

**Minutes of the  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
Friday, 3 March 2006, 12.00-14.00**

*Present:* Yehuda Elkana (chair), Eva Fodor, Julius Horvath, Janos Kis, Zdenek Kudrna, Laszlo Matyas, Liviu Matei (*ex-officio, non-voting*), Howard Robinson, Diana-Urge Vorsatz, Tibor Varady

*Not present:* Judit Bodnar

*In attendance:* Janos Amrik, Stefan Cibian, Istvan Teplan (for the whole meeting); Barrie Riome and Keith Maunders (only for the part of the meeting about Business School issues)

*Minutes:* Andrea Csele

Liviu Matei informed the Senate members that the Chair of the Student Council requested permission to attend the Senate meetings as an observer. The Rector stated that there is no regulation stipulating that the Senate meetings are closed. **At Janos Kis' proposal, it was agreed that the Chair of the Student Council shall be invited by the Senate to attend meetings as an observer, on a permanent basis.**

At this point, the Pro-Rector emphasized that in the context of the adoption of the new Organizational and Operational Regulations (OOR or SzMSz), the mandate of the present Senate will expire the latest by 31 December 2006 and elections for the new Senate should be organized before this deadline, the best time being in the Fall after the arrival of the new students. Liviu Matei announced that the guidelines for the election of the new Senate will be submitted for Senate approval in May.

**1. Approval of the agenda**

The Academic Secretary proposed to deal first with the agenda points about the Business School and to invite Keith Maunders and Barrie Riome to attend this part of the discussion. With this amendment the agenda was approved as submitted.

**2. Approval of the minutes**

The minutes were approved as submitted.

**3. Approval of validators**

Janos Kis and Zdenek Kudrna volunteered as validators.

**4. CEU Business School**

***a) Report regarding the launch of the CEU MBA program in Bucharest, Romania***

Keith Maunders summarized the written report distributed before the meeting on the launch of the Weekend MBA program in Romania. Although the recruitment started rather late, the start was very successful, the GMAT of the students enrolled in the

program being on the average much higher than that of the students at CEU Business School in Budapest.

The Rector asked the Business School to prepare a detailed report regarding the Bucharest students, including information such as the average age, work experience. Tibor Varady asked about quality assurance aspects related to the programs offered in Bucharest. Keith Maunders explained that the same professors teach in Bucharest as here in Budapest, there would be sessions of three hours but in case there is a need to condense, then the professors would teach six hours a day. Tibor Varady stated that such an additional load could be too much for the students as well as the teachers. Barrie Riome specified that at the end of a course, the students are requested to fill in an evaluation sheet, which highlights the students' satisfaction, or dissatisfaction related to the given course. Corrective action will be taken based on this feedback, should it need be.

***b) Proposal for a B.S. program in International Business***

Keith Maunders informed the Senate members that the point of departure for the new B.S. (Bachelor of Science) program in International Management was the BBA program launched last year in cooperation with Bocconi University. Although this cooperation resulted in a useful strategic alliance with Bocconi, it had some limitations (related to the number of students that can be admitted, Bocconi's initial insistence on national quotas) that made the management of the School to consider to launch the new undergraduate program, a B.S. this time, without Bocconi or any other partner. He emphasized that the new B.S. program gives an opportunity to develop the undergraduate program of the Business School. He also said that the Business School hired new professors in January, thus the faculty is developing in a healthy direction and the size of the faculty is sufficient to ensure a good start for the new program. The Curriculum includes some courses from the BBA program, as well as new courses, including general education courses to be taught with the involvement of the CEU departments.

Liviu Matei specified that the new program would be different from the existing BBA. In the U.S., where we will seek accreditation for this new program, the definition of a B.S. programs involves that half of the courses should be in general education, unlike the BBA where only one third should be of this nature. The B.S., thus, will allow for more participation from the non-Business School units, which would also mean more integration between the School and the rest of the university. Also, since the program has a different academic focus, it is aimed at a different market niche than the BBA.

At the Rector's question whether somebody graduating with a B.S. degree would be admitted at the MBA program, Keith Maunders' answer was positive.

**The Senate approved unanimously the new program, which is planned to be launched in Fall 2006.**

***c) GMAT waiver option***

Keith Maunders explained that CEU Business School has an additional admission requirement, the GMAT (General Management Admission Test). However, this test has a drawback since the majority of the applicants are not typical graduate students but employees with many years of work experience. Since GMAT is obsolete in these cases,

the Business School would like to consider the option of GMAT waivers for selected students applying for the MBA and IMM programs.

