QUALITY BOARD-LED SPECIAL REVIEW
The Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies

August 2022

Quality Board
for Icelandic Higher Education

Preface

This is the report of a Quality Board-led Special Review of The Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies undertaken at the behest of the Quality Board for Icelandic Higher Education under the authority of the Icelandic Government.

The review was carried out by an independent Team of senior international higher education experts together with a student from the higher education sector in Iceland. The Team was appointed by the Quality Board for Icelandic Higher Education.

Further information on the Quality Board for Icelandic Higher Education is available on the website of the Icelandic Quality Enhancement Framework (www.qef.is).

Dr Andrée Sursock   Dr Sigurður Óli Sigurðsson

Chair   Manager

Contents

Table of Contents

Team

The following experts comprised the Team:

Boyd Robertson, Professor Emeritus and former Principal, Sabhal Mòr Ostaig UHI, the National Centre for Gaelic Language and Culture, Scotland (team chair).

Tove Bull, Professor Emerita of Scandinavian Linguistics and former Rector, UiT The Arctic University, Norway.

Antal van den Bosch, Institute Director, Meertens Institute, The Netherlands.

Ólöf Gerður Sigfúsdóttir, PhD Candidate in Museum Studies, University of Iceland, Iceland.

Karen Willis, Professor Emerita and former Dean of Academic Quality and Enhancement, University of Chester, England (team secretary).

1. Executive summary

The Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies is an independent state-funded research institute that collaborates closely with the University of Iceland. The Institute holds unique national collections, including historic manuscripts, and also creates and maintains digital resources. It has eight divisions: Manuscript Studies; Lexical Studies and Lexicography; Onomastics; Ethnology and Folklore; Language Planning; the Administration; the International Office; and the Library. Currently located on three sites, from 2023 all staff and collections will be housed together in a new building, shared with the University of Iceland.

This review was requested by the Institute, to support development of its strategy in the context of this major change. The main focus areas were: strategy, governance and management processes; human resources and staff development; management of research activities; management of physical collections and planning of new digital infrastructure; national partnership and internationalisation; and social impact and knowledge transfer activities.

The review team considered the Institute's self-assessment report, and visited the Institute 5-7 April 2022. They met with the Director, heads of division, representatives of staff and students, members of the Board, and external stakeholders and partners.

The main conclusions of the review were:

- The new building offers opportunities for collaboration, exhibitions and public spaces. A new strategy, with explicit aims for research; collections and digital infrastructure; internationalisation; and outreach and public relations, would be timely. The move also provides an opportunity to consider and revise the regulatory

framework and structure under which the Institute operates, to support the Director's strong leadership.

- Staff are very committed and dedicated. Good staff development and research leave opportunities could be enhanced by clearer human resource processes and more resource for some administrative functions.

- The small size of some divisions highlights the need to plan for workforce sustainability.

- The Institute's research is highly regarded both nationally and internationally. A central research coordination role would support grant opportunities and the organisational research culture. The Institute provides a welcoming environment for research students.

- An agreed process for assuring the quality of digital research work is needed in order for it to be systematically reviewed, evaluated and rewarded.

- Curation of physical collections is outstanding. Many digital resources have been successfully developed and made available according to Open Science principles. Presenting these through a single user-friendly platform would improve public access.

- Staff engage actively in national and international partnerships and networks, and run popular summer schools in collaboration with other organisations. Visiting scholars are attracted by the specialist collections, expertise and research environment, and the Institute is considering how best to increase the visibility and recognition of its research overseas.

- Public access to the new building will enable the Institute to increase its social engagement and impact significantly. This could be extended through a full public relations strategy.

- The Institute is held in high regard in Icelandic society. External stakeholders appreciate its specialist expertise and resources, strong leadership, and receptive, engaged staff.

- To respond successfully to forthcoming challenges, and sustain its status and performance as a flagship institution, it will be important for the Institute to review its strategy, its governance and structures, and its relationship to society, although some changes may have funding implications.

2. Introduction to the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies and its institutional environment

2.1   Profile of the Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies

The Árni Magnússon Institute for Icelandic Studies (AMI) is an independent research institute within the university sector, with affiliations to the University of Iceland. It is funded by the state, and operates under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture and Business Affairs since 2022, and previously the Ministry for Education, Science and Culture (Self-Assessment Report (SAR) p6). Universities in Iceland are within the remit of the Ministry for Higher Education, Science and Innovation.

The purpose and role of the Institute are specified by law under state Acts and Regulations, which define the scope of the organisation's activities and responsibilities, including the requirement for research, projects and services relating to its collections and the Icelandic language. The Institute is the holder of national collections, including the historic Árni Magnússon Manuscript Collection; has a role by law in the registration and maintenance of a public name database; and is the office of the Icelandic Language Council, Icelandic Sign Language Council and the Committee of Place Names. (SAR p7).

Formed in 2006 from five previous institutes in the field of Icelandic Studies, the Institute's staff and activities are currently dispersed over three locations in Reykjavík. The Institute has been waiting for many years to bring its staff and unique manuscript collections together in a new building on one site, on the campus of the University of Iceland. Despite much delay, primarily due to the national context of financial restrictions, this move is now scheduled to happen in Spring 2023. The new building will be shared with staff from the University of Iceland's Department of Icelandic Studies.

An agreement with the University of Iceland sets out the relationship between the two organisations. Research students registered with the University of Iceland may be supervised by Institute staff and use the Institute's resources, and some Institute staff on occasion teach at the University.

The Institute, which has approximately 40 permanent employees, currently consists of eight divisions. Five of these are research departments: Manuscript Studies; Lexical Studies and Lexicography; Onomastics; Ethnology and Folklore; and Language Planning. The three other divisions are the Administration, the International Office, and the Library.

2.2   The review process

This review was organised by the Quality Board for Higher Education in Iceland, at the request of the Institute. In preparation for the review, the Institute prepared a detailed Self-Assessment Report (SAR), based on a SWOT analysis conducted at institutional level. The review process focuses on the key areas of: strategy, governance structure and management processes; human resources and staff development; management of research activities; management of physical collections and planning of new digital infrastructures; national partnerships and internationalisation; and societal impact and knowledge transfer activities.

For each of these six areas, the Institute considered and responded to the following questions:

    a. What are the Institute's goals?

    b. What are the Institute's activities to reach these goals?

    c. How does the Institute know it is reaching its goals?

    d. How does the Institute change in order to improve?

