

CIRRUS SYMPOSIUM

**KUNSTHØGSKOLEN I OSLO (KHIO)
OSLO NATIONAL ACADEMY OF THE ARTS
FACULTY FOR DESIGN**

**THE NEW FUTURE OF MASTER OF ARTS (MA) EDUCATION – HOW NOT TO REINVENT THE WHEEL
HOSTED BY THE MA DESIGN PROGRAMME**

DATE:

Tuesday 6th February 2007

The present report documents the proceedings of the CIRRUS MA symposium in Oslo, hosted by KHIO (Oslo National Academy of the Arts). The report contains a brief survey of the background as well as an overview of the one-day gathering, dovetailed to the objective of the symposium, and the structure of the present report.

The bulk of the report includes (I) a list of topics gathered from the participants, to give the reader some detail of what was “in the air”. The next section (II) contains a summary of three workshops that took place in parallel sessions. Then a third section (III) contains a synthetic assessment of the symposium in which an attempt is made to drive the discussions a step ahead.

Finally, two sections round up the report: the first section contains an evaluation of the conference and a critical self-assessment of the organisers, the second section concludes with proposals for the next gathering.

The sections of the report are fairly autonomous in order to allow the recipients the liberty of a hopscotch read.

Rapporteur: Theodor Barth¹

¹ Theodor Barth is a senior lecturer and researcher at KhiO (Oslo National Academy of the Arts) working in the Design Faculty, with a background in social anthropology.

BACKGROUND:

CIRRUS² is one of the major networks that currently offer Art & Design Schools in the Nordic countries for where they can talk about supranational professional concerns. The current discussions of the Bologna process have also been taking place in larger organisational frameworks such as Cumulus³ and ELIA⁴.

The PRE-Design network partook in the organisation of the CIRRUS-symposium in Oslo: its objective is to be present and active all arenas for co-operation between Art & Design Schools, and spur trans-national exchange on and beyond these arenas, in the fields of practice, research and education.

The domains of *exchange* discussed at the CIRRUS-symposium were: (a) student-mobility; (b) research; (c) curriculum development. Several models were discussed – *inter alia* the “resident class” model⁵.

In a general fashion, confidence in the importance of practice to learning, both in educational and research settings, emerged amongst the participants throughout the CIRRUS symposium: emphasising *communities of practice* in the development of co-operative ventures – at the BA/MA levels – before the development of common strategies for institution-building, organisational development and administrative structures.

OVERVIEW

We prepared for a small symposium but were surprised at considerable response and interest in the symposium: we found that many of the concerns that were tentatively expressed in our programme, were being discussed and debated by colleagues throughout Northern Europe.

At the symposium we discussed the many challenges faced by designers, researchers and educators at Art Schools and addressed a variety of questions about the nature of design practice and its future. We also discussed how we can ascertain that what we are teaching, and the way we are teaching, is preparing our students adequately for the fast changing world of design they will enter.

The Oslo gathering was organised as a symposium rather than a conference, in order to make sure that there was time for group discussions and debate, as well as the opportunity to learn from each other. For this reason we organised two group sessions in the one-day symposium: one group session to discuss targeted topics, another for free discussions, while the closing plenary was held to bring up a sufficient focus for future steps.

² <http://www2.uiah.fi/cirrus/>

³ <http://www.iade.pt/cumulus/cumulus.html>

⁴ <http://www.elia-artschools.org/>

⁵ E.g., an MA class with teacher from one Art School visits another, and blend into the daily work environment to participate, learn and contribute

Professor John Wood gave a keynote lecture to pitch the symposium's morning sessions (leader of the MA Design Futures, Goldsmith's College): John Wood is a leading figure in debates on design and design education in the UK and abroad. Recently involved in the Writing Purposefully in Art & Design⁶, and attainable utopias.

