Planning Process in the Design Studio

Given the described awareness of the interdisciplinarity of LA and individual specializations, how do we then approach the teaching of individual subjects, especially design studios in our daily practice? This is a common thread of almost all annual ECLAS conferences. Of all the conferences in the rich thirty-year history of the ECLAS organization, the author would like to point out two recent ones: the 2019 ECLAS conference in Norway and the 2022 conference in Slovenia.

The Norwegian conference presented to the professional public many contributions from *The Routledge Handbook of Teaching Landscape*[20], which is entirely devoted to the pedagogical approaches to teaching LA, from basic courses to design studios⑮. In the handbook, the design studio is highlighted, which according to ECLAS recommendations is the most suitable form of imparting knowledge and should comprise at least half of the curricula (contact hours). It is about establishing project work in studios and daily interaction between teachers and students. With the development of digital tools and the large amount of high-quality spatial data available, the relationship between the individual phases of the planning process is already changing. Carl Steinitz said that in the future, working with computers will be very easy, with a huge amount of available data, so we have to teach students methods, since the initial inventory phase is almost no longer necessary (as quality spatial data is available) and the analytical phase is accelerated by computer modeling. In his opinion, the classic one-semester studio will thus turn into a one-month studio, because much of the introductory work will be done in time[21]. A development in digital spatial data collections and increasingly powerful GIS packages undoubtedly make the work easier, but at the same time, can also be problematic. Namely, the speed and ease of accessing the available data, in the author's experience, to a certain extent, puts students to sleep and too often they do not learn and remember important information about the space or can even misinterpret the space. Therefore, the teacher must ensure "that students are able to connect all relevant information, that they learn how to evaluate the mass of data available to them and choose suitably. Students need to understand that the new media are an aid to the designer but are not necessarily an advantage for a quality solution, and that too-rapid use of digital presentations may be too superficial, to the detriment of substantive solutions to spatial problems"[22].

Digitization blurs the transitions and the boundaries between scales, which must be used as an advantage in the planning process. Former dependence on specific scale is no longer important. The computer is "scaleless." Students must take into account two starting points. The first is that there is no scale, or it is determined by a clear definition of the problem and the selection of the method by which the problem will be solved. Only substantive questions

⑮ For the book, the author himself contributed a chapter on studio-based landscape design teaching, which mainly talks about how to improve students' creativity in solving design problems.

and dilemmas, in accordance with the availability of spatial data during the planning process, define a concrete scale. The second point is that, if necessary, we transfer (switch) across different scales, all in the service of a high-quality final solution.

Spatial problems are so complex that many established methods and practices are no longer useful. Landscape architects must organize and conduct strategic stages of designing for long-term changes within complex systems, which is especially important in the study process. The author has participated in a design studio in which students focused on small-scale or large area planning projects, and then continued on larger-scale, small area design based on previous planning decisions. Spatial scenarios were designed for selected time windows with differing levels of response to a set of identified driving forces such as climate and demographic changes. The scenarios explored the spatial consequences of giving different priorities to environmental, societal, and economic goals. This exercise exposed various conflicts and different strategies of achieving global and local goals and offered a unique perspective to optimize spatial scenarios. The comparison of evaluations allowed the students to directly compare the effectiveness of different strategies/goal definitions in space and time.

The scenario development and evaluation serve as a reference and provide argumentation for planning proposals. In this process, students identify the key spatial decisions that need to be made and process them at the local level with more detailed criteria at selected locations, which is otherwise a common approach in spatial planning and design studios. Students are aware of the whole complexity of the problem and choose more thoughtful solutions. By that, students learn how strategic decisions can alter the detailed physical reality of the landscape, or in other words how to deal with complex problems, by understanding rather than "just" learning to respond to the driving forces and produce flexible proposals (instead of "fixed" solutions) to these problems⑯[23].

In practice and in the pedagogical process, we encounter a set of broad spatial problems. At the BSc level, the problems in the studio can still be tied to the specific type of open space and students in the first year studio, for example, start with a garden next to a single-family house, continue with a children's playground, a cemetery, a small city park, etc. Later (in MSc design studios), we can no longer follow "traditional" types of open space, for which there are several reasons. One reason is that there are simply too many types of spaces or landscapes or there are no longer types at all. The problems are also so complex that we often have to "invent types of space" on the fly, combine very different uses, and take into account very different specific criteria for solutions. For example, you are designing a public park for half a million citizens, but you have to take into account a specific habitat, plant or animal species, spaces for socializing, a children's playground, as well as an educational ecological path. In doing so, you jump between regional scale (e.g., ecological processes, green infrastructure) and local scale.

Another reason is that there is simply not enough time within a school year to systematically process all different types of landscapes. Therefore, the right approach is the one via which the students themselves have to choose a basic topic (interest), define a problem, and try to solve it at a given location. It is the phase of searching and defining the problem that opens up opportunities for asking the right questions, which is often more important than offering the right solutions. Here we find ourselves faced with a dilemma: are teachers still able, given the amount and complexity of the problems, to guide students to appropriate solutions? Or are we really more focused on asking the right questions? On the Slovenian conference, Steinitz said that the pedagogical approach according to which "we are training more than we are educating" is wrong. Teachers must be aware that they "must know a lot about a little and a little about a lot!" And as he added, "strategy across disciplines is more important than detail in one of them if the problem is complicated"[21]. Therefore, it is crucial, that the ideal teacher of a design studio is "a knowledgeable and theoretically well-versed landscape designer who, in addition to design itself, also masters the teaching of theoretical aspects, is a skilled art critic and who knows how to recognize the potential of an individual student"[22].

