

UDC 351.853.1(351.858)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2786-5681-2024-2.20>

**Serhii TSARENKO**

*PhD in Architecture, Master of Public Management and Administration, Associate Professor at the Department of Interior Design, Urban Environment and Landscape Art, National Academy of Management Personnel of Culture and Arts*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-4395-6390

**Tetyana GALYCH**

*PhD in Pedagogy, Master of Public Management and Administration, Associate Professor at the Department of Department of Philology and Humanities, Public Higher Educational Establishment “Vinnytsia Academy of Continuing Education”*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-0471-4671

**Larysa KYENKO-ROMANIUK**

*PhD in Pedagogy, Master of Public Management and Administration, Associate Professor at the Department of Management and Administration, Public Higher Educational Establishment “Vinnytsia Academy of Continuing Education”*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-2191-3453

**Olena SOLYEYKO**

*MD, PhD, DrSc, Professor, Master of Public Management and Administration, Professor of the Department of Internal and Occupational Diseases, Private Higher Educational Establishment “Kyiv Medical University”*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-7233-2886

## COMPETENCES OF PUBLIC MANAGERS FOR THE PROTECTION OF IMMOVABLE CULTURAL HERITAGE: CURRENT CHALLENGES

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to analyze the goal-setting and competence of public managers for the protection of immovable cultural heritage determined by international guidelines, to identify the key issues of the development of cooperation in this area, and to develop synthetic definitions. The research methodology is complex with the application of system analysis and the principles of management theory (cybernetics) and system-structural synthesis based on the general theory of systems, as well as the semantic-logical method of naming and classifying phenomena. The scientific novelty of the work lies in the fact that, for the first time, the problem of the lack of international consensus in the field of immovable cultural heritage protection on political culture as a necessary unifying personal competence, on integral special competences of managers has been raised, and appropriate terminological definitions have been formulated in accordance with Ukrainian traditions of branch management activity. Conclusions.* *The decisively significant obstacles to harmonious reciprocity – against the background of the development during the second half of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries of industry experience through the adoption of a number of guidance documents of specialized international organizations and forums on the protection of immovable cultural heritage, including recommendations on the competences of managers – turned out to be the pronounced centrism of civilizational identities, such as the European one, and the lack of a consensus definition for the competencies of public managers of their political culture. In the field of protection of monuments and sites, which involves their use in the interests of the world community, when each regional object presents the relevant national heritage at the world level, the decisive driving force should be an unambiguously equal treatment not only of any immovable cultural heritage, but as well as approaches to its preservation, use and presentation. The political culture of managers must be defined as a personal quality of mutual respect and the ability to negotiate without denying other identities, respectively, recognizing other approaches, traditions and interests, including the development of the national educational space, scientific, technical and industrial environment. In order for the manager to fully understand the local cultural identity, in the structure of competence of the public manager for the protection of immovable cultural heritage, which is systemically unified, along with his conditionally basic, properly managerial or administrative, personal educational and general technical competences, integral special competences are also defined. Integral competencies of public managers for the protection of immovable cultural heritage should be mandatory competencies – architectural and compositional, restoration, art history, archeography, country history.*

**Key words:** *competences, immovable cultural heritage, political culture, management.*

**Сергій ЦАРЕНКО**

кандидат архітектури, магістр з публічного управління та адміністрування, доцент кафедри дизайну інтер'єру, міського середовища і ландшафтного мистецтва, Національна академія керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-4395-6390

**Тетяна ГАЛИЧ**

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, магістр з публічного управління та адміністрування, доцент кафедри філології та гуманітарних наук, Комунальний заклад вищої освіти «Вінницька академія безперервної освіти»

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-0471-4671

**Лариса КИЄНКО-РОМАНЮК**

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, магістр з публічного управління та адміністрування, доцент кафедри управління та адміністрування, Комунальний заклад вищої освіти «Вінницька академія безперервної освіти»

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-2191-3453

**Олена СОЛЄЙКО**

доктор медичних наук, професор, магістр з публічного управління та адміністрування, професор кафедри внутрішніх та професійних хвороб, Приватний вищий навчальний заклад «Київський медичний університет»