Laszlo Matyas stated that the GMAT test is an admission requirement approved by the Senate at the proposal of the Business School and whatever is decided about the GMAT, well-defined and transparent criteria should be met. It was clarified that, following the Academic Forum on February 16, a list of criteria for exempting selected candidates from the GMAT requirement has been prepared. Eva Fodor and Laszlo Matyas noted that these criteria are still not specific enough. Laszlo Matyas proposed that the wording be changed, the phrase “Applicants who *will* be considered...” should be changed to “Applicants *who may be* considered...”. Other proposals made by the Provost included: i) under point 1. b).- to set a minimum GPA and ii) to introduce point nr .5 - to set a higher GPA for those students who do not have an MA degree but a BA degree. Diana Urge Vorsatz proposed that a paragraph be added about how the applications would be evaluated, that the Pro-Rector would have to approve finally the applications for GMAT waiver. It was agreed to modify the set of criteria accordingly and include the provision that all exemptions are to be submitted to the Pro-rector for approval. **With this conditions, the GMAT waiver option proposal was approved by the majority of the Senate members (one vote against).**

## **5. Examination procedures at CEU**

Laszlo Matyas explained that CEU’s rule regarding the examinations procedures need some completion in order to increase efficiency, transparency and fairness. Otherwise, the heads of departments, the Pro-Rector and the Disciplinary Committee might face a large number of complaints from the students and teachers. A proposal regarding additional clarification on examination procedures had been submitted to the Academic Forum on February 16. This draft had been amended following discussion in the Forum and it is now submitted for approval by the Senate.

Tibor Varady expressed his opinion that the proposed regulations are sometimes too rigid, occasionally difficult if not impossible to implement and also that they might hurt students’ dignity. **It was agreed that the regulations would be changed to include the following::**

- a) *A. i. Pre-session:* the 15-minute presentation to be taken out and change it to a brief presentation
- ii) Exam-scheduling:* the allocation of examination rooms by the Room Coordinator and not through lottery and the exam venues will be made known one week before the exam takes place.
- b) *B. ii)-* in exams where more than 25 students participate, the two versions might overlap. The question of the seat tickets remained unchanged.

**It was also agreed that the Pro-Rector may grant exceptions from these rules (when made necessary by the special nature of some exams).**

Zdenek Kudrna suggested that examination rules and procedures are very clearly explained to new students during their orientation. They could even sit in a mock-test to make it very, very clear and explicit that cheating is not tolerated.

## **6. Diploma preparation schedule**

**The diploma preparation schedule was endorsed by the Senate members.** Tibor Varady mentioned that at the Legal Studies Department students can decide between writing a short or long thesis. In case, they choose a long thesis than they would finish in November, which does not fit the time frame proposed for MA Cycle II. **Laszlo Matyas proposed to work out a special arrangement for LLM students.**

## **7. Hungarian Accreditation**

### **- Organizational and Operational Regulations of the Central European University**

Laszlo Matyas reported that an Organizational and Operational Regulation (OOR) of the Central European University had been prepared as requested under the new Hungarian Higher Education Law. The new CEU OOR is also in line with the By-Laws of the university adopted last year by Board of Trustees. There are two exceptions to this: 1). Student representation should be amended in the By-Laws, to increase the number of student representatives from one (in the By-Laws) to three (in the OOR). and 2). New Higher Education Law prescribes that non-academic staff should also be represented in the Senate (one member in our case). These two amendments need to be incorporated in the By-Laws. The OOR incorporates the internal basic regulations of the university and has to be formally adopted by the Senate and CEU's Maintainers.

The Chairperson of the Student Council, Stefan Cibian proposed the following amendments to the OOR:

- 1) Section 14 para (4): "The Student Representatives are members of their Departmental Council" instead of " Students must be represented in the Departmental Council"
- 2) Section 27: The Student Council members should be invited to the Academic Forum meetings.

**The above amendments were accepted and the OOR will be modified accordingly. The OOR was unanimously approved.**

Zdenek Kudrna inquired about the review of the Student Council Charter. Laszlo Matyas clarified that a revised Student Charter Council needs to be prepared as well; the document will have to go to the Senate for approval.