It is about defining the problem in an interdisciplinary spirit, so that we can then solve it with our knowledge and expertise. This supports the diversity of MSc programs and combined degrees in terms of content, as MSc students who do not have a landscape architectural background are often better in the end because they come to study being more mature and knowledgeable in other skills than BSc-educated landscape architects. If this process continues (also in Europe), the first level of LA studies will be sufficient for "landscape architectural operatives"—designers of green spaces

⑯ Five years ago the LA program in the University of Ljubljana joined the International Geodesign Collaboration (IGC), which includes 240 universities from 61 countries. The MSc design studio roughly follows the IGC structure of the planning process and constantly supplement with its own knowledge. It is the transition between spatial scales that has been proven to be very important in most cases. Namely, students often recheck the "local" solution at the "regional" or even "global" scale and refine it (source: Ref. [23]).

(gardens, parks, cemeteries), while masters will be more capable in solving more complex global problems, because of achieved knowledge at other programs in addition to LA. This can also be achieved through the aforementioned professional requirements in the chamber system. Similar to the case of physicians, who must first do an internship and then specialize (in practice) in the chosen field after completing their studies. Even landscape architects, just like the whole set of other professionals, will have to think about continuing education and acquiring competences in practice, so that we can make up for those subjects that interest us or are necessary for specific work, but we did not acquire them through the regular study.

6 Instead of a Conclusion

As already pointed out in the article, we are constantly faced with various definitions of the profession, its specialist branches, teaching methods, the organization of the design studio, and the like. We are constantly supplementing, adjusting, and improving our thinking, professional definitions, as well as formal legal definitions. At schools, we must react to all of this and decide which content (knowledge) we include in study programs. We pedagogues are committed to continuous and ongoing updating of curricula and syllabuses. We must respond to problems, invite experts to the studio, behave in an interdisciplinary manner, and introduce new contents and courses. It is practically impossible to predict what specific spatial problems will be acute in 30 or even 50 years from now, so it is not easy to create a curriculum. However, the profession is aware of this and sees the diversity of study programs as an added value to LA. Technical knowledge and craft skills can be acquired in practice, but at the faculties we must teach students to recognize and understand problems and to be creative in the broadest sense of the word. Armed with this knowledge, they will be able to participate in interdisciplinary groups and will ask the right questions in the future.

Competing interests | The author declares that he has no competing interests.

REFERENCES

[1] Gazvoda, D. (2002). Characteristics of modern landscape architecture and its education. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 60(2), 117–133.

[2] Stiles, R. (2023). Evolution and Reflection – Back in Ljubljana, and Still Talking About Definitions… In: T. Bevk & M. Golobič (Eds.). *Scales of Change: Conference Proceedings* (pp. 29–34). Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana.

[3] Stiles, R., Mertens, E., & Karadeniz, N. (2023). 'Invisible Infrastructure' – Or Why Some Professions Are More Equal Than Others. In: T. Bevk & M. Golobič (Eds.). *Scales of Change: Conference proceedings* (pp. 295–303). Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana.

[4] Stiles, R. (2009). *LE:NOTRE TWO+ Towards wider objectives* [unpublished, project presentation package distributed to ECLAS members].

[5] Bruns, D., Ortacesme, V., Stiles, R., de Vries, J., Holden, R., & Jorgensen, K. (2010). Tuning Landscape Architecture Education in Europe. *ECLAS Guidance on Landscape Architecture Education: The Tuning Project*. ECLAS–LE:NOTRE.

[6] The Keystone Master Studies Platform. (2023). *49 master programs in Landscape Architecture 2024*.

[7] SCI-Arc. (2023). *Master of Science in Synthetic Landscapes*.

[8] Fetzer, E. (2022). Joining Forces: Landscape Architecture and Education for Sustainable Development. In: D. Bruns & S. Hennecke (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Landscape Architecture Education* (pp. 62–70). Routledge.

[9] Gazvoda, D. (Ed.). (2022). *Yearbook of Landscape Architecture Program, 2020/2021, 2021/2022*. Department of Landscape Architecture, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana.

[10] IFLA Europe. (2022). *Recognised Landscape Architecture educational programs/courses*.

[11] IFLA Europe. (2023). *InnoLAND project*.

[12] ECLAS. (2023). *List of members*.

[13] de Vries, J., Stauskis, G., Auweck, F., Triboi, R., Andreucci, M. B., de Medina, M. C. A., … Teqja, Z. (2021). An EU Common Training Framework for Landscape Architecture Addressing the Current Needs of Society. *Stop and Think*. ECLAS Conference 2021, SLU, Uppsala, Sweden.

[14] Holden, R. (2007). *Europe-wide recognition of Landscape Architecture degrees and professional qualifications*. EFLA: the European Region of IFLA Advice Note 1.

[15] Stiles, R. (2022). European Cooperation Between Educators and Landscape Architecture Schools. In: D. Bruns & S. Hennecke (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Landscape Architecture Education* (pp. 40–53). Routledge.

[16] International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA). (2019). *IFLA recognition: IFLA policy, standards and procedures for recognition of Landscape Architectural education programmes*. Oslo World Council.

[17] European Foundation for Landscape Architecture (EFLA). (1992). *Teaching Landscape Architecture in Europe – The EFLA blue book 1992*.
[18] EU-Land21 Project. (2017). *Trans-European education for landscape architects, Output 01: Guidelines on revising and developing study programmes in Landscape Architecture*.
[19] InnoLAND, & Erasmus+. (2022). *Common training framework for Landscape Architecture—Minimum training requirements*.
[20] Jørgensen, K., Karadeniz, N., Mertens, E., & Stiles, R. (Eds.). (2019). *The Routledge Handbook of Teaching Landscape*. Routledge.
[21] ECLAS 2022: Scales of Change. (2022). *Round table recording*.
[22] Gazvoda, D. (2019). Studio-based Landscape Design Teaching. In: K. Jørgensen, N. Karadeniz, E. Mertens, & R. Stiles (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Teaching Landscape* (pp. 300–313). Routledge.
[23] International Geodesign Collaboration (IGC). (2023). *Call for participation in the global climate geodesign challenge*.

