

Executive Management
Direct phone: +45 7218 5072
E-mail: gigr@itu.dk
Journal no.: 2015-1410

October 5, 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) on October 1, 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,

September 17, 2015, at 14:00 – 17:00

Present:

From the Board: Jørgen Lindegaard; Annette Stausholm; Jay David Bolter; Maria Rørbye Rønn; Sebastian Büttrich; Thomas Hildebrandt; Vytautas Davidavicius; and Gabriele Zeizyte (via voice call from Singapore).

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

The minutes taker:

Gitte Gramstrup

Public items:**1. Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting (decision)**

No comments to the minutes from the meeting on April 16, 2015, had been received.

Recommendation:

The Executive Management recommended that the minutes were approved.

Conclusion:

The minutes were formally approved.

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

Mads Tofte referred to the comments on the agenda and added on T2 that there are no signs of an underlying issue and in his opinion no need to worry. The students at the IT University of Copenhagen are actually doing what they are expected to do, according to the study progress reform.

The Chairman of the Board gave a short briefing on his and Mads Tofte's recent meeting with the minister and the topics being discussed.

Sebastian Büttrich mentioned a noted effect of the study progress reform, being that hired student employees – programmers etc. – quit their jobs because the reform does not give them time to both study and work. On inquiry from Thomas Hildebrandt, Mads Tofte informed that there are no other negative effects noted yet.

On inquiry from Vytautas Davidavicius regarding T1, Mads Tofte stated that the number has been changing up and down over the years and that the present number, though preferred to be higher, is not seen as a crisis.

Mads Tofte elaborated on the comments on the agenda on T9; an increase in funding applications has not resulted in more money. The Chairman of the Board supplemented that this goes parallel with the strategy discussion and the need to do something to deal with the expected governmental demands on budget cuts the next four years. Thomas Hildebrandt commented that in his opinion, diversity is a good thing in itself; not everything can be put in money terms and some areas are difficult to get funded. On inquiry from Annette Stausholm, Mads Tofte explained that "move resources" means that areas attracting a lot of external funding will be given the opportunity to grow while the opposite will be the case for areas attracting too little external funding.

3. Half-year Accounts and Prediction for the Result of 2015 (briefing)

Georg Dam Steffensen stated that the results look very good; he referred to the contents of enclosure 3 and answered questions from the board members. On inquiry from Sebastian Büttrich, Georg Dam Steffensen stated that it would be difficult to invest some money on building improvements paying off in the long run, because the building is a rental. Sebastian Büttrich encouraged creative thinking. The Chairman

of the Board added that – with the expected governmental demands on budget cuts – he expects Executive Management to consider a large range of possibilities.

Confidential items:

4.

5.

6.

7.

Public items:

8. Framework Budget 2016-2018 (decision)

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to enclosure 5 and elaborated on a few of the assumptions. If decided on by Parliament, a 2 % budget cut will cost 3 million DKK in 2016 and 12 million DKK in 2017. External funding is not doing as well as expected, and faculty not attracting enough funding will be asked to do more teaching. In this way the VIP/DVIP ratio will be improved and it will be necessary to hire less new teachers.

On inquiry from Vytautas Davidavicius, Georg Dam Steffensen informed that Executive Management awaits the result of the political negotiations in Parliament before a plan is made for the 2 % budget cut. Georg Dam Steffensen also confirmed that a higher number of students would help to solve a budget cut. Vytautas Davidavicius was of the opinion that it would attract more students if the bachelor program in software was in English instead of Danish. Mads Tofte thought that the most important thing in that respect would be to get more female students. Maria Rørbye Rønn agreed and found the timing being right for this – things are changing.

On inquiry from Thomas Hildebrandt regarding faculty and more teaching (how it is supposed to be done?), Georg Dam Steffensen sketched the Department's model for this. The Chairman of the Board stated that this is very much an internal subject and not something for the Board to discuss.

Vytautas Davidavicius informed of a new student organization – "Female Coders".

The Chairman of the Board rounded the discussion and stated that a more specific picture will be ready for the next board meeting in November.

On inquiry from Vytautas Davidavicius, Executive Management confirmed that, based on a meeting, the money spent on student activities will be transparent in the ordinary budget, as in 2015.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Board approves the submitted budget framework and authorizes the Management to prepare the budget proposal for 2016. The final budget proposal for 2016 will be presented to the Board at the board meeting on 19 November, 2015.

Conclusion:

The Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

9. Institutional Accreditation (decision)

Mads Tofte referred to the comments on the agenda and enclosure 6, which is inspired by a format developed by University of Southern Denmark. The background of the document is the demands from the Accreditation Panel. On inquiry from Maria Rørbye Rønn, Mads Tofte briefly informed of the process, including the testing of the policy and the templates in practice, before Executive Management approves the Quality Policy. He clarified questions from the board members and received a few specific comments. Annette Stausholm mentioned the risk of the efforts it takes to maintain a document like this.

Recommendation:

Executive Management recommends that the enclosed Quality Policy is edited using input from the Board, from the Education Group, the Subject Area Teams and the Board of Studies and that the Board of Directors hereby give Executive Management the mandate to approve the resulting Quality Policy.

Conclusion:

The Chairman of the Board concluded that the recommendation was unanimously approved and that Executive Management with the comments received will push forward the work.

10. Rules of Procedure Review (decision)

The Chairman of the Board referred to the comments on the agenda and the recommendation and had no further comments.

Recommendation:

The Executive Management recommends that the Rules of Procedure, decided on and approved at September 19, 2014, are used unchanged.

Conclusion:

The Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

11. The Board's Self-evaluation 2015 (decision)

The Chairman of the Board referred to the comments on the agenda and to enclosure 8 and had no further comments.

Annette Stausholm asked if question 5 and 8 – or the answer possibilities – could be changed; there is a “mismatch” in the present questionnaire. The Chairman of the Board agreed to look into this.

Recommendation:

Based on the Self-Evaluation Questionnaire, the following procedure is recommended:

1/Each member of the Board receives a questionnaire in the end of September 2015. The questionnaire is filled in and returned by e-mail to the Chairman of the Board, e-mail: jli@newmail.dk (with cc to gigr@itu.dk) on Thursday, October 8, 2015, at the latest.

2/With the filled in questionnaire as starting point, the Chairman of the Board has a talk with the members of the Board – separately, if necessary. These talks will be scheduled by agreement with the parties in question.

3/As an item on the agenda at the board meeting on November 19, 2015, the Chairman of the Board will present his observations from the talks with the Board Members and lead a discussion of any identified problems. The item will be confidential and can take place without the presence of the Executive Management.

Conclusion:

With the above mentioned comment on question 5 and 8 in the questionnaire, the Chairman of the Board concluded that the recommendation was unanimously approved by the Board.

12. Questions regarding mail delivered briefings (briefing)

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

13. Any Other Business

Annette Stausholm reminded Executive Management to explain in the comments on the agenda why an item is being confidential (when so the case). Mads Tofte took note of the reminder.

Respectfully submitted,

Gitte Gramstrup
Assistant to the Executive Management