



Management
Direct phone: +45 7218 5072
E-mail: gigr@itu.dk
Journal no.: 2013-021-0006

9 December 2013

For the Members of the IT University Board

Comments on the minutes are kindly asked to be given in writing to the Journal (journalen@itu.dk) on December 6, 2013, the latest.

If no objections have been received within the deadline, the minutes will be regarded as approved. Subsequently, decisions and initiatives will be effectuated and the Publicly Available Information made public. The minutes are formally approved as the first item on the next Board meeting.

If objections of essential character are received within the deadline, the revised minutes will be sent out to the Members of the Board with a **further 8 days of deadline for objections**. If no further objections have been received within this deadline, the minutes will be made public. **In the case further objections are received within this deadline, the minutes will await approval at the next Board meeting before they are made public.**

Confidential Items are marked in grey and are only for the Board's own use. This applies to enclosures marked in grey as well.

The rest of the document and enclosures are Available Public Information.

MINUTES

Board meeting, November 22, 2013, at 14:00 – 17:00

Present:

From the Board: Jørgen Lindegaard, Per Ladegaard, Annette Stausholm, Jay David Bolter, Maria Rørbye Rønn, Sebastian Büttrich, Thomas Hildebrandt, Mark Gray and Vytautas Davidavicius.

From the Management: Jørgen Staunstrup and Georg Dam Steffensen.

Regrets: Mads Tofte.



The minutes taker:
Gitte Gramstrup

Public items:

1. Welcome to new member of the Board (briefing)

The Chairman of the Board welcomed the new elected student member Vytautas Davidavicius as member of the Board, and there was a presentation round.

2. Approval of minutes (decision)

No comments to the minutes from the meeting on September 20, 2013, had been received.

Recommendation:

The Management recommended that the minutes be approved.

Conclusion:

The minutes were formally approved.

3. Follow-up on result goals and strategy goals (briefing)

Concerning enclosure 1 and 2, Jørgen Staunstrup referred to the Management's comments on the agenda and added a few extra comments on enclosure 1. About M2 (employment rate of MSc graduates), he stressed that this is a significant concern. On inquiry from several board members, Jørgen Staunstrup sketched the actions being done, especially concerning the games line. About M9 (external funding), Management still hopes to reach 40 million DKK in 2014. Recently, one of our professors has been awarded a grant from ERC (European Research Council). Such a grant is rather prestigious and it is a step up the "reputation ladder". The Chairman of the Board asked what could prevent the university in reaching the goal of 40 million DKK in 2014. Jørgen Staunstrup replied that partly many new employees (because few are effective in getting grants from day one), partly an attitude among some employees not to seek funding opportunities for their research. Thomas Hildebrandt informed of work being done developing the quality of applications, for example, by knowledge sharing. Jørgen Staunstrup supplied, that a lot of effort has been invested in giving qualified support to the researchers in their applications. Thomas Hildebrandt agreed that this is helpful and good.

About M10 (average course evaluation), Jørgen Staunstrup stated that this is clearly unacceptable and something that needs attention and work. The Chairman of the Board fully agreed. On inquiry from Maria Rørbye Rønn, Jørgen Staunstrup informed that additional follow-up through the management chain is necessary. Thomas Hildebrandt confirmed that this is happening, but also voiced that the reasons for the problems (and the student responses in the course evaluations) can be many. The Chairman of the Board responded that issues like



that will always be there, but found it quite unacceptable that some courses constantly get low scores. Something has to be done about this. Asked by Mark Gray, the Chairman of the Board agreed that this issue is also something for the Study Board to take seriously.

In connection with M1 (the drop-out rate for first-year bachelor students), Mark Gray wanted to mention the SU-reform, which he expects is going to effect a lot of things – among these M1, and he would like to comment further on this under item 12.

Concerning enclosure 2, Jørgen Staunstrup mentioned S4 (student thesis in groups) which despite being red represents a big step in the right direction. Thomas Hildebrandt supplied, that actions are being taken to improve this.