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-7233-2886

## КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТІ ПУБЛІЧНИХ УПРАВЛІНЦІВ З ОХОРОНИ НЕРУХОМОЇ КУЛЬТУРНОЇ СПАДЩИНИ: АКТУАЛЬНІ ВИКЛИКИ

**Анотація.** Метою статті є аналіз обумовлених міжнародними настановами цілепокладання й компетентностей публічних управліців з охорони нерухомої культурної спадщини, виявлення ключової проблематики розвитку співпраці у цій сфері та розроблення синтетичних визначень. **Методологія** дослідження – комплексна із застосуванням системного аналізу та принципів теорії управління (кібернетики) й системно-структурного синтезу на основі загальної теорії систем, а також семантико-логічний метод найменування та класифікації явищ. **Наукова новизна** роботи полягає в тому, що вперше поставлено проблему відсутності у сфері охорони нерухомої культурної спадщини міжнародного консенсусу з політичної культури як необхідної об'єднуючої особистісної компетентності, з цілісних спеціальних компетентностей управліців та сформульовано відповідні термінологічні визначення згідно з українськими традиціями галузевої управлінської діяльності. **Висновки.** На тлі розвиненості протягом 2 половини ХХ – початку ХХІ століть галузевого досвіду шляхом прийняття низки настановних документів міжнародних організацій і форумів з охорони нерухомої культурної спадщини, у тому числі й рекомендацій з питань компетентностей управліців, суттєвими перешкодами гармонійній взаємності виявились центризм цивілізаційних ідентичностей, як-от європейської, і відсутність консенсусного визначення для компетентностей публічних управліців їх політичної культури. У сфері охорони нерухомих пам'яток, що передбачає їх використання в інтересах світового співтовариства, вирішальною рушійною силою має бути однозначно рівноправне ставлення не лише до будь-якої нерухомої культурної спадщини, але також і до підходів щодо її збереження, використання та презентації. Політичну культуру управліців необхідно визначати як особистісну якість взаємоповаги й здатності домовлятися, не заперечуючи інших ідентичностей, відповідно, визнаючи інші підходи, традиції та інтереси; цілісними спеціальними компетентностями охоронців нерухомої культурної спадщини визначаються компетентності архітектурно-композиційні, реставраційні, мистецтвознавчі, археографічні, країнознавчі.

**Ключові слова:** компетентності, нерухома культурна спадщина, політична культура, управління.

**Formulation of the problem.** With regard to the protection of immovable cultural heritage – a complex of tasks, which, according to the definitions of the Venice Charter of 1964, include the identification of heritage objects, their accounting, preservation, research, restoration and adaptation

and effective use, – the problems is usually called as that is methodical, technical, legal, technological, resource-financial, resource-personnel which regard the needs in restorers [9] and the needs in state bodies and their employees – public managers [11; 15]. The last named (but actually the most

important) problem – personnel, like the rest of the problematic aspects, is considered from the standpoint of the implementation of conventional international experience aimed at ensuring those goals that have been recorded at the UN level in recent decades as the goals of sustainable development of humanity, including – in sphere of culture [1; 4].

It is not by chance that the “Competence Framework for Cultural Heritage Management” developed and published by UNESCO aims not only and not so much to compile a list of competencies (it should be considered elements of a single competence) in order for the work with cultural heritage to be conducted efficiently and effectively, not only not so much the definition of competences (elements of competence) to promote the development of appropriate education, but last but not least – ensuring the creation of systems of professional qualifications and, ultimately, the possibility of introducing systems of professional certification and licensing [2, p. 19]. The declared “final result” actually contains the threat of the essential subjectivism of experts who, based on the authority of international guidelines, will certify specialists and license the activities of specialized organizations, in particular educational ones, and this is the biggest obstacle to the equal development of international cooperation in the management of immovable cultural heritage, and hence the problem of managing its protection. After all, even the leniency of UNESCO’s understanding (by managers) of local stakeholders, communities and cultures determined by the competencies of managers implies in practice the expert inclusion (inevitably subjective) of traditional knowledge systems in heritage management policies and processes [2, p. 64–71]. In addition, at the international level, a single definition of the mandatory integral special competencies of public managers in this field has not been developed: for the areas of preparation of the actual restoration specific group of skills [5], and for public managers, UNESCO experts recommend special technical competencies only as examples disciplinary content [2, p. 95]. And the most dramatic challenge today for the protection of immovable cultural heritage in Ukraine is the urgency of conceptually defining the relevant management competencies for the formation of educational programs and training of specialists, taking into account the obligation to borrow European and world experience, on the eve of the end of the

