

**Minutes of the
Extraordinary ACADEMIC SENATE meeting
Wednesday, 10 January 2007, 12.00-14.00**

Present: Yehuda Elkana (chair), Elissa Helms, Janos Kis, Laszlo Kontler, Zdenek Kudrna, Liviu Matei (*ex-officio, non-voting*), Michael Laurence Miller, Uku Lember, Howard Robinson, Roderick Martin, Robert Sata

Not present: Julius Horvath, Laszlo Matyas, Ahaoma Okoro, Tibor Varady

Invited: Beatrice Fromm, Gabor Klaniczay, Bela Greskovits

Minutes: Andrea Csele

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

2. Approval of validators

Zdenek Kudrna and Roderick Martin volunteered to validate the minutes.

3. Introduction of new senate members

The membership of the new Senate has already been communicated to CEU faculty and staff already in December 2006 following the Senate elections taken place between December 11-15. The new senate members introduced themselves.

4. Appeal of IRES Department regarding a decision of the University Doctoral Committee

Bela Greskovits, Head of the IRES Department made a short statement about the appeal of IRES Department which was submitted to the Senate. He stated that the University Doctoral Committee (UDC) reversed a decision of the Departmental Doctoral Committee without formally consulting this Departmental Committee or the IRES Department. He found that this procedure couldn't be accepted. In addition to the procedural aspect, he also expressed concern that the UDC took a decision invoking professional matters which should normally be within the purview of the departments. Not only that the UDC does not have the mandate to decide on professional matters but doing so undermines the authority of the departments. On these grounds, he requested to annul the decision of the UDC. He expressed no opposition to the idea of re-starting the whole procedure – provided that clear procedural rules would prevent to avoid the former errors. Gabor Klaniczay, as a member of the UDC recognized that even without formal regulations about how to proceed, the UDC should have invited a member of the IRES Department but the UDC somewhat took it for granted that the presence of Professor Nicole Lindstrom (a member of the UDC and IRES faculty) would be sufficient. He agreed with Professor Tibor Varady's letter, which had been sent to all Senate members, that regulations should be rewritten in order to rectify the incompleteness of the existing regulations. In his letter, Professor Varady stated that it should be made clear in the regulations that the UDC cannot render a decision upon appeal against the decision of the

doctoral committee of a department without giving an opportunity to the doctoral committee of the department to state its case.

At Zdenek Kudrna's question whether the student received any formal answer to his appeal, Liviu Matei said that Mr. Haiduk received no answer as far as he knows but it is important that after the Senate meeting, he should receive a formal answer from the Student Record Office regarding his status.

Janos Kis proposed that given the absence of the chair of UDC, Pro-Rector Laszlo Matyas, the decision of the UDC should be suspended and until the Pro-Rector comes back the student is given a provisional extension/enrollment. ***With one abstention, the Senate members endorsed the proposal made by Professor Janos Kis. The Rector was requested to grant the student concerned conditional re-enrollment until a final decision is taken. It was clarified that conditional re-enrollment means that the student will receive his stipend but will not take part in the normal PhD program and will not benefit of supervision.***

The Rector proposed to amend the University Doctoral Regulations with two new provisions, suggested in Tibor Varady's letter:

1) *According to the legal principle of "audiatur et altera pars" the UDC will be required to hear in full and in person both sides before it reaches a ruling.*

2) *Once the UDC has reached a decision, if it is contrary to the recommendation of the doctoral committee of the department concerned, it will send it back to the departmental committee for reconsideration of its previous recommendation, before the ruling of the UDC becomes final and effective.*

The Senate members unanimously endorsed the proposal.

5. Appointment of the new standing committees of the Senate

Liviu Matei explained to the Senate members that the new standing committees are appointed by the Senate and they report to the Senate. Their mandate is briefly outlined in each case. The suggested members of these committees were asked whether they would accept to serve on these committees and with one exception, all members agreed.

The Senate unanimously endorsed the membership and name of the committees listed with the following modifications:

- ***Grievance Committee- in addition to the members already listed, Robert Sata was also appointed as member.***
- ***Academic Travel Grants Committee- name was changed to Academic Travel and Conference Grants Committee***
- ***Senate Committee for CEU Honorary Degrees – decision about membership will be made in the next Senate meeting***
- ***"Egyetemi Docens" Application Evaluation Committee- Ferenc Huoranszki to replace Janos Kis.***
- ***"Egyetemi Tanar" Applications Evaluation Committee – since Andras Sajo did not accept the membership, it will be decided whether somebody else replaces him or not***

6. Other business

The Rector informed the Senate members about the upcoming meetings he would have with the departments regarding the departments' position on how to seek to achieve a "critical mass". He also drew the attention to the fact that the number of student applications to CEU is declining for which the reasons are the following: a) students do not feel that they have enough scope of studying at CEU and b) the image of CEU the students receive through the webpage, which is not attractive enough. Thus, the heads of departments and coordinators will have to be involved in creating a positive and attractive image for potential students.