

**Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
Thursday, 25 May 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

Excused: Judit Bodnar, Roderick Martin

In attendance: Janos Amrik, Stefan Cibian, Dr. Ellyn McLaughlin (only for point #4 of the agenda)

Minutes: Andrea Csele

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

2. Approval of the minutes

Liviu Matei informed the members of the Senate that this time two sets of minutes are to be approved: those of the regular meeting of 3 March 2006 and those from the extraordinary Senate meeting of 13 May, 2006.

Tibor Varady mentioned that there should be a reformulation in the Senate minutes of May 3, regarding examination procedures at CEU, under point 5, B.ii) : “in examinations where more than 25 students participate, the two versions might overlap”. He proposed that two versions should be optional beyond 25 students and these might overlap. Laszlo Matyas disagreed with this reformulation. The amendment proposed by Tibor Varady was submitted to vote, and with 9 for and 1 against, it was accepted.

Tibor Varady stated also that although the Senate had approved the new BS program in International Management, the term ‘Legal systems’ which appears in the curriculum of the new Business School program should be reworked. Liviu Matei informed the members that this change was already made.

With these amendments the two sets of minutes were approved.

3. Approval of validators

Eva Fodor and Zdenek Kudrna volunteered as validators.

4. Middle States accreditation

Liviu Matei informed the members of the Senate that CEU will have to start a new self-study process in fall 2006. Most probably, this time the main focus, according to the new standards of the Middle States, will have to be on assessment: institutional assessment, learning assessment and other types of assessment. The Senate would have a central role in designing and overseeing the new self-study process. Given the particular importance of outcome assessment, a consultant from the US with extensive experience in this field had been invited to spend a week at CEU and advice the administration and the faculty

on the implementation of CEU's outcome assessment strategy. Liviu Matei introduced Dr. Ellyn McLaughlin, Executive Director of Outcome Assessment at the University of Maryland University College, who made a short presentation to the Senate members about outcome assessment.

Dr. McLaughlin reported that she had already made three other presentations during the week she had spent at CEU prior to the Senate meeting: to the heads of the non-teaching units, to the heads of departments and to the Curriculum Committee.

Dr. McLaughlin distributed several handouts to the present members, including two Middle States accreditation standards specifically about assessment: Standards 7 (Institutional Assessment) and 14 (Student Learning) and provided suggestions about how CEU could approach these parts of the self-study process.

Julius Horvath inquired about the difference between undergraduate and graduate assessments. Dr. McLaughlin specified that the Middle States does not give clear specification on what needs to be included in the graduate assessment. Concerning the undergraduate programs, in one of the Standards they speak about the general education program, which needs to incorporate a few basic skills: writing, speaking, technology, science and mathematics but they leave the possibility to define how the university wants its graduates to act in the Master's programs to the institution itself.

Zdenek Kudrna and Stefan Cibian asked about the involvement of students and the Student Council's role in this evaluation process.

Dr. McLaughlin said that the students have an important role in the assessments; some of them are members of student assessing committees, providing the data needed for analysis, but that in terms of the rest of the process, the faculty would have to analyze the data.

Answering Stefan Cibian's question about the Strategic Planning Process and whether it should be worked out separately for every year, Dr. McLaughlin said that there is no need to work out a planning process for every single year but that what needs to be done is to assess the strategic plan originally worked out for a definite period of time.

The Rector asked about the availability of such outcome assessments already done by other universities. As Dr. McLaughlin said that it is up to the universities to decide whether they want to make their documents public or not, but there are documents that can be found online as well and she would send a few samples after her return to the US. She also explained that this assessment process is a mixture of institutional level, program level and course level and they are weighted equally.

Liviu Matei emphasized that although this assessment process is needed as part of the American Accreditation process, this is useful for the university as well since it will provide important data on students and faculty as well. He thanked Dr. McLaughlin for her presentation to the Senate members.

5. Interim report by the Senate representative to the budgeting task force

Julius Horvath informed the members that there is no written interim report prepared yet; they are in the process of assessing the budgetary needs of all units at CEU. There is a task force working on this matter whose members are: Janos Amrik, Judit Pallos, Lajos

Bokros, Liviu Matei and himself. They had 17 meetings where units were represented by the heads of departments where they could inform the budgeting task force about their departmental plans for the future, such as for example raising the number of faculty, possible promotions, evaluation of non-personal costs (e.g. photocopying, student readers). There is documentation about the faculty three years back, about their fulfillment of their contract in terms of number of credits taught. This document will be finalized as well.