https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-1-030049 收稿日期 | 2023-05-06 录用日期 | 2023-10-23 中图分类号 | TU986 文献标识码 | B

近二十年欧洲景观设计人才培养项目发展历程评述

达沃尔·格斯沃达*

斯洛文尼亚卢布尔雅那大学生物技术学院景观设计系，卢布尔雅那 1000

***通讯作者邮箱**：davorin.gazvoda@bf.uni-lj.si

摘要

本文从教师的视角回顾了欧盟景观设计教育与职业在过去二十年的发展历程。文章首先概述了不同学术环境下欧洲景观设计院系的创立背景及各类人才培养项目的演变，随后简要介绍了欧洲景观设计院系理事会统筹景观设计教学项目的进行情况，其以提出建立欧洲景观设计师职业资格认证制度的倡议为结果。最后，本文讨论了景观设计教学中研究问题的复杂性、尺度的转换、设计工作坊规划流程的逐步形成，以及实际教学与实践中的其他议题。

关键词

景观设计人才培养项目；
课程设置；
欧洲景观设计院系理事会；
职业资格认证

文章亮点

- 回顾了过去二十年欧洲景观设计人才培养项目的发展历程
- 评述了不同学术环境下景观设计院系的创立背景
- 剖析了欧洲景观设计师职业资格认证问题
- 指出景观设计教学研究问题的复杂性决定了景观设计工作坊的教学过程

编辑 田乐
翻译 汪默英，田乐，李迪华

1 引言

笔者在二十多年前发表的文章《现代景观设计与教育的特征》[1]中提到，景观设计师需要具备双重能力：在拥有广博知识的基础上，他们一方面需要精湛而系统地掌握某种科学研究方法，另一方面必须具备设计创造力，是典型的艺术职业。换言之，真正的景观设计师需具有“双重人格”，既是创造力十足的规划师，又是兼具系统思维和分析能力的艺术家（设计师）。笔者还在文中指出，正是因为景观设计具有科学（系统分析）和艺术（创造力）双重属性——且这些属性也需在毕业生身上有所体现——这就要求院校的人才培养项目具备全面性（跨学科）与灵活性。时至今日，笔者依然秉持这一观点。尤其值得一提的是，很多欧洲景观设计人才培养项目已经发生了深刻的结构性和实质性变革，打通了各项认证程序，并积极推动景观设计成为一项欧盟认证的职业。在景观设计所涵盖的强制性学习内容的背景下，本文将尝试简要阐明职业学习和院校教学项目的正式规范过程。

2 不同学术环境下欧洲景观设计院系的创立背景及多样化人才培养项目

目前，无论是各类人才培训项目、细分专业项目，还是大量相关课程，都体现出了景观设计的跨学科特点，而它们的区别很大程度上取决于开设这些项目的院系本身。有趣的是，不同景观设计院系在面临不同空间问题时，会开设不同形式的项目。例如，建筑学院或是艺术学院更关注建筑周边开放空间设计、城市开放空间设计、艺术设计和美学问题等；农艺与园艺学院聚焦于应用植物材料进行园艺设计（花园、公园及其他各类绿地）；林学院则关注植物栽培与应用、园艺与树木栽培等问题。自20世纪50年代以来，在自然科学学院中也陆续开设与环境问题及相关空间（景观）保护性规划相关的景观设计专业及项目。此后，尽管随着各类项目的步调逐渐趋于一致，景观设计毕业生应具备何种核心能力逐渐形成共识，但这种项目间的差异性仍然存在，阻碍了某些形式性和程序性问题的推进。

虽然景观设计研究的源起各不相同，但景观设计职业和教学内容很快围绕两个领域展开——景观设计与景观规划。学界对这二者有着不同版本的定义，并且随着专业的不断发展，针对这些定义的讨论一直是热门学术议题①[2]。除此之外，不同学派的建立也为世界各地景观设计研究的发展提供了框架基础，且这关系到对景观设计——无论是研究还是实践——基本专业概念的不同理解。对景观规划和景观设计定义的解读还受到包括各国的空间规划体例和相关法律法规②在内的多种因素的影响[3]。

景观设计实践起源于造园艺术，但超越了私家园林设计。几百年前，花园与公园设计多遵循客户需求，甚至是皇家贵族的异想天开。随着第一座城市公园的出现，景观设计开始关注一般城市开放空间的设计，特别是公共开放空间。公共绿地设计既要满足不同使用者的需求，也要考虑到城市的技术发展水平。这要求设计师不仅要掌握复杂的设计方法，还要对城市结构和功能具备全面认识。除了基本的花园设计工作，景观设计师还需要考虑城市公共开放空间的人口特征和社会特征，并对交通、能源及公共设施等复杂基础设施系统的功能和技术具备一定了解。当然，仍有部分景观设计院系开设相对狭义的园艺设计课程，但这些课程也足以让学生掌握“传统”的景观设计方法。不过，第二次世界大战后，欧洲乃至全球的景观设计都逐步突破园艺设计的局限，走向更广阔的领域。进入21世纪，随着环境问题的加剧，为了促进可持续发展并通过设计手段更好地应对气候问题，当代景观设计开始引入景观规划方法和知识，并要求设计师掌握其他相关学科的知识技能、开展跨学科团队合作。

自20世纪60年代以来，为了应对复杂的环境问题，欧洲院系开设了景观规划课程、教学模块和独立的硕士培养计划。“规划类院系”开设的景观规划课程讲授更宏观的空间与区域规划等成熟的规划方法，聚焦地理、规划方法、人口统计学和空间政策等。由景观设计院系设立的或完全独立的景观规划课程则促进了景观规划成为专门的研究领域。

