

# Academic Staff Handbook

of the Central European University

Approved by the Board of Trustees on 21 April 2002

Amended and restated on 25 May 2006

Further amended and restated by the Senate on 4 March 2011, further on 13 May 2011, 8 September 2011, 21 October 2011, 23 November 2012, 31 May 2013, 4 April 2014, 18 May 2015, and 27 May 2016

# Table of Contents

<b>Preamble</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Definitions</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>I. Academic ranks</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<i>I.A. Appointed academic staff members (resident academic staff)</i> .....	6
<i>I.B. Academic staff without appointment (nonresident academic staff)</i> .....	10
<i>I.C. Postdoctoral fellows</i> .....	12
<b>II. Recruitment policy and appointment procedures</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<i>II.A. Recruitment</i> .....	13
<i>II.B. Resident academic staff appointments</i> .....	13
II.B.1. Instructors, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Practitioners in Residence, Professors of Practice .....	13
II.B.2. Assistant Professors and Associate Research Fellows .....	13
II.B.3. Associate Professors, Professors, Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows .....	14
II.B.4. Unit affiliation .....	15
<i>II.C. Visiting faculty members and visiting research staff</i> .....	15
<i>II.D. Postdoctoral fellows</i> .....	15
<i>II.E. Endowed Chairs</i> .....	15
<i>II.F. University Professors</i> .....	16
<i>II.G. Professor Emeriti</i> .....	16
<i>II.H. Unit Heads</i> .....	16
<i>II.I. Communication of appointments</i> .....	16
<b>III. Periodic review and evaluation</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<i>III.A. Periodic review procedures for academic staff members</i> .....	17
III.A.1. Individual academic activity reports (IAAR) .....	17
III.A.2. Academic staff files .....	17
III.A.3. Procedure for the periodic review of academic staff members .....	17
<i>III.B. Guidelines for evaluating academic performance in periodic review and for promotions and re-appointments</i> .....	18
III.B.1. General Principles.....	18
III.B.2. Evaluation of research .....	18
III.B.2. Evaluation of service to the academic community .....	19
III.B.3. Evaluation of teaching.....	20
III.B.4. Course and Supervision Evaluation.....	20
<b>IV. Re-appointment and promotion</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<i>IV.A. Re-appointment and Promotion Committee for academic departments</i> .....	21
<i>IV.B. Re-appointment and Promotion Committee for the Schools</i> .....	21
<i>IV.C. Re-appointment of Instructors</i> .....	22
<i>IV.D. Junior faculty in the academic departments (faculty hired in the Assistant Professor Rank)</i> .....	22

IV.D.1. Junior faculty applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (or Research Fellow) in year 2-3 of their employment ('early promotion') .....	22
IV.D.2. Junior faculty appointed for a definite term, with no prior employment at CEU, normal procedure for re-appointment .....	24
IV.D.3. Promotion of junior faculty within 1-3 years of receiving a permanent contract.....	25
IV.D.4. Re-appointment and promotion of faculty with joint appointments .....	26
IV.D.5. Unsatisfactory progress in the first two years.....	26
IV.D.6. Non-research track.....	27
IV.E. Re-appointment of Associate Professors and Professors.....	27
IV.F. "Egyetemi tanár" and "Egyetemi docens".....	28
IV.G. Promotion to the rank of full Professor.....	28
IV.H. Appointment of University Professors .....	30
IV.I. Faculty hired with previous employment at CEU .....	30
IV.J Request to review procedure .....	31
<b>V. Residence, work load and research leave .....</b>	<b>32</b>
V.A. Residence.....	32
V.B. Workload .....	32
V.B.1. FTE for resident instructors .....	32
V.B.2. Full-time equivalent (FTE) workload for resident faculty members .....	32
V.B.3. Full-time teaching equivalency.....	33
V.B.4. Workload for visiting faculty .....	34
V.B.5. Expectations from the short-term visiting academic staff teaching at CEU .....	34
V.C. Research leave and short-term leave .....	34
V.C.1. Eligibility for research leave (sabbatical) .....	34
V.C.2. Procedure for requesting research leave .....	35
V.C.3. Obligations related to research leave .....	35
V.C.4. Short-term leaves.....	35
V.D. Academic travel.....	35
V.E. Research activities and internal conferences.....	35
<b>VI. Promulgation, validity, and transition.....</b>	<b>36</b>
VI.A. Promulgation.....	36
VI.B. Validity and transition measures .....	36
<b>Appendix 1: Handout on Reviewing Applicants.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Individual Academic Activity Reports (IAAR) .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Schedule for the promotion and re-appointment process.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Principles for evaluation of lecturers, senior lecturers, practitioners in residence, professor of practice, and writing instructors .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Appendix 5: Procedures for Course and Supervision Evaluation.....</b>	<b>50</b>

## Preamble

The Board of Trustees at its Meeting of 23 April 1995 in London agreed on procedures for appointments, promotions, academic staff privileges and duties as well as unit governance, which were revised and approved on 24 June 1999, to remain in force for not more than four years from this date at which time a full review is to be undertaken. The resulting policy was named Compendium of Regulations on Rank, Appointment, Promotion and Related Matters. Upon the recommendation of the University Senate, the Board of Trustees subsequently amended the Compendium on 21 April 2002 and on 30 July 2003. The Compendium was further amended and restated on 25 May 2006. To accommodate structural, institutional and other changes, the Compendium was revised and approved by the Senate on 4 March 2011. Further, minor revisions were approved by the Senate on 13 May 2011, where the policy was renamed Academic Staff Handbook. The Handbook was further revised and approved by the Senate on 8 September and 21 October 2011, 23 November 2012, 31 May 2013, 4 April 2014, 18 May 2015, and 27 May 2016. As a Preamble to the Handbook, it is noted that:

CEU operates in an academic and legal environment where American and Hungarian laws, usages and principles have to be harmonized.

It is a graduate research-intensive institution in which individual supervision of research students has to be combined with classroom teaching, individual and team-research projects.

To guarantee CEU's academic excellence it is necessary to have a combination of regular internal review, with the occasional critical assessment by the international scholarly community.

The Handbook is to be reviewed at least every three years to include modifications required by changes in CEU's institutional or academic structure. It is the responsibility of the Academic Secretary of CEU to monitor issues that may require the modification of the Handbook, and to maintain agreement among the Handbook and related regulations.

Related documents:

- Appendix 1: Handout on Reviewing Applicants
- Appendix 2: Content of Individual Academic Activity Reports
- Appendix 3: Schedule for the promotion and re-appointment process
- Appendix 4: Procedures used in the evaluation of lecturers, senior lecturers, practitioners in residence, professor of practice, and writing instructors
- Appendix 5: Procedures for Course and Supervision Evaluation

## Definitions

For the purposes of the Academic Staff Handbook of the Central European University:

- (a) the term 'Handbook' in the present document means the Academic Staff Handbook of the Central European University;
- (b) the 'University' and 'CEU' mean the Central European University;
- (c) the 'Rector' means the Rector and President of Central European University
- (d) the 'Provost' means the Provost and Pro-Rector of Central European University

- (e) ‘academic staff members’ include all persons participating in the teaching process, academic supervision and research at the University (instructors, faculty members and research staff members);
- (f) ‘instructors’ include everyone involved in teaching and consultancy without responsibilities to do research;
- (g) ‘lecturers’ and ‘senior lecturers’ include all persons whose primary area of responsibility is participation in the teaching process without responsibilities for research or supervision unless otherwise specified in the contract;
- (h) ‘practitioners in residence’ and ‘professors of practice’ include academic staff with documented professional experience relevant to CEU’s practice-oriented educational programs;
- (i) ‘faculty members’ include all persons whose primary area of responsibility is participation in the teaching process, research and academic supervision at the University;
- (j) ‘teaching staff members’ include instructors, lecturers, senior lecturers, practitioners in residence, professors of practice, and faculty members;
- (k) ‘research staff members’ include everyone whose primary area of responsibility is participation in academic research at the University;
- (l) ‘junior academic staff members’ include Assistant Professors and Associate Research Fellows. ‘Senior academic staff members’ include Associate, Full and University Professors, Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows;
- (m) the academic ‘units’ include all administrative units which award academic diplomas and any administrative unit, the primary function of which is to conduct research<sup>1</sup>at the University;
- (n) the ‘Unit Heads’ are the administrative leaders of units at the University;
- (o) the ‘Board of Trustees’ is the governing Board of the Central European University Corporation, an educational corporation established in the State of New York of the United States of America and chartered by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York;
- (p) the ‘Senate’ is the Senate of the Central European University as defined by the University Founding Charter. The Senate establishes its committees within its competencies as laid out in the Founding Charter. Those committees may contribute to the fulfillment of the regulatory goals of this Handbook.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This does not refer to individual research projects, but to University administrative units.

<sup>2</sup> The full list of the Senate and other University Committees is available on the University’s website.