The Pro-Rector reminded the Senate members that in a letter sent to the Senate Gabor Toka, Head of Political Science Department, proposed two amendments to section 9 of the OOR, discussed at the February 16 Academic Forum as well. Gabor Toka proposed the possibility of adding to section 9.: "The Senate adopts the budget as well as financial and asset management plans and the yearly budget report of the University". As a second amendment, he proposed that the Senate should delegate two faculty members and one student representative to the Maintainers' Council (Board of Trustees and Board of CEU Budapest Foundation). He understands that under the terms of the Hungarian Higher Education Act, private universities may not be obliged to adopt such rules as the ones proposed by him but there are a number of substantive considerations in favor of them. They include the goal of improving transparency at CEU, the need for better feedback

processes and greater accountability among the units of the University, improving communication between the Board and the Senate, who under the new rules will have to decide certain things jointly, but have little regular opportunity to communicate with each other otherwise.

Answering to the first proposal related to the **budget issue**, Laszlo Matyas explained that when the draft Higher Education Law was made public, a letter was written to the Prime Minister and as a result the Higher Education Law was changed, to make it more compatible with the international practice, and it now stipulates that in the case of private universities the Maintainers decide on the budget.

Answering to the second proposal, the Pro-Rector said that the Higher Education Law does not define at all how the Maintainers organize themselves, the law gives only prerogatives to the Maintainers. Given also that the Senate has the right to express its opinion on everything, including the budget, the information flow is thus guaranteed and therefore the reasons to promote this idea are not convincing. Laszlo Matyas added that it would be very difficult to imagine that those students and faculty have an active role there, it would rather be a formal role than a substantial one.

To Janos Kis' inquiry whether having faculty in the Board is acceptable, Tibor Varady said that the American Law does not prohibit this. However, with the membership of the students the situation is different since they represent a different constituency, spending only two, three years at CEU. Thus, appointing students to the Board would not be necessarily recommended.

The Rector said that at present, since the section 9 contains anyhow that the Senate has the right to express opinion about anything, it is politically sensitive at this stage, especially in the context of the U.S. higher education tradition regarding Board prerogatives, to ask that the Senate decide on the budget, rather than the Board of Trustees. He suggested that the Board be sent a clear letter that the Senate discussed the section 9, understood its meaning in the sense that the Senate has the right anyhow to express its opinion on all university matters, including the budget and intends to exercise this right and wants to make clear to the Board that consultation is needed in a formal way.

Liviu Matei added that under the U.S. law it is not possible for the Board to delegate their legal responsibility regarding the finances of the university. He reported that idea of bringing alumni on the Board was discussed several times by the Trustees, and the attitude to this is favorable. In addition, the Board agreed in principle to have Senate members on almost all Board committees. This will have to be incorporated in a formal document.

The Rector also suggested that a letter of recommendation be written to the Nominating Committee that the Senate recommends that a faculty member should be on the Board in addition to the Rector. Howard Robinson proposed that the election of the faculty member to the Board should be made in consultation with the Senate. The Rector asked Howard Robinson to formulate this letter.

Julius Horvath asked about the membership of the Rector and Pro-Rector in the Board of Trustees. The Pro-Rector answered that only the Rector is member of the BOT.

Diana Urge-Vorsatz asked whether the administrative staff elected by CEU employees would have the right to vote as a Senate member. Laszlo Matyas answered that the person would have full voting rights to vote.

**The Senate voted that until the mandate of the Senate expires in June, a Business School representative should be present. Thus, election will be organized to elect a Business School faculty to the Senate.**

**Concerning the student representation in the Senate, a Business School student should be included as well.**

## **8. Membership of Senate Committees**

### **- *Research Board***

Liviu Matei informed the Senate that Ayse Caglar resigned from the Research Board and after consultation with the chair, Ivan Szelenyi, it was suggested that Don Kalb replace her. **The Senate approved to elect Don Kalb in the Research Board.**

### **- *Academic Travel Grants Committee***

Diana Urge-Vorsatz explained that she is currently on maternity leave and proposed to appoint Eva Fodor as Acting Chair of the Academic Travel Grants Committee, for the few months remaining from the current mandate of the Committee, and to empower the Acting Chair to identify two faculty members who would join the Committee for this period (two places are vacant). **The proposals were unanimously approved.**

## **9. Academic Calendar**

**The Academic Calendar for the academic year 2006/2007 was unanimously approved as submitted.**

## **10. Sample of Writing Ability Test (TWA)**

Liviu Matei reminded the Senate that with the exception of the Sociology and Economics departments, the Senate decided (through vote by e-mail) to discontinue of this test as part of the admissions process.