需要指出的是，上述各类人才培养项目多为五年制（也称“3+2”学制，即本科学制三年、硕士学制两年）。美国和部分西欧国家的景观设计院系在过去几十年间均采用这种培养方式，使学生们可以完成各类（甚至非常专项的）硕士项目的认证。许多历史悠久的欧洲院系普遍采用四年制或五年制本科培养方式，但也在过去25年间跟随欧盟“博洛尼亚进程”计划③快速完成了培养方式改革。该进程不仅确保了学生能力培养和高等教育资格的质量标准，还推动了垂直知识体系的重构。在其影响下，大多数欧洲国家开始逐渐施行“3+2”模式。在此，笔者不赘述培养方式结构调整的利与弊，而旨在简要讨论这一变革对景观设计学习方式的影响。这种结构性调整使得学生可以在顺利完成本科学业后，在硕士学习期间选择更加细分的研究领域：依据博洛尼亚进程，景观设计院系应达到两项要求：其一，本科毕业生应具备就业所需的能力，且可以在硕士阶段变更其所学课程；其二，允许符合特定条件的其他专业的硕士一年级学生转入景观设计专业学习。这种培养方式极大地提高了景观设计硕士生的跨学科专业能力。以笔者所在的斯洛文尼亚卢布尔雅那大学为例，景观设计本科毕业生可以选择生物学、林学、农学、地理学或城市规划等硕士学位。令人欣喜的是，在博洛尼亚进程的影响下，很多相对保守的欧洲院校在思想认知上逐渐接纳了多元化的硕士预科培养方式。

目前，有些新兴的硕士培养项目已经不再使用“景观设计硕士”这一学位名称。在笔者看来，目前景观设计硕士培养项目可以分为三类。

1）更“广义”的景观设计项目：重视景观设计的跨学科特性，培养学生掌握更广泛的景观知识。虽然这类项目仍然分为设计项目和规划项目，但也会模糊规划与设计的界限，将二者结合起来综合解决空间问题。毕业生的学位名称依然是“景观设计硕士”。

2）偏“设计”或偏“规划”的项目：跳脱出复杂的景观设计，聚焦更加细分的领域。这类学位依然沿用“景观设计硕士”的名称，部分院系也会采用“景观规划硕士”等名称。

3）难以归为“景观设计”的新兴项目：尽管这些项目依然属于景观设计领域，但大部分院系则会采用更加具体的细分领域名称。

时至今日，已经涌现出大量的细分方向，与笔者二十年前在文章中描述的情况大相径庭。具体而言，随着景观设计的职业发展和专业院系中新兴项目的设立，景观设计的跨学科性更加突显，新的细分领域（连同新的学位名称）也不断涌现。新兴硕士培养项目的出现并非坏事，反而说明景观设计职业正在走向成熟。这类细分领域在某种意义上变得内涵丰富且要求严格，需要形成独立的研究体系。因此，这些领域对毕业生的素质能力有着明确的要求，且需要得到相关机构的认证。各国的职业协会在这一过程中发挥着至关重要的作用（他们决定了毕业生应具备的从事景观设计职业的能力）。

3 欧洲景观设计院系委员会景观设计人才培养项目一体化措施

上述三类项目在欧洲景观设计院系理事会（ECLAS）的成员院系中均有例证。ECLAS成立于1991年，其宗旨是通过不断吸纳各类“边缘”项目来推动景观设计的职业发展。ECLAS采取自愿加入制度，成员可以是机构或个人。当时，一些国家的景观设计职业定位并不明确，还有一些国家甚至尚未出现景观设计这一职业。ECLAS的成立催生了大量新兴

① 在关于景观规划与景观设计特征的讨论中，理查德·斯泰尔斯提出将这两个专业合并，因为“二者的理论基础所具备的共性远大于它们之间的差异”（来源：参考文献[2]）。

② 斯泰尔斯等人在关于“隐形基础设施”的文章中指出，应该从更宏观的社会视角来看待景观设计学的发展与定位（来源：参考文献[3]）。

③ “博洛尼亚进程”计划旨在提升欧洲各国高等教育系统的一致性。它建立了欧洲高等教育区，以促进学生和教职员工的流动，使高等教育更具包容性和普及性，并提高欧洲高等教育在全球范围内的吸引力和竞争力。

项目，使景观设计得以在欧洲多国得到职业认证，极大地促进了景观设计研究和相关继续教育的发展。

得益于2002年“景观设计教育：欧洲教学与研究的新机遇”（LE:NOTRE）主题网络的建立，以及一系列后续项目的实施，ECLAS实现了既定目标，即“明确景观设计在欧洲的职业定位，提高景观设计在欧洲政策制定中的话语权，加强景观设计与相关学科的联系，并保障景观设计与相关行业利益相关方组织的交流”[4]。

2006年，ECLAS开始发行《景观设计学报》。这本刊物除广泛关注各类景观设计议题及景观设计的各类教学问题外，每年还举办一次ECLAS大会，为景观设计教学经验分享提供了一个广泛的平台。

ECLAS的核心是一个名为“课程改革”的计划。“基于一套特有的方法论，该计划有助于加深对人才培养项目的理解并进行对比分析。”课程改革计划涉及五大方面：1）专业转换技能的一般能力培养；2）特定方向的职业能力培养；3）欧洲学分互认体系（ECTS）的应用情况；4）学习、教学和评估方法；5）教育过程中的教学质量提升的作用。[5]

