



Executive Management  
Direct phone: +45 7218 5072  
E-mail: [gigr@itu.dk](mailto:gigr@itu.dk)  
Journal no.: 2015-021-0008

30 April 2015

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](mailto:journalen@itu.dk)) on April 29, 2015, at 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, April 16, 2015, at 14:00 – 17:00
--

### Present:

From the Board: Jørgen Lindegaard, Jay David Bolter, Maria Rørbye Rønn, Sebastian Büttrich, Thomas Hildebrandt, Vytautas Davidavicius and Gabriele Zeizyte.

From the Executive Management: Mads Tofte and Georg Dam Steffensen

From Ernst & Young: Peter Gath

From Auditor General (Rigsrevisionen): Yvan Pedersen and Tina Møllerup Laigaard



Regrets: Annette Stausholm and Per Ladegaard

The minutes taker:

Gitte Gramstrup

The Chairman of the Board welcomed Peter Gath from Ernst & Young and Yvan Pedersen and Tina Mollerup Laigaard from the Auditor General, who participated during item 2 on the agenda. Also, he informed of regrets from the board members Annette Stausholm and Per Ladegaard.

## **Public items:**

### **1.Approval of minutes from the previous meeting (decision)**

No comments to the minutes (dated February 23, 2015) from the extraordinary meeting on February 4, 2015, had been received.

#### ***Recommendation:***

*The Executive Management recommended that the minutes be approved.*

#### ***Conclusion:***

*The minutes were formally approved.*

### **2. Annual Report 2014 (decision)**

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to the enclosures 1a and 1b and gave a short briefing on the main results, of which a lot is good: A lot of graduates and new PhD students; growth in income; and the establishment of ITU Business Development A/S, which is an exciting step. The equity is about 18% of the turnover and satisfies the Board's demands. All in all things are looking well.

Mads Tofte elaborated on T1 – follow-up on target performance for 2012-2014, page 48 - in the Annual Report. The bachelor drop-out has been pre-dominant on one programme (DMD). The university has contacted all the students who dropped out and asked them why they dropped out. It turned out, that a significant part of the drop-out on the DMD programme was due to students being surprised by the amount of theory on the courses. The marketing information on the programme has therefore now been changed to make it more clear to the applicants what to expect. On inquiry from Gabriele Zeizyte regarding students being part of the changed programme information, Mads Tofte could not add further information. Regarding T4, Mads Tofte clarified a question from Vytautas Davidavicius.



The Chairman of the Board found the only worrying point to be the external funding, which will be discussed again. There were no further comments or questions from the board members.

Peter Gath, Ernst & Young, referred to the enclosures 2a and 2b and thanked the parties involved for a good process, cooperation and an open dialogue and gave his brief comments. Things have been performed as planned. About 4.1 he drew the attention to a mistake in the English version in line 1: The right number is DKK 213.3 million (and not 21.3).

The auditors have not registered any kind of fraud, and asked by Peter Gath, the Board stated not to have any knowledge of fraud.

Yvan Pedersen, Auditor General, referred to enclosure 3 and the university's situation being well founded. However, the reporting of two of the three targets not totally full-filled, should be improved. Mads Tofte replied that this was accepted and being a timing issue (request received after the annual report had been sent for printing).

Tina Mollerup Laigaard, Auditor General, pointed the importance of the comment on 4.2.1 (enclosure 3, point 10), and thanked for a very satisfying cooperation with the parties involved. Finally, she informed of an upcoming major study report by the Auditor General on procurement in some institutions, which might interest the Board (although the IT University of Copenhagen is not part of the investigation).

The Chairman of the Board concluded that the parties involved once again can be pleased with the report, the cooperation and open dialogue and thanked Ernst & Young and the Auditor General.

***Recommendation:***

*The Executive Management recommended that the Annual Report 2014 be approved by the Board.*

***Conclusion:***

*The Annual Report 2014 (enclosure 1) was unanimously approved and signed by the Board members present (absent members will sign subsequently).*

**3. Fulfilment of goals and accounting figures for 2014 (discussion)**

Mads Tofte referred to enclosure 4 and had no further comments.

There were no comments or questions from the board members.

**4. Institutional Accreditation – a status (briefing)**

Mads Tofte referred to the comments on the agenda and sketched the process and things done up till now. Issue 2 (Diversity of Student Population) and 4



(Programme Relevance and Employment) are being addressed through close dialogue with the Head of Studies and the heads of study programmes.

Finally, Mads Tofte clarified questions from the board members on process, timing and procedure. Gabriele Zeizyte stated the importance of communicating to the students at once, when the Accreditation Panel is coming back next year, and to give information about what is going on and why. Mads Tofte agreed that this is important.

The Board took note of the briefing without any further comments.

#### **Confidential items:**

5.

6.

7.

8.

#### **Public items:**

#### **9. Appointments for the Board (decision)**

The Chairman of the Board referred to the comments on the agenda. The timetable is made in consideration of the strategy seminar on June 10, 2015.

Vytautas Davidavicius had no comments to the composition of the Recommendation Organ, but would like the process to be more democratic in the sense that everybody should be heard – all representatives. In his opinion, the process could be improved.

There was a discussion and exchange of opinions. Maria Rørbye Rønn reminded the Board members that the Board is one organ; the members should not think of themselves all the time as representatives, but as one joint organ.

The Chairman of the Board stated that the process is according to the rules and that everyone has the opportunity to propose candidates to be external board members when these are advertised for through the IT University of Copenhagen's internet page and a major Danish newspaper. The Board has no other interest than to find and appoint the best possible external members, and we hope to receive proposals for good and qualified candidates.

#### **Recommendation:**

*The Executive Management recommended that the Board at the meeting on April 16 appoint a Recommendation Organ consisting of the Chairman of the Board,*



*board member Annette Stausholm, Kristine Stenhuus, Employers' Panel, and Laura Watts, Academic Council.*

#### *Timetable*

*15/6 – 30/6: The Recommendation Organ advertises through the IT University of Copenhagen's internet page and a major Danish newspaper for proposals for candidates to be external board members. At the same time, any re-nominated candidate is briefly introduced.*

*1/7 – 15/8: The Recommendation Organ forms its list of recommended candidates to the Appointment Organ and sends the list to the board's secretary.*

*17/9: At the Board Meeting, the Appointment Organ (= the present board) appoints the two new - or re-nominated - external board members. The Recommendation Organ's list forms part (confidential) of the material for the meeting.*

#### **Conclusion:**

*With the above-mentioned comments, the Board approved the recommended plan and timetable.*

### **10. Questions regarding mail-delivered briefings (briefing)**

There had been no mail-delivered briefings since the previous board meeting.

### **X. Any Other Business**

On inquiry from Vytautas Davidavicius, Georg Dam Steffensen gave a brief status on the present rental case.

Vytautas Davidavicius also asked about the result of the semester, and Georg Dam Steffensen informed that this was according to the budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Gitte Gramstrup  
Assistant to the Executive Management