During the afternoon session Ulrik Jungersen, Head of the Institute of Form & Theory, gave a lecture on different models of art education – notable the German and British traditions – and their place on the contemporary European scene of common educational policies: an interesting debate emerged as to the relation between the German knowledge tradition and the British competence tradition in actual practice.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the symposium was to bring up a *problem-design* that can help us:

- see the Bologna declaration in the perspective of its current implementation in different Art Schools, and
- hold this variety of implementation-patterns as an *asset* that may give the European Art Schools a competitive edge on the world scene

the problem: implementing the 3/2 year structure of BA and MA education at Art Schools while securing the practice based repertoire of *skills*.

the design: using the professional diversity between (and within) Art Schools in (Northern) Europe as a pool in which the *variety* of question-solutions (patterns) of the...

- (1) co-generative development of BA & MA
- (2) curriculum-development
- (3) professional integration of the MA

... partake of the *service innovation* currently taking place on the design-scene in business environments.

⁶ Writing PAD – www.writing-pad.ac.uk.

STRUCTURE

The main bulk of the minutes from the symposium are organised into a body of three core sections and a tail with two concluding sections:

I - DETAILS

in this section the list of key-topics written by the participants on the A and B sheets [the yellow and pink sheets distributed during the symposium for the open forum discussions] were (a) *processed* after the CIRRUS gathering, (b) *transformed* into questions [as in the American “Jeopardy” game], and (c) *fitted* together to forms groups of evolving questions, and gathered into three thematic clusters⁷.

II - IMPLICATIONS

The group sessions in which (1) BA/MA interfacing, (2) MA curriculum development and (3) MA professional integration were discussed in parallel workshops, were held during the morning sessions, while the free discussions were conducted in the afternoon: the reason for presenting them in *reverse order* here, is to enable the readers to draw out some implications from the targeted discussions based on a broader contextual understanding of what went on at the symposium.

III - INTENTIONS

In this section we go beyond aggregating the diversity of views that come up in the discussions, and beyond designing the variety that makes the institutions represented by the participants potential and attractive co-operation partners, to map common assets in a landscape of change.

OBSTRUCTIONS

Assessment of the bottlenecks that we experienced during the Oslo-symposium that may help us enhance the work-form at future gatherings.

CONCLUSIONS

Where do we take it from here? And, when?

⁷ We wanted to do this during the one-day symposium, but time was short. Even though this interaction design was worked out from the participants A and B sheets after the symposium – though our method has obvious shortcomings – we still felt that the issues raised by individual participants at the conference come out better in this way, because it shows how their concerns appeared in the context.

I – DETAILS

During the free discussions at the CIRRUS symposium, a variety of questions, views and ideas came up: the participants were divided into two groups – A and B – and they presented themselves, their institutions and shared their concerns about the Bologna process. We did not have sufficient time, however, to go in depth of the individual issues that were raised, neither did we have the time to cluster them into thematic groups during the symposium day. So we ventured an experiment and attempted to do this in the aftermath.

We used the key-phrases of the yellow and pink forms – A and B – handed into us, and clustered them below in gross thematic groups⁸. Our objective is to thereby allow the readers of this report to get a panorama view, with some of the detail from the discussions that took place at the symposium: with the intention of following up these trails at the first possible occasion.

While emphasising that the below attempt is intended to spur further discussions we noted – with the experience of the symposium freshly in mind – that similar questions have different implications when raised at the BA- and MA- levels.

Finally, we have assumed that while drawing out the details and implications of the Bologna declaration each and every Art School make their own particular – and unique contribution – to the realisation of its *intention*. This bottom-up approach to working out the intention of the declaration, complements the top-down enactment of the policy: featuring conjointly the Bologna process at the Art School level.

