Nina Malterud receives a gift from Vice-Rector Berit Rokne on behalf of the University of Bergen at the centenary celebration of Bergen National Academy of the Arts (KHiB) in 2009.

Nina Malterud

Artistic Freedom and Public Responsibility: My Time as Rector

The Bergen-based artist Nina Malterud became a professor of ceramics at the National College of Art and Design (*Statens høgskole for hunsthåndverk og design*, SHKD) in 1994, continuing in that post until 2002, after the consolidated institution became Bergen National Academy of the Arts (*Kunsthøgskole i Bergen*, KHiB). She became pro-rector of KHiB in 1999 and then rector (2002–2010). Starting in 2000, she led the project of developing a new proposal for an artistic competency programme. She was a member of the steering committee for the Artistic Research Fellowship Programme (later called the Norwegian Artistic Research Programme, the NARP) (2003–2014) and a member of the Jørgensen Committee (2006–2007). She was project leader when KHiB applied for accreditation as a specialised university institution in 2014, and an advisor in the process of establishing the Faculty of Art, Music and Design, (*Fakultet for kunst, musikk og design*, KMD) at the University of Bergen (2014–2016). Malterud has authored numerous articles on education in the arts and on artistic research.[1]

In my work at KHiB,[2] I faced challenges I was not sure I could handle, and I felt the responsibility of using public funds. When I became a professor in 1994, I could not know it would eventually lead to an eight-year rectorate, and that for the next 20 years, I would be involved in making great changes in education in the arts across Norway. Worries and uncertainties there were aplenty, but the joy, when we accomplished something extra, renewed our courage. The work brought with it experiences and new friendships that I today find indispensable.

Making a Difference in a Changing World is the translated title of KHiB's 2009 yearbook, which was written by the academic leader group, and it represents the ambitions we jointly developed. We were not starting from scratch when I became rector in 2002. Since KHiB's establishment in 1996, its leaders had worked to create an institution that could meet the new demands put to higher education in the areas of transparency, reporting and quality assurance. The latter concept was, for us, new and foreign. The Ministry of Education and Research (hereafter the Ministry) now involved itself as active owner in a completely different way than before, not least by establishing the Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (*Nasjonalt organ for kvalitet i utdanninga*, NOKUT) in 2002, with authority to oversee and give accreditation. The two institutions that merged to form KHiB (see note 2) were state-owned higher-educational institutions, but before their consolidation, they had probably functioned largely as independent and self-owned.

KHiB in society

For all higher education in Norway, the new enunciated challenge was *the social task or mission*. But this was nothing unique to Norway; it could also be found amongst the international institutions with which we collaborated. We understood this primarily to mean that we needed, more than before, to define our relevance for the subject areas and to engage more with the public. It was also about seeing the institution as part of society's policies and organisation, with attendant administerial regimes. I sought to address this in a speech for the opening of the 2006/2007 study year:

> 'The ability to adapt' is a standard expression today, often used in relation to things that are required but which are seen as unnecessary, involving extra work one could have avoided, obviously unpleasant. But to face whatever comes, from whatever direction, to face the future in all its divergent representations, to meet demands from society, and continuously to transform these meeting into new professional entities – this is our job.

An important goal for KHIB's leaders was to instigate interaction between the artistic disciplines and to break down their borders. The two schools that merged to form KHiB – SHKD and West Norway Academy of Art (*Vestlandets kunstakademi*, VKA) – had been built on different educational traditions and had related, in part, to different external milieus and discourses. At VKA, individual supervision was at the core of the study programmes. At SHKD, there was a culture of learning based on planned progression in classes, with clearly defined assignments and technical training. Starting in 1996, the educational strategy came to include the aim of creating a space for diversity within art and design. Interdisciplinary meeting places were set up for both the staff and students. New personal contacts and alliances therefore emerged over time, and new projects bridged old boundaries between subject areas. Implementation of the national "Quality Reform" (*"Kvalitetsreformen"*) from 2002, which necessitated writing out study programmes, evaluation criteria and study contracts for students in bachelor and master programmes, was carried out within a joint format for KHiB's Department of Fine Art, Department of Specialised Art and Department of Design, yet with room for different content in each subject area. In this way,

1 http://www.ninamalterud.no/tekster-kunstutd.html accessed April 2017.