The SAR was sent to the review team at the end of February 2022, and the team visited the Institute on 5-7 April.

The review team (hereinafter the team) consisted of:

- Boyd Robertson, Professor Emeritus and former Principal, Sabhal Mòr Ostaig UHI, the National Centre for Gaelic Language and Culture, Scotland (team chair)

- Tove Bull, Professor Emerita of Scandinavian Linguistics and former Rector, UiT The Arctic University, Norway

- Antal van den Bosch, Institute Director, Meertens Institute, The Netherlands

- Ólöf Gerður Sigfúsdóttir, PhD Candidate in Museum Studies, University of Iceland, Iceland

- Karen Willis, Professor Emerita and former Dean of Academic Quality and Enhancement, University of Chester, England (team secretary)

The team thanks the Director, Guðrún Nordal, the heads of division and the staff and the students of the Institute for their warm hospitality and for their open discussions, and is grateful to the Board of the Institute and to external partners and stakeholders for their valuable contributions. The team would also like to thank Sigurður Óli Sigurðsson, Manager of the Quality Board for Higher Education in Iceland, for liaising with the Institute over the organisation of arrangements for the visit, and for providing orientation to the team on the context of higher education in Iceland.

3. Strategy, governance structure and management processes

3.1 Institutional strategy

The Institute's most recent Strategic Plan was for 2016-18, and was linked closely to the long-awaited move which will unite all staff and collections in the same building. The team found this document to be very detailed but also quite descriptive. Although the Strategy document has not been formally updated since 2018, when the building move had been expected, implementation of ongoing strategy has meanwhile been progressed by each division working to annual operational action plans. These are then combined in an institution-level overview, and have been found by staff to provide a useful and effective mechanism for operational planning and monitoring. The team observed that, in the absence of a current formal strategy, staff in all divisions had been proceeding with their own work while anticipating the major changes associated with the forthcoming move. The most significant aspect of recent institutional strategy has been to drive and plan the construction of the new building, halted in 2013 and resumed in 2018. This has formed what might be termed a 'metastrategy', with more specific strands of strategic planning generally awaiting, and dependent upon, its fulfilment. Notwithstanding this, the Institute has continued to engage in forward-looking developments, including participation in a significant national Language Technology Programme for the Icelandic language, also encompassing other organisations, which has been publicly financed for the four-year period 2018-2022. The team *commends the scale of ambition of the Institute in embracing the possibilities offered to them by the government for creating the new building with vision and vigour.*

In completing its SAR as an institutional exercise, the Institute is aware that it has laid the foundations for devising a new strategy that will shape its activity in the context of the opportunities offered by its staff being together in an improved working environment, and by the exhibition and other public spaces to be available in the new building. The review team found the SAR to be informative, reflective and self-critical. The Institute identifies a range of current issues and includes ideas for enhancement, demonstrating self-awareness and a willingness to change, but to date concrete plans to take these forward at organisational level have been limited.

Staff whom the team met indicated their expectation that the institution would be developing a new strategy from autumn 2022. Heads of division anticipated that research work in their areas would continue to be of primary importance, whilst recognising the cross-institutional significance of the language technology project, and looking forward to opportunities to work more closely with others both within and outside the Institute.

The team considers that the development of a new overarching strategy provides an ideal opportunity for the Institute to create and communicate a refreshed institutional identity, which can serve to unify its various divisions and functions and consolidate a strengthened sense of the organisation as a whole, both internally and externally. This will be particularly important in driving institutional change and engagement not only in new tasks and projects, for example in the area of language technology, but also in proactively promoting wider public engagement. To do so will require the Institute not only to identify ambitions within its specialist areas of expertise, but also to set expectations and emphasise the gains that can be realised through working across teams and boundaries. In the team's view, it will be necessary to articulate coherent, explicit strategies at institutional level setting out aims for each of its main types of activity. The team therefore *recommends that the Institute*

take forward the development of a new overarching strategy, to include explicit strategies

and aims for research; collections and digital infrastructure; internationalisation; and

outreach and public relations.

3.2   Governance structure and management processes

Under the current governance structure outlined in the SAR (p9), the Director is responsible

for managing the Institute's overall strategy and activities according to the law and

regulations, and is accountable to the Minister. The Director, who is appointed for a five-

year term which may be extended, consults and is supported by a board of five members,

comprising three nominated by the University of Iceland and two appointed by the Ministry,

one of whom acts as chair.

The Board is not responsible for operational or financial matters, and does not play a direct

role in development, approval or monitoring of institutional strategy or policy, but acts as an

advisory body. As reported to the team, the links to the University of Iceland and the

Ministry reflected in Board membership are mainly exercised informally. The team heard

that the Board Chair and members, some but not all of whom were long-standing, were

extremely supportive of the Director, and that she valued and benefited from their advice

and, as appropriate, their influence. However, there is no explicit mandate or role descriptor

for Board members, who have considered their role and would welcome it being more

formally articulated, with more clarity over the scope of their responsibilities and

accountability. The team, therefore, *recommends the governance of the Institute be*

enhanced by codifying the mandate and the role of the Board.

The annual budget is set by the Ministry, and adjusted as necessary for salary inflation. Core

funding otherwise remains unchanged each year, with any additional funding secured

through successful research and project grant applications. To support the move to the new building, the Minister and Parliament have approved additional fixed-term posts for a project manager and an exhibitions curator. Further posts associated with the running of the new building, for example in security, will also be required and requested.

The team acknowledges the requirements of the current legal regulatory framework and understands that government approval, by the Ministry and Parliament, is required for governance or structural changes to the Institute. The team considers that the move to the new building, involving new responsibilities, would provide an opportunity to consider and revise the regulatory framework under which the institute operates.

The Director role has professorial status, with academic leadership as well as administrative responsibilities. The team heard from all meetings with staff, students and external stakeholders of the Director's high standing, that she is well-respected and that the Institute is well-led. It was clear to the team that people enjoyed and took great pride in working in the positive and open atmosphere of the Institute which she heads. The team *commends the Director's high standing and strong leadership.* The team also *commends the open collegiality of the Institute's ethos, which was reflected in the discussions with all groups of staff.*

However, due to the current organisational structure, the Director carries a great deal of individual management responsibility and, together with the Financial Director, makes all financial, contractual and staffing decisions. Notwithstanding the undoubted support of colleagues, the Director is without the benefit of a deputy and a formally structured management team with whom to share aspects of her responsibilities and duties. In the team's view, to have such extensive responsibility invested in one senior role not only places a heavy burden on one individual but also presents a potential risk to the

organisation. The team therefore *recommends a review of the management structure to create a senior management/executive team, including a deputy director role, and each with allocated institutional responsibilities, for example in research; collections and digital infrastructure; internationalisation; outreach and public relations.*

The SAR highlights a need to reorganise the current organisational structure of the Institute in order to reduce the current number of eight divisions, some of which are very small, including only two or three members of staff. Heads of division met by the team also acknowledged that fewer divisions and barriers would be more appropriate in future, with views expressed that a more open approach and structures were needed, and that the move to the new building will increase options for more interdisciplinary research and collaborations.