The three thematic clusters singled out here are:

- (1) *Accountability*: focussing on BA/MA dynamics within the Art School
- (2) *Flexibility*: the place of curriculum in thinking/doing design
- (3) *Reflectivity*: locating the Art School activities in the wider professional environment

I. 1 *Accountability: focussing on BA/MA dynamics within the Art School*

In the batch of ‘accountability’ we located the following questions, views and ideas: Lennart Mänd – EAA, Estonia: *where to draw a line between the MA & BA with the objectives of developing the Art School while fitting into the Bologna process?* Claus Eckhardt – Lund University Industrial Design [LTH]: *what is time analysis factor required to educate students in 3 years – with meaningful results – and using years 4 and 5 to improve?* David Öhman – Stockholm Konstfack: *what are the entailments for organisational and strategic issues?* Lizette Graden – Stockholm Konstfack: *what do we mean when talking about theory vs. practice in regard of quality valuation; what is the importance of the heritage and professional culture in different departments, as providers of context and meaning in strategic and organisational processes?* Troels Degn Johansson – Denmark Design School: *how do*

⁸ The participants mentioned by name and institution are limited to those from whom we received the A-B sheets in return.

we integrate academic methods in the design project – at the BA and MA levels – in the development of design competences and values in the design education? Mads Rasmus Skov – DK Design Skoen Kolding: what is the logical bridge between the BA and MA, if the objective is to bridge educational life to working life?

I. 2 Flexibility: the place of curriculum in thinking/doing design

Eija Timonen – University of Lapland: how can new questions and ideas come up, skills be deepened in the curriculum, research and design methodology be developed, by listening to the questions and problems of other universities and by finding solutions together? Lynn Lindegren Lund University Sweden: how do we single out design thinkers for MA-programmes; would it be possible to exchange experts? Kristina Hänninen, University of Lapland, Faculty of Art and Design: How is curriculum work carried out in different institutions, and how do we conceive the flexibility in the master study? Anna Lill Nilsson – HDK Steneby: Can problem-defining skills be developed by integrating writing and reflection in the proper BA level? Tine Kjølse – Danmarks Design skole: if BA & MA integration is hinged on an adequate curricular structure and content, in regard of the complementary of theory and practice, can the meaning and importance of reflection in design be enhanced? Ulrik Jungersen – Kolding: how do we support the implementation of theory in practice? Eva-Maria Hakola – University of Art and Design, Helsinki: what is the role of support and services for teachers and students e-learning and the balance between science and practice in art education in curriculum development? Maziar Raein – Oslo National Academy of the Arts: how do we articulate the relationship between research and theory into our curricula, and the ideas embedded there around the roles for reflection? Theodor Barth – Oslo National Academy of the Arts: can we invent Bologna by describing the diversity between and within the art schools, and then design this diversity as a variety? Anette Christensen, Oslo National Academy of the Arts: how do we work with student exchange at the MA-level, in which phase and what would be the contents (e.g., desk and mentor at another school)?

I. 3 Reflectivity: locating the Art School activities in the wider professional environment

Gunnar Bolmsjø – Lund University: how can the individual choices and student mobility at the MA level affect the quality of progress and transition from BA, MA, PhD and beyond? Pete Avondoglio – Umeå Design: how do we determine and evaluate the problem identification process in design education? Tove Kjær – Oslo National Academy of the Arts: when considering how we should develop our future holistically, where should design studies go? Tarja Toikka – University of Art and Design, MediaLab: do the values of user-centred and design leadership affect how we think of academic practices vs. academic practices, ethics in the sense of design for all, and the author vs. user/client change of paradigm? Artis Kampaers – Art Academy of Latvia: Can we state that MA degree is the only degree of design? Jens Overbye – Danmarks Designskole: Can we strike a

balance between theory and practice by using theory from other professions, or do we have to develop our own theory in design? How can we avoid alienation among the students when goaded to seek knowledge in a language they do not know? How can we reach/communicate reflection through form? Ulf Sjöstrand – HKD Göteborg: can we embed learning processes in creativity? Johannes Thordarson – Iceland Academy of the Arts: the clarification of distinction in MA programmes; how does location of the programme affect it? Gunnar Krantz – Malmö: if we locate art, comics and literature in the theoretic field of image & narration, can we similarly locate entrepreneurship inside holistic design, pedagogy and reflective practice? Thomas Leerberg – Kolding: is pre-design, as a concept, fit to characterise design research in a professional setting?