# I. Academic ranks

## I.A. Appointed academic staff members (resident academic staff)

Rank	Hungarian Equivalent	Description
<b>Instructor</b>	'Lektor' (for CAW instructors)	Academic support staff member (e.g. language teacher, computer trainer) with relevant professional qualifications involved only in teaching and consultancy. The minimum academic requirement is master's degree in the relevant field.
<b>Lecturer</b>	Tanár or 'Tudományos fokozattal rendelkező tanár'	Academic staff whose tasks generally include significant responsibilities for teaching and may also include research or other academic activities, as appropriate to the individual school or unit
<b>Senior Lecturer</b>	Tanár or 'Tudományos fokozattal rendelkező tanár'	
<b>Practitioner in Residence</b>	Tanár or 'Tudományos fokozattal rendelkező tanár'	Academic staff with appropriate degrees, certificates and/or licensure and documented professional experience and accomplishments in a specific area relevant to CEU's practice-oriented educational programs
<b>Professor of Practice</b>	Tanár or 'Tudományos fokozattal rendelkező tanár'	Distinguished academics and practitioners with appropriate degrees, certificates and/or licensure, significant experience and senior level accomplishments in a specific area of expertise, who have had a major impact on fields important to CEU's practice-oriented educational programs
<b>Assistant Professor</b>	'Adjunktus'	Academic staff involved in teaching-related and research activities, completed the doctoral degree or equivalent.
<b>Associate Professor</b>	'Adjunktus' or 'Egyetemi docens'	Academic staff involved in teaching-related and research activities with minimum a PhD or equivalent degree and experience in her/his field.
<b>Professor</b>	'Egyetemi docens' or 'Egyetemi tanár'	Academic staff involved in teaching-related and research activities with minimum a PhD or equivalent degree and significant experience in her/his field
<b>University Professor</b>	'Egyetemi docens' or 'Egyetemi tanár'	Distinguished international scholars with interdisciplinary range of interests and scope of lectures who have made an outstanding contribution to CEU or wider academic community. The holder of the 'egyetemi tanár' title must be appointed by the President of the Hungarian Republic.
<b>Professor Emeritus</b>	n/a	Honorary rank given to reward long-time commitment to the University after retirement. (The rank can be recognized in the Hungarian accreditation system only if the holder is appointed as 'egyetemi tanár' by the President of the Hungarian Republic.)
<b>Associate Research Fellow</b>	'Tudományos munkatárs'	Academic staff involved primarily in research; comparable in terms of scholarly qualifications and appointment to an Assistant Professor.
<b>Research Fellow</b>	'Tudományos főmunkatárs'	Academic staff involved primarily in research; comparable in terms of scholarly qualifications and appointment to an Associate Professor.
<b>Senior Research Fellow</b>	'Kutatóprofesszor'	Academic staff involved primarily in research; comparable in terms of scholarly qualifications and appointment to a Professor or University Professor.

Rank	Standard FTE Teaching Credits	Standard FTE Thesis Supervision	Participation in Research	Term of Contract
Instructor	8 teaching credits + consultancy according to the Unit's guidelines	n/a	n/a	1 year with probation period. Renewal: fixed or indefinite term - depending on the result of the assessment. The contract must be terminated if the results of the review do not qualify the Instructor for re-appointment.
Lecturer	Up to 18 credits / academic year	According to allocation in the academic unit	According to the academic unit's needs	At the discretion of the academic unit
Senior Lecturer				
Practitioner in Residence	12 credits/ academic year		n/a	
Professor of Practice				
Assistant Professor	12 credits (7,200 minutes)/AY	maximum 6 PhD supervision; MA thesis supervision according to departmental allocation	At least 30% of the total working time	4 years; Renewal: 1 year or indefinite term - based on the results of the review to be held before the completion of the 4th year of employment. If the Assistant Professor is not promoted after 7 years of employment, s/he switches to non-research track and his/her FTE teaching load increases to 16 credits and/or extra administrative work is expected.
Associate Professor				
Professor				4 years; Renewal: 1 year or indefinite term - based on the results of the review to be held before the completion of the 4th year of employment.
University Professor				8 credits (4,800 minutes)/AY
Professor Emeritus	n/a	n/a	n/a	The appointment is for indefinite term; however, no contract is necessary
Associate Research Fellow	Occasional - not mandatory. <i>On pro bono basis.</i>	Occasional - not mandatory. <i>On pro bono basis.</i>	At least 90% of the total working time.	1 or 2 years but maximum 5 consecutive years - after 5 years: indefinite term; Renewal: based on the results of the periodic review.
Research Fellow				
Senior Research Fellow				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Periodic Review Necessary?</b>	<b>Review for Re-appointment</b>
<b>Instructor</b>	Yes – review after the first year, then a review biannually.	Re-appointment on the recommendation of the Unit Head subject to endorsement by the Rector. There are subsequent re-appointments.
<b>Lecturer</b>	Yes - IAARs and student course evaluations collected by the head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the unit head reviews the faculty member every year.	Re-appointment on the recommendation of the unit head, subject to endorsement by the Rector. There may be subsequent re-appointments. The maximum term of fixed contract is 5 years
<b>Senior Lecturer</b>		
<b>Practitioner in Residence</b>		
<b>Professor of Practice</b>		
<b>Assistant Professor</b>	Yes - IAARs and student course evaluations collected by the Head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the Head evaluates the Assistant Professor every year.	Eligible for re-appointment through the review process described in IV.D); to be endorsed by the Rector; subject to the limitation that this rank - as a rule - cannot be held for more than 7 years
<b>Associate Professor</b>	Yes - IAARs and student course evaluations collected by the Head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the Head evaluates the Associate Professor every three years. If the Associate Professor is the Head, the Provost performs the evaluation as described above.	Eligible for re-appointment through the review process described in IV.E., subject to endorsement by the Rector
<b>Professor</b>	Yes - IAARs and student course evaluations collected by the Head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the Head evaluates the Professor every three years. If the Professor is the Head, the Provost performs the evaluation as described above.	Eligible for re-appointment through the review process described in IV.E. and IV.G., subject to endorsement by the Rector
<b>University Professor</b>	Yes - IAARs and student course evaluations collected by the Head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the Head evaluates the University Professor every three years. If the University Professor is the Head, the Provost performs the evaluation as described above.	n/a
<b>Professor Emeritus</b>	n/a	n/a
<b>Associate Research Fellow</b>	Yes - IAARs and, in case of teaching activity was performed, student course evaluations collected by the Head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the Head evaluates the Associate Research Fellow every year. If the Associate Research Fellow is the Head, the Provost performs the evaluation as described above.	Eligible for re-appointment through the review process described in IV.D., subject to endorsement by the Rector
<b>Research Fellow</b>	Yes - IAARs and, in case of teaching activity was performed, student course evaluations collected by the Head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the Head evaluates the Research Fellow every three years. If the Research Fellow is the Head, the Provost performs the evaluation as described above.	Eligible for re-appointment through the review process described in IV.D., subject to endorsement by the Rector
<b>Senior Research Fellow</b>	Yes - IAARs and, in case of teaching activity was performed, student course evaluations collected by the Head of the academic unit each year. Based on them, the Head evaluates the Senior Research Fellow every three years. If the Senior Research Fellow is the Head, the Provost performs the evaluation as described above.	Eligible for re-appointment through the review process described in IV.D., subject to endorsement by the Rector

Rank	Promotion	Eligibility to Apply for Academic Benefits		
		Travel Fund	Research grant	Research Leave
Instructor	n/a	Yes	Yes – but under different provisions	
Lecturer	Promotion is considered during periodic evaluation; according to the unit's promotion rules		Yes	Under specific circumstances
Senior Lecturer	n/a		No	No
Practitioner in Residence	May be considered in exceptional cases			
Professor of Practice	n/a			
Assistant Professor	May request promotion to the rank of Associate Professor once a year. The Head of Department may also initiate promotion with the Provost. The review committee convened for re-appointment may also choose to recommend promotion; for the procedure, see IV.D.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Associate Professor	May request promotion to the rank of Professor once a year. The Head of Department may also initiate promotion with the Provost. If the Associate Professor is the Head of Department, the Provost may initiate the promotion procedure. The review committee convened for re-appointment may also choose to recommend promotion; for the procedure, see IV.G.			
Professor	The Rector/President can initiate promotion to the rank of University Professor based on recommendation of the Senate Committee on University Professors; approval by the Senate; for the procedure, see IV.H.			
University Professor	n/a			
Professor Emeritus	n/a	NO		
Associate Research Fellow	May apply for promotion once a year. Promotion to be considered during periodic review process, recommended by the Unit Head, according to the process described in IVD.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Research Fellow				
Senior Research Fellow	n/a			

## I.B. Academic staff without appointment (nonresident academic staff)

Rank	Hungarian Equivalent	Description	Standard FTE Teaching Credits	Standard FTE Thesis Supervision	Participation in Research	Term of Contract
<b>Visiting Instructor</b>	Nyelvtanár/ Lektor	One-time or recurrent academic support staff member (e.g. language teacher, computer trainer) with relevant professional qualifications involved only in teaching and consultancy - employed temporarily.	n/a	n/a - as defined in the contract.	As defined in the contract.	As defined in the contract.
<b>Visiting Professor</b>	Vendég oktató	One-time or recurrent academic staff involved primarily in teaching-related and, depending on the contract, research-activities, completed the doctoral degree or equivalent - employed temporarily.				
<b>Distinguished Visiting Professor</b>	Vendég professzor	One-time or recurrent academic staff involved primarily in teaching-related and, depending on the contract, research-activities, completed the doctoral degree or equivalent, with significant experience in the field - employed temporarily.				
<b>Research Affiliate</b>	Vendég társkutató	Honorary title given to those researchers who do not have active contractual relations with the University but who in some fashion cooperate with the academic community of the University on a permanent or recurring basis.				
<b>Junior visiting researcher</b>	Vendég kutatási segédmunkatárs	Ph.D. candidates and students, young researchers with MA degree participating in research projects on one-time or recurring basis.)				
<b>Visiting Researcher</b>	Vendég kutató	One-time or recurrent research staff with minimum a PhD or equivalent degree - participating in the scientific/research activities of the University.				
<b>Senior Visiting Researcher</b>	Kutatás-vezető or Vendég vezető kutató	One-time or recurrent senior or leading research staff with minimum a PhD or equivalent degree - participating in the scientific/research activities of the University.				

Rank	Periodic Review Necessary?	Review for Re-appointment	Promotion	Eligibility to Apply for Academic Benefits		
				Travel Fund	Research Grant	Research Leave
Visiting Instructors	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not eligible as a rule.	Not eligible as a rule.	Not eligible as a rule.
Visiting Professor						
Distinguished Visiting Professor						
Research Affiliate						
Junior Visiting researcher						
Visiting Researcher						
Senior Visiting Researcher						

## I.C. Postdoctoral fellows

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Hungarian Equivalent</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Term of contract</b>	<b>Promotion, review, re-appointment</b>	<b>Travel Grant</b>
<b>Postdoctoral fellow</b>	posztdoktori kutató	Academic staff member with a recent PhD or equivalent, engaged primarily in research (including research management).	1 or 2 years, employment contract or grant	n/a	eligible

## II. Recruitment policy and appointment procedures

### II.A. Recruitment

(a) Unit Heads who wish to fill a position (except for short-term and temporary hire) should submit a job description to HRO. Apart from a few exceptional cases when a senior position is filled by invitation, faculty positions are filled by an open search. HRO, in consultation with the unit(s) where the appointment is planned, prepares a recruitment advertisement, and sends it for approval to the COO and the Provost. All advertisements must include a statement of CEU's non-discrimination policy, as required by U.S. and Hungarian law and regulations. This statement may be in abbreviated form – e.g. “CEU is an equal opportunity employer.”

