



Management

Direct phone: +45 7218 5072

E-mail: gigr@itu.dk

Journal no.: 2011-021-0018

13 December 2011

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 9th 2011, 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 Available Public 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 **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 on 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 25th, 2011, at 15:00 – 17:00

Present:

From the Board: Jørgen Lindegaard, Per Ladegaard, Annette Stausholm Nielsen, Jay Bolter, Joseph Kiniry, Sebastian Büttrich, Kasper Videbæk Nielsen and Anders Bech Mellson.

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

Others: Jens Christian Godskesen (during item 8).

Regrets: Lisbeth Zornig Andersen



The minutes taker: Gitte Gramstrup

Public items:

1. The Board´s constitution (decision)

Chairman of the Board Mogens Munk-Rasmussen left the Board at the end of September, when he turned 70, and Jay Bolter took over his place on October 1th. Deputy Chairman of the Board Jørgen Lindegaard welcomed the new members to the first IT University Board Meeting conducted in English, and the Board had an introduction round.

Conclusion:

The Board constituted itself with Deputy Chairman of the Board Jørgen Lindegaard as new Chairman of the Board. Enclosure 1 was unanimously approved as press release. Based on the Board´s self-evaluation 2011, the Chairman of the Board noted that, for the time being, there is no need for a Deputy Chairman of the Board.

2. Approval of minutes (decision)

No comments to the minutes dated October 3th, 2011, from the meeting on September 16th, 2011 had been received.

Recommendation:

The Management recommended that the minutes dated October 3th, 2011, were approved.

Conclusion:

The minutes were formally approved.

3. Regulations of the IT University of Copenhagen (decision)

Mads Tofte referred to enclosure 2 and informed of the most important changes: The appointment of external members is going to be done by a combination of a nomination body ("indstillingsorgan") and an appointment body ("udpegningsorgan"), see § 7 and appendix 1 ("tillæg 1") to the regulations, and these two bodies cannot be identical. The Management proposes that the nomination body is made up by the Chairman of the Board, one other member of the Board, a person appointed by the Employers´ Panel, and a person appointed by Academic Council. The Management further proposes that the Board is the appointment body. This will need approval from the Ministry together with the rest of the regulations.

On inquiry from Annette Stausholm Nielsen, Mads Tofte confirmed that the appointment body according to the rules can reject the list from the nomination body and ask for a new one. Annette Stausholm Nielsen found it important to ensure that the Board will consist of not only men, but also women, and suggested this being written into the regulations. There was an agreement in the Board that a wish for diversity should be stated and written in the regulations;



Annette Stausholm Nielsen suggested to ensure "not only men on the Board". Mads Tofte confirmed that the Management gladly will write diversity into the regulations.

Mads Tofte proposed that the job title of Georg Dam Steffensen is changed from Head of Administration to University Director when the regulations have been approved by the Ministry. With this change, Georg Dam Steffensen will get the same title as his equals at the other seven universities in Denmark. The change has no salary consequences. The Board agreed on the suggested change.

Kasper Videbæk Nielsen referred to a previous discussion on student members of the board being elected for alternating two year periods instead of synchronized one year periods. The Board agreed to put this (student members being elected for alternating two year periods) into the regulations.

Annette Stausholm Nielsen would like to have a short paragraph in § 10 about what is a confidential item. Mads Tofte stated that the Management, instead of putting this into the regulations, suggested to put it into the rules of procedure. Jørgen Lindegaard added that, hopefully, for the most of the items on the agenda for the Board Meetings will be available to the public, but sometimes there can be exceptions to this.

Annette Stausholm Nielsen proposed a change in the wording of the first sentence in § 30. Mads Tofte informed that this paragraph, in fact, is historical, and suggested to delete the whole paragraph. The Board agreed to this.

Recommendation:

The Management recommended that the Board approved the regulations presented, including the changes discussed at the meeting. Subsequently, the regulations will be delivered to the Ministry for approval. When the regulations have been approved by the Ministry, Georg Dam Steffensen changes title to University Director ("universitetsdirektør").

Conclusion:

The regulations presented were approved with the following changes:

- *In § 7, subsection 1, it is stated that the appointed Board Members should reflect diversity and cannot be of one gender only (aiming at diversity).*
- *In § 7, subsection 4, the election period of the two student members is changed to alternating 2 year periods (instead of 1).*
- *§ 30 will be deleted.*
- *In the Rules of Procedure is put a requirement that confidential information must be accompanied with an explanation of why it is confidential.*

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

Mads Tofte referred to the contents of enclosure 3 and 4 and the comments on the agenda. There is a high degree of goal satisfaction, especially it is quite nice that more students than planned have been admitted (R1 and R2), and the external research funding (R14) exceeds targets.