armed conflict and the subsequent reconstruction of Ukraine, including solving all the problems of monument protection in the process of necessary reconstruction.

#### **Analysis of sources and recent research.**

Like the majority of complex specialized areas of activity, cultural heritage management, namely and especially the set of measures for the protection of immovable heritage, has always been in the focus of ideological and methodological discussions. Ambiguity of goal-setting is based not only on objective industry complexities and problems, but above all on the specifics of the linguistic and cultural environment and terminological ambiguity; the latter for culture in a broad sense and for immovable cultural heritage in particular is a characteristic meaningful essence of discussions [7], although, it would seem, terminology should be agreed upon, not argued about. That is why every international document begins with the definition of concepts, and this study is no exception: the proposed approaches and concepts are terminologically formulated here in the article. But it should be borne in mind that due to local linguistic and cultural peculiarities and objective difficulties of translation, there is always not only some incompleteness of international communication, but also a very definite need for the development of the local original environment (in particular, by studying foreign experience), and at all not the alleged need to “integrate” the original tradition into the system of politics predetermined by external borrowings. This really reveals a deep systemic problem of efforts to adapt domestic experience and approaches to foreign guidelines on cultural policy [1; 15]. Their implementation on the local soil is naturally faced with significant, sometimes insurmountable normative-methodical, organizational-legal, resource-financial and even socio-economic problems [12; 18].

The Ukrainian tradition of managerial activities involves the development of management culture [10], the comprehensive improvement of the manager’s communicative competences [8], the search for a harmonious compromise between public and private interests [10; 17] against the background of borrowing the best foreign achievements and practices in organization and management technology, in particular, in the field of cultural heritage preservation [11]. Until recently, the culture of industry management in Ukraine was considered

in the broad sense of positive cultivation and nurturing of a distinctive public environment under the administrative organization of society on the basis of a unitary state. This tradition is connected with national state-building of the European type in the conditions of overcoming the post-industrial deformations of the former so-called “administrative-command system”, under which a system of branch offices in the bodies of executive power was formed, which adds problematic specificity and differences from flexible and branch organization, including the sphere of cultural heritage protection, developed democratic countries with a complex federal system, such as Germany or the USA, or countries with a traditional society of ancient origin, such as Great Britain [13; 14].

**The purpose of the study** is to analyze the goal-setting and competence of public managers for the protection of immovable cultural heritage determined by international guidelines, to identify the key issues of the development of cooperation in this area, and to develop synthetic definitions.

**Presenting main material.** Features of the development of managerial activities in the field of culture from the experience of those countries that are usually evaluated as developed countries are characterized by the consistent implementation of a certain cultural policy as an a priori true civilizational trend [15; 16]. In general, the somewhat paradoxical phrase “cultural policy”, with all the consequences of such goal-setting, singles out Western civilization precisely in the global context [4].

Developed by UNESCO, the “Competence Framework for Cultural Heritage Management” as a guide to the basic skills and knowledge that professionals and organizations working in the field of heritage should have, contains 198 established competencies of their 4 types – from the so-called core, management, personal and special technical competencies [2, p. 3, 53–104]. International “best practices” of heritage policy regarding the rights of local communities; principles and ethical methods of participation and experience – again, internationally advanced – official participation of communities in the management of heritage objects [2, p. 69–71]. The desire for an organized and legitimized “official” participation of local communities correlates, in the context of these definitions of international experts, with the very first direction of managerial competences allocated by them – human resources management.