(b) All members of search committees shall be familiar with the relevant part of the Handbook concerning appointments, as well as CEU's ‘Handout on Reviewing Applicants’ (Appendix 1 to this Handbook).

(c) Procedures for conducting candidate visits, including the necessary meetings, lectures, and interviews will include, as a rule, the involvement of current students and consideration of their opinion as well as that of all academic staff members of the unit seeking to fill an open post.

(d) After the search committee (see below, in II.B) has arrived at a decision, the recommendation it makes should be accompanied by a brief (800-1200 word) report on the search, submitted to the Provost's Office (and in the case of the professional schools to the Dean who must then approve this report and send it on to the Provost). The report should summarize the response to the advertisement, describe the overall character of the applicant pool, include brief profiles of the shortlisted candidates, and explain the considerations upon which the top candidate was selected.

(e) Once the search committee's recommendation has been approved by the Rector, job offers are sent by the COO, based on the offer drafted by the HRO. Offer letters must follow a prescribed form, so as to avoid any possible misunderstanding that their content and agreement by the candidate constitutes a binding employment contract. Any changes compared to the offer initiated by the candidate must be approved by the COO and the Head of Unit(s) involved in the search.

### II.B. Resident academic staff appointments

#### II.B.1. Instructors<sup>3</sup>, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Practitioners in Residence, Professors of Practice

(a) The position description is the responsibility of the Unit Head in consultation with the Rector who must endorse the request to establish or refill the post.

(b) The Unit Head is responsible for conducting the search and selecting a candidate. The final decision must be endorsed by the Rector.

#### II.B.2. Assistant Professors and Associate Research Fellows<sup>4</sup>

(a) *Announcement of post.* The positions of Assistant Professors and Associate Research Fellows are to be filled by open advertising. The request to establish or refill a post shall be submitted to the Rector for

---

<sup>3</sup>A.I. as listed in chart

<sup>4</sup> A.II.1 and A.III.1 as listed in chart

approval. Determining the position description and term of appointment are the responsibility of the Unit Head in consultation with the Rector.

(b) *Search committee*: The committee is appointed by the Provost, in consultation with the Unit Head (in the case of the professional schools, by the Dean), and after final endorsement by the Rector (in the case of the professional schools after final endorsement by the Provost and the Rector). It consists of the Unit Head or a person designated by the Unit Head as Chair, at least three other members selected by the Unit Head, including one member external to the unit.

(c) *Appointment procedures*: The search committee draws up a shortlist. All shortlisted candidates must deliver a job talk and be interviewed by the search committee. At the end of deliberations, and after having received relevant input from faculty and students (see II.A (c) preceding), the search committee's recommendation and report, based on majority vote by the committee, is sent to the Provost's Office (in the case of the Professional schools to the Dean, who then transmits her/his recommendation and report to the Provost). Ultimate approval rests with the Rector.

(d) *Mentoring*. Unit Heads should assign a 'mentor' to all appointed junior academic staff members for at least one year. The mentor is a senior academic staff member of the unit, and s/he is to help the introduction of the junior member to CEU: to get acquainted with teaching practices, organizational structure, involvement in the community, usual expectations, and so on. The name of mentor should be sent along with the search committee's request to the Rector to endorse the appointment of a junior academic staff member.

### **II.B.3. Associate Professors, Professors, Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows<sup>5</sup>**

(a) *Announcement of post*: The positions of Associate Professors, Professors, Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows are normally to be filled either by promotion of CEU academic staff members or by open advertising. The request to establish or refill a post shall be submitted to the Rector for approval. The position description and term of appointment are the responsibility of the Unit Head in consultation with the Rector.

(b) *Invitations*. In exceptional cases, these positions can be filled on the basis of an invitation from the University, without conducting an open search. Candidates for such invitations must be internationally highly recognized scholars whose work is directly relevant to existing or planned priority areas in the university's academic endeavors. Issuing all such invitations has to be approved by a Standing Appointment Committee of the Provost. The Committee will make sure to receive input from the Unit where the appointment is planned. The members of the Committee are appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Rector.

(c) *Search committee*: When the position is filled by open advertising, a search committee is appointed. The committee is appointed by the Provost, in consultation with the Unit Head (in the case of the professional schools by the Dean, and after final endorsement by the Rector (in the case of the professional schools after final endorsement by the Provost and Rector). The committee includes the Rector, or a person designated by the Rector as Chair; the Unit Head; and at least three other members selected by the Unit Head, including one member external to the unit, or external to CEU. The Rector may appoint further members of the search committee in consultation with the Unit Head.

(d) *Appointment procedures*: The search committee draws up a shortlist. All shortlisted candidates must deliver a job talk and be interviewed by the search committee. At the end of deliberations, and after having received relevant input from faculty and students (see II.A.(c) preceding), the search committee's recommendation and report, based on majority vote by the committee, is sent to the Provost's Office (in

---

<sup>5</sup> A.II.2-3 and A.III.2-3, as listed in chart.

the case of the professional schools to the Dean, who then transmits her/his recommendation and report to the Provost). Ultimate approval rests with the Rector.

#### **II.B.4. Unit affiliation**

(a) Academic staff members are appointed to an academic unit. Faculty teaching in Interdisciplinary Programs (IDPs) must be appointed to at least one academic unit. Appointments to academic units are conducted by the unit in question. Appointments of academic staff teaching in IDPs should be made only through the relevant units: IDPs may not appoint academic staff on their own.

(b) The academic unit in which individual academic staff members perform more than 50% of their contractual teaching load will be considered as the home unit of the respective academic staff members with the exception of faculty teaching in IDPs, whose affiliation is considered on a case by case basis.

(c) In the exceptional case when an academic staff member's teaching is equally distributed in more than one academic units, he or she will be assigned a home unit by the Provost in agreement with the Unit Head and the academic staff member involved. The home unit will be one of the academic units in which the academic staff member teaches.

(d) The home unit is responsible for review, promotion, and all other matters requiring unit involvement. Other units hosting at least one third of the teaching-load of the respective academic staff member are to be consulted in all cases and shall express their evaluation in written form. Academic staff members with at least one third of their individual teaching located in a particular unit enjoy equal status with other permanent academic staff members with regard to internal decision making within the respective unit. In case of faculty teaching in IDPs, matters of review, promotion and participation in the internal affairs of their home units is determined on a case-by-case basis.

#### **II.C. Visiting faculty members and visiting research staff<sup>6</sup>**

(a) Visiting faculty teach normally up to 6 months in a given year.

(b) Recruitment of visiting faculty is usually not based on advertising and search, but rather on past experience of the person's participation in CEU's teaching and research activities including participation in summer schools or workshops. The post must be approved by the Rector. When advertised, the announcement is the responsibility of the Unit Head in consultation with the Rector.

(c) *Hiring procedure:* Detailed documentation of their past service, their future commitment to the CEU and the proposed visiting academic staff member's contract are submitted to the Provost and COO by the Unit Head, after appropriate input from the members of the unit. As a rule, at least two letters of recommendation from outside experts in the field will be requested. The position is subject to final approval by the Rector.

#### **II.D. Postdoctoral fellows**

Postdoctoral fellows are usually hired for specific research projects run by academic units, and their recruitment is usually determined by the particularities of the project.

#### **II.E. Endowed Chairs**

Appointments to endowed chairs or special professorships or research fellowships are regulated by their special by-laws.

---

<sup>6</sup>B as listed in chart.

## II.F. University Professors<sup>7</sup>

University Professors are appointed by the Senate from the ranks of existing CEU Professors, upon the recommendation of the Rector. The Rector informs the Board of Trustees about all University Professor appointments. Nominations by at least three CEU Professors are made to the Senate Committee on University Professors, which, upon conducting a review, including at least two internationally prominent outside reviewers chosen by the committee, advises the Rector and the Provost. The ratio of Professors to University Professors should not exceed 7 to 1<sup>8</sup>.

## II.G. Professor Emeriti<sup>9</sup>

Professor Emeriti are honorary ranks intended to reward long-time commitment to the University and distinguished international academic reputation. The appointment is made by the Senate upon the nomination of the Rector.

## II.H. Unit Heads

(a) *Residence*: Unit Heads should be resident senior academic staff members.

(b) *Appointment in newly established units*: The Rector appoints a Unit Head for a maximum 3-year period and may be renewed. The appointment is based on the recommendation of the steering committee of the unit.

(c) *Rotation*: Departments with at least 3 full-time permanent senior teaching staff (full professors or associate professors), elect their Head subject to the Rector's approval. Appointments are normally for three years and rotation of headship is recommended, but renewal of headship is possible. If the Head of Department is absent for an extended period, an Acting Head should be appointed by the Rector in consultation with the Unit Head. Departments should design their own procedure for electing a Head, and send a copy to the Provost for approval.

(d) Departments which do not meet the criteria outlined above shall have a Head appointed by the Rector after consultation with the Unit's faculty members for one or two year terms.

(e) Research centers decide on their internal procedure of appointing a Head, subject to the approval of the Rector.

(f) Interdisciplinary Program Directors will usually be appointed by internal search. The search committee will be chaired by the Rector and will include the members of the program's IDPC. Whenever a member of the search committee is also a candidate for the headship of the Program, he/she will be replaced by an ad hoc member appointed by the Rector upon proposal by the Unit he/she is representing.

## II.I. Communication of appointments

(a) The Rectorate informs the CEU and the Academic Secretary of all decisions made by the Rector concerning new academic appointments as soon as the appointment decisions have been made (these include appointment of the Provost, of Heads of CEU Departments, Schools, Research Centers, and Programs; as well as CEU academic staff members.)

---

<sup>7</sup> A.II.4, as listed in chart.

<sup>8</sup> University Professors are included in the count of Professors.

<sup>9</sup> A.II.5, as listed in chart

(b) CEU academic appointments are communicated to the CEU community by the Academic Secretary through a designated CEU Website and through the Internal Communication Bulletin.

(c) The list of CEU academic appointments is maintained by the Academic Secretary's office in an electronic location accessible to CEU Community, and in paper form at the Academic Secretary's office.

