Enclosure 1

Follow-up on the Accreditation Panel's Assessment of ITU

This note is to be presented as feedback to the Group of Managers at a GoM meeting on January 28, 2015, as Managements' suggestion as to which organisational body or role should own the issues listed in the previous version of this document.

The accreditation panel finds that ITU lives up to only one of five criteria which are required in order to obtain institutional accreditation. Consequently, the Accreditation Council has decided to give ITU a "conditionally positive institutional accreditation".

ITU will now have until spring 2016 to improve in the four criteria for which it is not yet up to the accreditation standards.

The purpose of this note is to summarise the Accreditation Panel's Assessment of ITU and to suggest a direction of change intended to bring ITU to full accreditation by 2016.

The suggested direction of change is indicated in terms of a formulation of an overall goal. Once we are decided on goals, we can start developing the actions that are intended to lead to the goals.

We have organised the panel's assessment into nine main areas. Within each area, we summarise the part of the assessment which requires a change of directions and then propose a change of direction in the form of and overall goal.

We will emphasize that for all areas and goals, changes have to ensure that ITU will have an ongoing and systematic solution to the area.

We believe that, apart from the obvious interest ITU has in obtaining institutional accreditation in order to be able to continue operating, reaching the goals stated below will lead to even better study programmes at ITU.

1 Ability to Execute

Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Executive Management

Panel Assessment

1. "Although the goals and procedures in the ITU's quality assurance system cover all programmes and all criteria, it is the panel's assessment that **the institution has not demonstrated effective and systematic ways of following up on identified problems regarding the research base of the programmes, the teaching of a diverse student body and the relevance of the programmes**. The institution has identified the problems and information exists about them, but it is the panel's view that **these problems seem to have existed for many years without the ITU addressing them in an effective and timely manner**." (p. 28)

2. "According to *The Education Strategy*, in 2016, 90% of the courses must have gone through a process that ensures that the structure of the course, the learning activities and the intended

learning outcomes are based on student-centred learning (*The Self-Evaluation Report*, p. 82). The ITU does not have a procedure for how it will implement this goal." (p. 39)

3. When (stretch) goals appear both in the Development Contract and in the Quality Assurance Policy, failure to reach them is seen as a quality deficiency (see p. 17).

Overall Goal (Tentative - pending input from the organisational body that owns the issue)

We must become better at reaching goals stated in our strategy documents and development contracts. Significant problems must not be permitted to persist.

2 Diversity of Student Population

Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Department Management

Panel Assessment

The panel writes:

1. "Indeed the panel found that the institution is trying to deal with and respond to the challenges associated with the diversity in the student population on the MSc programmes. However, there is not yet evidence that the chosen initiatives have addressed the pedagogical aspects of teaching a diverse student body. The challenges of teaching a diverse student body were obviously exacerbated when the ITU introduced its own BSc programmes, but the panel found that challenges have existed ever since the ITU took in the first MSc students. Since the challenges associated with the teaching of a diverse student body are such an embedded and fundamental part of the teaching at the ITU, the panel would like to see an adequate institutionalized strategy and systematic approaches to deal with the pedagogical aspects of teaching a diverse student body. It is the panel's view that choosing appropriate teaching and learning approaches and contexts as well as exploring appropriate student-centered learning strategies, should be in focus during the process to align pedagogics and the diverse student body." (p. 40)

2. "However, the panel found that although the challenges of teaching such a diverse student body have been known since the university introduced its first MSc programmes fifteen years ago, **the university has not yet established an institutionalized strategy, nor has it adopted systematic approaches to the pedagogical aspects of teaching a diverse student body**." (p. 8)

3. "However, as the university is fully aware, the diversity in the student body is also a challenge with regard to the programmes' academic level. The panel found that this is a particular challenge for the MSc programme in Digital Design and Communication." (p. 44)

4. "Despite the seriousness of the challenges already identified, the panel could not see a clear strategy in place with an action plan, processes and procedures showing how the university will implement real student-centred learning approaches in all the courses. The panel would also like to see an institutionalized and systematic approach to how the individual teachers should deal with the pedagogical aspects within the framework of student-centred learning in a diverse student body. For example, the university could systematically gather and exploit teachers' experiences or it could support teachers with pedagogical training on how to handle the diverse student body. The panel also believes that the university could benefit by providing a framework for teachers to exchange experiences in this area. The panel found that an institutional approach to this issue is

particularly important at the ITU with its high level of external lecturers who might not have any previous experience in teaching a diverse student body." (p. 40)

5. "According to *The Education Strategy*, in 2016, 90% of the courses must have gone through a process that ensures that the structure of the course, the learning activities and the intended learning outcomes are based on student-centred learning (*The Self-Evaluation Report*, p. 82). The ITU does not have a procedure for how it will implement this goal." (p. 39)

Overall Goals (Tentative - pending input from the organisational body that owns the issue)

1. ITU has a strategy in place, with an action plan, processes and procedures showing how the university will implement real student-centred learning approaches in all the courses
2. Every teacher learns how to deal with the pedagogical aspects within the framework of student-centred learning in a diverse student body.