The description of management competencies at the four levels proposed by experts, from qualified employee to official, as for the so-called core competencies, demonstrates the strengthening of competence (i.e., the level of responsible decisions) in the areas of human resource management, organizational management, and strategic heritage planning, of financial and operational management, as well as management and administration of information and from the direction of communication, cooperation and coordination. The last direction of competences (which is the first, for example, in the Ukrainian tradition of management culture [8; 10]) is ensured, according to international experts, by the skills to participate effectively (in meetings, negotiations, etc.), ensure effective communication (in the system cultural heritage), use effective communication techniques and similar skills under conventional labels of overly generalized content [2, p. 75–90]. Perhaps this incompleteness and shallow generalization of the definitions would be compensated by more detailed recommendations on personal competencies, but in this part, for all levels of managers, in two definitions – “foundation personal competencies” and “advanced personal competencies” – it is recommended to demonstrate skills, knowledge and fundamentals of behavior associated with the expected moral and ethical qualities of the manager and his developed ideas about management, reinforced by general literacy, knowledge of languages, methods and techniques of stress management, etc., the lists of knowledge and skills here are quite extensive [2, p. 92–93], but in fact it would be enough to indicate certain levels of higher education of the manager and his skills in possessing emotional intelligence. In the section on “Specialized technical competences”, the experts immediately noted that the professional directions given by them are only disciplines given as examples.

On the example of the study of numerous international – mainly European in their cultural origin – documents on the protection of immovable cultural heritage, there is indeed a tendency to accumulate permanent, over decades, analytical definitions from various aspects of this single case [6] – definitions that are contextually accurate in the discourse of each convention, charter or recommendations according to the types of heritage or areas of protection, but the content is not fully relevant to the holistic activity in its traditional

interpretations. We mean the long-term period of Western legislative and other normative and legal developments of a fairly integral sectoral nature, in particular, from the experience of Great Britain. It was with the adoption of the first British legislative acts in this direction in 1882 that the development of the protection of antiquities in the West began. Although after the Uniform Antiquities Act of 1913 (apparently following the American federal Antiquities Act of 1906), most British laws and other historic preservation regulations, as in the United States, were adopted after World War II, and it took more than a century for the organization of centralized management of cultural heritage protection, from the time of the first British law – the Department of National Cultural Heritage of the United Kingdom was created in 1992 – this experience confirms the pan-European tendency of consistent, unhurried formation of a meaningfully detailed, legally differentiated, institutionally and departmentally branched and at the same time holistic management in this field. In addition to the central key structure of the state, a number of high-ranking officials, as well as professional scientific research institutions, collegial bodies and public associations of specialists, determined at the state level, participate in decision-making on the protection of immovable (and other) cultural heritage of Great Britain. The latter was created in 1983 as an advisory body under the Ministry of the Environment, which finances a number of life-saving monument protection directions; the Ministry of Development of Scotland has similar functions [14; 15; 16]. An important organizational and structural feature of this work in the regions of Great Britain is the close interaction of special bodies with local authorities – with county and district councils and other units of local self-government that deal with the protection of cultural objects (and not entrusting, as in Ukraine, the entire issues related to officials with limited powers in executive bodies of local self-government). British special bodies have real, and not limited bureaucratically and financially, broad powers: they can declare the protection status of objects and take them under official state protection, open funding for research and rescue work, make decisions on including various objects in state protection registers and adjacent areas, etc. In Ukraine, there is no such official who would be authorized to make a personal professional decision, such as the British Secretary of State in the

matter of monument protection. A comparison of domestic problems with the achievements of Great Britain would seem to be insufficiently balanced from the point of view of the potential inaccessibility of relevant borrowings, because British culture, society, state and other structures of public administration are quite specifically developed. But it should be borne in mind that the Ukrainian national legal tradition in the field of monument protection also has ancient roots of its organization, starting from the instructive works of the scribes of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Relying on these domestic achievements, it is worth borrowing and developing on the Ukrainian basis of public administration the best achievements of EU countries in the complex of measures to protect monuments, historical landscapes, other culturally significant territories and building complexes. On the European continent, leading positions in this field are held by cultural heritage protection management bodies and specialized institutions of Italy, France and many federal states of Germany; the experience of Poland is considered to be close to Ukraine, territorially and typologically [15].