### **III. Periodic review and evaluation**

#### **III.A. Periodic review procedures for academic staff members**

##### **III.A.1. Individual academic activity reports (IAAR)**

(a) Every resident faculty member is asked to submit a report annually which indicates their achievements since the last report in the areas listed below. Research staff members are asked to provide information in the applicable categories. For the content of IAAR, see Appendix 2.

(b) The deadline for submitting the reports every year is the August 15. As a rule, the reports cover the period of 12 months prior to the submission of the report, or the period since the submission of the last report. The IAARs are collected by the coordinators of each Unit, and submitted electronically both to the Unit Head and to the office of the Provost. The IAARs are stored in the academic staff members' Academic Staff Files.

##### **III.A.2. Academic staff files**

(a) Academic staff files are electronically stored. They contain the staff member's IAARs, the results of the staff member's evaluation, letters of reference and other material relevant to the performance of the staff member. The Provost has access to the files and can give permission to others to view (part of the) contents of the file. Staff members have access to their files, with exception of their reference letters and the reports of the review and promotion committees.

(b) Materials in a staff member's file may be consulted during consideration for re-appointment, promotion, research leave, and awarding of other privileges for which academic staff members are eligible.

##### **III.A.3. Procedure for the periodic review of academic staff members**

(a) An evaluation of appointed (resident) academic staff members' performance (based on IAARs, previous academic performance reviews, if available, and other relevant materials) is done after the first year and then bi-annually in the case of resident instructors; annually in the case of junior academic staff members, and every three years in the case of senior staff members (senior staff members submit an IAAR every year, but they are reviewed every three years).

(b) Specific elements in the procedure for evaluating instructors, lecturers and senior lecturers, practitioners and professors of practice, are described in Appendix 4.

(c) The evaluation is conducted by the Unit Head (or by the Provost, in the case of Unit Heads) according to the following procedure. The staff member meets the Unit Head for an academic development meeting. At the meeting, they discuss the contents of the IAARs and other relevant materials, as well as the staff member's role in the university, and their academic development plans. In the case of junior staff members, special focus should be made on what is required for their promotion to a senior rank.

(d) After the meeting, the Unit Head issues a memorandum which includes the staff member's academic plans and an evaluation of their performance. The Unit Head will discuss the contents of the memorandum with the staff member. The evaluation process has to be concluded before the end of the academic year. The memorandum is filed in the staff member's Academic Staff File. Staff members may submit a request to the Provost to review the memo and may submit their written comments to the memo. Such comments are also to be filed in the staff member's academic file.

(e) If there are concerns about the performance of the academic staff member, the Unit Head should notify the Provost. If the Unit Head deems the performance of the staff member unsatisfactory, they can ask the Provost to initiate the following procedure, if the Provost agrees that the procedure is needed. The Provost calls a meeting with the staff member and the Unit Head where they discuss areas of concern and design a plan (one-year for resident instructors and junior ranks, and two years for senior ranks) to improve the situation. A record of this goes in the academic staff files of the staff member. The evaluation is repeated after one year for junior staff members (as usual) and after two years for senior faculty members. If the performance is not improved as expected, then proceedings to terminate the contract may be initiated.

(f) If a staff member has completed a review procedure for promotion, there is no need for a periodic review during that academic year. This circumstance should be indicated at the annual submission of IAARs.

### **III.B. Guidelines for evaluating academic performance in periodic review and for promotions and re-appointments**

#### **III.B.1. General Principles**

(a) Evaluation of academic performance is divided to three categories: research, service to the university and the larger academic community, and teaching. In case of research staff members who do not participate in teaching, the first two categories are applicable. In case of resident instructors, the second and third categories are applicable.

(b) Principles for the evaluation of instructors, lecturers and senior lecturers, practitioners and professors of practice, are to be found in Appendix 4, attached to the Handbook.

(c) In the case of promotions and re-appointments, the same guidelines are to be considered as when evaluating academic performance. Particular weight is to be given to research, with the understanding that competence in teaching and a collegial attitude in service to the community is also relevant.

#### **III.B.2. Evaluation of research**

(a) CEU is a university where research is a major component of academic activity. Therefore, all faculty members are required to do research alongside their teaching activities. The primary activity of research staff is participation in research.

(b) Research activity, evaluated in academic review, includes research leadership (creation and management of external and internal research groups, programs, centers, and networks) and efforts and success in raising external funding for research.

(c) It is required that all faculty members and research staff publish with reasonable regularity in scholarly periodicals and at academic publishing houses of international stature. The general guidelines for evaluating the publications activity of the staff members are as described below. Some variation across disciplines being unavoidable, each academic unit is expected to prepare its own guidelines. Particular

guidelines, however, must remain within the constraints of the general guidelines set by this document; to ensure conformity with the Handbook, specific guidelines should be submitted to the Senate Academic Quality Assurance Committee.

(d) The following general guidelines set the expected minimum research output:

- Normally, and on average, at least one publication of article length per year is required; that publication should be in English (see exception noted below) and must contain the standard attributes of academic publications.
- For the purpose of the periodic evaluation, an article published in a refereed journal (or, if the discipline of the professor does not fully adhere to the practice of refereed journals, a journal of high academic status) is considered to be a „publication”.
- A book published by an internationally respected academic publisher equals four articles
- Book chapters in books by internationally respected academic publishers count as articles.
- Co-authoring normally counts as publication, but the author may need to demonstrate that s/he played a key role in the underlying research.
- An edited book (by an internationally respected academic publisher) may count as one or two articles, depending on the significance of the staff member's contribution.
- Articles not yet published but accepted for publication shall count as publications.
- Depending on the particular discipline's international orientation, publications in German and French are also acceptable.
- It is desirable that CEU academic staff members be active participants in their local academic environment. Therefore, the university does not discourage publishing in other languages. However, publications in other languages are acceptable for purposes of academic evaluation at CEU only if: (1) there is documented evidence for the staff member's presence in international academic journals and at international academic publishing houses; (2) the choice of the local language is reasonable; (3) the publication appears in a refereed journal or in a non-refereed but highly prestigious academic journal (or publishing house). In case it is necessary, senior academic staff members from the Unit or elsewhere may be invited by the Unit Head to evaluate other language publications.
- Depending on discipline, other forms of scholarly output, such as catalogued exhibitions for historians and medievalists, may be acceptable as substitutes for publications.

(e) The Rector may give temporary exemption from the scholarly activity if the faculty member is involved in some very time consuming administrative tasks (e.g. Provost)

### **III.B.2. Evaluation of service to the academic community**

(a) As part of the academic performance review, it should be considered whether the staff member contributes to the administration of the department and the university in a collegial manner. For example, it may be asked whether they accept the need to serve on committees, help in organizing events, take part in recruiting and admissions activities, sponsorship of student and alumni organizations, contribution to publicity and fundraising activities, participation in SUN and outreach events, etc.

(b) CEU has a special relationship with OSF; cooperation with OSF can include work on OSF-CEU projects and other activities that contribute to the wider community in the context of CEU's mission such as guest lecturing, capacity building, and contribution to societies and organizations compatible with CEU's mission, etc.

(c) Further, services to the larger academic community may be considered: refereeing for journals and publishers, membership of editorial boards, involvement in the assessment of grants, promotions, projects, etc.

### **III.B.3. Evaluation of teaching**

(a) Evaluation of classroom teaching is based on course quality, including a review of syllabi, student opinion (based on course evaluations and other evidence if available), and the degree to which the faculty member has reflected and acted upon their own and external inputs into their teaching practice.

(b) Quality of supervision (or consultation in the case of instructors), is reviewed based on quantitative evidence (the number of students' supervised, completion rates), results of supervision evaluation by students, self-assessment forms by doctoral students, further feedback from masters and doctoral students, and other relevant materials and information.

(c) The course and supervision evaluation procedure is described in a separate section below.

(d) Classroom visits may be conducted if deemed necessary.

### **III.B.4. Course and Supervision Evaluation**

(a) Course, consultation and supervision evaluations by students serve as one of the tools of review in considering re-appointment, promotion, research leave, and the awarding of professional development funding. CEU students shall evaluate each course offered as part of their formal study program as well as the quality of masters and doctoral supervision. Evaluations are conducted anonymously through a university-wide online survey program. Both course and supervision evaluations should use the standard CEU forms. Programs should conduct additional evaluations and may add elements to the standard forms in consultation with the Provost and the Pro-Rector for Social Sciences and Humanities. Students shall evaluate consultation services anonymously as part of their course evaluation in the fall semester, and separately at the end of the academic year.

(b) In addition to surveys, Departments and Schools should employ other modes of evaluation and feedback, including regular meetings with students, either in the form of townhalls or meetings of the unit head and program director with student representatives. There should be at least two such meetings per academic year, one in the fall to collect student feedback, and one in the spring to collect any additional feedback and to report back to the students on the use of their feedback for program and course improvement.

(c) Individual faculty members should include course evaluation scores and summary of relevant student comments in their Individual Academic Activity Reports (IAARs), reflecting on their significance for their teaching and outlining any changes made. Unit Heads should ensure that this is complied with.

(d) The evaluation procedure is described in detail in Appendix 5 to the Handbook.

## **IV. Re-appointment and promotion**

### **IV.A. Re-appointment and Promotion Committee for academic departments<sup>10</sup>**

(a) The CEU Re-appointment and Promotion Committee for departments and research centres is a committee chaired by the Provost, who may delegate this to the Pro-Rector for Social Sciences and Humanities. The committee has five additional members, appointed by Senate. Normally, members are nominated by the Chair (after consulting the serving members of the Committee), but the Senate can also nominate members for the Committee.

(b) Members of the RP Committee will be Associate or Full Professors with a permanent contract at CEU, appointed in staggered, renewable three-year terms. At least half of the members of the RP Committee (including the Provost) are full Professors. There cannot be more than one member from one academic unit, and the composition of the Committee at any time should reflect a variety of disciplines (for example, both from the humanities and the social sciences). Over the years, membership should rotate among different academic units. Members of the RP Committee do not participate in internal committees for promotion and re-appointment during their membership in the RP Committee. Academic unit heads can be invited to attend the sessions of the RP committee when the cases from their respective units are discussed.

(c) The RP Committee reviews and discusses all promotion and re-appointment cases, and advises the Provost on forming a recommendation. The Provost formulates a recommendation and forwards it to the Rector, who has the final decision.

