

Follow-up Report

Iceland Academy of the Arts

Expert Committee Report

June 2010

Ministry of Education, Science and Culture in Iceland
June 2010

Publisher: Ministry of Education, Science and Culture
Sólhvólgata 4
150 Reykjavík
Tel.: 00 354 545 9500
Fax: 00 354 562 3068
E- mail: postur@mrn.stjr.is
Web address: www.menntamalaraduneyti.is

Layout: Ministry of Education, Science and Culture

© 2009 Ministry of Education, Science and Culture

ISBN 978-9979-777-92-2

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1 The Expert Committee	3
1.2 Terms of Reference	3
1.3 Working Method.....	4
1.4 Short evaluation of the work process	5
2. Role and objectives.....	6
3. Administration and organisation.....	7
4. Structure of teaching and research	9
5. Competence requirements of personnel.....	11
6. Rules regarding admission requirements and rights and duties of students.....	12
7. Facilities and services provided to teachers and students	14
8. Internal quality management system.....	15
9. Description of learning outcomes.....	16
10. Finances.....	17
11. Summary of Findings	17
12. Recommendation.....	18
13. Signatures of the Expert Committee	19
Appendix 1: Agenda of site visit of Expert Committee to IAA 2 June 2010.....	20
Appendix 2: List of documents received.....	22

1. Introduction

1.1 The Expert Committee

- Dr. Christian Thune, Past Executive Director of the Danish Evaluation Institute, Denmark (Chair)
- Dr. Frank Quinault, formerly Director of Learning and Teaching Quality, University of St. Andrews, Scotland
- Dr. Rita McAllister, formerly Vice-Principal of the Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama.

- M.A. Magnús Lyngdal Magnússon, Head of Research and Deputy Director, The Icelandic Centre for Research – RANNIS, Reykjavik, Iceland (Liaison Officer).

1.2 Terms of Reference

The Expert Committee is appointed according to Article 8 of Rules No. 321/2009 on Quality Control of Teaching and Research in Higher Education Institutions. The Committee is to base its reference on the components of Article 4 of the same act. They are:

- a. role and objectives,
- b. administration and organisation,
- c. structure of teaching and research,
- d. competence requirements of personnel,
- e. rules regarding admission requirements and rights and duties of students,
- f. facilities and services provided to teachers and students,
- g. internal quality management system,
- h. description of learning outcomes,
- i. finances.

1.3 Working Method

The Accreditation Report on the Iceland Academy of the Arts (IAA) was published in July 2007, following a site visit by a three person Expert Committee. Dr Rita McAllister from the 2007 Expert Committee was invited to participate in the follow-up. Drs Christian Thune (Chair) and Frank Quinault were appointed as the two other members of the new Expert Committee. This Expert Committee received the *Self-evaluation Report* (Follow-up to the Accreditation by the Minister of Education, Science and Culture of the Iceland Academy of the Arts in September 2007) on 21 January 2010 by email. Drs Thune and McAllister met, in Iceland, on 1 June to discuss the exercise before visiting IAA the following day. Unfortunately, Dr Quinault was unable to travel to Iceland but he corresponded with the other members by telephone and email. The Committee was given supplementary information (listed in Annex 2) at the beginning of their discussion, on 2 June.

During the site visit Drs Thune and McAllister spoke to management, faculty, support staff and students (see Annex 1). They drafted an interim account of their findings for a meeting, on 2 June, with representatives from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. The full report was produced later, following correspondence between all three members of the Committee. The descriptive parts of the final version (Sections 1.4-11) were sent to IAA on 18 June 2010 for correction of factual mistakes and misinterpretations. The IAA replied on 25 June 2010 not making any specific comments to the report.

For convenience, throughout the rest of this report:

- The Iceland Academy of the Arts is referred to as IAA
- The 2010 Expert Committee is referred to as the 'Panel', in order to differentiate it from the 2007 Expert Committee
- The 2007 Accreditation Report on the IAA is referred to as the AR
- The follow-up Self-evaluation Report by the IAA to the AR, of January 2010, is referred to as the SER

- The supplementary information supplied by the IAA at the start of the visit on June 2 is referred to as the SI.