II - IMPLICATIONS

II.1 Workshop led by Anke Coumans⁹ – Interfacing BA and MA

The BA/MA system adopted in the Bologna Declaration is derived from the Anglo-American educational system, and has a 500-year history in the UK. Its short and extremely recent history in the rest of Europe therefore has summoned a debate on its form and content.

In the design field, where research practices are in the process of being defined, the growing of roots into academic ways of doing research – in whichever tradition – cannot be taken for granted: hence the importance of research, and how it is defined, to determine how the BA/MA education should work as a system (whether loosely coupled or tightly integrated).

Developing research practices in a practice based discipline raises a number of problematic issues. What exactly is meant by the research in everyday parlance: practice based research, academic research, conceptual research, contextual research, material/form research or theoretical research?

Depending on the definition research is conducted in ways that differently affect the relations between the BA and the MA. Particularly, the way BA and MA curricula are connected is arguably determined by which research practice is adopted. What changes in the curriculum of the BA should be made to realise a transparent and functional relationship?

How do we create the foundations for research in activities conducted at the BA level, and what should then – subsequently – be developed as the student passes onto the MA? What are the thresholds to be crossed by the students to develop proper research skills at the BA level, and what faculties in innovating skills should be expected at the MA level?

Are the professional fields that can appropriately be used to guide us at the BA and the MA levels, the same professional fields or do we need to seek counsel from different professional fields? What are the skills and attitudes that in each case are required? Should there be a contribution to knowledge – at each two levels – and if so, to which knowledge? How do we select the curricula at the BA and MA levels accordingly?

⁹ Anke Coumans Hogeschool voor de Kunsten Utrecht.

Two basic models of the BA/MA compound were discussed in the workshop: the first model emphasises a continuum between the two, while the second emphasises a difference within that continuum. According to the first model both the BA and the MA should both educate the same sort of complete designer: i.e., someone who is able to reflect in the design process (reflection in action and on action).

The designer is here a maker and thinker, a problem definer and a problem solver: s/he knows the rules to the point of knowing when s/he can bend or break them. The design education is an education for autonomy. In the second model, the design education becomes more polar, in the sense that (1) the BA student is educated rather as a solver, and (2) the MA more as a definer; (1) the BA student as someone who knows the rules, and (2) the MA as someone who can bend or break them: obviously the polar model can be stronger or weaker (more or less accentuated).

We needed a new symposium to draw conclusions considering the practical consequences of these perspectives. In the discussions, during which the definition of research was emphasised, placing research in the dialectics of certainty/uncertainty, with theory as a tool for dealing with uncertainty.

In this part of the workshop – in which a model of progression from BA to MA was explored – methods and modes of research, technical skills, ability to ask questions, framed exercises in reflection were issues sorting under the BA, while exploratory quests, self-reflection, initiative and contextual understanding of context sorted under the MA. And then featuring professional practice, going from crafts to innovation, improving skills and being up to a certain degree content-less.

In a more refined stage of this discussion (Lennart Mänd [Tallinn] and others), the BA student's engagement with contents evaluated with regard to the student's ability to learn seeing and presenting them in context, whereas at the MA level context is work and content becomes a tool. At the BA level research is a tools-led research, while at the MA level the students starts up with research, and is – to the same extent – research driven.

A final exploration of alternative models of BA/MA interfaces, gravitated around a matrix model for cluster teaching, emphasising learning outcomes in the cluster formed by research, theory and design practice. In this way, the workshop appeared to have reached a common focus for more or less complex interfaces between the BA and the MA. A more complex interface makes way for a tighter integration between the BA and the MA, while creating a comparatively simpler focus on the come and go between design making and thinking throughout the education.

II.2 *Workshop led by Ulrik Jungersen¹⁰ – Curriculum Development*

This thematic group-discussion was pitched by Ulrik Jungersen, who introduced the theme by a line of questions going from simpler to more complex issues, emerging from the Bologna Declaration in the area of curriculum development.

The discussions in this group therefore departed from conceptual and elementary discussions on the nature of design as a professional activity: in making sense of design, which weight should we

¹⁰ Ulrik Jungersen, Designskolen Kolding.

place on making products and making meaning (given that design, in some share or ratio, has come to encompass both these aspects).