3 Research-based Teaching

Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Department Management[1]

Panel Assessment

1. The institution is not ensuring that all programmes have a sufficient research base (p. 8)
2. "It is the panel's assessment that the high use of external lecturers is a challenge to the research base, particularly for the part-time master programmes, but also for the BSc in Software Development and the MSc in Digital Design and Communication." (p. 33, similar on p. 8)
3. Very low VIP/DVIP ratio on many programmes (table 5, p. 31) "According to *The Quarterly Management Information Reports,* the ITU had the lowest ratio between internal lecturers (VIP) and external lecturers (DVIP) among the Danish universities in 2008-2012. Furthermore, the university had the lowest ratio calculated in full-time equivalents in the same period when comparing to technical/scientific programmes across universities. In 2012 the university's ratio was 0.86, which was significantly below the average 7.2 within the technical/scientific field. Further, the ITU also has the lowest VIP/DVIP ratio compared to the average ratios within the humanities, the social sciences and the health sciences (Audit Trail 3, pp. 215-242)." (p. 31)
4. The university lacks ambitious goals, formalised goals for the use of external lecturers on its programmes (p. 8)
5. ITU does not have a clearly defined standard for the ratio between internal and external lecturers. (p. 8, p. 20). Thus it is not clear on which basis the university decides whether the course manning process shows that a programme has deficiencies in the research base (p. 8, p. 20, p. 35).
6. No written analysis and a multi-year plan which is clear about the research profiles of the lecturers it intends to recruit in the coming years. (p. 8, p. 20, p. 33, p. 35)
7. "However the panel found that the course manning in some cases was used to ensure the research base of the programmes (the MSc programme in Digital Innovation and Management) while in other cases it was not (the Master of IT in Leadership and Management). Because of this it is the panel's assessment that the course manning is not systematically used to ensure the research base of the programmes." (p. 35)

---

[1] Remember that there is a dependency concerning (a) how one defines VIP/DVIP ratio and (b) the manning sanity check and the budget process

8. "It is the panel's view that the course manning process requires a close collaboration between the Head of Department and the Heads of Programme to ensure the research base of the individual programmes." (p. 34)
9. "Despite these measures, because of the serious nature of this issue [i.e., the VIP/DVIP ratio], the panel felt that the university could do more in order to reach the goal before 2016." (p. 33)

Overall Goal (Tentative - pending input from the organisational body that owns the issue)
We need to agree on one definition of VIP/DVIP ratio and all use the same definition. We need to plan the increase in VIP/DVIP ratio and achieve rapid progress towards a well-defined target ratio.

4 Programme Relevance and Employment
Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Heads of Study Programme (but requires change management led by Executive Management)

Panel Assessment
1. Lack of procedures on how to include external stakeholders in the development of new study programmes (p. 51).
2. "ITU needs more effective and systematic ways of following up on employment issues, when they become evident." (p. 21, p. 55)
3. "It is the panel's overall impression that, on an ongoing and systematic basis, the ITU quality assures programmes' relevance, but the panel also finds that part of the quality assurance system is not performed in an efficient way. " (p. 55)
4. Two programmes have high unemployment: Games and DDK (p. 8).
5. The individual programmes do not get feedback from the Employer's Panel on an ongoing and regular basis (p. 8). Several years can pass between discussions of individual programmes in the Employers' Panel. (p. 8)
6. "The [self-evaluation] report [concerning DDK] neither contains examples of initiatives the ITU has taken in order to deal with the employment rates, nor does it contain a plan for what the university will do in the future." (p. 54)
7. "The panel found it positive that the university has identified the unemployment problems for the MSc programme in Games and the MSc programme in Digital Design and Communication and reacted to resolve these as soon as they knew about them. However it is the panel's view that a well-functioning quality assurance system would have identified high unemployment on these programmes before 2013 (e.g. from its graduate surveys and dialogue with potential employers)." (p. 54, p. 55)
8. "The panel noted that the working group focusing on the MSc programme in Games consisted of personnel from inside the ITU and employers or graduates from the programme were not a part of the project. It is the panel's view that feedback from employers and graduates could contribute positively to the output of such a project which aims at increasing the programme's employment rate." (p.54)
9. "Furthermore, the panel noted that the ITU has different ways of analysing and handling the problems, which makes it difficult for the panel to see how the ITU will systematically address problems that may arise in the future." (p. 55)

Enclosure 1

- Must reduce unemployment of graduates (i.e., of those who graduated at most six months ago), especially at the DDK and the Games programmes

5 Employers' Panel

Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Executive Management (requires re-thinking of purpose of panel and its relationship to the emerging Key Account Manager structure).