2 For an overview of the institution's name changes and the history of consolidation, see the appendix.

the different learning cultures seriously encountered each other and had to exchange experiences, form opinions and allow themselves to be influenced by each other. Long-term effort gave results. KHiB's new study programmes and contract formulations (2003–2004) proved viable for many years and were used to some extent as models by other institutions. It proved possible to meet relevant disciplinary requirements for art and design within the national framework for bachelor and master degree studies and to allow for individualised study plans that combined courses from different departments. KHiB was perhaps one of the higher-educational institutions in the country that gained greatest benefit from "Kvalitetsreformen": we experienced that we mastered our encounter with the new regime, and we used the process for the benefit of our subject areas.

KHiB was one of three state-owned art-educational institutions with independent status, the other two being Oslo National Academy of the Arts (*Kunsthøgskolen i Oslo*, KHiO) and the Norwegian Academy of Music (*Norges musikkhøgskole*, NMH). The three increased their level of conversation from 1996 onwards, on account of many joint policy-related interests and challenges, especially in the area of developing artistic research. KHiB was the primus motor for strengthening this collaboration after the millennial turn. As independent higher-educational institutions directly reporting to the Ministry, we played an important national role, also on behalf of the other art schools localised within universities and university colleges. We took upon ourselves the task of making the artistic subject areas visible in such contexts as the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (*Universitets- og høgskolerådet*, UHR). The UHR became increasingly important as a strategic cooperative body, and after long-term work, we were able, in 2012, to establish the National Council for Artistic Research (*Nasjonalt råd for kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid*, NRKU) within the UHR. The UHR played an important role for higher education, as a consultative body, as a promotor for specific issues, and as a body that could report to the government on political and academic issues. Affiliation with the UHR gave authority.

"A squirrel let loose in a church" – I jotted down this characterisation of "the artist in academia" when attending the conference "Arts Research: The State of Play", held in Dublin in 2008. Squirrels and churches do have qualities. Squirrels are agile and quick, while churches (in the best cases) can be stable structures with lots of space and open doors. There will always be challenges in institutionalising and formalising research and study programmes in subjects that per definition are intended to be open, innovative and experimental. At the start of the study year in August 2004, I addressed this issue in my rector's speech:

> There must be ambivalence between having public responsibility and having a large need for independence. Discipline-related and ethical integrity, freedom of expression and critical reflection are, in our context, fundamental values. These do not arise by themselves. The understanding of what these concepts involve must continuously be revised and maintained. Freedom is also a concept with high status in our subject areas. It is however more seldom that we have qualified discussions about what freedom is. Values must be identified and recognised in new contexts, and they must be tested.

When I became rector, I discovered that many people in near and distant contexts thought I had taken an administrative job. Many considered being a leader an administrative role. On all possible occasions, I emphasised that my task was to be the academic leader of art and design, and that leading happens within a group setting. At UHR's Rector School in 2007, I received the following message: "The death of an institution is when the rector goes too much into the operative side of things; you must instead emphasise strategic leadership." But the Vice Rector Per Aarvik and I were probably operative *and* strategic. On a good day we could be both simultaneously. We were impatient; we wanted to be hands-on. The devil is in the details – this we experienced regularly. Precision in the daily work was important to us. Many a night we dreamed of losing papers, forgetting to prepare for things, or in other respects not fulfilling our duties.

Doctorate in art – KHiB as one of the initiators

In the guidelines for the "Norwegian Artistic Research Programme" (NARP, *"Program for kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid"*) one reads that the programme shall "…stimulate and facilitate artistic research education at the highest level (corresponding to PhD level)".[3] This was the premise since the programme started in 2003.

