

Follow-up Report

Bifrost University

Expert Committee Report

March 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 978-9979-777-91-5

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.....	6
2. Role and objectives.....	6
3. Administration and organisation	7
4. Structure of teaching and research.....	8
5. Competence requirements of personnel	9
6. Rules regarding admission requirements and rights and duties of students	10
7. Facilities and services provided to teachers and students	10
8. Internal quality management system	12
9. Description of learning outcomes	14
10. Finances	16
11. Summary of Findings	16
12. Recommendation	16
13. Signatures of the Expert Committee.....	17
Appendix 1: Agenda of site visit of Expert Committee to BU 16 February 2010.....	18
Appendix 2: List of documents received	20

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 Social Sciences at the University of Bifröst was published in January 2008, following a site visit in 2007 by a three person Expert Committee. Two members of that original committee were able to participate in the follow-up: Drs Christian Thune (Chair) and Frank Quinault. Dr Rita McAllister was appointed as the third member of the new Expert Committee. It received a *Report on responses to the Committee of Experts relating to the accreditation of Bifröst University in 2008* and further documentation on 18 January 2010 by email. Drs Thune and Quinault met, in Iceland, on 15 February to discuss the exercise before visiting Bifröst the following day. Unfortunately, illness prevented Dr McAllister from travelling to Iceland but she corresponded with the other members by telephone and email.

During the site visit Drs Thune and Quinault spoke to management, faculty, support staff and students (see Annex 1). They drafted an interim account of their findings for a meeting, on 18 February, 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 2-12) were sent to Bifröst University on 15 March 2010 for correction of factual mistakes and misinterpretations. The Bifröst University replied on 19 March 2010 making specific comments on Sections 4, 7, 8 and 10 which the Expert Committee took into account in the final version of the report.

The 2008 Accreditation Report on Social Science at Bifröst University consisted of 9 main sections, corresponding to the areas for review specified by the Ministry of Education, each of which ended with a Conclusion and Recommendations. The first part of the *Report on responses to the Committee of Experts relating to the accreditation of Bifröst University in 2008* described the actions taken by the University as a direct response to each of those recommendations. Other actions that the University had taken to improve its work and operations were described in a second part of the same document. Background information was supplied in a number of Annexes. During the visit by the Expert Committee to Bifröst,

the University offered to supply additional information in connection with seven of the issues that had been discussed and this was sent in the form of a short paper on 23 February.

For convenience, throughout the rest of this report:

- The University of Bifröst is referred to as 'BU'
- The 2010 Expert Committee is referred to as the 'Panel', which also differentiates it from references to the 2007/08 Expert Committee.
- The 2008 *Accreditation Report on Social Sciences at the University of Bifröst* is referred to as the 'AR'
- The *Report on responses to the report of the Committee of Experts relating to the accreditation of Bifröst University in 2008* is referred to as the 'Response'
- The additional information supplied by BU after the site visit is referred to as the 'Supplementary Response'.

Note: During its visit to the University of Akureyri, the Panel was given copies, in English, of two recent Self-Assessment Reports, one for Business and one for Law, produced at the behest of the Ministry of Education. The Panel learned later that Bifröst had also produced such reports, which it would have been helpful to see. Unfortunately, however, these were not available in English.

At the start of the site visit to BU, the Rector told the Panel that he and his colleagues had found the 2008 AR valuable. The University's response had been conditioned by the economic circumstances confronting all Icelandic universities, which Bifröst had met by raising tuition fees, reducing salaries, shedding some staff and reorganising student services. A guiding principle had been that BU should focus its resources by concentrating on its most distinctive programmes.

The Rector said that many staff had contributed to the preparation of BU's Response. Those who met the Panel, separately later on, confirmed that they were familiar with the Response and regarded it as a realistic appraisal. The students who met the Panel had all seen the Response and were aware that other students had contributed to it.

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 University of Bifröst – by Magnús Lyngdal Magnússon, Deputy Director at RANNIS, which ensured that the process operated smoothly throughout.