The team endorses the view that this would enable the Institute to move on from the historic distinction between the divisions and promote greater opportunities for people to work together in different ways, at the same time as the major change of moving to the new building will facilitate this physically. Although the current structure may generate some motivational benefit from divisional and individual autonomy, within the parameters of the annual plans, the team considers that it limits the potential for devising, driving and implementing a new institutional strategy. The team strongly supports the intention to reduce the number of divisions, and would agree that two or three divisions would be appropriate for an organisation of the Institute's size. There are different ways in which this could be achieved, for example by creating one division for academic research and one for administrative infrastructure; or by establishing distinct divisions for language, for literary texts, and for the administration; or by applying an alternative rationale, possibly after consultation.

The team was informed that the role of the divisional heads was primarily to coordinate staff in their discussions and development of the annual plan, and oversee grant proposals and individual research activities relating to their own division. While responsible for communication flows and for supporting the overall goals and ethos of the Institute, the current head of division role does not encompass direct managerial responsibility for staff, budget management or any aspect of the organisation's strategy. The heads act more as project leaders and representatives of their divisions than as managers.

An organisational restructuring into larger divisions would create new roles for heads, who would be well-placed to form part of a management team, each with an allocated responsibility for leading on the implementation of a specific area or areas of strategy at organisational level. Heads would also undertake more managerial responsibility at operational level, with direct authority over the wider team of people in each new division, and possibly some responsibility for local budgets. The team therefore *recommends that the number of divisions be reconfigured and reduced, with heads of divisions to form part of the senior management team, with divisional and institutional management responsibilities.* The current Regulations designate the role of the *Húsþing*, or Academic Advisory Body, which comprises all academic staff at the Institute and is convened by the Director every two months. The SAR notes (p10) that the *Húsþing* does not make decisions or have any direct management responsibility, but discusses and advises the Director on research policy, academic projects and publications, and plays an active role in the evaluation and appointment of new academic staff.

The team heard differing views about the structure and role of the *Húsþing*, both from those who were members and those who were not. For some members, the maintenance of a forum where academics may voice their views and debate research matters provided

parity with the University of Iceland, and was important in preserving academic democracy. There was agreement amongst members whom the team met that the *Húsþing* plays a coherent role in the hiring of new academic staff, from wording advertisements to evaluating candidates. The team was told that the Director generally accepts and acts upon the *Húsþing's* advice on new academic appointments. However, the team also heard some questioning of the usefulness and productivity of time spent in the *Húsþing* meetings and discussions, and a view that division meetings were more purposefully driven.

Membership of the *Húsþing* comprises academic members of staff only and the team heard that some non-academic staff, who do not attend, felt side-lined or excluded. Although the team was informed that non-academic staff were permitted to be present as observers, this did not appear to be generally well-known or enacted in practice. All staff are invited to monthly general staff meetings, which staff told the team were more for communication of information than for discussion.

The team suggests that one approach to addressing these points might be to increase the regularity of the all-staff meetings, perhaps including some opportunity for discussion, and to convene the *Húsþing* only when necessary for particular processes, for example relating to the recruitment of academic staff. The team, therefore, *recommends that the Institute re-examine the composition, functions and operation of the Húsþing and the general staff meetings*.

The team concludes that, in anticipation of the new building coming into operation next year, it would be timely both to produce a new strategy and to review the governance structure of the organisation. Amongst matters to be considered would be: the mandate and role descriptor for Board members; the senior management structure, to include a

deputy director and reorganised divisions; the structure and role of the *Húsþing* and more frequent all-inclusive staff meetings.

4. Human resources and staff development

Both the Institute's own internal employee evaluation analysis (SAR p21, Appendix 1) and the external employee survey (SAR p22) testify that staff are very positive about working at the Institute. Furthermore, in all discussions with staff at the Institute, the team was consistently impressed by their pride and sense of enjoyment at working there. The team strongly *commends the commitment and dedication of staff to their work and the purposes of the Institute*.

The Institute employs different categories of staff: academic, research project managers, affiliated researchers, and administrative and support staff. The team was informed that academic staff at the Institute are selected, employed and evaluated on the same criteria as university academics. However, academics at the institute spend 40% of their time on research (60% for those on older contracts), and are not required to teach but instead have responsibilities for the collections, or other projects such as managing a database. Those who wish to teach in addition to their duties at the Institute are able to do so when opportunities arise at University of Iceland or at international summer schools organised jointly by the Institute. Researchers are employed to manage projects, for example relating to dictionaries, the place name collection or manuscripts. Affiliated researchers are employed on fixed-term contracts dependent on external grant funding, of which the Language Technology Programme has been a significant example.

The team heard that few new permanent positions arise, and that a number of staff who have been working at the Institute for many years without tenure moved from one project to another. Affiliated researchers, some of whom are Masters or PhD students, felt fortunate to have been offered projects to manage or work on, although these were

generally short-term in nature. A view was expressed to the team by some non-academic staff that, in fulfilling their roles effectively, they also engaged in academic activities, for example presenting papers at conferences, that were not sufficiently recognised within the Institute.

Academic staff must submit annual reports and are awarded points within the Evaluation System of Public Universities for recognition of their research activities, such as the publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals. Points gained over the minimum requirement generate an additional payment for which allowance is set aside in the Institute's annual budget planning. Although only academic staff are eligible to be evaluated for progression of status, for example from associate professor to professor, the team was told that the Institute now also puts forward for evaluation publications produced by research staff who, if awarded points, can then receive the financial benefits. However, it was explained to the team that the Evaluation System of Public Universities does not generally recognise or reward the work of staff involved in less traditional forms of research, such as digital infrastructures or dictionary projects, and that this is problematic for the Institute.