The idea of establishing a doctoral degree in art had circulated in higher-level art schools since the late 1990s. It was a logical consequence of focusing on artistic research, upgrading the education and adapting it to the bachelor and master degree structures. I led the working group for NMH, KHiO and KHiB that in 2000 submitted to the Ministry the "Proposal for a Programme for Artistic Competence-Development in Art Educational Institutions" (*"Forslag til program for kunstnerisk kompetanseutvikling i kunstutdanningsinstitusjonene"*). The Ministry had initiated and financed the proposal, and it was positive to our recommendation to establish the NARP with financed positions for research fellows within the doctoral degree framework, yet with adaptation to the field of art.[4] 'Critical mass' was the most important argument for establishing a common, national artistic-research programme right from the start, since each institution on its own lacked resources to create a doctoral-level environment that was large enough, with a defensible number of participants.[5] With the NARP, 'the arts' came to be treated as a general term covering design, film, music, performing art and visual and conceptually based art. KHiB was appointed administrative operator for the programme. This was a significant declaration of trust from the Ministry, and it gave KHiB's leaders good insight into the programme's challenges and consequences. I was a member of the NARP's programme board from 2003 to 2014 and closely followed its development during these years.

In autumn 2003, only a few weeks after the NARP had been formally established, the programme leaders and the first six research fellows with their supervisors attended the first meeting for artistic research fellows. The mood was tense. We were uncertain about what the programme would entail and how the programme requirements, regulations and role distribution between the NARP's programme board, institutions, research fellows and supervisors should be practiced. Although beginners, we had a clear platform: the doctoral level of art education should have artistic practice as the core, just as did the bachelor and master degree programmes which we developed based on guidelines set by "Kvalitetsreformen" from 2002. There were many challenges in building a research programme as a formal career path. We needed relatively predictable quality-assessment criteria at the same time as we needed to retain a necessary rootedness in the wider art scene's more confusing and unstable practices, role models and criteria for success. The NARP's framework has been revised several times over the years, based on accrued experience.

The working group that submitted the report to the Ministry in 2000 recommended initiating the artistic research programme as soon as possible, but postponed the demand for the doctoral title. This was because we knew, in principle, that a 'doctorate of art' could unleash a larger discussion about definitions of research, both in the Ministry and in the UHR, and that such a discussion would waylay us. From our side, however, there was full openness about our aim to offer a doctoral degree – in the long term. But it was unthinkable to run such a programme without it being formally linked to an established degree level. When the Ministry, in 2011, published the document "Norwegian Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning" (*"Nasjonalt kvalifikasjonsrammeverk for livslang læring"*), one could read that the "Diploma, artistic research" was listed at level 8: PhD (3rd cycle), along with "Diploma, PhD" and "Diploma, Dr. Philos" – perfectly in agreement with our intention. Nevertheless, the formal recognition a candidate would receive after a successful research-fellowship project was still not a degree, but a paper document and competence as an associate professor (*førsteamanuensis*). The Ministry found it difficult to acknowledge that an artistically-based doctoral degree was a logical consequence of its own "Kvalitetsreform" and qualifications framework. After many years of pressure from the NRKU, the higher-level art-educational institutions and the NARP, the Ministry gave a binding signal in 2016 regarding the establishment of an artistic doctoral degree. The first admissions to a doctoral degree programme – based on the same artistic premises as the NARP – will probably take place in 2018.

Degree or no degree – has the NARP programme proved to be worth the investment for the artistic disciplines? I believe the answer is an unqualified yes. Important artistic projects, including some quite critical ones, have been developed within the programme's framework and have benefited both the art scene and art education. The requirement that researchers must document their reflection in the projects has challenged and raised the level of the artistic subject areas. Furthermore, the involved institutions have met and shown that they can collaborate based on the premises of the subject area.

Artistic research – A new institutional responsibility

"The idea of the genius must be left behind when you talk about research." I jotted this down in a supervisors' meeting during a research fellowship seminar in 2004. In many respects, it speaks volumes about the radical readjustment triggered by the new focus on artistic research.