Evidently, these questions are part and parcel of professional discussions among designers: there are no-two design schools thinking about these issues in exactly the same way – and according to the same traditions – neither are the Art Schools internally homogenous in these terms. Yet, by the standards of anthropologist Clifford Geertz, we all take the point of relating to these questions – even in contradiction and in debate – and we laugh of the same jokes.

In other words, Ulrik Jungersen made us start with a cultural issue proper to the designer community and led us into the discussion of the Bologna process from there. Cultural communities – including professional ones – are *not* consensus based, rather they are – pace Geertz – interpretive communities.

Everyone inside the room understood what a nightmare it can be when students with a BA in industrial design have finished their degrees, and come into work-life only to make the most elementary disastrous mistakes. At the same time everyone saw the point of a labour market in change where the BA/MA makes for the greater flexibility in the education needed for MA students who become employed in strategy development rather than product development in the industry.

The relative emphasis on theory and practice – throughout the BA and MA – was discussed on the background of these elementary considerations on current and emergent definitions of design that we are grappling with today. As a consequence, the question of curriculum development – and the diversity of possible curricula – was discussed in a fairly general fashion, in contrastive or synergetic relation to forms of teaching that exist in all Art Schools.

As in the II.1 workshop, the curriculum workshop drew up two contrasting models of how the theoretical and the practical dimensions of the design education could be seen to add up: (1) a sliding model, of an elementary or cumulative type, was sketched on the flip-board, in which a continuum was drawn up between practice at the one end and theory at the other end; (2) while a more complex, co-generative, model was drawn up – in contrast – by which the theoretical and practical dimensions of a design education with reflective practice as its major outcome.

Indeed, it was argued if future MA works are divided into a practical part and a theoretical part, then where is the design? In this model, theory and practice could come in any ratio and mix, but are not conceptually dichotomous. It was suggested by one of the participants that design education might be more fruitfully understood in terms of *design doing* and *design thinking*, since they are modalities of a single concept and do not draw on the inheritance – common to many art schools – of presupposing the practice/theory dichotomy, while at the same time mending – or, healing – it badly.

The II.2 workshop did not only share its distinction between cumulative versus more complex developmental models with II.1, it also shared the concerns with historical antecedents that may have brought similar structural assumptions to bear on the BA/MA division in the compound educational system currently developed in different art schools. While many Art Schools seem, in some extent, to share and even to operate on the assumption that the BA is the carrier of old school assumptions – i.e., the heritage foundation of a professional culture – while the MA is the herald and harbinger of innovation, holding the power of flexibility.

If this is true – even to a limited extent – the *pull* of the MA, as the locomotive of the Bologna process, and the push of the BA bottom-up from the roots of local heritage, together define a *dynamic fulcrum* in need of further description and discussion: indeed, if the quests and queries of educators working at the MA-level, result in the exportation of arrangements based on their experiences to the BA-level, and the MA level similarly becomes saturated by the *push* from below resulting from this exchange, then the idea the schools will *invent* the Bologna process makes sense¹¹.

In fact, we took a vote on this in the workshop: 15 of the participants votes yes, while 6 participants did not see the question in this way. One raised the problem of the time factor from a completely different point of view: to produce an education that will be accountable for professional skills in the time of the BA, there is simply not time to develop reflective skills, and the flexibility introduced into the education – in this regard – cannot come before the MA.

In this connection, a discussion of more holistic approaches to the BA/MA – such as the automatically accepting students who have entered the BA into the MA and expecting them to complete both, is a model adopted by the Faculty of Art and Design at the University of Lapland (Eija Timonen).

II.3 Workshop led by Thomas Leerberg¹² – Professional Integration

This section is particularly important because it deals with the discussion of how the educational activities of design schools can be located in the larger society, through alumni networks and life long learning whereby schools can evolve as a cross-roads and a market-place for designers in all walks of life and different professional vocations. However, as the convenor has been temporarily unavailable the rapporteur has left the section pending.