1.4 Short evaluation of the work process

The Panel wishes to record its appreciation of the excellent support provided before, during and after the visit to the IAA by Magnus Lyngdal Magnusson, Deputy Director at RANNIS, which ensured that the work process ran smoothly throughout.

This follow-up visit was unfortunately but unavoidably delayed by several months, so that fully three years had elapsed since the Accreditation process began. The Panel found the SER helpful in its presentation of developments since the 2007 report, but also somewhat defensive and in a few places unnecessarily disdainful towards the work of the 2007 expert committee. The panel was therefore pleased to note during the site visit that the institution had found the original process helpful, had taken the comments and suggestions of the Expert Committee seriously, and in the intervening period had continued to debate, discuss and develop their current role and their future strategies. It is no small achievement for this young institution, in little over a decade, to bring practitioners of the disparate creative arts together in such a strong and lively working relationship.

There had been genuine change in the last three years, notably in the following areas:

- development of appropriate new degrees, including at Master's level
- upgrading of documentation and accessible information - on courses, on the website and in publications such as the Handbook for International Students and Teachers
- development of an appropriate and interesting research agenda
- enhancement of international network and exchanges
- greater involvement of permanent staff, sessional teachers and students in the decision-making process
- development of student support systems, including the appointment of a student counsellor.

At the same time there were a number of significant areas which warranted further discussion and where further development was considered desirable. On the whole the IAA seemed to have taken ownership of the process of enhancing the institution. Discussions with staff and students were good natured and constructive. Despite the setbacks caused by the current financial situation, the mood – especially amongst the younger staff – was one of creative optimism.

The supplementary information provided at the beginning of the visit was useful, but would have been even more helpful to the proceedings had it been sent out in advance.

2. Role and objectives

Included in the SI was the 2008-12 Strategic Planning document. Quite appropriately, this describes the IAA as a ‘small, multi-faceted, distinguished arts Academy...[which] operates in an international context and [which] compares itself with schools in neighbouring countries that are considered to excel in teaching and communication of knowledge in the arts.’ Its core role, according to the Rector, is ‘to advance the country – culturally, economically and socially – through artistic research and performance’.

So the IAA has marked the step into its second decade by taking stock, and by defining what the AR called its ‘future idea’. Its plans for the next few years were ambitious and expansionist: new undergraduate programmes in film and photography; no fewer than ten new Master’s courses, including acting, curating and creative writing; a consequential substantial increase in student numbers; a far-sighted research policy; some departmental and committee re-structuring; and some interesting outreach initiatives. All of these initiatives were, of course, to unfold in a new, customised building in the centre of Reykjavik.

Such plans might have seemed more than a little over-reaching for a young institution, still establishing its identity, even before the financial crisis which heralded the current funding constraints. As things now stand, one new undergraduate and three postgraduate courses

have been introduced with a modest increase in student numbers. Plans for a new building have unfortunately had to be shelved. The Planning has been put on hold; consolidation of the teaching and administrative staff became the priority more or less by default.

In the current circumstances, aspirations may well have to be reined back, but it is arguable that sound strategies with clear priorities – along with robust quality assurance systems – are even more necessary in straitened times. The process of formalisation, like that of documentation, should not be either halted or reversed. The IAA should certainly not wait until priorities are suggested either by others or by dire necessity. The Planning process should continue, perhaps with greater pragmatism, but as soon as possible. The five objectives suggested in the AR - interdisciplinarity; a unique Icelandic profile in an international context; a small number of distinctive Master's courses, which attract students and professors from abroad; a focused research unit; and the establishment of an International Summer Academy – are still achievable priorities: some of them are already well under way. They can happen with or without a new building.

The all-Icelandic identity of the IAA is important. Of course, the Academy already has a high profile in Iceland itself: it is the sole institution of its kind. Further, more formal, collaboration with other Icelandic institutions with wider experience and complementary expertise could benefit the IAA – though the Rector has specific views on the ways in which HEIs in Iceland might relate in future. As it develops, however, the institution will have to look increasingly outwards, and decide on what could be its unique attraction for international initiatives and for overseas staff and students.