In 1999 the Ministry unexpectedly allotted KHiB one million kroner to develop artistic research amongst the institution's professional staff. This amount went a long way back then. The academy established a small professorship dedicated to the purpose and earmarked funds which KHiB's professional staff could apply for in order to do research projects and produce publications. A committee was also set up, mostly with external international members, to award the project/publication funds to applicants, and to engage in strategic discussions with the institutional leaders. The combination of members in this committee signalled a clear ambition to establish an international network and level, also a will to allow external professionals to assess our activities. In this way, KHiB took responsibility to define, gather and strengthen artistic research, and to contribute actively to the subject areas.

3 The regulations were stipulated by the Ministry on 5 December 2013. NARP today includes both the research fellowship programme and a programme for funding larger projects, see note 4. The website is www.artistic-research.no Guideline document in English: http://artistic-research.no/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Retningslinjer-SP-150915-en.pdf accessed April 2017.

4 The second proposal was to establish a project programme for artistic research. This was finally achieved in 2010.

5 As of 2017, the following institutions, with faculties/institutes for various fields of art, are involved in the research fellowship programme: Oslo National Academy of the Arts, University of Bergen, Norwegian Academy of Music, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Oslo School of Architecture and Design, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Østfold University College, University of Agder, University of Stavanger and Arctic University of Norway.

6 In Norwegian, *kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid* literally means 'artistic development work'. In the international community, however, it is called 'artistic research'.

Colleagues in the lift. From left to right: Per Aarvik, Einar Wiik, Nina Malterud, Åshild Grana, Paula Crabtree, Department of Fine Art (Avd. Kunstakademiet), C. Sundtsgate.

As early as in the revised "Act Relating to Universities and University Colleges" (*"Lov om universiteter og høyskoler"*, henceforth 'the Act') from 1995, the concept of 'artistic research' has been treated as comparable to 'academic research' and seen as one of the main tasks of higher-level art education.[6] It took some years, however, for KHiB and the other higher-level art schools to understand the breadth of this and to act upon it. Research-and-development work within the art educations had previously been synonymous with the work professors did in their studios or workshops; it had little to do with educational institutions because there, the main focus was on teaching. Several new structural initiatives for strengthening artistic research were introduced at KHiB in the early 2000s. An increased demand for collaboration, communication and participation in the institutional environment contributed to changing the role of professional staff members. At the same time, initiative, motivation and direction were contingent on the individual – as in other research. Guidelines were drawn up for the professional staff – for their use of time, attendance requirements, individual work plans to ensure time for research, arenas for critical discussion with peers, funding for projects and publications, and physical space in which to do research – all these factors together comprised well-cogitated framework conditions. Under the heading "A structure designed to improve and assure quality" in KHiB's "Application for Accreditation as a Specialised University Institution" (*"Søknad om akkreditering som vitenskapelig høgskole"*, 2014),[7] these initiatives were listed as preconditions for quality.

7 http://www.khib.no/media/2301050/3175-13-KHiB%20Eng_Application%20LR.pdf UHR translates the Norwegian term '*vitenskapelig høgskole*' (directly translated: 'scientific university college'), as 'specialised university institution'. This surprising translation points to an institution at university level that has a national responsibility for a type of education and research that is fairly narrow in scope, such as sports or theology, or in this case, the arts.

Emphasis on dialogue, the project format and peer evaluation improved the discussion of results and quality, and of the relation between individual and institutional professional interests. Each year the rectorate, in collaboration with the professor Søren Kjørup, organised at least four or five internal obligatory seminars for the professional staff, with presentations and discussions of research projects. This had great significance for anchoring the artistic research, with all its different formats and forms of expression, in the institution. For me as rector, these gatherings were important because I learned about the staffs' projects, gained increased insight into the artistic subject areas and became more confident to work long-term, systematically and in goal-oriented ways within the professional environment.