Panel Assessment

1. "The panel's overall concern regarding the involvement of the Employers' Panel is mainly the low frequency between the rounds of feedback for individual programmes. According to the documentation, it is the panel's analysis that there can be up to six years between separate rounds of programme feedback on objectives, content and results from the Employers' Panel, and the panel found that unfortunately the university fails to fulfil the requirement for continual and systematic dialogue on programmes. " (p. 55)

2. "The panel was concerned about the long intervals between the feed-back from the Employers' Panel on the individual programmes. According to the minutes from all the meetings of the Employers' Panel 2012-2013 and the *Plan for Programme Evaluations,* two out of the four MSc programmes have not received systematic feedback from 2012 until now, and **there are 3-6 years between each round of feed-back**. The panel found the long intervals especially critical when it comes to the two MSc programmes with high unemployment rates. In connection to this, the panel noticed that one of the conclusions in the ITU's self-evaluation report on the MSc programme in Digital Design and Communication from June 2014 says that **there is currently no systematic dialogue with industry on the programme** (*Additional Documentation*, p. 204). The panel found that **this is the reality for other MSc programmes**, and that the long intervals between the feed-back are a **deficiency** in the quality assurance system regarding assurance of the programmes' relevance." (p. 51) my emphasis.

3. "Given that different members of the Employers' Panel attend meetings, and the full Employers' Panel is rarely gathered, this means that the oral feedback is given to different members than those present at the initial meeting at which the recommendations were given." (p. 48)

4. "However, the panel also found that since all the members of the Employers' Panel seldom, if ever, are gathered, and the programmes get feedback from 2-7 members with specialist knowledge of the 11 individual programmes, the consequence is that the Employers' Panel functions as several small panels and not one. As only a few members are invited to each meeting, the feed-back becomes fragile, with emphasis on apologies and one-sided feedback. The organisation also means that the continuity in the Employers' Panel might be weak, as not the same members attend each meeting." (p. 49)

5. "It is the panel's view that the university especially uses the Employers' Panel's feed-back in relation to extensive development projects. The development of the MSc programme in E-Business and the revision of the MSc in Software Development and Technology involved the Employers' Panel. However, the panel failed to see how the feedback from the Employers' Panel contributes to all the university's study programmes." (p. 50)

6. "The panel acknowledges that the management prioritize participating in the meetings of the Employers' Panel, **but it was difficult for the panel to see how the feedback is disseminated to the rest of the staff**. In addition, the panel recognises that according to some members of the Employers' Panel, the university could benefit more from the dialogue with external stakeholders." (p. 50), my emphasis.

7. Programmes do not get feedback from the Employers' Panel on an ongoing and regular basis. (p. 8)

8. "The ITU prepares minutes from meetings of the Employers' Panel, and according *to The Terms of Reference for the Employers' Panel* the university prepares a status report on the benefits of the work of the Employers' Panel. However, the follow up method with a status report every second year has not yet been implemented as part of the Employers' Panel meeting process." (p. 48)

Overall Goal(s) (Tentative - pending input from the organisational body that owns the issue)

Devise and implement an alternative form of employers' panel(s) which gives much more direct dialogue and has much more frequent and direct impact on the study programmes than is the case currently. The new design must both increase key employer's and stakeholders' knowledge of ITU's study programmes and result in changes in those study programmes that increase the employability of graduates.

6 Student Evaluations

Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Head of Studies (Kasper)

Panel Assessment

1. Student evaluation of other learning activities than courses (i.e., projects and thesis) is missing (p. 9)

2. Students do not evaluate entire programmes (p. 9)

Overall Goal(s)

Courses, projects (including thesis projects and final projects) and entire programmes must be evaluated regularly by students.

7 Organisation of Quality Assurance Work

Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Executive Management (need for re-design of organisational responsibilities)

Panel Assessment

1. "ITU has a complex organisation with many institutional levels for a relatively small institution." (p. 23)

2. "The subject area teams are situated below the Board of Studies and they do not make any formal decisions regarding the programmes (*The Self-Evaluation Report,* p. 40)." (p. 23)

3. Heads of Programmes do not have formal responsibility for the programmes (p. 23)

4. Absenteeism among student representatives in permanent representative bodies (p. 25). "It is the panel's view that the ITU could gain significantly from encouraging the students to engage actively in the permanent representative bodies, and hence make sure that student views and proposals

are channelled into the discussions about the institution's quality work and strategy in a continuous, systematic manner." (p. 27)