2. Role and objectives

The 2008 AR concluded that BU had a tendency to overstate its achievements and advised it not to claim more for itself than its circumstances, as a very small university, would ever allow. The Panel was therefore pleased to learn that the University had, for example, modified the wording of Article 1 of its University Regulation, substituting a “first class education” for one “comparable to the best education offered by institutions in the Western World”.

Judging by the documentation it saw, the Panel **concluded** that BU is now promoting itself appropriately, without hyperbole or claims that might be difficult to justify.

During the discussion with senior management, the Rector expressed his disappointment that a proposed merger between Bifröst University, the Iceland Academy of the Arts and Reykjavik University had failed to materialise. When members of the support staff were later invited to say what they would wish for the future of BU, they seemed to favour its continuation as a small, independent university.

3. Administration and organisation

The 2008 AR recommended that BU should have provided the Expert Committee with strategic plans: one for the institution as a whole and one for each of its three Faculties. The Response did incorporate what were said to be strategic plans. However, while these constituted a helpful statement of institutional aspirations and of the principles guiding the development of the Faculties, they lacked any specific information about targets, or who would be responsible for achieving them and when, or how success would be evaluated. It seemed surprising, for example, that the Strategy for the Faculty of Business made no reference to the new degree in Health Care Management and its expected development.

The Panel explored this matter at some length with the senior management team. They said that these more operational questions were the subject of regular discussion but acknowledged that this had not resulted in formal implementation plans showing how the University intended to achieve its strategic aims. The lack of such plans was partly due to the ease of informal communication in a small institution and partly due to the difficulty of formulating definite plans in uncertain times and when guidance from the Ministry was awaited. The Panel understood these considerations but nevertheless judged that it would be in the University's best interests to take a lead by producing clear plans, for external as well internal use. Indeed, the need for such plans is arguably all the greater precisely because of the difficult economic situation in Iceland. The Panel was therefore *reassured* to find that BU's senior managers evidently understood what it was proposing and appeared to have (for instance, in the person of its new Dean of Business) the requisite expertise.

Mention was made on a couple of occasions during the visit about a possible restructuring at BU whereby the current Faculties would merge, but this had not been prefigured in the Response and was not explored further by the Panel.

The Supplementary Response includes a helpful section clarifying the relationships between the Board of Governors, the University Council and the Rector.

4. Structure of teaching and research

The 2008 AR recommended that BU should be particularly careful, because of its small size, not to introduce too many new programmes. The senior management team assured the Panel that it was aware of the risks that proliferation could entail. Two new programmes had been launched since the 2007 visit. However, the University was already committed to one of these, the Masters degree in Health Care Management, at that time; and the other one, an undergraduate degree in International Studies, was closely tied to the existing degree in Politics, Philosophy and Economics. The Panel met a student from each of the two new programmes, as it had requested, both of whom were well satisfied with what was being offered. The University is also planning to introduce a Masters degree in European Corporate Law.

The AR had also noted a potential tension between BU's customary emphasis on its situation as a campus university, and the close, face-to-face contact with students which that facilitated, and its early entry into distance learning. The Panel wished to know how the University foresaw the future balance between these two modes and how it sought to ensure an equivalent experience for distance learning students. They were told that Bifröst does not anticipate any significant expansion of its distance learning provision. Personal contact with and between distance learning students is achieved through regular visits to the campus. Section 8 of the Response also addressed the question of equivalence, recognising as it did that different teaching methods may be required in order for distance students to achieve the same outcomes as their on-campus peers.

The Expert Committee did not express any particular concerns about the organisation of research at BU in its 2008 Report, beyond noting that there might be a case for some consolidation of its four research centres. The Panel met the Directors of three of these, as well as the Director of a new one – the Centre for Management and International Business – and the Director of the University's generic Research Institute and the Editor of the Bifröst Journal of Social Science. The possibility that some of these centres might be merged, in order to strengthen BU's research profile, was mentioned, spontaneously, but so was the argument that excellence in research depends more on individual initiative than it does upon structures. It was not possible, within the time available, for the Panel to pursue this

question further. It learned, with interest, about the development of the Bifröst Journal, including its role in the promotion of open access publishing.