Before 2005, KHiB and KHiO belonged to a separate institutional category that was equal in status to universities and scientific or specialised university institutions (see note 7). With a change in the Act in 2005, this separate category ceased to exist, and we were put into the category of state-owned university colleges. KHiB understood itself as a university institution with a specialised national responsibility limited to the arts and comparable to that of specialised university institutions, not least after we had increased our emphasis on artistic research. We therefore wanted, as soon as possible, to apply for an increase in our institutional status, among other reasons, in order to be in the same category as the Norwegian Academy of Music and the Oslo School of Architecture and Design. The key to institutional accreditation lies in the Ministry and NOKUT's regulations, where artistic research and academic research are treated as having equal status. The Ministry showed little understanding of the challenging situation it had put KHiO and KHiB in when it gave the two institutions university college status. When KHiB, in 2014, completed the accreditation process with NOKUT, receiving exceptionally positive feedback from both the accreditation committee and from NOKUT's leaders, the Ministry ended up *not* implementing the accreditation on the grounds that there would soon be changes to the Act.[8] Such changes to the game rules during the accreditation process strained our relation to the Ministry. Accreditation from NOKUT was nevertheless a victory for the artistic disciplines. I quote from the expert committee's unanimous recommendation:

> The committee's main impression is that Bergen Academy of Art and Design has, through goal-oriented and active initiatives, generated professional environments in the fields of art and design. In these environments, artistic research is conducted at a high international level, and there is good integration between the teaching and the artistic research.

When KHiB, in 2015, started the negotiations with the University of Bergen that culminated in establishing the Faculty of Fine Art, Music and Design in 2017, the recognition from NOKUT proved to be crucial for the university's understanding of the high level of KHiB's study programmes and artistic research.

Interdisciplinary dialogue and competence

"It's about getting impulses that pollute the field's own confidence!" This statement is from the late Morten Eide Pedersen, professor at the Grieg Academy, and I jotted it down at a NARP research-fellowship seminar in 2004. An interesting and demanding aspect of the NARP programme's construction is its obligatory interdisciplinary meetings. Different institutions, disciplinary traditions and cultures encounter each other in the programme's steering committee, in research fellowship gatherings, and in research fellowship seminars. Collaboration and task distribution in the steering committee have exceeded all expectations, but many research fellows and advisors have been dissatisfied with the discussions at the meetings and seminars because they have felt that the participants lack sufficient specific knowledge of each other's fields.

Through working with the NARP programme, I have become a passionate advocate for interdisciplinary meetings. The transition between specialised and general competence interests me. The divergent fields of art have surprisingly different histories and subject-related discourses. When these meet, interesting friction arises; at the same time, the group of interdisciplinary artists raises a question that cannot be answered once and for all: *What is art?*

But just as in the NARP, we at KHiB were in the process of introducing interdisciplinary strategies. We experienced that within the small environments for each subject area, there was a strong presence of field-specific jargon, local criteria for quality and little insight into other art forms. Cross-disciplinary initiatives at KHiB were stimulated both through seeking to change attitudes and through financial measures. I addressed this in my rector's speech at the start of the 2006/2007 study year:

> The belief that cross-disciplinary meeting places and inter-disciplinary confrontations raise the professional level has been the foundation for our entire educational venture: Friction and confrontation generate development – as long as they take constructive forms. Our task, among other things, is to civilise these meeting places between design and art, between the one and the other art form, between our subject areas and quite different fields, and, not least, between the

8 The "Study Programme Quality Regulation" ("*Studiekvalitetsforskriften*") from the Ministry, where the requirements for degrees and institutional categories are formulated, was changed on 24 June 2016. Requirements for "specialised university institutions" ("*vitenskapelig høgskoler*") were increased in terms of volume in the doctoral programme/research fellowship programme. KHiB, on its own, would be unable to meet this new requirement, but the requirement could be met within the scope of the University of Bergen. This became one of the driving factors for KHiB, in the process leading to the new Faculty of Fine Art, Music and Design in 2015–2016.

artistic subjects and the institutional administration. It has been shown that we have everything to gain through deliberately and resolutely working towards critical and generous difference. The benefits for the artistic disciplines are improved content, improved communication, a wide orientation and breadth in expression.