课程改革计划也顺应了欧洲教学工作在博洛尼亚进程影响下的革新过程。博洛尼亚进程的目标是将所有欧洲院系的培养模式统一调整为五年制，涵盖本科和研究生学习两个阶段。大多数院系（特别是ECLAS的成员院系）采用“3+2”模式④。根据课程改革计划，“本科学习阶段应着重培养学生的景观设计核心能力；在硕士学习阶段，可以专注于特定细分领域……来培养学生的研究能力或职业技能”[5]。革新后的景观设计人才培养模式连同整体职业发展方向的调整及新的技能需求，共同催生出了一些完全独立的项目——这些项目至少在名称上已经脱离了景观设计，有的甚至在内容上也有所偏离。部分细分专业顾名思义，符合景观设计的职业发展趋势，例如“景观管理硕士”⑤、“景观发展硕士”“景观与人类福祉硕士”⑥[6]等。需要指出的是，这些项目都是从成熟且高质量的景观设计人才培养项目中分化而来的，实际上体现了景观设计的精细化职业发展趋势。

在景观设计教学与实践高度成熟的国家和院校，细分领域的出现是一种必然。在笔者看来，真正的问题在于，在某些国家，景观设计虽然已经作为一门独立学科出现，但它的话语权仍不够大，传播范围也不够广，且高度依附于建筑学体系。这也体现在课程命名上，一些课程更像是某种高质量复杂景观设计课程的“别称”，如“城市景观建筑与创意实践硕士”“土地景观遗产硕士”“园艺设计硕士”等⑦。

需要指出的是，这些新兴人才培养计划的设置依然在很大程度上取决于其所属院校。以美国洛杉矶南加州建筑学院的“人造景观科学硕士”项目为例。当时，建筑系决定开设一个全新的景观设计人才培养项目，并赋予该项目“人造景观科学硕士”这一罕见命名。项目为期一年，共设三个学期，聚焦于景观设计领域新兴课题相关的知识教授和专业技能培养。由于学院官方网站公开的信息有限，笔者无法判断该项目的质量，但从其开设初衷和课程设置中可见一斑。就开设初衷而言，“传统的景观设计人才培养项目着眼于自然管理，教授与壮美如画的自然景观密切相关的传统西方文化价值观；本项目则基于全球视角，强调在人造环境越发占据主导地位的当下，自然系统和人造系统的协同演化”。就课程设置而言，与传统培养项目大同小异，“……课程注重培养学生将专业知识和技能应用于景观设计实践的能力。在教授植物学、园艺学、土壤工程学和土地利用政策等传统知识的同时，也会涵盖地理信息系统、数据分析和高级表现技法等新兴专业技术”[7]。项目宣传片中强调，该项目致力于解决从气候变化到具体景观问题的诸多现实难题。当然，每个学院都有其自身的发展策略，“新”项目的设立也是为了培养学生具备解决此类现实问题的能力。不过，这些问题并不是新问题，而是现有景观设计人才培养项目在过去至少五十年间一直致力于解决的问题。在最广义的层面上，空间规划囊括了可持续性、可持续发展、全球变暖、气候变化、生态意识和焦点议题、绿色设计、绿色建筑、绿色基础设施、“新欧洲包豪斯”等概念，而我们所有人的教学内容都或多或少与这些概念相关⑧[8]。显而易见，此类新兴项目甚或边缘项目的出现得益于公关营销工作。因此，我们必须让景观设计走入公众视野、突出景观设计师的核心竞争力、宣传实践范例，并最终借助政党及民间力量参与政治活动，让人们清晰地认识到景观设计的职业价值所在。

当我们评述人才培养项目及评估各类潜在景观设计课程的质量时，笔者认为，必须认真考察每个项目的课程设置及每个课程的教学内容（教学大纲）。不过，真正能够反映培养对象综合能力的依然是学生作品及其所取得的成绩。因此，笔者建议继续通过传统的“年鉴”、个人汇报、作品展览或教学网站等方式展示学生的作品⑨[9]。通过各个阶段的

④ “博洛尼亚进程”（修订）更加倾向于 ECTS 下三年制 180 学分的本科学习结合两年制 120 学分的硕士学习。当然，也有一些院系采用“4+1”和“5+0”培养模式。

⑤ 在景观管理领域，几乎每年都有很多细分方向和独立硕士培养项目出现。ECLAS 最终将景观设计项目划分为景观规划、景观设计、景观管理三大方向。

⑥ “基础硕士培养项目”平台汇集了很多景观设计硕士培养项目，对每个项目都有简要介绍及相应的网页链接。本文中援引的相关项目的所属院校和官方名称分别为：英国谢菲尔德大学的景观管理硕士、英国纽卡斯尔大学的前沿景观规划与管理硕士、德国德累斯顿应用技术大学的景观发展硕士、英国爱丁堡大学的景观与人类福祉硕士，以及完全独立的英国伦敦大学的花园与景观历史硕士（来源：参考文献 [6]）。

⑦ 这些硕士培养项目主要由意大利的院系开设，如意大利博洛尼亚大学的城市景观建筑与创意实践硕士、米兰理工大学的景观设计 – 土地景观遗产硕士、米兰高等建筑设计学院的园艺设计硕士。

⑧ 艾伦 · 菲泽尔指出，景观设计教育需要关注可持续发展和全球可持续发展目标，确保现有的景观设计教育框架契合联合国教科文组织“可持续发展目标”下的第 11 号目标——可持续城市和住区可持续发展（来源：参考文献 [8]）。

⑨ 以卢布尔雅那大学生物技术学院景观设计系的年鉴为例。近年来，年鉴中不仅包含所有设计工作坊的图片介绍，还有在国际大赛中荣获各类奖项的学生作品，以及教职人员的研究设计成果（来源：参考文献 [9]）。

问题描述、工作方法和项目图片，以及项目成果（最终图纸、模型、阐释等），我们能够合理地判断培养项目的基本定位与质量。

4 欧洲景观设计师职业资质认证

从跨学科性（便于在各学习项目间切换）和可流动性（便于远程完成部分学习任务）层面来说，人才培养项目的异质性也可以被视为一种优势。那为什么还要通过课程改革计划等手段进一步统一各类项目呢？原因很简单：项目的统一性对于景观设计学习的国际认证、申请新学校时或从事跨国景观设计工作时教育经历的认定等正规流程都至关重要。常见情形包括三大类：1）各个国家内部的景观设计学历认证；2）国际景观设计学历认证；3）职业认证（特别是欧洲地区间的职业认证）。

