



Executive Management
Direct phone: +45 7218 5072
E-mail: gigr@itu.dk
Journal no.: 2014-021-0007

22 December 2014

For the Members of the IT University Board

Comments on the revised minutes are kindly asked to be given in writing to the Journal (journalen@itu.dk) on December 19, 2014, 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 21, 2014, at 14:00 – 17:00

Present:

From the Board: Jørgen Lindegaard, Annette Stausholm, David Jay Bolter, Maria Rørbye Rønn (from item 4), Sebastian Büttrich, Thomas Hildebrandt, Vytautas Davidavicius and Gabriele Zeizyte.

From the Executive Management: Mads Tofte, Jørgen Staunstrup and Georg Dam Steffensen.

Regrets: Per Ladegaard



The minutes taker:
Gitte Gramstrup

Public items:

1. Welcome to new student elected member of the board (briefing)

Student Gabriele Zeizyte has been elected as new member of the Board as per November 1, 2014, and was welcomed by the Chairman and other members of the Board. There was a short presentation round.

Also, the Chairman of the Board informed that board member Per Ladegaard's present absence at board meetings was due to illness, but Per Ladegaard has given his comments verbally to the items on the agenda to him.

2. Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting (decision)

A few comments from Vytautas Davidavicius to the minutes from the meeting on September 19, 2014, had been received and implemented.

Vytautas Davidavicius asked why a document from the students had not been made publicly available together with the publicly available minutes. In his opinion this had been requested by Mark Gray. The Chairman of the Board and Mads Tofte disagreed that the board had been asked and agreed to make the document, which was part of a confidential item 4 on the agenda and as such threatened confidentially, publicly available. The document had been sent out again to the board members together with the minutes, as requested by Mark Gray.

Recommendation:

The Executive Management recommended that the minutes be approved.

Conclusion:

The minutes were formally approved.

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

Mads Tofte referred to enclosure 1 and 2 and the comments on the agenda, especially the follow-up actions concerning M1 (Drop-out on the bachelor programmes), M2 (Graduate Employment), M4 (Timely Completion) and M9 (External Funding) - enclosure 1 – and answered clarifying questions from the board members.

About M1, Gabriele Zeizyte had talked to some students and received different kinds of feedback. Several software bachelor students pointed to the structure and workload distribution in the third semester courses as being very problematic. Mads Tofte replied that it is an important point, however, it does not explain the dropout of the first semester students. Vytautas Davidavicius suggested that a mentoring programme might be a solution. Mads Tofte responded that we cannot know which solutions are appropriate until we know what the problem is. The administration is therefore contacting the 44 students



who dropped out. About M2, Mads Tofte thought that this is quite serious, needs attention and probably requires a change of culture to improve.

The Chairman of the Board informed, that Per Ladegaard agrees in the necessity of exploiting how to obtain better contact between industry and faculty. Vytautas Davidavicius found it important to keep Games, and Mads Tofte responded that it is a concern that so few Games graduates end up working with Games. This is an issue that has to be exploited. Thomas Hildebrandt strongly supported a close contact between industry and faculty to know "what's going on". About M9, Mads Tofte stated that this is another serious issue, and Jørgen Staunstrup added that the Department Management is working on a plan. In his opinion things are progressing, and a plan will be implemented soon. No doubt, this is a long turn around, and results are unlikely to turn up in a short time. Thomas Hildebrandt informed that a lot of faculty members are far from happy with the connection between more external funding and the performance model which management has put forward. It causes anxiety. People agree that something has to be done, but not this. Jørgen Staunstrup responded that even so, this is still the right and necessary thing to do. The Chairman of the Board agreed and found it quite unsatisfactory to be that much below average among Danish universities, so something must be done.

About M5, Mads Tofte stated that this was a real success. Annette Stausholm encouraged looking closer into the successes and perhaps learn from them.

4. The accounting of third quarter and the prediction of the result of the year 2014 (briefing)

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to enclosure 3 and the comments on the agenda, especially the expected improved result of the year, and answered clarifying questions from board members. On inquiry from the Chairman of the Board, Georg Dam Steffensen informed of the on-going negotiations with the Building Agency about the rental case; things seem to be going in the right direction, and an agreement is hopefully to be expected in the beginning of 2015.

The Chairman of the Board concluded that the board was very satisfied with having a stable and safe situation for now.

5. Development Contract 2015-2017 negotiations and strategic goals 2015-2017 (briefing)

The Chairman of the Board informed that the contracts with all the universities are going to be signed in January 2015 by the Chairmen of the Boards and the minister. Regarding the development contract negotiations, Mads Tofte referred to enclosure 4, the comments on the agenda and the revised draft made by the Executive Management, based on the feedback from the ministry on a negotiation meeting on November 3, 2014, and sent out to the Board by e-mail on November 17, 2014. Also, a version with translation into English of the goals and some of the clarifying text has been sent out to the board members. The revised draft is to be sent to the ministry after the board meeting. There is a good discussion with the ministry. Mads Tofte went through the measuring points in the document and responded to comments from the board members.