3. Administration and organisation

The 2007 AR recognised that, in a small and specialist institution like the IAA, where everyone knows everyone else, where there is constant and easy communication and – most significantly – where the Rector has played an absolutely key role, an informal organisational framework had served the institution well. It also advised that, as the institution grew and matured – and particularly if it encountered adverse or straitened

circumstances – informal decision-making would be less appropriate, and a more formal, though not over-elaborate, committee structure would be necessary.

The IAA's Strategic Planning document for 2008-12 suggests a restructured administration including, eventually, the appointment of an external Advisory Council of international specialists. In the meantime two new important committees – which allow, as the AR suggested, for the separation of day-to-day management from institutional policy-making – have been instigated. These are the Management Council, a collaborative forum for IAA's executive management, and the Academic Council. The Academic Council should be a key committee of the institution, responsible for developing academic policy, for the standards of awards and for student progress. This Council, as currently constituted, has representation from across all institutional constituents (including – the Panel was pleased to note – sessional teachers and students), but has no external members. It has generated a number of working groups for specific tasks or policy development.

However, given the stated remit of the Council: that it merely *discusses* professional standards, quality and performance, *supports* the Rector and management in making decisions, and *makes recommendations* on study programmes and policy, and also given the range of perceptions of the Council amongst staff and students, the Panel was left with some uncertainty about the division of responsibilities and power, as between the Rector, the Academic Council and the Academy Board. The role of the Academy Forum in the committee structure also remains unclear.

It may be that current arrangements are transitional, to be firmed up when the IAA has a clearer view of its future development; the Rector stated that, as far as administrative and committee structures are concerned, the institution is in a development phase. If so, the Panel urges that, in firming up these structures, the IAA:

- clarifies the full remit of the Academy Board, according to the IAA's constitution and in relation to the authority of the IAA's executive staff – if only so that this is commonly understood by staff and students
- reconsiders the recommendations offered by the AR as regards the role and remit of the Academic Council, and its relationship to the Academy Board. This body should

have real authority in academic and Quality Assurance issues, reporting to, but with powers delegated from, the Academy Board

- clarifies the role of the Academy Forum, in relation to the Board and the Council
- considers how the range of informal gatherings which currently discuss institutional issues (eg quality of teaching, course content and delivery) relate to the formal discussion framework, and
- reconsiders the desirability of including external members (from the professions, from other HEIs and/or other sectors of education) on the Board and/or the Academic Council, in order to extend the range of experience and expertise of these committees.

It is clear that much of the success of the IAA, along with the cooperation, enthusiasm and goodwill amongst its staff and students, is a result of the strong personality and guiding vision of the Rector. But the future of an institution must be framed independently of any individual, and while vision and inspiration amongst senior staff are always a welcome bonus, the maintenance and development of standards and quality must be based on strong systems, which will support the institution in whatever circumstances it encounters.

Whilst the various support services were not represented in discussions with the Panel, these seem to be efficiently line-managed and, as far as possible given the three sites of the IAA, seem to collaborate effectively both with staff and students and with each other. Library, Computer and Web Services are cooperating in the creation and dissemination of necessary information (in print and online), and may yet merge into a central Information Department, which would provide the necessary back-up for future developments, such as the research agenda.

4. Structure of teaching and research

The Panel welcomed the very evident improvement in the quality and quantity of easily accessible documentation: on the IAA, its role and its working processes; on the individual Departments and their aims; on the curriculum – course content and structure; and on the

developing research agenda. It was also pleasing to hear from members of the teaching staff that they had valued the process of producing this material as a stimulus to reflection on the nature of their teaching, as well as to clarify the processes of learning for their students. The Handbook for International Students and Teachers was an asset to the IAA's publications – though this booklet threw up very clearly the differences in approaches, aims and even policies of the various Departments. While the differing nature of the various specialisms naturally results in diversity of practice, in view of the key concept for the IAA of interdisciplinarity, some closer calibration of approach might be considered to assist in team-working across these Departments.