4. The accounting of third quarter and the prediction of the result of the year, 2013 (briefing)

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to enclosure 3 and the expected result for the year 2013. There are still some uncertainties, for example, that the rates for ECTS being reduced because of large production from all the universities combined. The Chairman of the Board concluded that, though reason to be concerned of the uncertainties, so far things look good.

5. Goals 2014 (decision)

Jørgen Staunstrup referred to enclosure 4 and the Management´s comments on the agenda, including the note to M18. The first 16 goals (M1-M16) are given by the Development Contract. The last 3 goals (M17-M19) were developed with the group of Managers over the last couple of months and are seen as a small number of important development areas.

Maria Rørbye Rønn missed the discussions on the Board´s strategy seminar to be somehow reflected in the goals (the point being the importance of being able to know if you succeed on your strategy or not; a way to do that is having it reflected in the goals). Jørgen Staunstrup responded that there are quality oriented goals in the development contract (employment rates and course evaluations). Furthermore, the overall goal of the accreditation process (that will be a major task for 2014) is quality assurance.

The Chairman of the Board rounded the discussion and noted that he will sit down with Management to re-consider M17-M19.

Mark Gray mentioned that he and the student organizations would like to follow the drop-out rate in general and the amount of dispensations from the new rules (the SU-reform).

Recommendation:

Management submitted the 2014 strategic goals for the approval of the Board.



Conclusion:

With the above mentioned comments, the Chairman of the Board concluded that he together with Management will reconsider the contents of the strategic goals M17-M19.

Confidential item:

6.

Public item:

7. The Budget 2014 (decision)

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to enclosure 8 with the expected total result of 2014 to be -1,4 million DKK and the assumptions it is based on. Jørgen Staunstrup and Georg Dam Steffensen answered a number of clarifying questions from Board Members.

Per Ladegaard was pleased to see the positive forecast for 2015 and 2016.

The Chairman of the Board stated that for the time being, there are no indicators of radical changes or less freedom for the universities.

Recommendation:

Management recommended that the Board approve the 2014 budget as presented in Enclosure 5.

Conclusion:

The Chairman of the Board concluded that the Board unanimously approved of the budget.

Confidential items:

8.

9.

10.

Public items:

11. Questions regarding mail delivered briefings (briefing)

The Chairman of the Board concluded that there were no questions to the mail delivered briefings.



12. Any Other Business

Mark Gray informed that the SU-reform is a big concern among students and should also be so to the Board. The Chairman of the Board informed that the reform and its consequences also is a concern among chairmen of the university boards.

It was agreed to send out the presentation given by Lene Rehder (Head of Student Affairs and Programmes) to the Board Members for information.

Jørgen Staunstrup stressed that although the reform makes it necessary to make many changes (in study regulations and procedures) the IT University has given a quite positive response in the formal hearing of the laws. It should also be noted that substantial financial rewards are given to universities meeting the required reductions in completion time.

Mark Gray informed of changes at Copenhagen University (KU) and would like the IT University of Copenhagen to make a public statement like KU. He had different links to the internet (sent to the Board Members by e-mail):

Høringsvar: <http://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/lovforslag/l226/bilag/1/1253488.pdf>

Lovtekst: <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/r0710.aspx?id=152740>

Artikel om notat fra KU: <http://universitetsavisen.dk/politik/notat-afslorer-hvordan-ku-vil-gennemfore-fremdriftsreformen>

Information fra SDU: http://sdu.dk/nyheder/nyt_fra_sdu/fremdriftsreform

Jørgen Staunstrup stressed, that one cannot automatically assume that IT University of Copenhagen agrees with the position of Copenhagen University (KU) on the various aspects of the reform.

Finally, Mark Gray informed of an event at Labitat and will send the Board Members and Management an invitation by e-mail.

The Chairman of the Board ended the meeting by stating, that 2013 has been a good year for the IT University of Copenhagen, and he is looking forward to new challenges in 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Gitte Gramstrup
Assistant to the Management