The Director has to date undertaken all annual staff interviews, although these have not been a requirement. From this year onwards, it is intended that heads of division share the load by undertaking some of these interviews, using a standard form. This approach would be further enhanced by strengthening the management responsibilities of heads of division, which would also help to ensure that all staff engage and that matters agreed in their interviews are taken forward. The team *recommends that the Institute embed annual staff interviews for all staff, to be conducted by members of the senior management team.*

The Institute has various HR policy statements, including a Lifelong Learning policy, Gender Equality Plan and Harassment Plan, and an overarching HR policy, reviewed in 2021 but awaiting approval at a staff meeting (SAR, p15). However, the team heard from staff that they often experienced difficulties in finding HR information, procedures and forms, and that it was, therefore, easiest to ask someone directly or email the Finance Manager. Staff reported their perception that there is no intranet which acts as a local repository for policies, procedures and documents, nor a staff page on the Institute's website. Different platforms such as Microsoft Teams or Facebook are used within the Institute for various purposes, but not consistently across the organisation. The team *recommends that the Institute make all institutional policies and supporting documentation available and accessible in a centralised online space available to all staff.*

Academic staff are entitled to a six-month sabbatical every three years and sometimes make study trips abroad (SAR p16). The team was told that academic staff found this a highly valued and productive opportunity to further their independent research. The team heard that non-academic staff also have the opportunity to study for relevant qualifications or to take study leave for a PhD. The team *commends the good opportunities for staff development, particularly for academic staff, and also for non-academic staff.* However, the team had a concern about the pressures created and the impact on non-academic positions in small units, such as IT support or the administration, which lack staff cover when professional or academic courses are undertaken. The team heard that, in some cases, this had led to staff foregoing potential opportunities to develop, due to workload implications. Although the SAR (p16) refers to ongoing improvements in welcoming new staff to the Institute, the team did not hear evidence of any formal induction courses or arrangements for new employees. A staff handbook was mentioned, but staff met by the team reported

that new staff did not receive clear communication about where to find information. A mentoring programme was also mentioned but does not appear to be established across the organisation. The team *recommends that the Institute establish formal induction arrangements for new staff.*

The team heard that there was a designated individual whom staff or students might contact should they need to discuss any matter of a confidential nature, although most staff and students whom the team asked were unclear about who this might be or what matters they might be contacted over. There was no evidence of awareness of any formal procedures for cases of harassment or bullying. Although no one felt any reason to expect that such an issue might arise at the Institute, it was indicated to the team that clearer procedures, such as those at the University of Iceland, would be welcomed. The team therefore *recommends that the Institute clarify and communicate the role of confidential contact for all staff and students, including in policy documentation.*

The Finance Manager holds a significant position in the Institute and has multiple roles, which include accounting and support for research project budgets and grant applications, and responsibility for human resources (HR). A total of five administrators covers all administrative tasks, with a heavy workload particularly at peak times of the year. The team was informed that there were currently 63 employees at the Institute, including 19 researchers with short term or varying contracts that required frequent processing. The Institute has its own finance system but does not have its own HR software. The partnership agreement with the University of Iceland does not include access to any of its HR systems. Many of the Institute's HR functions, for example processing staff sabbatical or study leave applications, or managing staff research bonuses, mirror those operated by the University, but lack relevant supporting systems.

The team heard that there was no cover for various tasks within the Finance Manager's workload, which in addition to daily pressures limited both the amount of leave that could be taken at one time, and their capacity to pursue qualification-bearing staff development. In the view of the team, the scale and scope of the Finance Manager's role presents a potential risk to the organisation. The team thus *recommends that consideration be given to bolstering support for the finance function as part of an overall review of the Institute's administrative requirements and structure*. There is also a particular need to strengthen the Institute's capacity for specialist management of HR. The team, therefore, *recommends a strengthened HR function which would look afresh at the policy framework of the Institute. This could be achieved in different ways, for example by greater interaction with the University systems; by outsourcing the service; or by adding to the staffing of the Institute.* The University hosts various IT systems and software used by the Institute, including the web service. The Institute has a very small team of IT developers, who have been working to standardise technical approaches and solutions across the organisation. The team heard that one of the members of the IT team was currently on study leave and had also been working on specialist language technology projects. A single IT developer, with some support from temporary technical staff working on projects, was therefore currently covering two distinct types of activity: the development of standardised systems, alongside ongoing support for employees and hardware. Due to financial constraints and the requirements for government approval of new posts, it is difficult for the Institute to secure the additional budget required for more IT specialists to support both infrastructure and research. The team considers that IT staffing is under-resourced and endorses the view that further strengthening of IT support would be necessary to adequately support the

maintenance of the Institute's digital infrastructure and the ongoing development of its technology-based activities.

Some administrative and support staff whom the team met identified a tension between academic freedom and establishing standardised organisational systems, which at times manifests itself to them as a resistance to change that may slow progress.

The team also noted concerns highlighted by the Institute in its SAR (p18-9, 40), and also by others they met, about the capacity and sustainability of its specialist knowledge and expertise, due to the very small numbers of staff in some divisions (for example, Onomastics) and the overall age profile and likely retirement of many long-standing academics and project managers over the next few years. Alongside the maintenance of established scholarly and research specialisms, workforce planning will also require consideration of the changing context of opportunities for additional activities offered by the new building, and the evolution of newer work areas such as language technology, which have hitherto largely depended on fixed-term grants. The team, therefore, *recommends that the Institute takes steps to plan for workforce sustainability, most notably in the context of the age profile of its staff.*

5. Management of research activities

The Institute holds important manuscript and other collections and databases of significance to the history and development of Icelandic Studies, which form the basis of its research activity. As part of its role under law, the Institute is required 'to carry out research into its manuscripts, ethnographic collections, and other sources for Icelandic language, literature, and history, to conduct dictionary and onomastics research, and to develop projects in the field of language technology' (SAR p7).

The team recognises from discussions with external stakeholders, including representatives of the University of Iceland, that the Institute's research activity and output are held by them in high regard, with staff expertise and scholarship nationally and internationally esteemed in the academic field. The Institute is regarded as a flagship research institute, and external indications are that the standard of its research is high. The SAR (Appendix 6) lists the extensive publications and other outputs of the Institute's academics. The team *commends the Institute for the high regard in which its research profile is held.*

Research activities are undertaken by permanent academic staff and research staff working on specific projects and collections, and temporary researchers and students funded by research grants and recruited on a project basis (SA p35). The team heard that, although the Institute had a good success rate in applying for research grants, it was nonetheless essential to maintain the government funding required for its core research activity and to avoid the risk of over-dependence on external funding. There was concern that public funding for the Language Technology Programme partnership, in which the Institute has played a leading role, should be continued, to enable this significant area of work to be extended and embedded beyond 2022. A brief position statement of research policy agreed

by the *Húsþing* describes the organisation's core functions as 'researching, recording, processing, and disseminating the data maintained by the Institute'. However, there is no explicitly articulated research strategy setting out institutional aims or specific objectives over a period of time.