(d) In cases of promotions and reviews which are, for some reason, not covered by the following sections, the RP Committee, in consultation with the head of department, should design a process that follows the most appropriate process as closely as possible. In general, the process should be treated with appropriate flexibility to accommodate possibly unforeseen circumstances.

### **IV.B. Re-appointment and Promotion Committee for the Schools**

(a) The Business School and the School of Public Policy have both scholarly, professional and practitioner missions. Accordingly, each school has its own re-appointment and promotion committee. This committee comprises members of the senior faculty of the School, according to the School's internal regulations. Several external letters for re-appointment and promotion are solicited for all cases described below for academic departments: for re-appointment of junior academic staff members, and for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor.

(b) Re-appointment and promotion adhere generally to the same processes that are carried out in the case the academic departments as described below. The Schools' policies regulate the rules for early promotion of junior academic staff members, the review for re-appointment in the fourth year of the junior academic staff member's contract, and subsequent promotions. It is generally an expectation at the Schools – as well as at the rest of the university – that all Assistant Professors should be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor in the seventh year of their employment the latest (adjusted for parental leave or other relevant circumstances.)

(c) The School Re-appointment and Promotion Committee comprises the Provost, the School Deans, and two additional senior faculty members of the rank of full Professor with a permanent contract at

---

<sup>10</sup>Faculty members teaching in an interdisciplinary program will observe the same policy as faculty in departments. Most research centers at CEU have faculty whose primary affiliation is in an academic department. Some research centers belong to one of the Schools: faculty in those centers participate in the promotion procedure of their School. Faculty in research centers outside the Schools, and without a primary affiliation in a department, participate in the promotion procedure of academic departments.

CEU, from departments outside the Schools, who are nominated by the Rector and are approved by the Senate. The Provost chairs the SRP Committee. After a rigorous and comprehensive re-appointment and promotion process is carried out at the School level, the Dean sends a recommendation to the Provost, together with the external letters and the materials submitted by the faculty member considered for promotion or re-appointment. The Provost submits the Dean's recommendation and the supporting materials for discussion to the SRP Committee. Taking into consideration the recommendations of the Dean and the advice of the SRP committee, the Provost forms a recommendation and forwards it to the Rector for a final decision.

(d) Further aspects of the re-appointment and promotion process are regulated by the internal regulations of the Schools.

### **IV.C. Re-appointment of Instructors**

(a) Normally, instructors initially receive a contract for one year. Observing the deadline for preparing the review, the Unit Head convenes, upon consultation with the Provost, a review committee in due time. The committee is chaired by the Unit Head and includes two or more senior staff members from other units. The review is based on student feedback from courses and consultations, classroom visits and any other relevant material collected by the committee or submitted by the Instructor (who is notified about the convening of the committee.) The review should focus on whether the Instructor is proceeding with his or her professional, teaching, and administrative duties. The review will be finished by the end of April of the first year, and either the contract runs to the end of the academic year and no re-appointment is made, or after the expiry of the initial contract, a re-appointment is made with a fixed term or an indefinite contract, depending on the recommendation of the review committee. The re-appointment is subject to final endorsement by the Rector.

(b) In case an Instructor's contract is up for further renewal, the same process should be observed. No promotion is possible in the case of Instructors.

### **IV.D. Junior faculty in the academic departments (faculty hired in the Assistant Professor Rank<sup>11</sup>)**

This section (IV.D) applies to junior faculty appointed in a department, interdisciplinary program or research centre outside the Schools, with no prior employment at CEU. The first contract for junior faculty is usually for four years.

#### **IV.D.1. Junior faculty applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (or Research Fellow) in year 2-3 of their employment ('early promotion')**

(a) Junior faculty members can be recommended by their heads of departments, or can apply themselves, after consultation with their head of department, for early promotion, starting in the second year of their employment. Normally, promotion is done according to the usual promotion schedule (specified in Appendix 3). In exceptional cases, a different schedule can be designed with the agreement of the Provost.

(b) The procedure for early promotion is as follows.

- An **internal committee**, usually chaired by the head of department<sup>12</sup>, including at least two

---

<sup>11</sup> The same procedure applies to Associate Research Fellows, with proper adjustment for the fact that Associate Research Fellows may have only a limited involvement in teaching.

<sup>12</sup> In case of interdisciplinary programs, the head of the interdisciplinary program assumes the duties of the head of department. In case of faculty with a primary appointment in a research centre outside the Schools, the head of the centre

additional senior CEU faculty members (in or outside the department) is appointed by the Provost, following a recommendation by the head of department. Departments may involve more than three members in their internal deliberations.

- The candidate is invited to submit materials by the chair of the internal committee.
- The internal committee prepares a joint report based on the materials submitted by the candidate, and any other materials the committee deems as relevant. In case there is no consensus in the committee, committee members can submit dissenting opinions.

The general expectations to qualify a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the following. There must be evidence of international recognition in the relevant subject with reference to originality and contribution to the advancement of knowledge. The evidence must include appropriate international publications. It is expected that the faculty member starts to develop a research direction that goes beyond the material of the doctoral thesis. There has to be effective contribution to teaching and a collegial attitude towards service of the community. Each of these areas should be addressed in the report, and the findings should be supported by adequate evidence.

The report concludes with one of the following recommendations:

1. The faculty member is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor and receives a permanent contract.
  2. The faculty member is not promoted to the rank of Associate Professor.
- If the internal committee's unanimous recommendation is against promotion, or if the internal committee cannot reach a consensual decision, the report and the materials are submitted to the RP committee for discussion. If, based on the submitted materials and this discussion, the Provost recommends that no promotion takes place, the recommendation can be directly forwarded to the Rector for a final decision. Alternatively, after the discussion by the RP committee, the Provost may decide that external reports are needed. The Rector can also request, even if the matter was first directly forwarded to him or her, that external reports are collected before he or she makes a final decision. In these cases the process moves to the next stage below. No promotion can be granted without the involvement of external referees.
  - In the cases indicated in the previous paragraph, or if the internal committee's unanimous recommendation is for promotion, the Provost selects at least three external reviewers; the reviewers are chosen from a list of at least five names submitted by the chair of the internal committee, but one reviewer can be proposed by the Provost, after consultation with the chair of the committee. The chair of the internal committee solicits reports from the referees by using a sample letter, asking the referees about promotion and the consequent permanent contract.
  - After the external reports arrive, the internal committee has an opportunity to reflect on the content of the external reports. This has particular relevance if there is a discrepancy between the internal reports and the external reports. If there is no discrepancy, the extra reflection can be omitted at the discretion of the internal committee.
  - All materials (materials used for the reports, internal, external reports, possible reflection on external reports) are submitted to the RP Committee.
  - After due deliberations by the Committee, the Provost makes one of the following recommendations to the Rector:
    1. The faculty member is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor and receives a permanent contract
    2. Reject the request for promotion. In such a case, the normal process is to repeat the whole review at a later time (including external referees who should preferably be different from the referees employed in the first round.)
  - the recommendation is sent to the Rector who makes a final decision.

---

assume the duties of the head of department. In all units, in case of conflict of interest, or other exceptional circumstances, the internal committee may be chaired by a faculty member other than the head of department.

#### **IV.D.2. Junior faculty appointed for a definite term, with no prior employment at CEU, normal procedure for re-appointment**

(a) The maximum period for continuous fixed term employment in Hungary is five years. The first contract at CEU is usually for four years. The re-appointment process normally starts in the fourth year of the junior faculty member's employment, according to the schedule specified in Appendix 3.

(b) The procedure for re-appointment is as follows.

- An **internal committee**, as described in IV.D.1, is appointed by the Provost
- The candidate is invited to submit the relevant materials by the chair of the internal committee. (See Appendix 3)
- The internal committee prepares a joint report based on the materials submitted by the candidate, and any other materials the committee deems as relevant. In case there is no consensus in the committee, committee members can submit dissenting opinions.

CEU aims to promote all junior faculty within seven years of the start of their employment. Parental and medical leave, and certain forms of unpaid leave (at the discretion of the Provost, in consultation with the unit head) do not count towards the seven years. Parental leave has to be taken into account in the internal report explicitly.

The report should focus on whether the Assistant Professor is proceeding with his or her academic work, with his or her professional, teaching, and administrative duties, whether he or she is well integrated in his or her academic unit, and whether he or she is suitable for promotion at that point, or within one or two, but a maximum of three years (in case of medical leave, parental leave or other instance when the seven years are extended, this number should be modified accordingly).

The last point should be addressed, in particular, with reference to the promotion criteria for Associate Professor, as specified in IV.D.1 above. If the candidate is not suitable for promotion at the time of the re-appointment review, the report should indicate, as precisely as possible, what further conditions need to be fulfilled in order to become suitable for promotion.

The report concludes with one of the following recommendations:

1. promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and re-appointment with a permanent contract
  2. re-appointment with a permanent contract, but no promotion. In this case, the report should specify at least some of the missing elements that would be needed for promotion (e.g. publications of a certain kind, etc.). The report should also express a view on whether promotion will need the repeated involvement of external referees
  3. no promotion, and re-appointment for a further year of grace period.
  4. in exceptional cases, a re-appointment for a further year with a proposal to repeat the review with an extraordinary schedule before the additional year runs out.
- If the internal committee's unanimous recommendation is against re-appointment with a permanent contract, or if the internal committee cannot reach a consensual decision, the report and the materials are submitted to the RP committee for discussion. If, based on the submitted materials and this discussion, the Provost recommends that no re-appointment with a permanent contract should take place, the recommendation can be directly forwarded to the Rector for a final decision. Alternatively, after the discussion by the RP committee, the Provost may decide that external reports are needed. The Rector can also request, even if the matter was first directly forwarded to him or her, that external reports are collected before he or she makes a final decision. In these cases the process moves to the next stage below. No re-appointment with a permanent contract for junior faculty can be granted without the involvement of external referees.