5. It is both a strength and a weakness that so much of the quality assurance is anchored at one person (the Head of Studies). (p. 24)
6. Risk that the Head of Studies has too much on his shoulders for one person, which makes the system vulnerable (p. 9)
7. Head of Studies being so central involves a risk of information not being spread and discussed in the organisation (p. 24).
8. "The panel found good examples of a well-functioning bottom-up quality culture on some programmes. Thus it is the panel's view that many problems are discussed and dealt with locally. However, it is the panel's assessment that the ITU could benefit from a more systematic and institutionalized approach to quality assurance which can support and further develop the bottom-up quality culture." (p. 9) "the ITU lacks to some extent a systematic and institutional-ised approach to quality assurance, which can support and further develop the bot-tom-up quality culture." (p. 28)

Overall Goal(s) (Tentative - pending input from the organisational body that owns the issue)
The quality assurance can be characterised as a strong bottom-up quality culture, where quality assurance is systematic and ongoing and achieves the goals defined in the strategy documents of the university.[2]

8 Information Flow and Reporting
Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: University Director (in the future, the administration has two important new categories of clients: section heads and heads of study programmes)

Panel Assessment
1. "ITU has not yet established a system of management information for use among Heads of Programme. *The Quarterly Management Information Reports* are distributed to different management levels in the organisation, but so far they have primarily been used by the Vice Chancellor and the Head of Studies to identify problems." (p. 26)
2. "The panel found that the fact that the ITU has not yet established a system of management information for Heads of Programme means that **the Heads of Programme do not connect directly to the overall strategies and goals addressed in *The Quarterly Management Information Reports*.** Making the management information an integrated part of *The Head of Programme Reports* could possibly promote the desired bottom-up drive for quality development because the Heads of Programme would identify problems bottom-up instead of the Vice Chancellor identifying the problems top-down. " (p. 27)
3. The Head of Programme Reports are focused on individual courses and not on the programme as such (p. 25)

---

[2] Keep in mind Criterion II: Quality management and organisation. Quality assurance is anchored at management level and is organized and performed in such a way as to promote development and the maintenance of an inclusive quality culture that supports and furthers the quality and relevance of programmes. Details: Quality assurance must be performed in pursuance of the institution's quality assurance policy and strategy and must:
- include all management levels and relevant institutional levels and be based on a clear division of responsibility and labour, […]

4. "The Head of Programme Reports contain no information about key figures, feedback from Employers Panel Meetings, graduate surveys, external examiners' reports or key figures." (p. 25)
5. "The panel further found that *The Head of Programme Reports* are primarily a tool for follow-up on course evaluations and exam results. This means that the reports are focused on individual courses and not on the programmes as such." (p. 25)
6. "It is the panel's view that the different sources of information about the programmes are discussed separately and not as part of ongoing monitoring of the entire programmes. This means that discussions of the programmes' levels and content are not linked to discussions about the re-search base or the relevance of the programmes." (p. 26) "Although the panel understands that it is the same group of people in the Board of Studies and the Subject Area Teams who discuss the separate parts of information, the panel believes that the institution could benefit from connecting these sources of information and discussing them with regard to entire individual programmes." (p. 26)
7. "The feedback from Employers' Panel is not discussed in the Boards of Studies, the Subject Area Teams or in the Head of Programme Reports." (p. 25)
8. Management could pick up good bottom-up initiatives and make sure that the institution disseminates these ideas (p. 27)
9. "The panel was critical of the fact that there is no goal for dropout rates from MSc programmes in the reports". (p. 18)

Overall Goal(s) (Tentative - pending input from the organisational body that owns the issue)
ITU has one single coherent and straight-forward reporting system which for all study programmes gives a true picture of the status of the study programme and the status of changes to the study programme and supports action in a bottom-up manner.

9 External Evaluation of Programmes
Organisational body or role where this issue must be owned: Education Group (= quality organisation)

Panel Assessment
1. "The [self-evaluation] report [concerning DDK] neither contains examples of initiatives the ITU has taken in order to deal with the employment rates, nor does it contain a plan for what the university will do in the future." (p. 54)
2. "The research base of the programme is not always a part of the reviews (cf. Criterion IV)." (p. 25, p.43)
3. Programme evaluation: the university has not specified which competences the experts are to possess (p. 42).
4. "The panel acknowledged the development there is between the self-evaluation reports on the BSc in Global Business Informatics and the MSc in Digital Design and Communication. However, the panel found that the university could benefit well from elaborating the *Concept for Re-view of ITU Study Programmes by External Experts* in order to ensure more systematic and transparent procedures for the re-views. For instance, the programmes' research base should be a systematic part of the reviews." (p. 44)

5. Programme evaluation: concept described in a very "open" way and does not, for example, include a procedure on how to conduct the evaluation or requirements that employability and research base should be evaluated (p. 43).

Overall Goal(s) (Tentative - pending input from the organisational body that owns the issue)
The external evaluations give a true and fair picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the study programmes on a well-defined set of quality dimensions.