We are looking forward to the completion of this section, since professional integration of design education – in many ways – is the proof of the pudding for reflective practice: the need to locate reflectivity in practice by professionals who have an external but active relation to the Art School is of great value, since – not rarely – such professionals go further and along unexpected itineraries in emphasising the importance of reflection to practice. While the school, by definition, has space and time devoted to this purpose, the professionals – through their practice outside of school – come up with emergent rationales for reflective practice.

The school is not a closed system, nor a basic assumption group constructed as perennial isolate in the fashion of a monastery. Rather it is an aesthetic space created with an ethic to develop new affordances from the seeds of a socially responsive professional practice¹³ (which – let us not forget – is in some aspects eruptive, since, beyond being productive, is also expressive).

¹¹ Invention in the sense of semiotics: even the mere transposition from one medium (such as text) to another medium (such as practice) requires invention. A legal document (the Bologna Declaration) is by the same token always distinct from the jurisprudence that ensues from it (the Bologna Process).

¹² Thomas Leerberg, Designskolen Kolding.

¹³ C.f., Boal, Augusto: (1995): *The Rainbow of Desire – the Boal Method of Theatre and Therapy*, London & New York: Routledge.

III - INTENTIONS

During the day of the CIRRUS-symposium in Oslo a number of interesting points regarding the daily interaction between the tutor and student: for instance, the tutor may tease out her working habits – developed in time – in triangulating practice, education and research in clusters of daily tasks for the students to observe.

Reflective skills and multitasking are neighbours: they become family whenever dissimilar tasks are made to operate in synergy. The synergy becomes apparent in a situation where tasks are carried out under the constraints of time, and therefore – in quite obvious ways – demand *choices*. Accordingly, when learning to transform constraining factors into enabling factors, the student can learn how to be guided by *intention* in her work.

But what are the drivers of this reflective multi-tasking? During the symposium a discussion came up on the adequacy of problem-based learning (currently used in the medical profession) as way to conceptualise what designers do. This excellent idea brings up some problems, however, as to how design research departs from academic disciplines.

In the aftermath of World War II, *La maison des sciences de l'homme* was established as a multidisciplinary research environment in the spirit of Fernand Braudel's idea of problem-driven research. Immanuel Wallerstein – a student of Braudel – observed in the nineties¹⁴, that this concept of multidisciplinary research had not contributed to build down the boundaries between the academic disciplines, but – on the contrary – consolidated them in new ways.

Wallerstein's critique was part of an initiative to open the social sciences towards the humanities and natural/technical sciences. Disciplines, according to him, operate in this way as long as they are allowed to operate in their own time. Evidently, in academia like isolates, disciplines can exist in this way: at least, for the time being. However, when seated in realities – Wallerstein continues – these basic assumptions become so squeezed and brittle that they produce *phase transitions*: i.e., shifts that produce changes of time (rather than in time).

To the design disciplines such shifts are terribly concrete: they take place in a tradition where *critiquing* works is as integrated into professional practice as skills. Indeed, the hallmark of mastery might be that *critique* – rather than being impatiently suffered – is *expected*, and a minimum of it required, for an individual to partake of the life of the designers' communities: the professional association of designers tend to organise in *communities of practice* – communities with deep histories based on apprenticeship¹⁵ – rather than in activity systems¹⁶.

¹⁴ Wallerstein, Immanuel: (1991) *Unthinking Social Science: the Limits of Nineteenth Century Paradigms*, Cambridge: Polity Press. (1996,) *Open the Social Sciences – Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences (Mestizo Spaces)*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

¹⁵ Lave, Jean & Wenger, Etienne: (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁶ Activity systems: engineered social systems organised for a purpose, which they attain by carrying out specific functions.

The question as to whether quality disappears when people with non-same background cooperate, therefore can be discussed both at the individual and institutional level. The twilight of *mastery* and *mystery* in which John Wood caught the corporate claims for skills and uniqueness – that make schools and designers diverse – therefore does *not* have to represent a defensive position in the wake of Bologna. And by engaging with writing – as a graphic medium and material culture at the same level as drawing and photography – designers can develop working habits that can make positive contributions to the wider research community: after all, the most important dividing line may not run between practice and theory, but between who you can work with, and with whom you can't.