- In the cases mentioned in the previous paragraph, or if the internal committee unanimously recommends promotion or re-appointment with a permanent contract, the Provost selects at least three **external reviewers**; the reviewers are chosen from a list of at least five names submitted by the chair of the internal committee, but one may be proposed by the Provost, after consultation with the chair of the internal committee. The chair of the internal committee solicits reports from the referees by using a sample letter. If the internal committee proposes promotion, the external referees are contacted on the issue of promotion (mentioning the issue of re-appointment with a permanent contract). If no promotion is proposed, the referees are asked about re-appointment for a permanent contract (mentioning the issue of promotion).
- After the external reports arrive, the internal committee has an opportunity to reflect on the content of the external reports. This has particular relevance if there is a discrepancy between the internal report and some of the external reports. If there is no discrepancy, the extra reflection can be omitted.
- All materials (materials submitted by the candidate, additional material used by the committee, internal, external reports, possible internal reflection on external reports) are submitted to the Re-appointment and Promotion Committee. After due deliberations by the Committee, the Provost makes one of the following recommendations to the Rector:
  1. promotion + re-appointment with a permanent contract
  2. re-appointment with a permanent contract, but no promotion. In this case, the committee needs to specify at least some of the missing elements that would be needed for promotion, and recommend that certain conditions are accordingly put in the contract, (e.g. about papers, book manuscripts submitted/accepted within a certain deadline). The committee also specifies if the promotion will need the repeated involvement of external referees (taking into account the department's recommendation).
  3. re-appointment for a further year of grace period with no promotion.
  4. in exceptional cases, a re-appointment for a further year with a proposal to repeat the review with an extraordinary schedule before the additional year runs out.
- the recommendation is sent to the Rector who makes a final decision.

(c) In the exceptional case where a further one year contract is given and the Rector endorses the recommendation to repeat the review before the additional year runs out, the conditions of the review are established by the Provost, after consultation with the chair of the internal committee and the RP committee, on a case-by-case basis. No permanent contract can be given to junior faculty members, and no promotion can take place without the involvement of external referees at some point of the process.

#### **IV.D.3. Promotion of junior faculty within 1-3 years of receiving a permanent contract**

(a) As IV.D.2 makes clear, junior faculty can be awarded a permanent contract before they are promoted, with the understanding that there is a serious prospect of their becoming suitable for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor within one to three years of the review. Whenever this point arrives, and in the seventh year the latest (unless the deadline was extended because of parental leave or similar consideration), a process of promotion should be started. The process should go as follows:

(b) The procedure for promotion is as follows.

- An **internal committee**, as described in IV.D.1, is appointed by the Provost.
- The candidate is invited to submit materials by the chair of the internal committee.
- The internal committee prepares a joint report based on the materials submitted by the candidate, and any other materials the committee deems as relevant. In case there is no consensus in the committee, committee members can submit dissenting opinions. The report should assess whether the faculty member is suitable for promotion, based on the criteria listed in IV.D.1. Each of these points needs to be addressed in the report, and the findings need to be supported by adequate evidence. If the internal committee recommends that external reports are solicited, this

should be signalled and justified in the report (taking into account the recommendations formulated on the occasion of the faculty member's receiving a permanent contract.)

The report concludes with one of the following recommendations:

1. The faculty member is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor
  2. The faculty member is not promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. In this case, particular attention should be paid to the issue whether the conditions specified in the contract were fulfilled by the faculty member.
- In the standard case, no external opinion is solicited at this point, given that the faculty member had gone through a thorough review involving external reports when his or her contract was renewed a few years before the promotion process takes place. Therefore in the standard case, the next step concerning external reports is omitted, and all materials are submitted to the RP committee.
  - In some cases the Provost may decide, upon the advice of the RP committee and taking into account the internal committee's recommendation and the recommendations made on the occasion of awarding a permanent contract, to involve external referees, according to the process specified in IV.D.1. The referees asked may be different from those involved in the previous re-appointment process. If external reports are solicited, the internal committee has an opportunity to reflect on the content of the external reports. This has particular relevance if there is a discrepancy between the internal report and some of the external reports. If there is no discrepancy, the extra reflection can be omitted.
  - All materials (including reports) are submitted to the RP Committee.
  - After due deliberations by the Committee, the Provost makes one of the following recommendations to the Rector:
    1. The faculty member is promoted to the rank of Associate Professor
    2. The faculty member is not promoted to the rank of Associate Professor. In this case, particular attention should be paid to the issue whether the conditions specified in the contract were fulfilled by the faculty member. If not, the Provost can recommend that the termination of contract is initiated.
  - the recommendation is sent to the Rector who makes a final decision.

#### **IV.D.4. Re-appointment and promotion of faculty with joint appointments**

At the beginning of the joint appointment, heads of respective units should agree on a single joint process of the faculty member's review, re-appointment and promotion. This process should acknowledge the faculty member's multiple academic commitments and should take his or her interdisciplinary work into account. Evaluation criteria should be based on the primary disciplinary area of the faculty member's academic focus. Departments and schools should select external reviewers jointly, with the goal of identifying scholars who are capable of looking beyond traditional disciplinary cores.

#### **IV.D.5. Unsatisfactory progress in the first two years**

If the academic performance of the Assistant Professor in the first year is highly unsatisfactory, and no improvement is shown in the course of the second year, the head of department may decide to convene a review committee in the third year. Following the usual process for review, the internal committee may propose to the RP Committee not to renew the contract beyond the initial four years at all. After due deliberations by the RP Committee, the Provost makes a recommendation to the Rector, who makes the final decision. If no renewal is to be made at the expiry of the first contract, it is expected that the Assistant Professor is notified of this decision by the beginning of their fourth year, so that he or she still has sufficient time for searching for new employment.

#### IV.D.6. Non-research track

(a) If an Assistant Professor is not promoted by the end of the eighth year of their employment, they will be assigned to a non-research track and their standard FTE teaching load increases to 16 credits and/or their administrative duties may increase. This does not preclude promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (in the standard sense) at a later date.

(b) Faculty on non-research track are not automatically entitled to the usual forms of research support, for example, travel grant support or sabbatical research leave.

#### IV.E. Re-appointment of Associate Professors and Professors<sup>13</sup>

This section (IV.E) applies to faculty appointed for a definite term in a department, interdisciplinary program or research centre outside the Schools, with no prior employment at CEU. Normally, the first contract at CEU is for four years.

(a) Faculty can be appointed in the rank of Associate or Full Professor with a fixed term contract. No later than in the fourth year of their employment, a re-appointment review should take place. As a rule, this review does not involve external referees, but exceptionally, the Provost may decide (based on appropriate advice) that external referees are consulted. The re-appointment should follow the schedule for promotions and re-appointments as specified in Appendix 3.

(b) The procedure for re-appointment is as follows.

- An **internal committee** is appointed. For Associate Professors, the internal committee is chaired by the head of department and includes at least two additional senior CEU faculty members (in or outside the department); for Professors, the internal committee consists of at least three Professors. The committees and the chair of the Professorial committee are appointed by the Provost, following a recommendation by the head of department.
- The candidate is invited to submit materials by the chair of the internal committee.
- The internal committee prepares a report, which should focus on whether the Associate Professor or Professor is proceeding with his or her academic work, with his or her professional, teaching, and administrative duties, whether he or she is well integrated in his or her academic unit. In case there is no consensus in the committee, committee members can submit dissenting opinions.

In exceptional cases, the internal committee can propose – after proper justification – that external referees are also appointed.

The report should conclude with one of the following recommendations:

- a re-appointment with permanent contract is given
- a re-appointment with an additional one year is given which serves as a grace period.
- in exceptional cases, a re-appointment for a further year with a proposal to repeat the review with an extraordinary schedule before the additional year runs out.
- All materials (materials used for the reports and the internal report) are submitted to the RP Committee. In the case of full Professors, the constitution of the RP Committee needs adjustment. Only the full Professor members of the RP Committee participate in the decision, but they can co-opt, for the purpose of this particular case, Professors from other departments at CEU.
- In the standard cases, no external opinion is solicited at this point. In some cases the Provost may decide, upon the advice of the RP committee and taking into account the internal committee's recommendation, to involve external referees.
- If external referees are appointed, the Provost consults the chair of the internal committee for

---

<sup>13</sup>The same procedure applies to Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows, with proper adjustment for the fact that these faculty members may have only a limited involvement in teaching.

recommendations, then selects at least three **external reviewers**; one out of the three may be proposed by the Provost, after consultation with the chair of the internal committee. The chair collects the reports by using a sample letter.

- If external references are asked, the internal review committee has an opportunity to reflect on the content of the external reports, especially in case there is a discrepancy between the internal and external recommendations.
- Once the RP committee is in possession of all the materials, after due deliberation of the Committee, the Provost makes one of the following recommendation to the Rector:
  - a re-appointment with permanent contract is given
  - a re-appointment with an additional one year is given which serves as a grace period.
  - in exceptional cases, a re-appointment for a further year with a proposal to repeat the review with an extraordinary schedule before the additional year runs out.
- The recommendation is sent to the Rector who makes a final decision.

(c) In the exceptional case where a further one year contract is given and the Rector endorses the recommendation to repeat the review before the additional year runs out, the conditions of the review are established by the Provost, after consultation with the chair of the internal committee and the RP committee, on a case-by-case basis.

#### **IV.F. “Egyetemi tanár” and “Egyetemi docens”**

‘Egyetemi tanár’ (literally, ‘university professor’<sup>14</sup>) is the highest faculty rank in the Hungarian university system. Appointment or promotion to this rank is not an internal affair of institutions of higher education: the position is announced by the university, but is filled through a process of external quality control by the Hungarian Accreditation Committee (MAB), as well as administrative supervision by the ministry responsible for the higher education. The title is eventually formally awarded by the President of the Republic. At CEU, the academic record of applicants for promotion / appointment to the ‘egyetemi tanár’ rank is internally pre-assessed by the Senate Egyetemi Tanár Applications Evaluation Committee, according to criteria provided by the MAB.

According to 87.§ (3) of the Hungarian Higher Education Act, the conditions for being appointed as ‘egyetemi docens’ are the following: possession of a doctoral degree, competence in advising students, PhD students and in mentoring junior faculty, the ability to lecture in an international language, appropriate experience in teaching at a university level. It is expected that everyone at CEU who is appointed as an Associate Professor or in a higher rank, either through internal promotion or external search, satisfies these criteria, except for the requirement of possessing 10 years of experience or habilitation. The guarantee of appropriate standards is to be found in the internal review procedure and the external expert reviews (by the external reviewers in the case of promotion, and the external referees in the case of a search). Therefore everyone at the university in the rank of Associate Professor or higher, having 10 years of university level teaching experience or habilitation, is entitled to appointment as an ‘egyetemi docens’. The equivalent Hungarian academic rank of CEU Associate Professors, until they have accumulated 10 years of teaching experience or obtained habilitation, is ‘adjunktus’.