The legislation of Poland assigns a set of protection measures to the tasks of the state, and measures to care for monuments – to the tasks of the owners of objects and professional institutions and public organizations. The protection of monuments, as a field of activity of the public administration of Poland, involves the creation of conditions for the preservation of cultural heritage, in particular, the state registration of objects with the recognition of their special status as monuments and, importantly, the establishment of appropriate protection regimes in the local spatial plan management (it partly corresponds to the Ukrainian town-planning or planning documentation at the local level, such as the general plan of the settlement and its special “layers”, now already in digital format). Unlike the Ukrainian somewhat bureaucratized accounting system of types (by species origin of value) and categories of monuments (of national or local importance), similar formal definitions are not applied in Poland.

The given examples from the European experience of monument protection convincingly confirm the interdisciplinary and administrative multifacetedness and, at the same time, the methodical and organizational integrity of this activity, in which competent individuals play a decisive role.

Therefore, the formation of a unified structure of competences of public managers for the protection of immovable cultural heritage is a completely logical matter, which in Ukrainian conditions not only follows from the interdisciplinary nature of protection, but is also determined by the rarity of educational programs (their development is just in time) and the small number of such personnel in comparison with by the number of specialist training programs for branches of economic activity, such as the construction industry (which in Ukraine still normatively includes the restoration of monuments).

Based on the priority of Ukrainian professional environment' originality together with bringing it to the international level, it is logical to ensure for public managers of the protection of monuments those competencies, thanks to which the manager will, firstly, be able not only to implement recognized international doctrines according to the European cultural policy together with its tolerance, but also effectively support the national institutional potential through its own political culture, and secondly, the manager will receive qualification grounds for making specific administrative decisions regarding certain objects or complexes of immovable cultural heritage.

Culture as the processing of a unique space and values means the development of the environment of human life in all its manifestations, and in this sense, political culture implies a compromise acceptance by the public manager of other visions and methods, of course, those broadcast by the professional community or local public consensus. Such competence can be considered a specifically developed quality of the manager's personality, that is, personal competence. For example, his literacy and knowledge of languages should be personal, and political culture as a quality of mutual respect and the ability to negotiate is precisely personal. Accordingly, only a politically cultural personality will be able to undertake a certain coordination of the activities of all specialists and organizations involved in the objects, and for effective administrative decisions, she will need such competences that ensure the effective involvement of immovable cultural heritage in the development of a unique environment.

Based on the Ukrainian experience of industry management and the tradition of management culture, taking into account the interdisciplinary

approach, it is worth recommending for public managers for the protection of immovable cultural heritage artistic integral competences, the integral content and methodological orientation of which most fully reveal, on the one hand, a conservation approach to the protection of authenticity, and on the other – a compositional approach to the development of the subject-spatial environment. These can preliminarily define systemically interrelated integral special competences: architectural-compositional – knowledge and skills in the construction of architectural structures and landscape-species structure of space, restoration – mastery of methods of conservation, restoration, adaptation of objects of a wide species and typological range, art critic – knowledge of stylistic, genre and other features of objects, archeographical (source studies) – knowledge and skills of effective use of written and graphic primary sources to obtain the most complete information about objects and territories, as well as one more integral related to all the above special competences – country studies (local studies), which consists in objective knowledge of the local cultural heritage, which meaningfully enables its political and cultural perception and professionally indivisible acceptance by the manager.

**Conclusions.** The decisively significant obstacles to harmonious reciprocity – against the background of the development during the second half of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries of industry experience through the adoption of a number of guidance documents of specialized international organizations and forums on the protection of immovable cultural heritage, including recommendations on the competences of managers – turned out to be the pronounced centrism of civilizational identities, such as the European one, and the lack of a consensus definition for the competencies of public managers of their political culture. In the field of protection of monuments and sites, which involves their use in the interests of the world community, when each regional object presents the relevant national heritage at the world level, the decisive driving force should be an unambiguously equal treatment not only of any immovable cultural heritage, but as well as approaches to its preservation, use and presentation. The political culture of managers must be defined as a personal quality of mutual respect and the ability to negotiate without denying other identities, respectively, recognizing other approaches, traditions and inter-