The students whom the Panel met appreciated the additional information now provided. There were two areas which concerned them, however: the quality of Departmental documentation issued by sessional teachers; and the vagueness - to them - in matters of assessment (in particular, again, assessment carried out in the more specialist areas). It may be that in addressing the whole question of staff development and training for sessional teachers (see section 5), the institution might solve both of these issues. It is an important element in the European Standards and Guidelines that students fully understand why they achieve the assessment grade they receive, and that the understanding of the staff assessing them accords with this view. The IAA must take action accordingly.

The new courses which the IAA has been able to develop and introduce since the AR – undergraduate degrees in contemporary dance and church music, a Master's course in musical composition, a joint MA in music with institutions overseas and an MA in Art Education – seem very much in keeping with the role and the key aims of the Academy. The fact that 50% of the Master's degree in composition is research-orientated has created considerable interest in this course from abroad.

Many more Master's degrees were envisaged in the 2008-12 Strategic Plan, and these developments are clearly viewed as a priority for the IAA's future amongst deans, teaching staff and students: to enhance the institution's profile and standing; in order to extend artistic and intellectual horizons; more clearly to define the content and scope of the

undergraduate programme; and as the degree currency for international collaboration and exchange. The Panel saw the reasoning in this, though even in a rosier financial climate there would be a danger of over-stretching the institution and of over-diversifying too soon in the IAA's evolution. As with other aspects of future planning, careful and realistic prioritisation will be needed in the area of curriculum development.

The new research agenda, which has been developing since the Accreditation visit, has made an impressive start. A Director of Research Services has been appointed to advise on, and develop policy (the policy proposal has been approved by the Academic Council), to inform and motivate staff, and to look for appropriate initiatives and funding. Research in/for/through the arts is a controversial topic, and debates continue on the relationship of research to creativity and to artistic practice. In a young, practice-based institution it may take time for the concept of research to become embedded, and to find a research focus appropriate to both the needs of the IAA, and of Iceland. Collaboration and support from an older, experienced HEI on the development of research methodology would be helpful. The IAA's relationships with the artistic community and professional associations, already extensive, would be further enhanced by its provision of on-going training and professional development, and also by its evolving an R&D role – acting as a creative laboratory – for the arts in Iceland.

5. Competence requirements of personnel

The Rector told the Panel that there were difficulties in recruiting staff with the necessary expertise, in all of the fields the IAA covers, especially given that the ability to teach in Icelandic is a prerequisite: the decision to keep this requirement had just been renewed. The interviewing process for new staff appears to have been formalised; and despite the difficulties, the Panel had the impression that there had been an upgrading in qualifications amongst the new appointments. The same recruitment process, however, does not seem to be applied to the appointment of sessional teachers.

Given the present and foreseeable financial strictures, which hardly suggest an increase in staffing numbers, it is the more surprising and indeed regrettable that the systematic development and training of current permanent staff and sessional teachers is not an institutional priority. Staff research is being encouraged; but neither the briefing and training of staff when they are first appointed nor the development and upgrading of their skills in post seem to happen either systematically or even regularly. The Panel suggests that this situation be reviewed, in order that all staff can give their best to the institution in times of change and/or retrenchment. The development of a systematic process of staff development, involving all staff, is a much needed and excellent investment. It can be very cost-effective: peer observation of teaching, for example, is low-cost and has benefits for everyone involved.

There seems moreover to be no formal system of staff appraisal in the IAA, whereby deficiencies can be addressed and excellence in teaching can be recognised. Nor is there any true Personnel/Human Resources function in the Academy. The role of the Director of Academic Affairs in this respect might seem satisfactory; but this situation poses a dilemma for her in sensitive cases of complaint, such as against line management, however rare these are.

The staff of the IAA – particularly the younger staff and the new appointments – are full of enthusiasm for their work and are strongly committed to the institution and its aims. There has been a clear focus in the last three years on improving the student environment and this is welcomed. The future of the Academy, however, depends heavily upon the quality of its staff, and one priority in the new Strategic Plan should be the establishment of strong systems of support for its specialist teachers.