理论上讲，景观设计学历认证只需遵照国家高等教育法律法规，以及相关部门或国家机构的规定要求，即可完成。但在实际认证过程中，会遇到职业定义、行业定义，以及对培养对象的能力要求等问题。当前，如果缺乏相关海外培养项目作为对照，就很难完成项目认证。例如，为了完成博洛尼亚进程的认证，斯洛文尼亚国家机构要求提供三个海外相似的景观设计人才培养项目作为对照。这种统一化举措使调整后的培养项目符合课程改革计划的要求，也对项目认证的积极推进有着建设性作用。卢布尔雅那大学已与其他ECLAS成员院系间达成对照，这有助于培养项目更加便捷地获得认证。

就培养对象而言，只要符合所选院系的要求，任何人都可以申请任何国际学历认证，这一点并不难。比如，国际景观设计师联合会（IFLA）可提供景观设计学历认证服务，并清晰地列出了认证要求。根据要求，院系要提交一系列复杂的认证文件，包括必须清楚描述学生的知识与技能培养目标、提供课程清单及相应的学分等。此处还是以卢布尔雅那大学景观设计本科和硕士培养项目的IFLA认证经验为例。早在五十年前，即项目开设之初，卢布尔雅那大学景观设计系便向欧洲一流景观设计院系看齐，并按照ECLAS的课程改革计划⑩[10]、遵照博洛尼亚进程要求进行教学调整。令人惊讶的是，欧洲只有来自14个国家的20个景观设计人才培养项目获得了IFLA认证[11]。这个数字远远低于预期，因为欧盟25个成员国共有73个院系开设了132个景观设计本科和硕士培养项目[12]。如果加上英国13个院系和瑞士3个院系开设的36个项目，则欧洲的景观设计人才培养项目数量已有160余个之多。造成这一结果的原因并不是景观设计人才培养项目达不到认证要求；相反，景观设计在很多欧洲国家（如英国和大部分斯堪的纳维亚半岛的国家）都备受认可和重视，因此他们认为不再需要额外申请国际认证。

在过去五六年间，ECLAS和IFLA一直在积极推广欧洲景观设计师的职业资格认证规范导则，其工作重点包括统一培养项目，并就学生能力培养目标达成共识。职业资格认证的最终目标是让跨国求职的毕业生无需进行额外的从业能力认证。当然，这并不代表毕业生不再需要根据各个国家的具体要求申请从业执照，但职业资格认证的确简化了整体流程，提高了申请效率。

为了制定职业资格认证的统一标准，我们需要一个“通用教学框架”（CTF）⑪[11][13]。事实上，IFLA在三十年前便开始着手开展相关工作。2010年，ECLAS也加入其中⑫[12]~[17]。为建立景观设计职业资格认证的通用标准，二者于五年前共同启动了“EU–LAND21项目”[18]，明确规定了景观设计人才培养项目的设立要求，并指出了景观设计师的三个主要分支领域/方向：“在职业资格认证过程中，院校级教学机构必须确保其景观设计人才培养项目囊括景观规划、景观设计和景观管理三大核心学科领域”[18]。

有关认证进程不得不提到“InnoLAND”项目。该项目为认证工作提供了相应的参考文件、考量因素和建议方案。统一认证的目的也通过InnoLAND项目的具体目标得到诠释，即“贯彻‘职业资格认证规范导则’要求，推动景观设计职业在欧洲地区的自动认证；制定欧洲通用的景观设计人才培养项目质量标准，提高欧洲地区景观设计教育均一化水平；根据CTF建立示范性硕士培养项目框架”⑬[12]。

景观设计CTF遵循博洛尼亚进程。博洛尼亚进程明确指出，在以界定能力与技能的方式规定学生必备的专业知识时，须使用专业语言。在专业能力方面，博洛尼亚进程指出学生必须掌握三种能力，分别是核心能力、学科能力和通用能力（具体而言包括思维转换能力、应用工具能力、人际交往能力及系统组织能力）。InnoLAND成员拟定的景观设计CTF最终版已于2022年10月28日向欧洲各景观设计院系颁布。其中，在“知识、理解力和技能”章节中，CTF规定：

> 景观设计人才培养计划、项目和策略应兼具灵活性和可持续性，应脱胎并适应于具体的社会、环境、经济和文化背景，各利益相关方应共同推进。因此，景观设计人才培养项目必须按照欧洲景观设计组织对于高等教育和从业能力的规范要求，保证培养对象具备景观规划、景观设计与建造，以及景观管理方面的能力。

⑩ ECLAS共有91个成员院系，其中也包括来自土耳其、俄罗斯及中国的（一个）院系（来源：参考文献[10]）。

⑪ 更多信息请参见“InnoLAND项目”报告，以及报道总结项目主要活动及成果（截至2021年）的相关文章（来源：参考文献[12][13]）。

⑫ 关于职业资格认证历程的全面回顾请参见相关综述文献，其中一些发表于十几年前（如罗伯特·霍顿于的《欧洲景观设计学历与职业资格认证》、斯泰尔斯的《欧洲教育家与景观设计院系之间的合作》），以及ECLAS发表的IFLA在过去四五年间认证工作的相关文章（来源：参考文献[14]~[17]）。

⑬ “职业资格认证规范导则”（即《2005/36/EC令》）通过对那些希望在非本国或非学历获得国从事相关工作的专业人才做出规定，增加了欧盟国家之间专业人才的流动性。

a. 景观规划指为可持续的城乡景观制定规划、策略、预景方案和愿景；

b. 景观设计指建造可持续、兼具功能与意义的高品质景观；

c. 景观管理指基于当地生态条件制定战略性、策略性、可操作的景观管理计划。[19]