One matter raised in the AR, under this heading and also in the final summary, concerned benchmarking. The University had made it clear in 2007 that it wished its teaching and research to be judged by international standards, but it had not provided any detailed account of how it carries out such benchmarking itself. As this point was not addressed in the Response, it was raised with the senior management, who were able to name several overseas institutions to which they looked as comparators. However, as the process seemed rather ad hoc, the Panel **suggests** that it might usefully be made more systematic.

Overall, the Panel was **satisfied** by the present organisation of teaching and research at BU.

5. Competence requirements of personnel

The 2008 AR commented that, although the Expert Committee had no reason to doubt that BU's Evaluation Committees operated in a manner comparable to that of other Icelandic universities, it had not been supplied with any details concerning the criteria used for the appointment and promotion of academic staff. BU acted on this by adopting an evaluation system, very similar to that of the University of Iceland, which was included in its Response. The system awards points under six headings, and the Panel **welcomes** it as a significant step forward. It observed, however, that no provision is made for recognising excellence in teaching by awarding points based on student evaluations. Staff explained that this does not happen in any Icelandic universities.

The Panel **suggests** that, as there are obvious advantages to a set of criteria that is broadly comparable across universities, possible refinements of the system, such as that just proposed, might best be explored nationally.

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

The 2008 AR observed that it had not been possible to assess the adequacy of BU's procedures for dealing with student complaints or appeals because no details had been given. These were summarised in the Response. The Panel omitted to ask the student interviewees whether, in their judgement, they were operating satisfactorily.

A discussion, during the course of the 2007 visit to BU, of factors that might affect student retention gave rise to a recommendation that the University undertake some systematic research into drop-out rates. BU has now begun collecting statistics that will allow it to determine whether, for example, drop-out is correlated with age on entry. Staff acknowledged that the process is still at an early stage, with little analysis of the data so far. The Panel *commends* this initiative and hopes that the University will develop it and look for other possible indicators of student performance.

What the existing data did show is that drop-out rates are, mostly, very low at Bifröst, with some striking reductions in recent years. The Panel therefore needed to be confident that this trend was not due to any lowering of academic standards. Senior management assured the Panel that the good results are explained by increased selectivity at admission and the close monitoring of student progress that the University's small size and intimate nature (at least for those on campus) permits. The Panel has no reason to doubt this explanation but nevertheless *advises* Bifröst to continue to pay very close attention to the maintenance of academic standards.

7. Facilities and services provided to teachers and students

The AR concluded that both students and faculty at BU were well served by support staff and that the facilities available to them met their needs. It did, however, repeat its earlier warning about a tendency to overstatement in publicity materials. According to the Response, this has now been addressed by the University.

The Panel met key members of the support staff, who told them how the University had sought to protect services despite the recent financial pressures. For example, expenditure on the Library had been protected and it has been sharing its resources with other university libraries, and there has been investment in the equipment used for distance learning. There has been a steep decline in the number of BU students able to afford study abroad, but the number of incoming students appears to be rising.

The Educational Adviser was not able to meet the Panel but had supplied them with a written report on the Counselling Services, which has since been supplemented with additional information about the Careers Guidance available to students. The first Role defined in Bifröst's Strategy 2008-12 is "To prepare students for positions of responsibility, leadership and management at the national and international level ..." This is a worthy but also a bold ambition, which the University should seek to justify through data about actual graduate destinations.

The meetings with academic staff and with students appeared to confirm that the support provided by the University remains good. BU has apparently introduced a "Teachers' Day", providing advice on lecturing and communicating with students. Staff agreed with the panel, however, that more could usefully be done in this respect. The Panel **recommends** that BU expand its staff development programme, for part-time as well as full-time staff.

Peer observation of teaching has occurred, recently and to a limited extent, in the Faculty of Business. The Panel **recommends** that BU consider making this standard practice, in all Faculties, for developmental purposes.