About goal 1.2, this is something the university has already been told to do ("studiefremdriftsreformen"). Mads Tofte thought that the intention of the reform is good, but that one has to be careful in how one implements it. Annette Stausholm liked the idea of faster completion, but was concerned that the students perhaps will lack time to work while studying, which is bad. Mads Tofte agreed that students will have less time for working besides their studies. Thomas Hildebrandt found it very difficult for the students to do both – faster completion and work during studies – and stated that work during studies gives the students a link into the labor market.

About goal 2.1, there was a discussion raised by Annette Stausholm of the percentage of unemployment of the graduates and what would be a satisfying – and realistic - number. Mads Tofte and the Chairman of the Board stated that reaching the national average (12%) is both difficult, necessary and takes time. Per Ladegaard has suggested having a discussion at the Board's next strategy seminar of where the IT University of Copenhagen should be in 5-10 years from now. Sebastian Büttrich added that another topic could be a need of closer dialogue with industry. The Chairman of the Board rounded the discussion by noting that the 12% was agreed on.

About goal 3.1, Mads Tofte and the Chairman of the Board answered clarifying questions from Maria Rørbye Rønn and Annette Stausholm. The intention is to be as open to bachelor students from other education institutions as possible. Maria Rørbye Rønn suggested that the balance between internal and external recruitment of MSc students could be a topic for a strategy seminar.

About goal 3.2, there was a minor discussion of diversity in terms of what is known about the relationship between educational background and graduates' salaries. On inquiry from Vytautas Davidavicius about international students, Mads Tofte informed that data about salaries for people not working in Denmark are not available.

About goal 4, Mads Tofte informed that this is basically a process goal and has been accepted by the ministry.

About goal 5, a grammatically mistake ("or" is not correct) was pointed out by Thomas Hildebrandt, and Mads Tofte answered clarifying questions from Annette Stausholm. Vytautas Davidavicius brought up again a previous suggestion from the students to make voluntary mentoring programmes, and Mads Tofte replied that he still did not think of this as a good idea and referred to experiences with voluntary mentoring at other universities.

About goal 6, Mads Tofte stated that although the goal is to reach the mentioned average, reaching the goal is not easy. The IT University of Copenhagen has had goals for years to increase the number of external funding. Investigations have shown a very large spread among faculty within this area, which is why the Department Management has developed a measuring system to improve things. In Mads Tofte's opinion, measuring such a system is a necessity to reach an



improvement, and the IT University of Copenhagen is still a very long way from reaching the national average. Thomas Hildebrandt raised a serious, but not personal, concern from the faculty group and informed of the feedback given to him. In his opinion researchers are not motivated by goals like this, and there is a concern that measuring like this will damage a lot. Also, the measuring system in its present form only measures a few of the many things done by the researchers, and the measuring goal is unrealistic to reach. Any measuring should be based on time spent by researchers, not on money spent. In short, a majority of people has reported back to him that this is a wrong goal and disagrees on the numbers and the individual measuring basis.

There was a discussion on this, and the Chairman of the Board urged to keep the discussion at board level and not at management level. Mads Tofte stated the fact that external funding spent is the way externally funded research is measured in Denmark, and that the IT University of Copenhagen is far behind the average numbers. When looking at the actual number of researchers who gain external funding, it is clear that the IT University of Copenhagen has a problem. That is exactly why the Board at the strategy seminar earlier this year discussed and agreed that this must necessarily be changed. Also, there is an issue of too few projects in pipeline. The Chairman of the Board referred to the known fact of the IT University of Copenhagen being far below average in this – and publicly exposed – and found it essential to bring the university to the same level as the other universities. Thomas Hildebrandt replied that none the less, he could only repeat the feedback given to him from a large group of faculty.

After further discussion, Sebastian Büttrich urged to have an open discussion at the university on how to obtain this and what kind of university we are. In the light of the discussion at the strategy seminar and the fact of being lower in average numbers compared to other universities, Maria Rørbye Rønn found it necessary to have this measuring goal, but also encouraged management to discuss with faculty how to do this. Vytautas Davidavicius stated that the students should have been involved earlier in the process. The Chairman of the Board replied that this had nothing to do with the present discussion.

About goal 8, the Chairman of the Board noted that the IT University of Copenhagen is doing well, but still a little behind average.

There were no further comments to the measuring goals.

Regarding the strategic goals, Mads Tofte referred to enclosure 5. There were no comments.