CTF还进一步明确了景观设计本科和硕士培养项目应培养的学生个人能力。不过，欧盟景观设计职业资格认证的目标是尽量简化认证要求。因此，CTF仅涵盖了用一页纸就能容纳的12项主要领域。由于认证条件非常宽泛，很多景观设计院系都能被纳入其中。这也延续了ECLAS的理念，即尽可能多地将各类跨学科培养项目纳入其中。笔者认为，虽然宽泛的认证条件全面覆盖了景观规划与设计两大领域，但也使得职业资格自动认证缺乏针对性。因此，各国在开展认证工作时需要制定更加详细的要求。但总体而言，由于CTF列出的认证条件具有建设意义且便于理解，其得到了成功推进。

景观设计职业资格认证要求申请者的知识水平不低于“欧洲职业资格认证框架”中的七级，即硕士水平。IFLA欧洲区认证标准要求受教育年限不低于四年。在部分国家，国家协会或学会也认可学位课程或本科学历。在国家法律法规的要求下，景观设计师的能力水平应与其他学科从业人员（如建筑师）持平。这就引发了一个问题：部分景观设计硕士的本科专业并非景观设计，他们仅接受了一年的预科培养和两年的景观设计硕士培养（即共接受了三年的景观设计教育），那么这些学生是否满足资格认证要求呢？对于这个问题，部分人给出了肯定回答，认为拥有其他本科专业背景的学生能够进一步发挥景观设计的跨学科性。也有部分人指出，针对接受景观设计教育不足五年的硕士生，如果想要成为职业景观设计师，须按照学会体系的规定，参加专业考试、获得执业许可，确保其知识或能力达到相应要求。尽管如此，在笔者看来，仅就尚没有任何从业经验的毕业生而言，接受过五年制景观设计培养的景观设计师的专业知识和经验会相对更丰富。此外，硕士毕业生应在有资质的景观设计师的指导下接受从业培训，而相关国家部门应就从业培训的组织形式和认证工作作出具体规定。

有趣的是，CTF并未针对（前文提到的众多）景观设计细分方向作出相关规定。起草人员对此解释道：“CTF中未对景观设计专业方向进行明确规定。有人认为，文件中至少应提及‘景观规划’和‘景观设计’这两大方向。但我们认为，只要符合CTF标准，培养项目可以在教授内容上有所侧重，高校也可以针对不同的细分方向自主开设课程。如果专门提及这两大方向，反而可能造成困惑，而解答这些困惑则需要针对每个细分方向制定具体的标准、明确具体的能力要求。”[13]

统一认证工作涉及方方面面。CTF未就景观设计人才培养项目的学制作出规定。鉴于培养项目各有特色，笔者认为可以就项目的学年学分和总学分作出要求，学生可根据自身需求选修相应课程。这一方案适用于选修课程丰富、课程安排灵活（如美国大部分院校）的教学体系。而在相对严格的欧洲院校，学生选修课程时需充分考虑既有课程安排及校历安排；如若安排不当，则可能会延期毕业，这将会影响学生选修必要课程的积极性。ECLAS可就教授内容、转专业硕士及其之前的专业力认定提供指导。

对于从业实习的相关规定，笔者认为决策权应该留给各个国家的相关部门。对于斯洛文尼亚这样的小国而言，国内基本没有可供学生完成必修实习任务的景观设计部门。因此，笔者建议最好将相关要求调整为毕业后先完成为期两年的景观设计从业实习，实习结束后方可参加执业考试。

5 人才培养项目的复杂性、尺度的转换及尚未成熟的设计工作坊规划流程

上文提到，景观设计是一门细分方向众多的跨学科专业，那么应该如何进行各个课题、尤其是日常设计工作坊的教学设计呢？自成立以来，ECLAS几乎每年的年会都会讨论这一问题。囿于篇幅，本文仅回顾2019年的挪威年会和2022年的斯洛文尼亚年会。

在挪威年会上，参会人员广泛讨论了《劳特利奇景观教学手册》[20]（以下简称《手册》）的内容，聚焦景观设计的教学方法，从基础课程教学到设计工作坊等不一而足⑭。根据ECLAS的建议，设计工作坊是最理想的传道授业方式，至少半数的课程（课时）都应在设计工作坊中进行，包括教师与学生在工作坊中共同完成项目和日常互动。不过，随着数字工具的发展，以及越来越多高质量空间数据的开源，规划过程各个阶段之间的相互关系已发生改变。卡尔·斯坦尼兹曾表示，未来计算机作业将愈加便捷，大量优质的开源空间数据触手可得，现在的数据获取阶段将不再必要，计算机建模也将大大提升数据分析效率。因此，我们需要教给学生适用于这些变革的景观设计方法。在斯坦尼兹看来，由于前期的准备工作时间将被大大缩短，原本为期一个学期的工作坊的教学将会缩短至一个月[21]。随着数字空间数据采集技术与GIS工具的进步，工作过程毋庸置疑得到了简化，但笔者认为这也会带来一定的问题：由于数据过于唾手可得，学生将因为不用学习或记住重要的空间信息而“无脑操作”，甚至会做出错误的空间干预行为。因此，教师必须保证“学生能够将所有相关信息关联起来，学会从大量数据中辨别并筛选适宜的数据。学生需要明白，新的媒介只能辅助设计师，并不是生成高质量解决方案的决定性因素，过度依赖数字化表现形式可能会让设计方案仅仅流于表面，对制定空间问题的实质性解决方案并无助益”[22]。

⑭ 本文作者撰写了《手册》中的“工作坊景观设计教学”章节，主要讨论了如何提升学生在解决设计问题时的创造力。

数字化模糊了不同尺度之间的转换与边界，规划流程应将此作为一种优势。计算机帮助我们摆脱了过去对特定尺度的依赖。学生需要牢记两点：一是特定尺度已不再重要——或者说，尺度取决于具体的问题和解决办法；在解决实际问题时，会依据规划阶段可用的空间数据量级确定某一具体的尺度。二是在必要时，为了获得更优的解决方案，可以在不同尺度间转变 / 转换。