The documentation supplied to the Expert Committee before its visit to BU in 2007 included the results of a survey of the working environment that had been issued to staff in each of three recent years. The Committee had commended this initiative and the present Panel **suggests** that the survey, which has been suspended to save costs, be reintroduced when finances permit.

Note: The Panel also wondered, following its visit to the University of Akureyri, which, like BU, has developed its own learning management system, whether this diversification of systems – successful though each appears to be – is sensible, since a shared system might be cheaper and facilitate student transfer. However, this was not discussed within anyone at BU.

8. Internal quality management system

This was the aspect of the 2008 accreditation process that caused the Expert Committee most concern. It felt able to state that BU was meeting its legal requirements because of the evident dedication of staff and the favourable comments about teaching it heard from students. It concluded, nevertheless, that there were significant weaknesses in respect of quality control and recommended that the University reconsider its adoption of the EFQM model and improve its Quality Handbook.

The Response stated that the EFQM had been discontinued and that the quality system had been strengthened. However, no details were provided as to what had replaced the EFQM or how the system had been strengthened. Moreover, when the Panel inspected the version of the Quality Handbook that was sent to it in advance it found that some of the key sections, including that describing the operation of the Quality Board (now ‘Quality Council’), were still dated ‘August 2007’. These apparent shortcomings were therefore an important topic of discussion with senior management during the Panel’s visit to Bifröst.

Those responsible for the Quality Manual (as it is now called) acknowledged that it lacked a proper version control mechanism but did explain that it had been improved by eliminating material which, as had been noted in the AR, might be appropriate to a staff handbook but not to one focussed on Quality. The Supplementary Response includes a comprehensive summary of changes to the Quality Manual, showing which items are new and which have been removed. The Panel **welcomes** these improvements as it does the information that staff are instructed in the use of the Manual and that the Quality Council is to begin issuing an annual report.

Something that the Panel did not receive before its visit was an adequate account of how a new programme of study is approved by the University or how an existing one is reviewed after a given period of time to ensure that it is still functioning effectively. When teaching quality and standards are audited at universities in the UK, the documentation always includes not only a detailed account of these processes but also actual examples with all the associated paperwork. The University volunteered to provide the Panel with a description of how it had approved the new undergraduate degree in International Studies, which it has now done as part of the Supplementary Response. The process appears to have been thorough and, crucially in the opinion of the Panel, did involve consultation with subject experts at another university. Even so, the Panel **recommends** that these procedures should be formalised and then incorporated in the Quality Manual. The Supplementary Response also contains a short description (though not a worked example) of how programmes are reviewed. This is satisfactory so far as it goes but it makes no mention of timescales nor is there any requirement for external involvement. In the opinion of the Panel, programme reviews should always incorporate a strong element of external scrutiny, but this is arguably still more important in the case of a small university, like Bifröst, because there is less scope internally for independent vetting. The Panel therefore **recommends** that BU develop a rigorous system of periodic review and that this too be documented as part of its Quality Manual. It further **invites** the University to consider the introduction of a formal process for the annual monitoring of all its programmes.

An important component of annual monitoring is usually the evaluations of teaching by students derived from questionnaires. Students – two of whom were current members of the Quality Council - told the Panel that these are taken seriously by BU and that they knew of cases where staff (presumably on part-time or short-term appointments) had been terminated because of poor results. On the other hand, staff admitted that questionnaires are not always administered, apparently because of questionnaire fatigue among students, and that they no longer include the opportunity for open-ended comments, which many had found illuminating, because of occasional misuse by respondents. The Panel **agrees** that a review of these instruments would be timely.

When the Panel met with a representative group of students it asked a series of questions about the clarity of assessment criteria for coursework, the time taken by staff to return assignments, and the level of feedback provided to them. Their replies suggested that there is considerable variation between programmes and between staff in these matters. That is what reviewers are almost always told in an exercise of this kind and there was no indication that the variability at BU is unusually high. However, one of the main justifications for a robust quality system - which requires clear grading criteria, specifies the times within which assignments will be returned to students and encourages helpful feedback, for instance through the use of standardised cover sheets for marked work – is precisely to ensure that there is an acceptable degree of consistency so that all students are treated fairly.