The use of 'peer reviews' became more widespread and gained greater influence, both in the NARP programme and internally in the art schools. Thus the question of *who* should be a peer in various contexts became more urgent. The NARP programme had (and has) the requirement that a research fellow's main supervisor and the majority of members in the assessment committees should have artistic competence in order to ensure the NARP programme's artistic profile. Surprisingly enough, these requirements in the programme guidelines have been regularly challenged by the participating institutions themselves, perhaps because art educations have the tradition of being generous by inviting associated theoretical disciplines to contribute and collaborate. The choice of competencies used in advisory settings and in assessment has long-term professional (and financial) consequences. For me, it is crucial that people with artistic competence have the primary responsibility for developing the premises of a given subject area. In my own work as an expert assessor, I have experienced that my general and my specialised artistic insight should apply to different areas of use. Accordingly, to encourage cross-disciplinary and inter-artistic conversations in order to pollute a discipline's self-confidence does not mean that everyone can be a peer within all fields.

Sensuous Knowledge – An international icon

"Sensuous Knowledge and Strategic Success" was the title of Søren Kjørup's article about the Sensuous Knowledge project in KHiB's yearbook for 2010. He presented some basic goals for the project:

> Our intention was to get away from the abstract discussions about what might constitute research and development in art. Rather, we wanted to look at specific examples of what artistic R&D actually is, thereby helping to create a tradition for presenting, discussing and assessing artistic R&D projects and their results.[9]

At KHiB in 2003, the idea emerged of hosting an international conference on artistic research that would focus on specific examples. Also in this case, the rectorate was hands-on.[10] This was a huge initiative for KHiB. After the first conference, we sensed it had been a great success. Support from the Research Council of Norway in 2006 was a big encouragement. Six conferences were held from 2004 to 2009, each with 60 to 80 participants: "Creating a Tradition" (2004); "Aesthetic Practice and Aesthetic Insight" (2005); "Developing a Discourse" (2006); "Context, Concept, Creativity" (2007); "Questioning Qualities" (2008); "Reflection, Relevance, Responsibility" (2009).[11]

The format for this conference series was initially an experiment. A structure based on active participation obviously helped generate enthusiasm and eventually became a hallmark. The number of keynote presentations was limited; emphasis was on working in groups and on specific discussions about projects. At the start of each conference, we divided the participants into groups that were to be permanent throughout the conference. This was to promote concentration, a sense of responsibility and development in discussions, and to avoid the commotion generated by people wandering between groups. We sent out an open invitation for *proposals for presentations*, not *papers*, because we wanted the projects' artistic form to be included in the presentations. Seven publications were produced during these years, with authors presenting artistic, theoretical, reflective and interpretive content.[12]

In recent years, the prevalence of international conferences and meeting places for artistic research has increased exponentially, and it would probably be difficult to generate as much interest for such a conference series today. We were lucky with the timing. Eighty-five institutions were represented amongst the participants during these six years. KHiB developed an international network for artistic research which included very interesting people and institutions. The "Sensuous Knowledge" project became an icon for artistic research, and it gave KHiB an important position that was regularly confirmed in international meetings.

The long road to the new building in Møllendal

"From here I see enchanting visions, the bay Lungegaards Vandet, the surface so blue…" This line from a song by Johan Nordahl Brun (1789) is on the invitation I received to attend a gathering on 24 June 2005, which would publically announce the winner of the architectural competition for KHiB's new building. It was sent by Statsbygg, the national agency that manages, plans and constructs public buildings in Norway. Co-location of KHiB's departments was a stipulated premise when it was established nine years earlier (1996), yet it was not initially certain

9 Quote translated by Bjørn Inge Follevaag and Gillian Carson.

10 "Sensuous Knowledge" was profiled as "an international working conference on fundamental problems of artistic research and development". We translated the concept '*kunstnerisk utviklingsarbeid*' as 'artistic research', even though different environments can put different content into the concept of research.

11 KHiB's next rectorate organised the conference "Sensuous Knowledge 7, Ta(l)king Place", in 2013, in partnership with KODE Art Museums of Bergen.

12 Some of the publications are widely distributed and included in required reading lists, not only in the NARP programme, but in international artistically-oriented doctoral programmes.

that this would involve a brand-new building. Soon, however, it became clear that no building available was large enough, suitable for remodelling and near town centre. In 2000, therefore, Statsbygg purchased the Munck property alongside the bay Store Lungegårdsvann. But the process was slow. KHiB's frustration increased due to operations being spread between several buildings in different parts of town. Once the preconditions for the architectural competition's design started to be planned, we had great influence, also in choosing participants. We wanted the building to signal a unique institution, yet the form should not impede the activities inside the building. The architectural firms that participated in the competition were internationally profiled and of the highest calibre.