由于空间问题极其复杂，很多既有方法和做法已不再适用。面对这种持续变化的复杂系统，景观设计师必须进行策略性阶段设计，这一点在学习过程中尤其重要。笔者曾参加过一个设计工作坊，这个工作坊首先要求学生聚焦小比例尺或大区域规划项目，然后根据所做出的规划决策开展小片区或大比例尺详细设计。在不同的历史时期，空间设计要重点考虑的因素（如气候变化、人口变化）不尽相同。当环境、社会和经济目标的优先级发生变化时，空间问题的解决方案也要随之改变。这种训练方式有助于学生们发现全球性目标和局地性目标之间的各种冲突，以及相应解决方案的差异，为优化空间设计提供了独特视角。通过对比，学生们可以结合时空特点，直接评估不同策略 / 目标的优势所在。

空间场景建构与评估能够带来参考启发并支撑规划构想的提出。在这个过程中，学生需首先确定关键空间决策，然后根据目标场地的具体要求进一步将决策落实到区域层面——这有别于空间规划和设计工作坊内的传统做法。通过空间场景建构与评估，学生得以充分了解问题的全貌与复杂性，提出深思熟虑后的解决方案。学生可以从中理解空间决策对现实景观的具体影响。换言之，学生将学会基于理解来解决复杂问题并提出灵活的解决方案，而不“仅仅”是为机械地回应问题与需求而提出“定式”方案⑮[23]。

在实践及教学过程中，我们会遇到一个又一个的空间问题。在本科阶段，问题主要存在于开放空间的具体类型层面。例如，一年级的新生会由浅入深地依次接触花园设计、独户庭院设计、儿童游乐场设计、墓地设计、小型城市公园设计等。而硕士阶段接触的案例已经跳脱出了“传统”开放空间类型。其中一个原因是目前空间或景观类型过多，或者实践案例难以被划入某个具体类型。由于问题太过复杂，我们常常不得不结合不同用途和不同解决方案的标准，“创造出新的空间类型”。例如，在为几十万市民设计公园时，我们还需考虑特定栖息地、动植物物种、社交空间、儿童游乐场、教育性生态游径等，这就要求我们必须在区域尺度（如生态过程、绿色基础设施）和局地尺度间来回切换。

另一个原因在于，一学年的时间太短，不足以系统学习所有景观类型。因此，合理的做法是要求学生在某一给定场地内自行选择一项基础课题（兴趣方向），并提出问题及解决方案。在发现和拟定问题的过程中，学生有机会学习如何提出合理的问题，而这往往比给出合理的解决方案更重要。那么，面对如此众多、如此复杂的问题，教师有能力指导学生做出适宜的解决方案吗？我们真的能做到将重心放在传授如何提出合理问题上吗？在斯洛文尼亚ECLAS年会上，斯坦尼兹指出，“重训练、轻教授”的教学方法是错误的；教师必须认识到，他们“不仅要在某一领域精专，也要广泛涉猎知识”。此外，“在解决复杂问题时，跨学科策略比在某一学科内深钻更为重要”[21]。因此，理想情况下，设计工作坊的教师应该是“知识渊博、理论扎实的景观设计师，他们不仅能够指导设计，还能够讲授理论；既能对学生作品进行精准点评，也善于发现每一个学生的潜力”[22]。

在基于跨学科视角提出问题后，我们就可以利用自身专业知识来解决问题。这也体现了提高景观设计硕士培养项目多样性、鼓励非景观设计专业背景的学生攻读景观设计硕士的重要意义。由于掌握了其他领域的专业技能和知识，非景观设计专业背景的学生往往会表现得更加出色。按照（欧洲）这种培养模式，完成景观设计第一阶段学习后，本科毕业生已经能够胜任“景观设计工作”，可以从事绿地（花园、公园、墓地）设计；而非景观设计专业背景的硕士毕业生则可以利用自己在其他领域的专业知识，更加有效地解决更为复杂的综合问题。这种培养模式也符合前文提到的学会体系的专业要求。这与临床医生的培养模式类似：临床医学生毕业后需先完成在院实习，然后再选择具体的细分方向。和其他职业一样，景观设计师也需要在实践中进行再教育和能力提升，依据个人兴趣或具体的项目要求，不断补足在校期间无法习得的知识短板。

6 结语

本文指出，在职业界定、细分领域、教学方法、设计工作坊组织形式等不断变革的过程中，我们也在不断完善、调整并优化思维方式，加强职业认证和法规认证。作为教育工作者，我们要积极响应这些变化，不断更新课程设置和教学大纲；我们要直面问题，邀请专家指导工作坊，拥抱跨学科思维，引入新课程和教学内容。诚然，我们无法预测三十甚至五十年后会出现哪些严峻的空间问题，因而课程设计工作并不容易。但是我们应该看到，提高景观设计人才培养项目的多样性具有重大意义。景观设计实践固然离不开专业知识和技能，但作为教职人员，我们必须教会学生在最广义的学科领域中认识并理解问题，努力培养学生的创造性思维。唯此，学生才能更好地参与跨学科合作，并发现问题。

⑮ 五年前，卢布尔雅那大学的景观设计人才培养项目被纳入国际地理设计联盟。该组织的成员包括来自 61 个国家的 240 所院校。卢布尔雅那大学的硕士设计工作坊基本遵照国际地理设计联盟的规划流程结构，并不断融入自身特质。在工作坊的大部分教学案例中，规模转换都发挥了重要作用，学生经常从“区域”甚至“全球”尺度反思并优化“局地”尺度方案（来源：参考文献 [23]）。