ests, including the development of the national educational space, scientific, technical and industrial environment. In order for the manager to fully understand the local cultural identity, in the structure of competence of the public manager for the protection of immovable cultural heritage, which is systemically unified, along with his conditionally basic, properly managerial or administrative, personal educational and general technical competences, integral special competences are also defined. Integral competencies of public managers for the protection of immovable cultural heritage

should be mandatory competencies – architectural and compositional, restoration, art history, archaeology (source history), country history (local history), acquired on the basis of the interdisciplinary nature of relevant educational programs and the combination of national traditions with the best world practices.

The development of the conceptual content of educational programs for the training of public managers for the protection of immovable cultural heritage, especially in Ukraine, will be promising for the development of this scientific direction.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. A New European Agenda for Culture – SWD (2018). URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM:2018:267:FIN>.
2. Bienstman H., Chapagain N.K., Imon S.S., Kim I. et al. Competence framework for cultural heritage management: a guide to the essential skills and knowledge for heritage practitioners. Paris, UNESCO; Office Bangkok and Regional Bureau for Education in Asia and the Pacific, 2021. 119 p. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379275>.
3. Bilovus L., Homotiuk O. Cultural Heritage Preservation as a Component of Cultural Policy: a Global View. *Гуманітарні студії: історія та педагогіка*, 2022. 3, 97–118. URL: <http://dspace.wunu.edu.ua/bitstream/316497/48446/1/56.pdf>.
4. Council resolution on the EU Work Plan for Culture 2023–2026 (2022). URL: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/60399/st15381-en22.pdf>.
5. Guidelines on innovative/emerging cultural heritage education and training paths. *CHARTER European cultural heritage skills alliance*, 2023. 100 p. URL: [https://charter-alliance.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/D3.6.-Guidelines-on-innovativeemerging-cultural-heritage-education-and-training-paths\\_final.pdf](https://charter-alliance.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/D3.6.-Guidelines-on-innovativeemerging-cultural-heritage-education-and-training-paths_final.pdf).
6. Lin M., Roders A.P., Nevzgodin I. and Wessel de Jonge. Values and interventions: dynamic relationships in international doctrines. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable*, 2022. 10, 56–78. URL: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JCHMSD-10-2022-0178/full/pdf?title=values-and-interventions-dynamic-relationships-in-international-doctrines>.
7. Акуленко В.І. На дискусійних перехрестях пам'яткознавства. *Праці Центру пам'яткознавства*, 2016. Вип. 30. С. 270–283. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Prp\\_2016\\_30\\_25](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Prp_2016_30_25).
8. Василенко Н.В. Професійна комунікативна компетентність фахівця: психолого-педагогічні аспекти мережевої комунікації. Харків : Вид. група «Основа», 2016. 112 с.
9. В Україні започатковано «Національну програму підготовки фахівців з реставрації пам'яток культурної спадщини» / *Детектор медіа*, 17 квітня 2024. URL: <https://detector.media/infospace/article/225580/2024-04-17-v-ukraini-zapochatkovana-natsionalna-programa-pidgotovky-fakhivtsiv-z-restavratsii-pamyatok-kulturnoi-spadshchyny/>.
10. Герчанівська П.Е. Культура управління: Навч. посібник. Київ : ІВЦ вид-во «Політехніка», 2005. 152 с.
11. Гончарова К. У пошуках нових підходів до збереження культурної спадщини: приватно-громадське партнерство / Український центр культурних досліджень, 2018. URL: <https://uccs.org.ua/detsentralizatsiia/statti/u-poshukakh-novykh-pidkhodiv-do-zberezhennia-kulturnoi-spadshchyny-privatno-hromadske-partnerstvo/>.
12. Груздова К.Є. Про практику впровадження міжнародного досвіду в державне регулювання сфери культури в Україні на початку XXI століття. *Держава та регіони. Серія: Державне управління*. 2009, № 1. С. 52–54.
13. Касяненко І.О. Охорона культурної спадщини у Сполучених Штатах Америки. З історії розвитку пам'яткоохоронної справи. *Праці Науково-дослідного інституту пам'яткоохоронних досліджень*. Вип. 8. Київ : Фенікс, 2013. С. 81–103.
14. Катаргіна Т.І. Збереження культурної спадщини у Великій Британії, США, Канаді (історія і сучасність). Київ : НАН України; Ін-т історії України, 2003. 186 с.
15. Кириленко Л.М. Система державного управління у сфері охорони культурної спадщини в європейських країнах. *Праці Науково-дослідного інституту пам'яткоохоронних досліджень*. Вип. 5. Київ : Фенікс, 2010. С. 51–58.
16. Кузьмич Н. Досвід здійснення державної політики у сфері охорони культурної спадщини в країнах Європейського Союзу. *Актуальні проблеми європейської та євроатлантичної інтеграції України*: м-ли регіон. наук.-практ. конференції. Дніпро : ДРІДУ НАДУ, 2006. С. 107–109.
17. Сороко В.М., Ходорівська М.В., Дмитрук Н.А. Теоретико-методологічні засади державно-управлінської діяльності: професійні стандарти, процедури, технології. Київ : НАДУ, 2008. 184 с.