#### **IV.G. Promotion to the rank of full Professor<sup>15</sup>**

This section (IV.G) applies to faculty appointed in a department, interdisciplinary program or research centre outside the Schools.

---

<sup>14</sup> Please note that the ‘egyetemi tanár’ title is distinct from the ‘University Professor’ title, and faculty holding the ‘egyetemi tanár’ title should not use the ‘University Professor’ title at CEU. Please see section IV.H. for the procedure of appointment of University Professors.

<sup>15</sup> The same procedure applies to promotion to the rank of Senior Research Fellow, with proper adjustment for the fact that these faculty members may have only a limited involvement in teaching.

(a) Associate Professors can apply for promotion to the rank of full Professor after a consultation with their head of department, or be recommended by their heads of departments directly. If someone starts his or her employment at CEU in the rank of Associate Professor, the earliest they can apply for promotion is in his or her second year. In case of unsuccessful application, re-applying is possible after two years. Normally, promotion is done according to the usual promotion schedule (specified in Appendix 3). In exceptional cases, a different schedule can be designed with the agreement of the Provost.

(b) This process starts with the adjustment of the Re-appointment and Promotion Committee to make sure that everyone who participates in the decision is a full Professor. The full Professors who are members of the RP Committee may decide to co-opt other Professors for the purposes of this specific review.

(c) The procedure for promotion is as follows.

- An **internal committee** is formed by at least three CEU Professors, selected by the Provost, upon recommendation of the head of department. The Provost also appoints the chair of the committee.
- The candidate is invited to submit the relevant materials by the chair of the internal committee.
- The committee prepares a joint report based on the materials submitted by the candidate, and any other materials the committee deems as relevant. In case there is no consensus in the committee, committee members can submit dissenting opinions.

The general expectations to qualify an academic staff member for promotion to the rank of Professor are the following. There must be evidence of international recognition and established research leadership in the relevant subject with reference to originality, contribution to the advancement of knowledge and reputation. Beyond publications, evidence can be collected from citations, successful completions of supervised PhDs, awards, leadership and role in international professional organisations and research projects. There must be evidence of an effective contribution to teaching. Further, there must be evidence of an effective contribution to the subject other than in teaching and research, in the service of CEU and the wider academic community.

Each of these areas should be addressed in the report, and the findings should be supported by adequate evidence.

The report concludes with one of the following recommendations:

1. Promotion to the rank of Professor. In case the faculty member has a fixed term contract, promotion also means awarding a permanent contract.
  2. No promotion to the rank of Professor.
- If the internal committee's unanimous recommendation is against promotion, or if the internal committee cannot reach a consensual decision, the report and the materials are submitted to the RP committee for discussion. If, based on the submitted materials and this discussion, the Provost recommends that no promotion takes place, the recommendation can be directly forwarded to the Rector for a final decision. Alternatively, after the discussion by the RP committee, the Provost may decide that external reports are needed. The Rector can also request, even if the matter was first directly forwarded to him or her, that external reports are collected before he or she makes a final decision. In these cases the process moves to the next stage below. No promotion can be granted without the involvement of external referees.
  - In the cases mentioned in the previous paragraph, or if the internal committee's unanimous recommendation is for promotion, the Provost selects at least four **external reviewers**; the reviewers are chosen from a list of at least six names submitted by the chair of the internal committee, but one referee may be proposed by the Provost, after consultation with the chair of the internal committee. The chair of the internal committee solicits reports from the external

- referees by using a sample letter.
- After the external reports arrive, the internal committee has an opportunity to reflect on the content of the external reports. This has particular relevance if there is a discrepancy between the internal report and some of the external reports. If there is no discrepancy, the extra reflection can be omitted.
- All required materials are submitted to the Re-appointment and Promotion Committee. On the basis of the Committee's advice, the Provost makes one of the following recommendations to the Rector:
  1. promotion of the candidate to the rank of full Professor
  2. no promotion to the rank of full Professor
- the recommendation is sent to the Rector who makes a final decision.

#### **IV.H. Appointment of University Professors**

This section (IV.H) applies to all faculty members, in departments, Schools, research centres or interdisciplinary programs.

(a) The general expectations to qualify a Professor for appointment to the rank of University Professor are the following. There must be evidence of a very high level of internationally recognized and published scholarship; demonstrated leadership in interdisciplinary teaching and research; and an outstanding contribution to CEU or wider academic community.

(b) Nominations for the rank of University Professor are made by at least three CEU Professors to the Senate Committee on University Professors, which, upon conducting a review, including at least two internationally prominent outside reviewers chosen by the committee, makes a recommendation to the Rector and the Provost.

(c) The Senate Committee on University Professors is formed by the decision of the Senate. The committee is chaired by the Provost and comprises three to five members elected by the Senate. The members of the Committee are faculty members in the rank of Professor or University Professor. The term of membership of the Committee is three years, renewable at the discretion of the Senate.

(d) Based on Committee's recommendation, the Rector and the Provost make a proposal to the Senate to appoint the candidate to the rank of University Professor. Following Senate's approval, the Rector communicates the appointment to the Board of Trustees.

#### **IV.I. Faculty hired with previous employment at CEU**

This section (IV.I) applies to all faculty members, in departments, Schools, research centres or programs.

Occasionally, people who are employed as visiting faculty or work at CEU in some other capacity are appointed to a faculty position following a search. Since the maximum of five year fixed term contract (required by Hungarian labour laws) applies to these people too, the normal procedure is not applicable in their case.

There is no general recipe for these cases, because individual circumstances (eg length of employment) may vary, and hence we need a case-by-case treatment. The general guidelines are:

- as a rule, the requirement of promotion within seven years from initial junior faculty appointment applies here too (with considering parental leave, etc.)
- as a rule, no permanent appointment is to be given without a proper review process. Hence the initial contract cannot go beyond the maximum period of fixed term employment. (Eg. if the faculty member spends two years at CEU as a visiting professor, the maximum length of initial contract is two or three years).

- a review for permanent contract will have to take place earlier than normal. It is best to agree at the time of the employment how this will be done. The timing of the review may shorten the grace period that can be given in case of a negative decision. This has to be agreed clearly at the time of drawing the initial contract.
- HR should review whether there are faculty members at any time in this situation at CEU (ie with employment at CEU prior to appointment to a faculty position). For each of them, an individual plan for the review of re-appointment should be drawn up.

#### **IV.J Request to review procedure**

(a) A Review Committee is appointed by the Senate, with the authority to investigate claims that a University policy was not properly applied in the process of promotions and re-appointment. The Review Committee will not consider substantive issues of professional competence or issues which are within the competence of other university bodies.

(b) The candidate is notified of the recommendation of the internal review committee, and also of the recommendation of the Provost to the Rector. If the candidate has good reason to believe that prior to the recommendation, some policy was not applied properly, he or she can register his or her complaint with the Review Committee within 14 days of being notified of these recommendations, and before the Rector's final decision is made.

(c) The Review Committee has three members who are permanent faculty members at CEU, and are appointed in staggered three-year terms by the Senate, based on nominations by the Rector. The members of the Review Committee are different from those of the Re-appointment and Promotion committee.

(d) The chair of the Review Committee or a member appointed by the chair will attempt to resolve the matter informally; if that is not successful, the Review Committee will consider the case and establish whether the complaint had any basis. The members of the committee will have access to documents that are relevant to the process and were made prior to the complaint, except for those which are covered by legal privilege. If the committee finds that some policy was not properly observed, they can recommend repeating in full or revisiting in part the appointment or promotion procedure with appropriate changes. Once the Review Committee starts a process, the schedule of the re-appointment or promotion process needs to be readjusted upon consultation with the Provost, including a deadline for the Review Committee to complete its work. The recommendation of the Review Committee is sent to the Rector, who can request a part of the procedure to be repeated or revisited, and takes the findings of the Review Committee into account before making a decision to offer a new contract or grant a promotion.

(e) Decisions by the Review Committee or by the Provost or the Rector are not labor measures even if – as an indirect consequence – the academic staff member's contract was to terminate through expiration or otherwise.

## **V. Residence, work load and research leave**

### **V.A. Residence**

(a) Resident full-time academic staff members intending to engage in teaching or other salaried appointment outside CEU—beyond occasional or incidental professional consultation, etc., up to 4 hours/week—are required to request written permission from the Rector, following the endorsement of the Unit Head. Permission is dependent on the academic staff member's ability to continue to perform his/her responsibilities at CEU; otherwise the appointment has to be re-negotiated provided CEU's academic staffing needs continue to be satisfied.

(b) No full-time academic staff member is allowed to have more than a half additional teaching load at another university, nor to fulfill the task of head of a department elsewhere. This restriction does not apply to research positions, provided that the published research also carries the imprimatur of the CEU.

(c) Direct contact with students during term time (including classroom teaching, office hours and other consultation) is normally expected to spread over at least three days of the week.

### **V.B. Workload**

#### **V.B.1. FTE for resident instructors**

The FTE for resident instructors is 10 course credits. They are also expected to provide consultation and be in their offices according to the guidelines agreed between the head of their unit and the Provost. They should also undertake such items from the 'workload' list of academic faculty as may be relevant for the unit in which they work.

#### **V.B.2. Full-time equivalent (FTE) workload for resident faculty members**

(a) The normal full-time work load of resident faculty members is 40 hours per week. All resident faculty members are expected to engage in research, administration, as well as teaching. A workload is normally divided according to the following approximate percentages: teaching (including supervision) 30-50%; research (including research management) 30-50%; other administration 30-10%. For faculty with joint appointments, heads of respective units should agree on which administrative responsibilities the faculty member will perform in each unit, with a view of avoiding administrative overload. Whenever feasible, administrative tasks should be proportionate to the percentage of employment in each unit.

(b) The time schedule and work-load of research staff members should be approximately equal to the teaching staff members, and will be defined from case to case; research staff is engaged in research (including research management) at least 90% of their time.