6. Rules regarding admission requirements and rights and duties of students

Whilst the processes of selecting students for the IAA seem fair and transparent, the Panel was a little concerned by the blunt statement in the SER that ‘it is not an option for the IAA

to become specialised according to an ideology or arrangement that would exclude a large proportion of the skilled applicants that receive their preparation in the Icelandic school system.’ This is an entirely understandable position, but one which might pose a dilemma for the IAA both in terms of its mission – its future idea – the position it aims for in the international arena, and in its attempts to raise standards: increased selectivity is directly related to achieving higher standards and to increasing international appeal, but may not sit well with domestic need.

There was clear evidence, from documentation as well as discussions that the student environment had improved considerably in the last three years. Students are now represented on all relevant committees. There are regular surveys of student opinion. Their views are listened to by staff at all levels and a student counsellor has been appointed to support their needs. All these changes are welcomed by the Panel.

However, the panel has substantial concerns about the extent of the formal and systematic impact of the student voice in all the institution’s process, and also about students’ rights in terms of natural justice. The Rector stressed that an Ethics Policy was indeed in place; but the Panel understood this to refer to how far students could go in artistic self-expression rather than to a policy of ethics in the IAA’S treatment of its students.

There is no suggestion here of bad practice. When problems arise they are treated sensitively, and students seem reasonably satisfied with the ad hoc, informal solutions to their concerns. But here again, the Panel felt that formal systems were needed for when the Rector was not at hand to solve a specific problem. There is no forum which systematically addresses the recurrent problems with which the Counsellor presumably deals. There is no systematic process for dealing with student complaints: the necessity for this is not precluded by the fact that complaints are rare, and the institution is small. Complaints about grades – the most common in educational institutions – are dealt with through an extraordinarily hierarchical procedure. The scope of the appeals process is very limited. The student disciplinary code still lacks necessary definition.

As a means of gathering student views on their courses and the quality of teaching, even the regular surveys now carried out are but a blunt instrument. More focussed wording of

the questions would help, but the response rate for student questionnaires is notoriously low. Here it averages 50%, which gives it little validity. Students admit they do not respond unless they have a specific problem – which, however, on an ad hoc basis, is usually adequately dealt with.

Despite the need for systems that would protect both the institution and the students against adversity, the students interviewed were content with the changes that have been made. Staff and curriculum are held in high regard. The interests of international students (of which there are 20-22 a year) are well supported. Drop-out rates are very low – almost zero amongst overseas students.

7. Facilities and services provided to teachers and students

The 2007 AR states that ‘one of the main obstacles for the Academy’s development today is the spatial separation of the three different sites of the Academy in the city of Reykjavik’, adding that centralisation on a single site would be a prerequisite to fulfilling the institution’s key concept of interdisciplinarity. Of course the acquisition of a new building in the centre of the city would immeasurably enhance the profile and the potential of the IAA, and had the economic crisis of October 2008 never happened this building might now be nearing completion. A great deal of institutional time went into the planning and commissioning of this building between autumn 2007 and summer 2008 – time which was not entirely wasted, as that process has undoubtedly helped the IAA articulate its developing identity.

The SER confidently states that building ‘plans will be revived when the nation’s economy gets back on track’, and the Panel sincerely hopes that this ideal will be achieved. Mixed views, however, were expressed in the Panel’s discussions as to whether a new building was the top priority in the current circumstances. Clearly there are severe deficiencies in the institution’s present accommodation: a split site has endemic problems, and spaces have had to be adapted for artistic usage. This is yet another area for thoughtful and realistic prioritisation in the IAA’s new Strategic Plan.

8. Internal quality management system

This area was one of the Expert Committee's main concerns at the time of the Accreditation visit. The AR sets out four pages of comments and a list of suggestions on the development of a QA system which would not be over-elaborate for a small institution, in which personal knowledge and judgement would remain a key feature, but which was considered essential both to deal with future adverse trends and to enable enhancement.

Some progress has been made in this respect. A review of QA procedures is apparently underway. There is now a QA Manual – but presented to the Panel in the SI only as a list of key elements. However, documentation on the curriculum is now much more formal, extensive and transparent. There is a recognised process for the development of new courses, and a procedure for institutional approval of these. Course evaluation, in the form of student surveys, happens more regularly. PIs are being developed for the evaluation of staff research. There are at least annual discussions on teaching and the curriculum involving students, senior staff and the Rector. The introduction of the new Academic Council which discusses policy, the direction of the curriculum and QA issues such as standards and benchmarking is a positive move. Nonetheless, the Panel finds that internal quality assurance, as a systematic framework that promotes a culture of quality linking the institution at all levels, is unfortunately not yet in place at the IAA.