18. Стеблянко І.О. Євроінтеграційні прагнення України: проблеми та соціальні перспективи. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету. Серія «Світове господарство і міжнародні економічні відносини»*. Т. 22. 2014. Вип. 6. С. 85–93.

#### REFERENCES:

1. A New European Agenda for Culture – SWD (2018). Retrieved from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM:2018:267:FIN> [in English].
2. Bienstman, H., Chapagain, N.K., Imon, S.S., & Kim, I. et al. (2021). *Competence framework for cultural heritage management: a guide to the essential skills and knowledge for heritage practitioners*. Paris, UNESCO; Office Bangkok and Regional Bureau for Education in Asia and the Pacific. Retrieved from: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379275> [in English].
3. Bilovus, L., & Homotiuk, O. (2022). Cultural Heritage Preservation as a Component of Cultural Policy: a Global View. *Humanities studies: history and pedagogy*, 3, 97–118. Retrieved from: <http://dspace.wunu.edu.ua/bitstream/316497/48446/1/56.pdf> [in English].
4. Council resolution on the EU Work Plan for Culture 2023–2026 (2022). Retrieved from: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/60399/st15381-en22.pdf> [in English].
5. Guidelines on innovative/emerging cultural heritage education and training paths. *CHARTER European cultural heritage skills alliance*, 2023. 100 p. Retrieved from: [https://charter-alliance.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/D3.6.-Guidelines-on-innovativeemerging-cultural-heritage-education-and-training-paths\\_final.pdf](https://charter-alliance.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/D3.6.-Guidelines-on-innovativeemerging-cultural-heritage-education-and-training-paths_final.pdf) [in English].
6. Lin, M., Roders, A.P., Nevzgodin, I., & Wessel de Jonge (2022). Values and interventions: dynamic relationships in international doctrines. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable*, 10, 56–78. Retrieved from: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JCHMSD-10-2022-0178/full/pdf?title=values-and-interventions-dynamic-relationships-in-international-doctrines> [in English].
7. Akulenko, V. (2016). Na dyskusiinykh perekhrestyakh pamiatkoznavstva [At the debatable crossroads of monument studies]. *Praci Centru pamiatkoznavstva – Proceedings of the Center for Monument Studies*, 30, 270–283. Retrieved from: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pcp\\_2016\\_30\\_25](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pcp_2016_30_25) [in Ukrainian].
8. Vasylenko, N.V. (2016). *Profesiina komunikatyvna kompetentnist fakhivtsia: psykholoho-pedahohichni aspekty merezhevoi komunikatsii [Professional communicative competence of a specialist: psychological and pedagogical aspects of network communication]*. Harkiv: Osnova [in Ukrainian].
9. Detector Media (2024, April 17). *V Ukraini zapochatkovano “Natsionalnu prohramu pidhotovky fakhivtsiv z restavratsii pamiatok kulturnoi spadshchyny” [In Ukraine, the “National Program for the Training of Specialists in the Restoration of Cultural Heritage Monuments” was launched]*. *Detector Media*. Retrieved from: <https://detector.media/infospace/article/225580/2024-04-17-v-ukraini-zapochatkovana-natsionalna-programa-pidgotovky-fakhivtsiv-z-restavratsii-pamyatok-kulturnoi-spadshchyny/> [in Ukrainian].