9. Description of learning outcomes

The AR recommended that, in order to fulfil the rationale for learning outcomes, BU needed to align them, explicitly, with appropriate means of assessment. The Response reported on work in progress and included (mainly via one of the Appendices) the current descriptions for all programmes.

The Panel welcomed these developments and was pleased to hear, from the meeting with teaching staff as well as that with senior management, that the engagement with learning outcomes was proving to be a valuable experience.

It remains the case, however, that although the latest programme descriptions describe the learning outcomes in considerable detail, none of them includes information about the corresponding methods of assessment. The Expert Committee was aware, when it produced its 2008 Accreditation Report, that the National Qualification Framework does not in fact require this additional information but recommended it nevertheless because it considered that it is as important to show how the achievement of learning outcomes by students will be demonstrated as it is to specify the outcomes themselves. The Panel was pleased to find that staff at BU fully understood and accepted this point. It therefore

recommends that BU now expands its programme descriptions by aligning learning outcomes with corresponding methods of assessment. It also **welcomes** the mention in the Response that short courses on the construction and use of learning outcomes are to be offered to teaching staff.

During the meeting with students it was suggested to the Panel that BU's reputation for producing graduates who are particularly well-equipped for the world of work, because they are accustomed to more frequent assignments than students elsewhere, was no longer as widely accepted. Teaching staff were asked about this alleged perception and whether it might reflect an actual change in teaching style. They seemed to confirm that there had indeed been some shifts, with less use, for example, of open book examinations, but the Panel gained the impression that staff welcomed this additional flexibility and might wish there to be still more, for instance through greater differentiation across years of study. What was clear, and which the Panel **welcomes**, is that how best to teach is a matter for lively debate at Bifröst.

Mention was made in the Response (p.11) of the fact that BU offers students on some of its Masters programmes the option of taking additional courses instead of submitting a thesis. The Panel viewed this development with some concern, wondering how it was approved in the first place and how it is being monitored. Staff explained that the opportunity was aimed at students who were in full-time work and seeking a vocational rather than a purely academic qualification. The difference is apparently reflected in the nomenclature of the degrees, which, the Panel were told, do not include 'MA' or 'MS' in their titles. The Panel was broadly satisfied by these explanations but **suggests** that the effects of the change be carefully monitored, especially bearing in mind that it was told that it had contributed to the fall in drop-out at the Masters level.

The Panel noticed some variations in the way in which degrees were named in the documentation. The differences were minor but as these are the titles of awards, which BU publicises in English, the Panel **recommends** that they be checked for consistency.

10. Finances

The 2008 AR concluded that BU appeared to be taking the necessary steps to achieve financial stability after a period of deficits. It made no recommendations.

The Panel was informed that, despite the economic crisis that has engulfed the country meanwhile, BU had a surplus in 2009 and expects to record a small surplus in 2010.

11. Summary of Findings

When the Expert Committee visited Bifröst University in 2007 it sensed some apprehension on the part of senior staff. On this visit, and despite the critical tone of parts of the 2008 Accreditation Report, the same individuals appeared much more confident. In the opinion of the Panel this was for good reason, because the University had gone a considerable way towards meeting each of its major recommendations. There is still work to be done, especially in formulating clear strategic plans and a comprehensive quality management system that includes formal procedures for programme approval and review (with external involvement), but staff were responsive to advice and already moving in the right direction. Although Bifröst is suffering, like all universities, from the country's parlous economic situation, its senior management did not seek to make this an excuse for any of the possible shortcomings mentioned by the Panel. It was also noteworthy that, despite the impact of severe budgetary cuts, staff morale was said to be, and indeed appeared to be, high.