We were elated when the winning proposal turned out to be from Snøhetta. At KHiB we thought the winning project's progress was assured, based on the resources that Statsbygg, the competing participants and KHiB had invested in the preliminary project and competition. Our reaction was of both shock and anger when the Ministry, in March 2006, declared that the building was too expensive and would have to be put on hold. We experienced that our efforts and the whole competition process had been made a mockery. The work did actually start later that year, but a premise set by the Ministry was that KHiB would need to find external financial contributors. This premise from the Red-Green Coalition government drew criticism from many groups.[13] After strenuous effort to find private funding, KHiB reported back to the Ministry in 2009 that it was impossible. The project nevertheless went ahead, but our confidence in the Ministry and in Statsbygg's role in it had experienced a blow. This came to expression when I, as rector, was interviewed for KHiB's 2010 yearbook:

> *Are you disappointed, Nina, that the Academy has not yet moved into a new building?*
> Disappointed is putting it mildly. It has been a harrowing process. The newspaper *Bergens Tidende* called it a scandal, and I have to agree. Neither the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research nor Statsbygg has ensured the delivery of the results of the ambitious competition won by Snøhetta in 2005. The resources allocated to the project have been completely inadequate, with the Academy being the loser.[14]

The building project was one of my biggest responsibilities throughout my period as rector, and it resulted in many experiences and reflections. During the architectural competition, we received fewer viable proposals than expected. The descriptor 'signal building' seemed to trigger a need amongst some architects to express themselves at the expense of functionality, despite us having clearly specified our requirements and inviting them for on-site briefings. The competition format, where dialogue with the user is disallowed during the competition period, might have contributed to derailing of some proposals. If KHiB could have had closer contact with the architects during the competition, it would have been easier for them to avoid ideas that did not suit our needs.

The institutions who use Statsbygg often find the agency challenging to work with. KHiB was given little guidance as a first-time user. Our opinions seemed, paradoxically enough, to be less and less important the more the process progressed. Deadlines were adapted to Statsbygg's own needs and often put KHiB's staff in a bind. The project would lie dormant for long periods, then all of a sudden, critical decisions affecting the artistic subject areas would need to be made at very short notice. KHiB's leaders had to defend the process internally, and we often found ourselves in a difficult position. We were very critical of Statsbygg's project leadership during various phases. But there were also positive experiences. Communication with Snøhetta was demanding but rewarding, and it meant a great deal to us to have continuity by dealing with the same people there throughout all the years of the project. The competition's proposal – of a spectacular glass ceiling over the entire building – was luckily replaced with a more sober façade, and the design of the building's contents were re-structured based on a thorough process of analysing our functional needs. KHiB, Bergen and Norway now have a thoroughly designed building with great potential.

As far as 'enchanting visions' of Lungegaardsvannet are concerned, it is thanks to Bergen Municipality that we can see Snøhetta's building from across the bay. Statsbygg's contribution to the local zoning plan was both thorough and important. Extensive negotiations with private land owners were concluded by the municipality in 2006, with a property exchange that opened the building site to the bay.

New epoch in 2017

The new building will be finished in 2017. The co-location of art and design, formerly spread across six buildings, will have consequences for education and research, yet these consequences will not be visible for several years. The establishment of the Faculty of Fine Art, Music and Design / University of Bergen will also, over time, have great consequences. The localisation to Møllendal will eventually probably be expanded to include the Grieg Academy in a new building on the neighbouring property. Art, music and design will be able to pollute and challenge each other at close range. The story that began in 1996 is definitely starting a new chapter.

13 The Red-Green Coalition (2005–2013) consisted of the Labour Party, the Socialist Left Party and the Centre Party, thus a 'centre-left' political position.

14 The translated quote is by Bjørn Inge Follevaag and Gillian Carson.