In his afternoon lecture, Ulrik Jungersen featured the parameters of choice that come with reflective practice as a way of creating value for/in design. His method of maturing questions rather than providing answers is a practical approach to harnessing complexity and avoids premature closure. He succeeded in capturing the overall positive attitude to the Bologna process that emerged during the symposium.

And by underscoring the co-generative potential of the German knowledge centred and the British competence centred models of education, Jungersen linked up with some core discussions that have been going on in the EU for a long time: indeed, the German *Kompetenz Kompetenz*¹⁷ – featuring the competence on competencies – is a kind of sovereign (or, master) knowledge of how to make knowledge convertible: e.g., the extension of the Bologna Declaration into the Bologna Process is a case in point, featuring this autonomy. In the value chains of the knowledge society designers, therefore, can be seen as movers of knowledge.

Maziar Raein and Halldor Gislason (Oslo National Academy of the Arts) rounded up the conference by calling on the plenary to evaluate the symposium – the evaluation was generally positive – and to suggest concrete steps forward: Maziar Raein was concerned with the steps to organise the next gathering, at the 2007 Cumulus conference in Schwabisch Gmünd. While Halldor Gislason (Dean) drew up a scenario for exchanging classes (with teachers) for a sufficiently extended time to span institutional boundaries and explore possibilities for co-operation between Art Schools.

Pete Avondoglio (Umeå) closed the session by sharing his impressions of the day, based on his previous experience with CIRRUS-gatherings, and made a number of constructive suggestions for the follow-up.

¹⁷ *Was heißt Kompetenz-Kompetenz?* Unter der sogenannten ‚Kompetenz-Kompetenz‘ der EU-Mitgliedsstaaten versteht man die Souveränität der einzelnen Nationalstaaten, ihre Interessen auf allen Gebieten selbstständig zu vertreten. Die EU basiert auf der Kooperation einzelner souveräner Staaten. Sie sind als solche alle Mitglieder der Vereinten Nationen und besitzen die alleinige Kompetenz, beispielsweise bei der Schließung internationaler Abkommen oder der Gestaltung der EU-Verträge. Die teilweise Übertragung von einzelnen Kompetenzen auf Gremien der EU bedeutet deshalb auch nicht die Aufgabe der Souveränität, sondern drückt die Bereitschaft aus, bestimmte Entscheidungen in einem Staatenverbund zu treffen.

OBSTRUCTIONS

Our rationale for documenting the CIRRUS-Oslo as comprehensively as possible has been to create a maximum of freedom in our next step forward: the detail of this report is intended to support the participants at the conference – and other recipients – to extract their ideas from the context in which they became embedded in Oslo, to develop them further on other arenas, sites and locations.

The day after the CIRRUS-Oslo symposium the PRE-Design core – that had taken responsibility to coordinate the gathering – convened to conduct a self-critical evaluation. It was quite clear to us that the participants had too little time to develop their discussions, and the process design was not sufficiently robust to gather the views of the participants *in situ*.

It was agreed that CIRRUS-Oslo would have needed two days to optimise the original intention with the symposium, and to fulfil the ambition of securing an output of outcomes at the conference.

CONCLUSION

This is why we opted to create a report in a form of documentation that could distil provisional outcomes, and prepare for PRE-Design gathering in Schwabisch Gmünd in 2007 where all the participants at the Oslo-symposium are welcome. These are the short-term conclusions: Maziar Raein has drawn up a suggestion for a “second day” process design that has been circulated among the participants.

We also came up with a number of ideas of how to improve the PRE-Design portal as a communication channel, a knowledge resource and collaborative tool for a wider group of users. These are the mean-term conclusions.

Finally, the long-term conclusions: the rationale for keeping PRE-Design as an active node hosting a variety of professional networks in the design field, is to make a stable contribution to re-group knowledge assets in the design-field, particularly in the domain of design-research.