Concerning R5 in enclosure 3 Mads Tofte informed that the Management has set in motion activities to attract more part time students. Due to the financial crisis, this is difficult, but the university is trying all the same.

Joseph Kiniry pointed out a discrepancy in T33/R20, which was noted by Mads Tofte.

On inquiry from Annette Stausholm Nielsen, Mads Tofte elaborated on T46 in enclosure 4. At present nobody knows if it possible to use the cloud computing for the university's mail and calendar services. We are still in the process of finding out what is possible within the law. If necessary, a plan B will be activated.

Sebastian Büttrich, IT Department, added that a decision is expected within the next couple of weeks. The cloud and a plan B are two different solutions.

Joseph Kiniry stated that this is on the top 3 items on the agenda among staff concerns and therefore important.

Concerning T47, enclosure 4, Annette Stausholm Nielsen would like the IT University to have a plan. Mads Tofte informed that the university knows what needs to be done, but the difficult part is to execute the plan (to get the staff needed for it). Management is committed to changing the VIP/DVIP ratio on part time education as detailed in the education strategy.

Conclusion:

With the above-mentioned comments the Board took note of the presented follow-up on strategic and result goals.

5. The accounting of third quarter and the prediction of the result of the year, 2011 (briefing)

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to enclosure 5 and the expected result by the end of the year to be 0.2 million DKK, which is quite different from what was expected in November 2010, mainly due to greater-than-budgeted increases in education and a number of one-time incomes. The expected equity will be about 16 % of turnover.

Previous it has been discussed how to place the money of the IT University, and Georg Dam Steffensen informed of an obtained suggestion from the the bank. Per Ladegaard stated the importance of not taking any risks, and the Management agreed in the importance of investing safely and carefully.

On inquiry from Annette Stausholm Nielsen, Georg Dam Steffensen briefly told about the reactions from the staff on the new – and better – financial result, and Joe Kiniry recommended to use small visible changes to convince and show the staff that things are actually going well.

Conclusion:

The Board took note of the information without further comments.



6. Strategy 2012-2016 (discussion)

Jørgen Lindegaard referred to the on-going process.

Mads Tofte referred to the contents of enclosure 6, 7, 8 and 9, and the Management's recommendation: That internal hearings of the overarching strategy are conducted from December 2011 up to and including March 2012, in parallel with discussions about a development contract with the ministry, leading to the decision of a new strategy for the IT University at the Board meeting on April 20th, 2012. The strategies were discussed at the HSISU-meeting on November 24th.

The Board agreed on the process without further comments.

Concerning enclosure 6 – the overarching strategy: Mads Tofte pointed out the big items (ambitious growth in external research funding combined with a growth in the volume of teaching and all happening without a growth in the administrative staff. Besides is the whole discussion on developing 1-3 strategic areas.

Jørgen Lindegaard agreed that the Board cannot take the final decision until the internal discussions are finished. These are going forward as planned.

Anders Bech Mellson was wondering if the administrative staff can cope with the planned growth in studies and funding and – if not – a backup plan might be necessary? Georg Dam Steffensen informed that up till now we have managed, and that money has been put in the budget to improve different kinds of aid (technical etc.) to comply with the challenges ahead. Mads Tofte added that it was always the plan that the administration should grow before the faculty, which it did.

Joseph Kiniry found the goals ambitious and wondered about number 1, page 3. Jørgen Staunstrup informed that the university do yearly benchmarking and wants to be in the middle of the field of best universities.

Sebastian Büttrich encouraged the Management to keep an eye on the good stories and communicate these.

On inquiry from Annette Stausholm Nielsen about goal number 6, page 3, Georg Dam Steffensen informed that the university hopes to negotiate money to admit 22 PhD's per year and not only 11 as in the budget.

Per Ladegaard found it important to phrase something more about global interaction in the strategy; Mads Tofte and Jørgen Staunstrup will do so.

Jay Bolter would like to stay informed on the internal process before the final decision on the Board Meeting in April 2012, and Jørgen Lindegaard rounded the discussion and noted that it will be considered how to inform the Board along the way before the final decision on this ambitious strategy.



Concerning enclosure 7 – research strategy: Jørgen Staunstrup informed that input has been given from faculty. A final version will be made after input today from the Board.

Per Ladegaard recommended having strategic goals in the education strategy and the communication strategy as well, and to add a few lines on the global part.

