

**Minutes of the
extraordinary ACADEMIC SENATE
18 June 2007, 12.00-14.00**

Present: Stefan Cibian, Julius Horvath, Laszlo Kontler, Iryna Koshulap Zdenek Kudrna, Uku Lember, Liviu Matei (*ex-officio, non-voting*), Laszlo Matyas, Michael Laurence Miller, Howard Robinson, Roderick Martin, Robert Sata, Tibor Varady

Not present: Yehuda Elkana (chair), Elissa Helms, Janos Kis

Invited: Karoly Bard, Gabor Kezdi (UDC member)

Minutes: Andrea Csele

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

2. Approval of validators

Zdenek Kudrna and Michael Miller volunteered to validate the minutes.

3. Delegation of members for the Rector search committee

At the joint Board and Senate meeting held on June 15 regarding the organization of the Rector search it was agreed that one senior and one junior faculty would be appointed to join the search committee. The proposal was to appoint Tibor Varady as senior member and regarding the junior member there were two approaches, either to propose Michael Miller as a delegate member of the Senate or to delegate any other junior faculty.

The Senate members decided on the voting method, whether to have a secret or open vote. With four (4) votes 'for' the secret vote, three (3) 'against' it and four (4) 'abstentions', the proposal to vote secretly was not accepted.

The proposal to appoint Tibor Varady as a senior member to the search committee was submitted to open vote and with two (2) 'abstentions', the proposal was endorsed.

Regarding the appointment of a junior faculty to the search committee, there was a proposal to have a secret vote, a 24-hour written secret ballot collected in a ballot box in order to allow those not present today to cast their ballot. This proposal was submitted to vote and with five (5) 'against', four (4) 'abstentions', and nobody 'for' it, the proposal was not accepted.

The proposal to appoint Michael Laurence Miller as a junior member in the search committee was submitted to vote and with seven (7) votes 'for', three (3) 'abstentions', the proposal was accepted.

4. CEU Doctoral Regulations - revision

The Pro-Rector explained that due to changes in the new Hungarian Higher Education Law, in the present form the regulations are obsolete, unclear and not ready for implementation. Therefore, there was a need to rewrite the present regulations and to come up with a single document in accordance with both the Hungarian and American legal requirements. The document was prepared by Ferenc Huoranszki, Gabor Kezdi, Katalin Farkas. The Student Union (SU) discussed the material and came up with

suggestions, comments at the UDC meetings. Stefan Cibian wanted to emphasize that there are issues, which are not included in the regulations but should be, such as the *stop-the-clock option* and the *sandwich-year*. The Pro-Rector explained that this is a financial issue and cannot be included among the academic regulations. However, the financial regulations could be added later as an appendix to the Doctoral regulations. The Senate members had several comments regarding the submitted material, and the document was approved with the following modifications:

- the term 'doctoral students' should replace the term 'PhD' everywhere in the text
- Article 1, point 1.3 : 'It must have at least *four* members'.
 - one paragraph to be added: '*The Doctoral Committee shall include one student representative. The student member of the Doctoral Committee is the student representative elected by the Doctoral Students*'
- Article 1, point 1.4: '*..one student member delegated by the Student Union from among its doctoral student members;*'
 - one paragraph to be added: '*In case of appeals or complaints it should start proceedings in 15 days*'.
- Article 1, point 1.6: 'The Comprehensive Exam Committee is appointed by the *University Doctoral Committee, based on the recommendation of the program's Doctoral Committee*'.
- Article 1, point 1.8: 'The Doctoral candidate whose thesis is examined shall be invited to name individuals whom he/she does not wish appointed as examiners *before the submission of the thesis* and shall give precise...'
- Article 2, point 2.6: '*...grants an extension before the termination of the enrolment.*'
- Article 2, point 2.7 : '*but only in cases where they do not receive financial assistance from two institutions at the same time*'- to be taken out
 - one paragraph to be added : '*Students employed full time cannot receive full CEU scholarship. Exemption to this rule can be granted by the Doctoral Committee*'.
The Pro-Rector has informed the Senate that the provisions of Article 2, point 2.7 would not be enforced retrospectively and thus will be applicable only to PhD candidates joining CEU in the AY 2007/2008 and later.

Deleted: ¶
¶

- Article 3: 'Doctoral Students who a) have successfully completed their comprehensive examinations, b) have their *supervisor(s)* accepted become Doctoral candidates'.
- Article 6, point 6.2: '*Supervisor* and associate supervisor' – instead of 'principal supervisor'
- Article 6, point 6.5: '(g) encouraging students to play a full and active role in the intellectual life of the department *and the university*'
- Article 6, point 6.6: 'CEU encourages its Doctoral Candidates to spend *at least three months* at another university..'
- Article 7, point 7.1: 'Programs should also specify, in their regulations, the grading system *and the timing* of the comprehensive examinations.'
- Article 7, point 7.4 – one paragraph to be added : 'A prospectus can only be resubmitted once.'
- Article 8, point 8.2: '*Thesis* examination', instead of 'Theses examination'
 - one paragraph to be added: '*If the thesis is defended in a written defense the Examiners and the Principal Supervisor shall prepare a detailed written evaluation of the*

thesis. This should contain eventual questions the Candidate should answer in writing, suggestions and proposal for the modifications of the thesis, and any other comments that they consider relevant. The Candidate then must prepare a written answer to the questions, carry out the changes and modifications suggested in the reports or argue in details why the suggested changes or modifications are not executed. The Examiners and the Principal Supervisor can accept this or suggest one additional, final, round of questions, clarifications and/or modifications. Then the Examiners and the Principal Supervisor must declare in writing that the thesis is fully adequate in originality, scope, depth and quality as to be awarded the doctoral degree or state that in its present form the degree should not be awarded’.

‘Doctoral Programs should have detailed regulations with regard to both written and oral defense.’

The Senate members voted separately on the paragraph concerning the question of appeal on academic grounds. (In Article 9, point 9.1) With one (1) vote ‘for’ keeping the paragraph, four (4) ‘against’ it and four (4) ‘abstentions’, it was decided that the following paragraph should be taken out: *‘There shall be no appeal on academic grounds. Appeals can be lodged if the student believes that there has been a procedural irregularity involving a breach of the University, or Program Doctoral Regulations; or that there exist circumstances affecting the student’s performance of which the appropriate committees had not been made aware when their decision was taken.’*

At the same time, the Senate decided that this question of appeal on academic grounds should be dealt with next AY. It was also decided that upon adoption of this document the departmental doctoral regulations should be submitted by October 31st in order to comply with these regulations, exceptions are the History, Economics and Medieval studies departments, which have to submit the documents by June 30, as required by the Hungarian Higher Education Law.

5. Workload of Senate Committees

The Pro-Rector informed the Senate members that many of the University Senate committees, such as the Disciplinary committee, Grievance committee are overburdened and the regulations should be revised. Robert Sata said that the Grievance Committee is revising its code of ethics and proposals, suggestions are welcome by the committee.