10. Herchanivska, P.E. (2005). *Kultura upravlinnia: Navch. posibnyk [Management culture: Educational Manual]*. Kyiv: Polytechnics [in Ukrainian].
11. Goncharova, K. (2018). U poshukakh novykh pidkhodiv do zberezhenia kulturnoi spadshchyny: pryvatno-hromadske partnerstvo [In search of new approaches to the preservation of cultural heritage: private-public partnership]. *Ukrainskyi tsentr kulturnykh doslidzhen – Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies*. Retrieved from: <https://uccs.org.ua/detsentralizatsiia/statti/u-poshukakh-novykh-pidkhodiv-do-zberezhenia-kulturnoi-spadshchyny-pryvatno-hromadske-parterstvo/> [in Ukrainian].
12. Gruzdova, K.E. (2009). Pro praktyku vprovadzhennia mizhnarodnoho dosvidu v derzhavne rehuliuвання sfery kultury v Ukraini na pochatku 21 stolittia [About the practice of introducing international experience into state regulation of the sphere of culture in Ukraine at the beginning of the 21st century]. *Derzhava ta rehiony. Seriya: Derzhavne upravlinnia – State and regions. Series: Public administration*, 1, 52–54 [in Ukrainian].
13. Kasyzenko, I.O. (2013). Okhorona kulturnoi spadshchyny u Spoluchenykh Shtatakh Ameryky. Z istorii rozvytku pamiatkookhoronnoi spravy [Protection of cultural heritage in the United States of America. From the history of the development of monument preservation]. *Pratsi Naukovo-doslidnoho instytutu pamiatkookhoronnykh doslidzhen – Proceedings of the Research Institute of Monument Protection Studies*, 8, 81–103 [in Ukrainian].
14. Katargina, T.I. (2003). *Zberezhenia kulturnoi spadshchyny u Velykii Brytanii, SShA, Kanadi (istoriia i suchasnist) [Preservation of cultural heritage in Great Britain, USA, Canada (history and modernity)]*. Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
15. Kyrylenko, L.M. (2010). Systema derzhavnoho upravlinnia u sferi okhorony kulturnoi spadshchyny v yevropeiskykh krainakh [The state management system in the field of cultural heritage protection in European countries]. *Pratsi Naukovo-doslidnoho instytutu pamiatkookhoronnykh doslidzhen – Proceedings of the Research Institute of Monument Protection Studies*, 5, 51–58 [in Ukrainian].



16. Kuzmich, N. (2006). Dosvid zdiisnennia derzhavnoi polityky u sferi okhorony kulturnoi spadshchyny v krainakh Yevropeiskoho Soiuzu [Experience of implementation of state policy in the field of cultural heritage protection in the countries of the European Union]. *Aktualni problemy yevropeiskoi ta yevroatlantychnoi intehratsii Ukrainy – Actual problems of European and Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine*. Dnipro: NAGM, 107–109 [in Ukrainian].

17. Soroko, V.M., Hodorivska, M.V., & Dmytruk, N.A. (2008). *Teoretyko-metodolohichni zasady derzhavno-upravlinskoj diialnosti: profesiini standarty, protsedury, tekhnolohii* [Theoretical and methodological foundations of public management activity: professional standards, procedures, technologies]. Kyiv: NAGM [in Ukrainian].

18. Steblyanko, I.O. (2014). Yevrointehratsiini prahnennia Ukrainy: problemy ta sotsialni perspektyvy [Ukraine's European integration aspirations: problems and social prospects]. *Visnyk Dnipropetrovskoho universytetu – Bulletin of Dnipro University*, 22, 6, 85–93 [in Ukrainian].