Annette Stausholm Nielsen liked the strategy a lot, especially the part about ethics.

On inquiry from Jay Bolter, Jørgen Staunstrup and Mads Tofte elaborated on how the strategic areas are expected to emerge. The idea is to make it possible for faculty to join forces and aim for the building of a new strategic area. The strategy only defines the criteria, not the research areas. Joseph Kiniry stated that faculty is happy with this. The influence given has engaged and calmed down people.

Concerning enclosure 8 – education strategy: On inquiry from Jørgen Lindegaard, Mads Tofte confirmed that Per Ladegaard's recommendation on adding strategic goals in the strategy will be carried out.

Concerning enclosure 9 – communication strategy: On inquiry from Jørgen Lindegaard, Mads Tofte confirmed that Per Ladegaard's recommendation on adding strategic goals in the strategy will be followed.

Annette Stausholm Nielsen saw a mismatch in the master brand in the strategy and the values in the overall strategy. Sebastian Büttrich informed having heard the same thing from others. It was agreed that Mads Tofte takes steps to make contact between Annette and the Head of Communication to discuss this issue. Annette Stausholm Nielsen also had some views on sponsorships and the importance of carefulness in this matter.

Jørgen Lindegaard rounded the strategy discussion and encouraged the Management to consider the input from the Board. The Management will arrange that a booklet with all the strategies is produced, once they are final.

7. The budget 2012 (decision)

Georg Dam Steffensen referred to the contents of enclosure 10 and the Management's recommendation and answered questions from Joseph Kiniry on table 1 and 7. On inquiry from Annette Stausholm Nielsen, concerning table 4, it was decided to delete the first line ("Master of HealthcareIT").

Recommendation:

The Management recommended that the Board approved the budget presented for 2012 and accepted the projected development in the University's equity.



Conclusion:

The budget was approved without further comments.

8. Organisational changes (briefing)

Head of Department Jens Christian Godskesen visited the Board Meeting and gave a briefing motivating why the re-organisation of the department has been set in motion, and describing when he expects it to be completed.

On inquiry from Jørgen Lindegaard, Mads Tofte stated that this is not an easy, but an important change to carry through.

Conclusion:

Jørgen Lindegaard thanked Jens Christian Godskesen for the briefing and asked the Management to inform the Board of the final result.

9. Language Policy (briefing)

Jørgen Lindegaard informed that this is an issue that has been discussed a lot at the IT University.

Joseph Kiniry gave his expressions of the matter – including his fear that some of the faculty will leave the IT University because they do not want to spend the time necessary on learning Danish. A softening of the policy would be better for moral and view.

Annette Stausholm Nielsen asked if it is necessary for non-Danish-speaking faculty to learn some Danish. Mads Tofte referred to and elaborated on the comments on the agenda with concrete examples. Jørgen Staunstrup added that the document is a deliberate choice to live up to the mission of the IT University and is carefully worded on roles; there is no demand of fluency or passing specific tests.

Sebastian Büttrich found the substance convincing, but perhaps the implementation could be softened.

Jay Bolter stated that he could not imagine living in a country for years without trying to learn the language and found it a reasonable burden.

Conclusion:

Jørgen Lindegaard rounded the discussion by stating that he has been convinced by the Management that this is the necessary and right language policy to have. Management will have to lead a suitable implementation process. The policy has been discussed carefully at the IT University, and the Chairman of the Board would like the joined Board to approve. There were no objections to this.



Confidential items:

10. The Board´s self-evaluation 2011(briefing)

Jørgen Lindegaard concluded, as a result from the Board´s self-evaluation this year, that there is a desire for more strategic discussions and time for some special topics on the agenda along the way. He will discuss this with Mads Tofte. Some of the Members of the Board have expressed a desire for longer meetings (½-1 hour longer than now).

Conclusion:

The Board agreed that Friday still is the right day of the week to have the Board Meetings, but decided to extend the meetings with one hour. Thus, future Board Meetings will start at 14:00 (instead of 15:00). The Board Members will receive a new "Plan for Tasks of the Management, Board Meetings etc, 2012". Note that the dates of the meetings are unchanged!

Public items:

11. Questions regarding mail delivered briefings (briefing)

The Chairman of the Board noted that there were no questions concerning the sent out briefing.

Conclusion:

The Chairman concluded that there were no questions concerning the previous sent out briefing.

X. Any Other Business

At the end, the Chairman of the Board thanked for the meeting and expressed his hope of being able to contribute to a good process to make the right decisions.

Respectfully submitted,

Gitte Gramstrup
Assistant to the Management