To the Rector's question about whether there is a correlation between the quantity of work invested in this task force and the information received, Julius Horvath said that due to their work, transparency would increase at CEU.

Liviu Matei informed the members that there was a question whether the Senate representative should attend meetings with the non-academic units as well and it was agreed that he should participate in all the meetings, including those with non-academic units. The Academic Secretary emphasized that these meetings are not only about collecting numbers but following the discussions there are recommendations as well, which are to be decided by the Executive Committee.

Julius Horvath informed the members that a report of the budgeting task force would be finalized by 2 June, 2006.

7. Eligibility criteria for research leave

Liviu Matei informed the members that the Academic Forum discussed a proposal to clarify the eligibility criteria for paid research leave (sabbatical), which means that only full-time faculty (as defined in the Compendium) can apply for sabbatical, and only those credits would count towards the sabbatical that were earned while the applicant had a contract with CEU as a full-time faculty member. The Academic Forum members did not express an objection to this so if the Senate approves it, the Compendium will be modified accordingly.

Eva Fodor proposed that the Compendium should contain also a clause for special cases, for example, when the applicant is part-time faculty having CEU as a primary employer and no other full-time position anywhere else. The Senate accepted that such a clause should be included specifying that those part-time faculty teaching 5 credits at CEU with no other full-time employment anywhere else, would be proportionally eligible for sabbatical leave: for example, after teaching 6 credits over two years, they would receive half of what full-time faculty receive.

A revised Compendium would be circulated to the Senate members with specifications related to the previously mentioned two issues.

8. Proposal by the Student Council regarding mentioning of student ranking on transcripts

The Pro-Rector informed the Senate members that the issue had been discussed at the Academic Forum and it was suggested that the ranking should not be mentioned on the transcript but be kept in the CEU database and when students needed it for specific purposes, it should be given to them as a separate document.

Eva Fodor and Tibor Varady agreed with this since the transcript already contains the student's grades in any case and it gives a clear picture of how the student is performing in different courses.

Julius Horvath added that when there is a need to rank a student, the grade averages of the departments can be found on the CEU website as well.

The decision about mentioning of student ranking on transcripts was submitted for approval: five members voted for abolishing ranking on transcripts and four members voted to maintain it.

9. Proposal to establish a Department of Public Policy

Laszlo Matyas said that at the Academic Forum Lajos Bokros had introduced the program and there were questions related to the future of the program, and about the doctoral programs. He also added that in the case of this new program there is a clear picture of it, in terms of finance, administration, and faculty.

The Senate members endorsed unanimously the submitted proposal for the new Department of Public Policy.

The Rector said that since the selected candidate to chair the new department finally rejected the university's proposal due to personal circumstances, Uwe Puetter was asked to chair the newly-established department. The search will be restarted to find a suitable candidate for the position.

10. Hungarian accreditation, two-year MA program in Economics

The Pro-Rector informed the Senate members that since the existing two-year MA program in Economics was endorsed in 1996 and CEU as a Hungarian institution had existed only for a few months, the Senate would need to vote again on the submission of the existing two-year MA program for the Hungarian accreditation. The Senate members unanimously endorsed this.

He also informed the Senate meeting that the Consortium of which the Center for Policy Studies/Public Policy Program changed the name of the two-year program in Public Policy from a MA to an MSc (Master of Science). Thus, he proposed to submit the same proposal for the Hungarian accreditation, only the title would be changed to Master of Science.

The Senate unanimously accepted the Pro-Rector's proposal.

11. Appointment of a Senate Election Committee

The Pro-Rector stated that according to the new Higher Education Law, a new Senate would be elected in the fall, thus a new Senate Election Committee needed to be appointed to organize the election and the rules. He proposed Tibor Varady as head of

the Senate Election Committee; his role would be to prepare a document about the rules applying for the election. There would also be a separate subcommittee, which could run the election itself. Diana Urge-Vorsatz volunteered to be a member of the Senate Election Committee.

12. Other business

Stefan Cibian expressed the point of view of the students regarding the available scholarships. He asked that the Scholarship Committee analyze the financial situation of the students applying for scholarships more deeply. The Senate asked the representative of the Student Council to submit a paper with their recommendations.

Another issue was raised by Diana Urge-Vorsatz related to the payment of PhD students for work performed as part of research grants. The Pro-Rector informed the members that a policy is being prepared and within a few weeks it would be finalized.