Research activity is overseen locally within each division, and staff who met the team emphasised that they valued the freedom to work on their own research activities and grant-funded projects. Currently the Institute has no centralised management or support specifically for research, with academics preparing their own grant applications locally at division level, and liaising where necessary with the Finance Manager over accounting requirements for projects. The team heard that a new central post for the management of research had been discussed, but that some academic staff thought this unnecessary and were concerned that the role might infringe their autonomy. There was some discussion about terminology, and it was thought by some that framing the role as 'coordinator', rather than 'manager' might be helpful, as less intrusive or directive. There was mostly agreement among staff that such a role could provide support in identifying and communicating research grant opportunities, preparing applications and supporting budget and other monitoring activities.

The team suggests that the Institute might wish to consider articulating an overall research strategy and strengthening its approach to managing research. There are a number of possible ways in which this might be achieved. For example, once the new structure is in place, the Institute might consider delegating responsibility for leading on research to one of the senior management team. A further option is to establish a research coordination post to support grant applications, assist in budget management and create a more

coherent organisational research culture for students and staff. The team *recommends that the Institute establish a role for research coordination*.

Some early career researchers commented that they were very well-supported by colleagues in developing publications and those with longer-term contracts noted that they were able to write more articles when not having to prepare numerous grant applications. University research students may access the Institute's collections, resources and library and be supervised by its staff. They apply to, and are registered for awards at, the University of Iceland, which provides the supporting infrastructure. If an Institute supervisor is not affiliated to the University, students also have a tutor there who advises on programme arrangements. Students met by the team affirmed very positive views of studying at the Institute and being supervised by its staff, indicating that they feel valued and integrated within the organisation. The team *commends the Institute on its welcoming environment and support for research students.*

However, the team also heard that there were no organised meetings or seminars at the Institute for PhD students to discuss and share their work, and that students would be keen to have such opportunities to interact with each other and with staff. The function of a research coordinator could contribute to addressing this, through supporting PhD students to present their work, and organising seminars at the Institute[1]. The facility of a meeting room in the new building would help to facilitate this. The team *recommends that the Institute establish a platform for PhD students to share their work with other students and staff.*

---

[1] PhD students are affiliated to the University of Iceland and receive their degrees from the University of Iceland, but conduct their research at the Institute.

The team was told that some research and innovation activities in the humanities are excluded from the Evaluation System of the Public University by the governing rules, and that there is a need also to recognise and reward different forms of output, for example dictionaries, software, and the creation and ongoing maintenance of databases. The points system for evaluating research prioritises and incentivises more traditional academic output, such as scholarly journal articles, with little recognition of the wider concept of 'impact' which is becoming more customary in many other countries. As previously stated, a major issue for the Institute, therefore, is that significant aspects of its research activity – such as updating dictionaries and developing databases to create digital research infrastructures – are not recognised or rewarded by the evaluation methodology. The team was given the example of a claim that research-based printed catalogues describing manuscripts would be eligible to be awarded points, whereas websites publishing the same material are not, although they reach a wider public. While acknowledging the challenges, staff who the team met indicated that an agreed process for assuring the quality of digital work was needed in order for it to be systematically reviewed and evaluated. The team encourages the Institute to continue to contribute a leading voice in this important debate at national level, and *recommends that the Institute introduce an internal methodology to recognise and reward forms of output other than academic publications, for example dictionaries, software and databases.*

6. Management of physical collections and planning of new digital infrastructures

The Institute houses and is responsible for a unique physical collection of manuscripts, sound recordings and other documents, which are used as resources for research both by Institute staff and students, and by visiting scholars. The team found that these collections have been well-managed within the constraints of their current closed environment, which has greatly limited wider access and prevented the materials being made available to the general public as the Institute would have liked. The team *commends the outstanding work undertaken by staff in curating and maintaining the physical collections, within the prevailing conditions and constraints.*

The Manuscript Division is responsible for the Icelandic part of the Árni Magnússon collection of manuscripts, which was added to the UNESCO *Memory of the World* Register in 2009 (SAR). Due to the age of the documents, the management of this unique collection involves continuous monitoring of the environment of the repository by a specialist conservator. The SAR (p24) explains that the Institute keeps under review its guidelines for protection from disaster, environmental conditions and procedures for handling the documents, which may only be studied in a controlled environment under the supervision of academic staff. The team was fortunate to be able to view some items from this collection, and witnessed the extreme care with which these documents were overseen.

The planned move to the new building also highlights challenges for those in other divisions managing physical collections which are still in old formats. The SAR (p26) outlines a number of examples, such as the Onomastics division's Place Name Archive, which has mostly paper-based records, with many documents unregistered. The Institute is addressing this by employing additional staff to archive and prepare documents to be

moved to better storage in the new building, but notes that this work will continue to require funding for some years to come. The division of Lexical Studies and Lexicography also faces challenges in storage of its extensive paper-based citation archives. Similarly, the division of Ethnology and Folklore continues to receive items of recorded material for archiving; this is currently undertaken by temporary staff, some collaborative support from the University of Iceland, and a new part-time position. The Institute has itself identified the need to assess, as part of the move, the requirements for continued survival of its physical collections, and intends to establish procedures and protocols for the conservation and use of these collections in the new building.

The new building will house all the Institute's physical collections and enable them to be made available for exhibition, affording many possibilities for display and engagement of the public in activities. It was explained to the team that, in planning the building, much care has been taken in the design of climatic and other control and security requirements to protect and preserve the physical collections, including enhancing safeguarding of the fragile historic manuscripts and preparation of an emergency plan in case of disaster. The team heard that the library, which Institute staff recognise as one of its greatest strengths (SAR p30), will rationalise and consolidate its collections from the Institute's current three sites. Although the current facilities are difficult to access and have limited reading space, the new building will enable the library to become more open to the public while continuing to serve the research community.