It is true that the IAA has had many serious issues demanding its attention in recent times, and the Rector emphasised more than once in discussions that this is a developmental phase for the institution. This being so, the Panel urges the institution to make the formalisation of its quality assurance practices a top priority. The key concept in carrying out the process will be 'systems' – for it is the systematic aspect of quality management which is most noticeably absent: systematic and objective processes of course development, approval, monitoring, evaluation and review; the production, year on year, of statistics, PIs and other objective measurements (and the interpretation of these) of standards and student achievement; periodic total school and departmental review; staff

appraisal and review; the systematic use of external reference points in all evaluative processes, and in particular for course approval and review.

The IAA has expressed its concern on the appropriateness of national mechanisms for standards and benchmarking, and its desire to calibrate its processes with those of European arts academies. The Panel is very aware of the special mission of the IAA and the factors which set it apart from other HEIs in Iceland. However, it is re-stating the need for the further development of QA in the institution, and encouraging the Academy to develop systems which are both in line with European models and appropriate to its needs, in order to support and protect the quality of its creative practices and aspirations, at a time when difficult strategic decisions will have to be made.

9. Description of learning outcomes

At the time of the Accreditation visit, the Expert Committee noted that while current curriculum documents fulfilled national HEI requirements, they were mechanically stated, barely functional for the purposes of guiding both faculty and student work, and certainly uninspiring. It was suggested in the AR that the specific and dynamic articulation of learning outcomes would motivate staff and students in striving to achieve institutional goals.

The Panel has welcomed the significant improvement in all of the IAA's documentation. Course descriptors are now not only clearer and more detailed; they also show the obvious ownership of the institution and convey some of the excitement of the courses' artistic content. Learning outcomes have been developed for all the Academy's programmes; faculty expressed to the Panel the benefits of developing these for their own teaching and for the students' learning.

However, there now remains the task of aligning these learning outcomes to the corresponding means of assessment. The vagueness of students' understanding of processes of assessment in the IAA was one of their few stated areas of concern. So while

the National Qualification Framework does not require this additional information, it is recommended that it be supplied, so that knowledge of assessment procedures and practices is consistently shared by teachers and students. Staff training should be allied to this development, including for sessional teachers.

10. Finances

The Panel acknowledges the problems facing the IAA in the current budgetary situation. Faculty of the institution seem to be facing the situation with inventiveness, together with optimism that the difficulties may not be too long-term, and that they will not prevent the institution from achieving its key targets of a new building, diversification, the introduction of new Master's courses, and the developments of international networks.

Nonetheless, the funding situation has real consequences for at least the short-term, and maybe for the longer-term future, as far as innovation and expansion are concerned. In these circumstances the Panel can only encourage the IAA to set carefully thought-out priorities; to build upon its strengths; to collaborate and share resources where appropriate; to decide what can be reduced in order for growth to be possible in more important areas; and also, perhaps, to explore whether and how it might be possible for the institution to earn funding. The development of clear institutional systems will be of particular importance in monitoring the IAA through this unfortunate period.

11. Summary of Findings

The achievements of the IAA in the little over a decade of its existence are admirable in many respects, not least their success in melding practitioners of the diverse creative arts together into a resourceful and productive educational team. At the time of its first visit in 2007, the Expert Committee sensed a slight defensiveness on the part of some senior staff about the whole procedure, and a certain lack of conviction that such a process truly matched the institution's specialist mission. While some of the institution's reservations

may be justified, such processes are now the European norm in arts institutions, and there is little doubt that, if addressed in a positive spirit, much benefit can accrue from them.

The follow-up visit demonstrated a much more relaxed and cooperative approach: clearly the recommendations in the AR had been debated and developed, and many changes had taken place as a result. The Strategic Planning process, in particular, and the evolution of important institutional policies – such as the new research agenda – were well underway. These processes have now stalled, though they are arguably even more necessary in these straitened times, when tough decisions will have to be made.