The Chairman of the Board rounded the discussion and concluded that enclosure 4 (version 12) is the revised draft that will be sent to the ministry on Monday, 24, 2014.

6. The Budget 2015 (decision)

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to enclosure 6 and the comments on the agenda, especially the necessary made choice between various infrastructure



investments, and answered clarifying questions from board members together with Mads Tofte. Vytautas Davidavicius asked why IT infrastructure investments for 2015 are decreased from 6.2 million DKK to 5.3 million DKK, although it is mentioned as key infrastructure priority for 2015, and Georg Dam Steffensen responded that the IT Department has just been granted 1.3 million DKK. Sebastian Büttrich asked how frequently the IT University of Copenhagen updates its IT infrastructure, and Georg Dam Steffensen answered that it should be upgraded approximately every 3 years.

About "Research Grants", Table 1, the Chairman of the Board stated that the number is the same as in the Development Contract. The number represents steep growth and requires changes. The challenge is to find out what needs to be done and how, and to accept this as challenging. The IT University of Copenhagen must be able to perform as well as the other Danish universities, and a discussion of how to develop is necessary. Per Ladegaard agrees to this opinion.

About Table 4 and "student activities", Georg Dam Steffensen and Mads Tofte answered clarifying questions from Sebastian Büttrich, Vytautas Davidavicius and Gabriele Zeizyte and explained that table 4 does not show all means spent on student related activities. A discussion took place about how executive management has to make necessary choices when having a lot of proposals from departments, student organizations, Infrastructure Group etc., and a limited amount of money. Naturally, it is impossible to comply with every proposal put forward, but if a surplus should appear later in the year, naturally, it will be possible to reconsider previously turned down proposals. On inquiry from Gabriele Zeizyte, Mads Tofte and Georg Dam Steffensen confirmed that Anabib definitely could be one of these. Gabriele Zeizyte and Vytautas Davidavicius requested in the future to have more clearness and transparency for the students of what means have been given and the reasons for it. Annette Stausholm found it positive to have Table 4 in the budget, but not necessary to go into more details. Of course the means given and the reasons for it should be clear to the students. *Vytautas Davidavicius and Gabriele Zeizyte have requested the following rider to the minutes: "Vytautas Davidavicius expressed the frustrations and lack of transparency on funding of student organizations at ITU. Mads Tofte disagreed and explained that student organizations are included in budgeting process at ITU, negotiations proceed in June and decisions are communicated if some activity is not financed. In addition, Executive Management has just granted stupIT to decide to which activities (stupIT grants and Project student secretary) funds be assigned."*

Also Thomas Hildebrandt would like to have more clearness in these matters, and Mads Tofte responded that he is having pre-meetings with the elected members of the board to give the members the opportunity to have clarified any questions they might have to the documents for the meetings. Also, members of the board can always contact him with any further questions. The Chairman of the Board ended the discussion by reminding the board members to distinguish between board matters and executive management work, and by concluding that the budget was approved by the board.



Recommendation:

Executive Management recommends that the Board of Directors approve the budget.

Conclusion:

The Chairman of the Board concluded that with the above mentioned comments on necessary future development regarding research grants, the budget 2015 was approved.

7. Institutional Accreditation (briefing)

Mads Tofte briefly informed that the final report is expected to arrive on Friday, November 28, 2014, and that it will most likely be a conditional positive accreditation. There will be a lot of work to follow. The report will be sent to the board members.

On inquiry from Thomas Hildebrandt, Mads Tofte briefly informed of the reasons for the approval being conditional, and that this in fact was a surprise and a disappointment, because the impression from the meetings had been different.

8. Ministerial Limits on Admission Numbers (briefing)

Mads Tofte referred to the comments on the agenda and had nothing to add.

The Chairman of the Board stated that he found it hard to disagree with the minister that the universities should not educate people to unemployment. On inquiry from Thomas Hildebrandt, the Chairman of the Board was of the opinion that the cooperation between the universities has not been damaged by the process.

Confidential items:

9.

Public items:

10. Questions regarding mail-delivered briefings (briefing)

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

11. Any Other Business

A short briefing on the present rental case was given under item 4.

12. Presentation of Professor Roman Beck

Professor Roman Beck presented himself and his research. He came to the IT University of Copenhagen from Frankfurt ten months ago and has previously been at several other institutions. His work is focusing on the service sector, and he answered clarifying questions from the board members.



The Chairman of the Board thanked Roman Beck for his interesting presentation and ended the meeting – the last board meeting this year - by stating that he will call for an extraordinary board meeting in the beginning of February 2015 (not on a Friday), to discuss external funding, institutional accreditation report and follow-up on the rental case.

Finally, he wished all board members a merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Respectfully submitted,

Gitte Gramstrup
Assistant to the Executive Management