The team learned from the SAR (p25-29) of the range of collections and associated activities in each division, including several digital material collections managed by the division of Language Planning; the work underway to archive and prepare documents in the Onomastics division to be moved to the new building; the physical materials and web-based

dictionaries and other digital resources for which Lexical Studies and Lexicography is responsible; and work in Ethnology and Folklore on digitising and preserving its sound recordings archive. The team found that the Institute has adapted well to digitising its resources in order to make them more widely available according to Open Science principles[2] and useable free of charge, with some divisions creating digital archives of electronic versions of physical items.

The Institute has played a significant role in the national Language Technology Programme, through which resources it has developed, for example lexicons of linguistic information, that are used as the basis for language technology developments elsewhere by other organisations. The team heard that the Institute's contribution has been greatly appreciated by the Language Technology Centre. The Institute is also the leading partner in the Icelandic National Consortium for CLARIN (a European digital infrastructure offering data, tools and services to support research based on language resources). As a small institution, the Institute has made impressive progress in its involvement in the planning and development of digital infrastructures. The team *commends the Institute's success in adapting to digitisation of material, being up to date with digital methods, and the achievements made within limited resources.*

The team noted, however, that the digital resources created by the Institute are published over a number of different websites. Some external stakeholders reported difficulty and confusion in finding information they sought and suggested that it would be an improvement for all resources to be accessible through one platform. The team agrees that

---

[2] The Institute may consider following explicitly the FAIR principles [https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/] for all online digital resources, and communicating that it actively supports and follows FAIR.

the practice of publishing of digital resources on multiple websites might present barriers

and complications for external users in locating and accessing those resources, and might

also dilute the online public identity of the Institute. The team, therefore, *recommends that*

the Institute streamline the signposting and presentation of the range of different websites

for resources and make them easily accessible in one place.

7. National partnerships and Internationalisation

The Institute's staff are active in engaging in collaborative partnerships, both nationally and internationally. Its strong relationship with the University of Iceland is underpinned by a formal partnership agreement, and overseen by a joint cooperation committee which meets twice per annum. The forthcoming move of the University's Department of Icelandic Studies with the Institute into the new building was welcomed by staff from both institutions, as enabling closer interaction and integration between colleagues and students in the same field. The team was told that the new building has been purpose-built for the Institute, but that day-to-day management will be communal. As part of the campus, the building will be managed by the University's buildings management function.

The team heard that there had been many collaborative projects over the years, with the Institute contributing both data and scholarly expertise, and that grant applications were strengthened by the inclusion of staff from both the University and the Institute. University staff reported that many student projects, research-based summer jobs and postgraduate applications for grants were linked to the Institute. The team heard a view that the development of closer links between the Institute and the University, through staff contacts and teaching, could potentially facilitate recruitment of students to the Institute's research or project posts in fields in which there had sometimes been a shortage of interest.

The team also heard that much of the collaborative interaction between staff in the University and the Institute at department level was informal and *ad hoc*. However, the team was told that some aspects of identity and status of the Institute's staff in relation to activities with the University were not always clear. Some Institute staff supervise research students registered with the University, either as lead supervisors or as members of

supervisory teams, or contribute periodically to teaching courses at the University in addition to their substantive roles at the Institute. It was suggested by some staff from both institutions that more explicit guidance on expectations around these roles might be helpful. This might clarify details, for example, of the administrative tasks required of PhD supervisors at the Institute, or whether Institute staff should attend department meetings at the University when teaching there.

Within its limited resources, the Institute is active in internationalisation and lists many international projects on its website. Staff at the Institute are able to apply for, and benefit from, mobility programmes through the University. There is a cooperation agreement between the Institute and a sister institute at the University of Copenhagen housing documents from the Árni Magnússon Manuscript Collection, and the team heard of staff and students engaging in collaborative activity and travelling there to pursue research. The Institute hosts the Icelandic base of CLARIN, the European Research Infrastructure for Language Resources and Tools, and is part of the European Federation of National Institutions for Language. The team was told that all divisions collaborate with other national and international universities and specialist networks, and organisations such as the National Library, on externally funded projects.

Staffing in the International office is at present reduced to only one person, the project manager, who promotes Icelandic culture abroad and, in a cooperation between the Institute and the University of Iceland, organises summer courses on Icelandic Modern Language and Culture, and on Manuscript Studies. The Institute also runs a summer school for Nordic students, and administers a government scholarship programme for BA studies in Icelandic as a Second Language at the University of Iceland (SAR p43). The team heard that

these courses are popular and that, with more resources, the Institute could greatly extend its reach and provision in supporting Icelandic as a Second Language.

The team recognises and *commends the culture of partnership and collaboration at the Institute and its activity in internationalisation through summer schools and links with colleagues abroad.*

The team heard that visiting scholars from overseas were attracted by the specialist collections, expertise and research environment at the Institute, and that these contacts were welcomed and valued by the Institute's academics and researchers. Notwithstanding this interest, the team acknowledges that knowledge of the Icelandic language is required in order to be able to be employed at the Institute. This may present a limitation on attracting and recruiting more international staff. The team was told that in some areas, for example Ethnology and Folklore, international interest from students was higher than local interest, although the reverse was the case with language. Academic staff publish mainly for an Icelandic audience but also contribute to English language journals. Output from research projects is sometimes published in parallel Icelandic and English versions. It was suggested to the team that it could be beneficial to offer courses in English in order to attract other nationalities to study Icelandic disciplines. The team notes the Institute's recognition of the importance for its sustainability of establishing new connections nationally and internationally (SAR p46) and *recommends the Institute to progress further its own suggested ideas and approaches to increasing the visibility of research and its recognition overseas*.

8. Social impact and knowledge transfer activities

In addition to its core role as an academic research institute, the Institute has an important cultural and social role relating to its collections and to its responsibility to promote knowledge of the Icelandic language. The opening of the new building will constitute a radical change from the closed premises which the Institute currently occupies, and it will be important to capitalise on the new opportunities which this will create for raising awareness and engagement with the wider society. Although the Institute has previously organised exhibitions elsewhere, the opportunities which are planned for sustained public access to exhibitions, displays and the library, together with open lectures, events and interactive activities, will enable the Institute to raise its profile and increase its social engagement and impact significantly. Those involved with planning the building have been mindful of the need for it to be both very open and welcoming for the public, while also maintaining high security for staff and the valuable collections.