The institution should now begin to demonstrate its maturity. The Panel must emphasize the need for the IAA to continue the course of development: in particular to further clarify the committee structure, to introduce systems of staff support, development and training, and to devise comprehensive quality management systems with formal procedures and with external involvement. The evolution of the curriculum and the plans for expansion and diversification may have to be put on hold or introduced over a longer period of time – which will at least prevent the institution from trying to do too much too soon. The Panel hopes that, in time, suitable alternative accommodation will be found, more suitable to the Academy's laudatory interdisciplinary mission.

Although the Academy, like all other HEIs in Iceland, is undoubtedly suffering in the present financial downturn this was rarely used as an excuse in discussions. Institutional morale seemed high, with many staff expressing their determination that good could indeed come out of the crisis.

12. Recommendation

The Panel recommends that the Accreditation of the Iceland Academy be continued.

13. Signatures of the Expert Committee

Dr. Christian Thune, *Denmark*
Chair

Dr. Frank Quinault, Scotland

Dr. Rita McAllister, Scotland

Appendix 1: Agenda of site visit of Expert Committee to IAA 2 June 2010

08:30-09:50 *Meeting with Rector and Directors*

Present: Hjálmar H. Ragnarsson, Rector, Jóna Finnsdóttir, Managing Director, Björg J. Birgisdóttir, Director of Academic Affairs

10:00-11:15 *Meeting with Deans of Departments*

Present: Jóhannes Þórðarson, Dean of Department of Design and Architecture Kristín Valsdóttir, Dean of Department of Art Education, Kristján Steingrímur Jónsson, Dean of Department of Fine Arts, Mist Þorkeldsdóttir, Dean of Department of Music, Ragnheiður Skúladóttir, Dean of Department of Theatre and Dance

11:30-12:30 *Meetings with Director of Research Services, Dean of Department of Design and Architecture, Director of Academic Affairs, International Coordinator and Student Counsellor*

Present: Jóhannes Þórðarson, Dean of Department of Design and Architecture, Ólöf Gerður Sigfúsdóttir, Director of Research Services, Björg Birgisdóttir, Director of Academic Affairs, Alma Ragnarsdóttir, International Coordinator, Ingibjörg Kristinsdóttir, Student Counsellor

12:40-13:30 *Lunch with Rector, Deans and Directors*

13:30-14:15 *Meeting with Students*

Present: Embla Vigfúsdóttir, Department of Design and Architecture, Anna Hrunn Másdóttir, Department of Fine Arts, Anna Gunnadís Guðmundsdóttir, Department of Theatre and Dance, Jón Teitur Sigmundsson, Department of Art Education, Gunnar Karel, Department of Music

14:30-15:30 *Meeting with Members of Academic Staff*

Present: Una Þorleifsdóttir, Department of Theatre and Dance, Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir, Department of Design and Architecture, Hulda Stefánsdóttir, Department of Fine Arts, Kjartan Ólafsson, Department of Music, Vigdís Jakobsdóttir, Department of Art Education

16:15-17:00 *Final meeting with Rector, Managing Director and Director of Academic Affairs*

Present: Hjalmar H. Ragnarsson, Rector, Jóna Finnsdóttir, Managing Director, Björg J. Birgisdóttir, Director of Academic Affairs

Appendix 2: List of documents received

From the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture

Act on Public Higher Education Institutions 85/2008 (draft translation)

Higher Education Act no. 63/2006 (draft translation)

Rules no. 37/2006 on Doctoral Studies in Higher Education Institutions according to art. 7 of the Higher Education Act no. 63/2006 (draft translation)

Rules no. 1067/2006 on Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions according to art. 3 of the Higher Education Act no. 63/2006 (draft translation)

Article 8 of Rules No. 321/2009 on Quality Control of Teaching and Research in Higher Education Institutions (draft translation)

Accreditation Report, 2007: Iceland Academy of the Arts

From the Iceland Academy of the Arts

Self-evaluation Report. Follow-up to the Accreditation by the Minister of Education, Science and Culture of the Iceland Academy of the Arts in September 2007. Report presented to the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, 15 January 2010