12. Recommendation

The Panel *recommends* that the Accreditation of Social Sciences at the University of Bifröst 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 BU 16 February 2010

09:15 – 11:30 *Meeting with rector, deans and directors of academic services, statistics and quality board. Report on responses to the report of the Committee of Experts*

Present: Ágúst Einarsson, Rector, Professor, Bryndís Hlöðversdóttir, Dean of the Faculty of Law, Associate Professor, Jón Ólafsson, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Professor, Ásta Dís Óladóttir, Dean of the Faculty of Business, Associate Professor, Ingibjörg Guðmundsdóttir, Director of Academic Services, Geirlaug Jóhannsdóttir, Academic Services, Quality Council, Guðrún Björg Aðalsteinsdóttir, Academic Services, Statistics

11:30 – 12:15 *Lunch and informal discussions*

Present: Ágúst Einarsson, Rector, Professor, Bryndís Hlöðversdóttir, Dean of the Faculty of Law, Associate Professor, Jón Ólafsson, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Professor, Ásta Dís Óladóttir, Dean of the Faculty of Business, Associate Professor, Ingibjörg Guðmundsdóttir, Director of Academic Services

12:15 – 13:00 *Meeting with directors of research institutes*

Present: Njörður Sigurjónsson, Assistant Professor, Director of Bifrost University Research Institute, Eiríkur Bergmann Einarsson, Associate Professor, Director of Centre for European Studies, Elín Blöndal, Professor, Director of Centre for Labor Law and Equality, Ásta Dís Óladóttir, Associate Professor, Director of Centre of Management and Business, Ian Watson, Assistant Professor, Editor of the Bifrost Journal of Social Science

13:15 – 14:00 *Meeting with students*

Present: Guðjón Guðmundsson, undergraduate study, business administration, chairman of the Student Union, Böðvar Sigurjónsson, undergraduate study, business law, Magnús Snorri Snorrason, undergraduate study, international studies, Máni Eskur Bjarnason, undergraduate study, business administration, Davíð Fjölfnir Ármannsson, undergraduate study, philosophy/politics/economics, Quality Council, Erlendur Eiríksson, graduate study, master of law, Guðrún Helga Árnadóttir, undergraduate study, business administration, distance learning, Jóna Hildur Bjarnadóttir, graduate study, master in health management.

14:00 – 14:15 *Coffee break*

14:15 – 15:00 *Meeting with representatives of academic staff*

Present: Ástráður Haraldsson, Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, Birgir Hermannsson, Associate Professor, Faculty of Social Science, Geirlaug Jóhannsdóttir, Academic Services, Quality Council, Ingibjörg Guðmundsdóttir, Director of Academic Services, Ingibjörg Þorsteinsdóttir, Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, Jón Freyr Jóhannsson, Adjunct, Faculty of Business, Njörður Sigurjónsson, Assistant Professor, Snæfríður Baldvinsdóttir, Adjunct, Faculty of Business, Stefán Kalmansson, Adjunct, Faculty of Business.

15:15 – 16:00 *Meeting with directors of housing, library, finance, computer services, academic services, master's programs, educational advising and study abroad*

Present: Alda Baldursdóttir, Housing, Andrea Jóhannsdóttir, Library, Einar Valdimarsson, Finance, Guðrún Björg Aðalsteinsdóttir, Academic Services, Statistics, Hjalti Benediktsson, Computer Services, Ingibjörg Guðmundsdóttir, Director of Academic Services, Kristín Ólafsdóttir, Master's Programs, Sigrún Hermannsdóttir, Study Abroad.

16:10 – 16:30 *Wrap up*

Present: Ágúst Einarsson, Rector, Professor, Bryndís Hlöðversdóttir, Dean of the Faculty of Law, Associate Professor, Jón Ólafsson, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Professor, Ásta Dís Óladóttir, Dean of the Faculty of Business, Associate Professor.

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, 2008: Bifrost University

From the Bifrost University

Report on responses to the Committee of Experts relating to the accreditation of Bifrost University in 2008

Appendix 1: Bifrost University Quality Manual

Appendix 2: Description of Bifrost University study programmes and learning outcomes

Appendix 3: Statistical information on the activities of Bifrost University

Appendix 4: Research at the Centre for Management and International Business

Appendix 5: Foreign partner universities of Bifrost University

Supplementary Response from Bifrost University (23 February 2010)