The team met with a range of representatives of organisations and individuals who are external stakeholders of the Institute, all of whom were enthusiastic in their support of the organisation. They felt that many improvements had been made in recent years, that the Institute had strong leadership, and that staff were open-minded, receptive, and strongly engaged in their work. There were many positive expressions of appreciation of the specialist expertise and resources made available. Examples given included joint participation in research projects; Institute staff giving public lectures; daily use of the Institute's online resources and research on place names; school visits to manuscript exhibitions; and the Institute's key role in building infrastructure on language technology for the national project. All reported that the new exhibition space would be strongly

welcomed and looked forward to school children, students, tourists and the general public being able to visit the building, particularly to view the manuscripts.

The team was told that the creation of extensive online resources has increased the profile of the Institute, and the digitisation of material now enables the public to interact with documents and sources that it had held for many years. However, as mentioned above, there was a view from several stakeholders that general accessibility to the Institute's online resources could be improved by bringing them together on one platform with a user-friendly interface. Some representatives mentioned that they would find it very helpful to have guidelines for the general public on using the online material and also, for example, a more responsive approach to providing customised tools to support the learning and teaching of the Icelandic language.

The Institute was praised for its role in the Language Technology Programme, and the team was told that the Institute should continue to play a leading part in work with the Icelandic Centre for Language Technology as it progresses to the next stage with learning technology solutions, which it is hoped will involve engagement with "Big Tech" platforms.

A survey commissioned by the Institute in 2021 to gain insight into the Icelandic public's knowledge of the Institute and view of its role in society showed that 71.6% of respondents were either 'very positive' or 'rather positive', with younger people being both the most positive, and the most likely to have used the Institute's databases and websites. However, the team was told of a general concern of many, both staff and external voices, that interest in languages generally was decreasing, and that this extended to a declining interest in the use and study of Icelandic. The team heard of discussions in society concerning the perceived threat to the Icelandic language from the numbers of people now predominantly speaking English, whether local or newcomers to Iceland. In this context, it was considered

that language technology and outreach activity to make the language more accessible would become increasingly important. Several contributors also felt that more could be done to capitalise on young people's interest in the sagas, and in international popular culture derived from their narratives and characters, together with more exploration of inventiveness and creativity in the language. Some emphasised the role of the manuscripts in Icelandic national identity, and suggested that the Institute might focus more on communicating those texts to the general public, possibly through different versions for a new, wider readership. The team heard in several meetings with external representatives a view that the Institute should be better funded by the government to take a major role in making Icelandic language and culture more inclusive.

The team heard that the image of the Institute was thought to have greatly improved over the past few years and that it had taken significant steps recently (as detailed in the SAR pp52-3) to increase its social media profile. Several staff and external stakeholders thought that, to be effective, social media and outreach generally needed to link up particularly with the needs of teachers. The team suggests that the progress to date could be further extended through the development of a full public relations strategy. The team recognises and *commends the Institute's initiative in seeking public opinion through the survey, and in developing its social media profile.*

The team understands the societal environment of the Institute and that in Iceland there is not an established tradition of philanthropic research and sponsorship. However, the team heard of the activities of the Friends of AMI, a group of volunteers who support the Institute with publicity and some fundraising. For example, the Friends had raised funds to restore a badly damaged manuscript, produced a documentary on the 50th anniversary of the delivery of documents from the Árni Magnússon Manuscript Collection from Copenhagen,

and were now considering ideas for celebrating the opening of the new building. The team would urge the Institute to continue to seek to maximise the potential benefits of such goodwill, and to consider also wider opportunities for generating publicity and income to further support their mission.

The team *commends the Institute on the high regard in which it is held in Icelandic society* and *recommends that the Institute consider opportunities for wider engagement in interfaces with cultural industries, Big Tech (through the Language Technology Centre), school and college education, and the wider population*. This might be achieved through the production of a full public relations and communications strategy.

9. Conclusion – Overall summary assessment of the Árni Magnússon Institute

The Árni Magnússon Institute is a leading research institute in the field of Icelandic Studies, with an established tradition and reputation for outstanding scholarship in Icelandic language and literature. The Institute's work on its physical collections of manuscripts and other materials, and its growing digital archives, dictionaries and new databases; represents its achievements and success both in preserving and furthering understanding of the nation's cultural history, and in developing new knowledge and resources for the present and the future. The team was impressed by the strong commitment shown by the leadership and staff of the Institute, and the high regard in which their work is held by their partners and stakeholders. The Institute's forthcoming move to a new building, with public access to enhanced facilities, opens up many opportunities but also presents challenges. To respond successfully to these, while also maintaining its established activities and ongoing developments, it will be important for the Institute to make changes, by reviewing its organisational strategy, its governance and structures, and its relationship to society. The team considers that, although some aspects of organisational change are likely to have funding implications, these should be considered in order to support the Institute in refreshing and further strengthening its identity and impact in this new context, and to enable it to continue to sustain its status and performance as a flagship institution

Summary of the commendations and recommendations

Strategy, governance structure and management processes

The team commends

- the scale of ambition in embracing the possibilities offered to them by the government for creating the new building with vision and vigour

- the Director's high standing and strong leadership

- the open collegiality of the Institute's ethos, which was reflected in discussions with all groups of staff

The team recommends

- the Institute to take forward the development of a new overarching strategy, to include explicit strategies and aims for research; collections and digital infrastructure; internationalisation; outreach and public relations

- that the governance of the institute be enhanced by codifying the mandate and the role of the board

- a review of the management structure to create a senior management/executive team, including a deputy director role, and each with allocated institutional responsibilities, for example in research; collections and digital infrastructure; internationalisation; outreach and public relations

- that the number of divisions be reconfigured and reduced, with heads of divisions to form part of the senior management team, with divisional and institutional management responsibilities

- the Institute to re-examine the composition, functions and operation of the *Húsþing* and the general staff meetings

Human resources and staff development

The team commends

- the commitment and dedication of staff to their work and the purposes of the institute

- the good opportunities for staff development, particularly for academic staff and also for non-academic staff

The team recommends

- that the Institute embed annual staff interviews for all staff, to be conducted by members of the senior management team

- that the Institute make all institutional policies and supporting documentation available and accessible in a centralised online space available to all staff

- that the Institute establish formal induction arrangements for new staff

- that the Institute clarify and communicate the role of confidential contact for all staff and students, including in policy documentation

- that consideration be given to bolstering support for the finance function as part of an overall review of the Institute's administrative requirements and structure

- a strengthened HR function, which would look afresh at the policy framework of the institute. This could be achieved in different ways, for example, by greater interaction with the University systems; by outsourcing the service; or adding to the staffing of the Institute

- that the Institute takes steps to plan for workforce sustainability, most notably in the context of the age profile of its staff

Management of research activities

The team commends

- the Institute for the high regard in which its research profile is held

- the Institute on its welcoming environment and support for research students

The team recommends

- that the Institute establish a role for research coordination

- that the Institute establish a platform for PhD students to share their work with other students and staff

- that the Institute introduce an internal methodology to recognise and reward forms of output other than academic publication, for example dictionaries, software, databases

Management of physical collections and planning of a new digital infrastructure

The team commends

- the outstanding work undertaken by staff in curating and maintaining the physical collections, within limited resources

- the Institute's success in adapting to digitisation of material, being up to date with digital methods, and the achievements made within limited resources

The team recommends

- that the Institute streamline the signposting and presentation of the range of different websites for resources and make them easily accessible in one place

National partnership and internationalisation

The team commends

- the culture of partnership and collaboration at the Institute and its activity in internationalisation through summer schools and links with colleagues abroad

The team recommends

- the Institute to progress further its own suggested ideas and approaches to increasing the visibility of research and its recognition overseas

Societal impact and knowledge transfer activities

The team commends

- the Institute's initiative in seeking public opinion through the survey, and in developing its social media profile

- the Institute on the high regard in which it is held in Icelandic society

The team recommends

- that the Institute consider opportunities for wider engagement in interfaces with cultural industries, Big Tech (through the Language Technology Centre) school and college education, and the wider population.

Annex 1: Visit Schedule

<u>Tuesday 5 April 2022</u>
Meeting 1
9.00-9.50   AMI Director
Guðrún Nordal, AMI Director

Meeting 2
10.00-11.00   Board of Directors
Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir, senior lecturer. Faculty of Icelandic and Comparative Cultural Studies, University of Iceland
Torfi Tulinius, professor and head of Faculty of Icelandic and Comparative Cultural Studies, University of Iceland
Guðrún Dröfn Whitehead, lecturer, Faculty of Sociology, Anthropology and Folkloristics, University of Iceland

Meeting 3
11.30-12.30   Heads of Division
Ari Páll Kristinsson, research professor. Division of language planning
Ásta Svavarsdóttir, research associate professor. Division of lexical studies & lexicography
Branislav Bédi. Project manager international office and summer courses
Gísli Sigurðsson, research professor. Division of ethnology and folklore
Guðný Ragnarsdóttir, librarian
Guðvarður Már Gunnlaugsson, research professor. Division of manuscripts
Sigurborg K. Stefánsdóttir, manager of finance and HR

Meeting 4
**13.30-14.30   Academic Advisory Board (*Húsþing)*
Annette Larson, research associate professor. Division of manuscripts
Ellert Þor Jóhannsson, research lector. Division of lexical studies and lexicography
Haukur Þorgeirsson, research associate professor. Division of manuscripts
Helga Hilmisdóttir, research associate professor. Division of lexical studies and lexicography
Margrét Eggertsdóttir, research professor. Division of manuscripts
Rósa Þorsteinsdóttir, research associate professor. Division of ethnology and folklore
Svanhildur Oskarsdóttir, research professor. Division of manuscripts
Þórunn Sigurðardóttir, research professor. Division of manuscripts

Meeting 5
14.45-15.45   Representatives of research staff
Ágústa Þorbergsdóttir, project manager language planning
Haukur Þorgeirsson, research associate professor. Division of manuscripts

Rósa Þorsteinsdóttir, research associate professor. Division of ethnology and folklore
Ellert Þór Jóhannsson, research lector. Division of lexical studies & lexicography
Aðalsteinn Hákonarson, Project manager. Division of onomastics

Meeting 6
16.00-17.00   Representatives of affiliated research staff
Katelin Parson
Birna Lárusdóttir
Dale John Kenwards
Arni David Magnussoon

Wednesday 6 April 2022
Meeting 7
9.00-9.50   Representatives of administrative staff
Sigurborg K. Stefánsdóttir, manager of finance and HR
Trausti Dagsson, project manager and IT-developer
Rebecca ?, administrator
Steinunn Aradóttir, archivist

Meeting 8
10.00-10.45   Representatives of affiliated PhD students supervised by AMI staff
Nikola Macháčková
Lea Debora Pokorny
Sofia Gudny Gudmunsdóttir

Meeting 9
11.00-11.50   Department of Icelandic Studies and Department of Folklore, University of Iceland
Kolbrún Friðriksdóttir, Adjunct Lecturer in Icelandic as a second language. Worked on Icelandic online
Marc Daniel Skibsted Volhardt, Adjunct Lecturer in Icelandic as a second language and teacher in Nordkurs summer courses
Kristinn Schram, senior lecturer. Faculty of Sociology, Anthropology and Folkloristics
Haraldur Bernharðsson, Associate Professor of Medieval Studies
Aðalheiður Guðmundsdóttir, Professor. Faculty of Icelandic and Comparative Cultural Studies

Meeting 10
12.00-13.00   External Stakeholders
Örn Hrafnkelsson, University library, division manager
Bergur Þorgeirsson, director of Snorrastofa in Reykholt

Bjarney Guðbjörnsdóttir, project manager National Land Survey of Iceland

Hugrún Hólmgeirsóttir, teacher at Hamrahlíð College

Halldora Bjort Ewen, teacher at Hamrahlíð College

Rúna Björg Garðarsdóttir, teacher at Laugarnesskóli

Johanna Vigdis Guðmundsdóttir, Director of the Icelandic Centre for Language Technology

Meeting 11

13.30 – 14.30 Open meeting/individual meetings with full-time and affiliated staff, and affiliated students

Meeting 12

15.00-15.30   Planners for the new building

Sigrún Kristjánsdóttir, Curator

Ögmundur Skarphéðinsson, Hornsteinar, Architect

Sólmundur Már Jónsson, relocation project manager

Guðrún Nordal, Director

Meeting 13

15.30-16.30   Chair of Board of Directors, and AMI Director

Dagný Jónsdóttir, former member of Icelandic parliament. Chairman.

Guðrún Nordal, AMI Director

Meeting 14

16.45– 17.45 Representatives from wider society/informal stakeholders

Kristján Kristjánsson, journalist and chairman of Friends of AMI (Vinir Árnastofnunar)

Kristín Ragna Gunnarsdóttir, illustrator and writer

Örnólfur Thorsson, guest scholar at AMI