(c) Apart from the obligation of resident faculty members to engage in research, the work load (other than Unit Heads) consists principally of the following:

- formal (classroom) teaching hours (for research staff members: research work on specified projects);
- thesis (research, writing) supervision and consultation with students upon their request or by unit scheduling;
- consultations during open office hours, totaling four hours per week;
- examination and evaluation duties;
- duties in admissions and recruitment;

- participation in the administration of the unit (including, but not limited to, correspondence, scholarly contacts, curriculum and/or research project planning and development) and of CEU (service on University or Senate committees, etc.)
- participation in unit and CEU research projects, directing of researchers, regular research and publication, preparation and delivery of papers to the scholarly or professional community (or comparable contributions)
- service to the wider community, including cooperation with OSF and the Soros Foundations.

### **V.B.3. Full-time teaching equivalency**

#### *V.B.3.1. Classroom teaching*

(a) The full-time CEU teaching load is 12 credits (7,200 teaching minutes) allocated for classroom teaching over the course of three terms. Faculty members with the title of the “University Professor” need to teach only 8 credits instead of 12. Departments can award a teaching reduction of altogether 4 credits for junior faculty in the first two years (2 in both years or 4 in one year).

(b) Unit Heads have to satisfy a minimum of 6 teaching credits.

(c) Heads of MA programs directors of interdisciplinary specializations and advanced certificate programs, doctoral programs and doctoral schools may, at the discretion of the Provost and in consultation with the Head of the Unit, be allowed a teaching concession of no more than 2 credits.

(d) The Provost, the Pro-Rector(s) and the Deans teach at their discretion.

(e) If two or more teachers jointly teach a course, dividing the sessions between them and not both (all) participating in all sessions, each of them will each receive a pro-rated portion of the credit(s) assigned to the course. However, if the teaching is carried out jointly by two teachers, and they are both participating in all sessions and each assessing all course work, then each of them will be granted the full number of credits assigned to that course.

(f) These guidelines should be understood as an annual average for the time period when CEU is in session. As the full-time load is calculated as an average, there may be years with a higher load, while others will have a lower load.

(g) To accommodate extra administrative duties, special assignments or major research projects, the Unit Head and Provost, in consultation, may temporarily reduce a teaching staff member’s teaching load.

#### *V.B.3.2. Supervision and class minimums*

(a) Supervision is part of the normal workload, and it is understood that every faculty member participates in the supervision of theses. Supervision of MA and doctoral theses should be distributed as equally as is consistent with the competence of the potential supervisors at the level in question (for example, if someone supervises a large number of PhD students, they should supervise fewer MA students). Under normal circumstances, no-one should supervise more than 6 doctoral students. Departments may fix limits on the number of MA dissertations to be supervised by a single member of faculty.

(b) The minimum number of students for any CEU lecture or seminar course is five (5) for master’s courses and three (3) for doctoral courses. Any exception has to be approved by the Provost.

#### **V.B.4. Workload for visiting faculty**

Visiting faculty are involved primarily in teaching; they may also be involved in supervision and various administrative tasks. The workload of visiting faculty is too diverse across the university to allow meaningful generalizations, so these workloads are specified in the individual contracts.

#### **V.B.5. Expectations from the short-term visiting academic staff teaching at CEU**

(a) Traditionally, short-term visiting academic staff members have made an important contribution to CEU, primarily in terms of teaching, together with resident and other visiting academic staff. CEU aims to bring in high quality short-term visiting academic staff in a way that allows students to benefit substantially from their presence at CEU, by intensive classroom activities which are organized over a reasonable period of time, and also by interaction outside the classroom, for example through consultation time. In order to avoid rigid implementation, which could result in these guidelines becoming counterproductive, exceptions can be made with the approval of the Provost.

(b) The normal period for teaching a one-credit course should be two weeks, that is ten working days, with 3 x 100 minutes lectures each week. Only with approval of the unit head, or the head of the doctoral program for doctoral courses, can this time be shortened, and only to a minimum of eight working days, unless special permission is sought from the Provost. For courses over one credit, this rule should apply proportionally.

#### **V.C. Research leave and short-term leave**

##### **V.C.1. Eligibility for research leave (sabbatical)**

(a) In order to allow resident faculty members to pursue research and advance their professional standing, full-time resident faculty members who have fulfilled the full-time equivalency (including teaching research and administration) for at least three years, may apply to be considered for one semester of research leave with full pay. Applications for research leave may be combined: i.e., one semester requested after three years taught, or a whole year after six years taught. "Unused" years can be counted towards subsequent sabbaticals. A junior faculty member can apply for a one-semester early research leave after two years if they can demonstrate that a leave will materially advance their preparation for a reappointment review. If a research leave is awarded early, the period before being eligible for another leave will be correspondingly longer.

(b) Exceptionally, part-time resident academic staff members can also apply for research leave if they teach at least 6 credits and have no full-time employment with another institution. In this case, the duration of the research leave will be calculated on a pro-rated basis.

(c) The CEU academic year is divided into three terms, rather than two semesters. A 'semester' in this context is understood as six months of actual term time (that is, outside the summer and winter breaks). A faculty member can request a semester research leave in such a way that this remains compatible with his/her teaching a half FTE teaching load in the given academic year. (For example, if the structure of the program allows, a research leave can be requested for the Fall term and the Spring term of a given academic year, while the faculty member teaches a half FTE load in the Winter term. Alternatively, a research leave can include a Winter term and a Spring term, with the faculty member teaching a half FTE load in the Fall term. But for programs that do all their teaching in the Fall term and the Winter term, the research leave cannot span both these terms.) Fulfilling examination and evaluation duties related to courses taught that academic year is expected even during research leaves.

(d) Plans to apply for a research leave should be, in the first instance, coordinated with the Unit Head, in order to make sure that all the unit's needs are covered in the absence of the faculty member. Planning

should start well in advance of the leave, so that possible need of replacement teaching can be accommodated in the budget.

(e) Instructors are not required to do research and hence they do not participate in the scheme of research leaves. However, in case they fulfilled at least the full-time equivalency of three years, Instructors can apply for an occasional one term/one semester research leave to pursue specific research tasks. The applications have to be submitted through the Unit Head to the Provost. The application has to make clear how the research leave will contribute to the work of the staff member as an instructor.

### **V.C.2. Procedure for requesting research leave**

A faculty member who wishes to apply for research leave must submit a request for approval to the Provost, preferably one year in advance of the period of absence. The request should be accompanied by the endorsement of the Unit Head and the following supporting materials:

- A list of courses taught at CEU in the period which earned the research leave,
- The names and current status of students for whom faculty member has been the primary thesis supervisor during the period which earned the research leave.
- Additional activities which might be "credited" (e.g. unit headship)
- A proposal for research to be pursued on leave

### **V.C.3. Obligations related to research leave**

(a) Research leave cannot be used to teach at another university; it is meant to be a period of research which will enhance teaching at CEU. Supervision of PhD students should be continued during research leaves, and evaluation duties related to taught courses should be fulfilled. If the resident faculty member intends to postpone his/her leave, the Unit Head should be informed well in advance in writing. It is the responsibility of the Unit Head to plan the recommendations for granting research leave so as to maintain the ability to offer the department's courses and to maintain staffing of ongoing research projects.

(b) Those obtaining research leave are required to submit a short report on the completion of their research proposal and to teach at CEU after their return for a period at least as long as their leave.

### **V.C.4. Short-term leaves**

Short-term leave during academic sessions should be granted only if unavoidable. As a rule, absence from classes must either be made up or substitute instruction arranged within the unit. A grant of a leave lasting up to a total of one week in any semester or term is the responsibility of the Unit Head. Whenever the Unit Head is absent from the University, he/she shall inform the Provost in advance and designate a member of the respective unit substituting him/her during that period.

## **V.D. Academic travel**

CEU provides financial support for its faculty in attending academic meetings and conferences. Issues about academic staff members' travel is regulated in the Academic Travel Fund Policy.

## **V.E. Research activities and internal conferences**

All CEU faculty members are expected to engage in research as part of their regular academic activities. The University allocates special research funds to be distributed on a competitive basis and supports the

organization of conferences at CEU. These practices are regulated in the Research Support Scheme Policy and in the Conferences and Academic Events Support Policy.

## **VI. Promulgation, validity, and transition**

### **VI.A. Promulgation**

(a) Upon entering a contractual agreement with the University, every academic staff member must receive a copy of these Regulations from the Human Resources Office. Additional copies will also be distributed to existing members of the academic staff.

(b) The Regulations will also be made available in the University electronic repository, and may be obtained in hard copy by placing a request with the Rector's Office or the Provost's Office. If any changes to these Regulations are made, the information contained in this document will be updated as needed and will be redistributed, at the beginning of each academic year, by the Academic Secretary's Office to all current academic staff. Notwithstanding these distributions, it remains the obligation of every academic staff member to ensure that he or she has obtained a copy of the most current Regulations and is familiar with its content.

### **VI.B. Validity and transition measures**

(a) Upon approval by the Senate and by the Board of Trustees, the initial version of these Regulations came into force on 1 October 1999 and they were subsequently amended by the Board of Trustees and the Senate on 21 April 2002, 30 July 2003 and 25 May 2006. Further amendments were agreed by the Senate on 4 March 2011, 13 May, 2011, 8 September 2011, 21 October 2011, 23 November 2012 and 31 May 2013. At any given time, the current version of these policies is valid for all contracted academic staff members and will govern all extensions of contracts to new academic staff from the date of the Regulations' adoption.

(b) Except where prohibited or contradicted by governing national law or regulations, or by specific contractual agreement to the contrary, these Regulations shall govern the appointment, promotion and related matters affecting CEU's academic staff members, teaching staff members and research staff members.

(c) In the event of a conflict between the Regulations on the one hand and, an individual employment or consultancy contract, governing law or regulation, on the other hand, the contract, law or regulation shall govern. Exceptions to the general rule of supremacy contractual provisions are expressly noted herein: for example, the definition of a full teaching load shall be set by these Regulations, as amended from time to time and shall supersede any contrary definition contained in a prior, individual employment contract.

(d) If national employment laws necessitate changes in the Regulations these shall be automatically incorporated and reported to the Senate and the Board of Trustees. Matters not regulated in the present document are to be settled according to the policies of the University, accepted principles of academic ethics and usage or the laws of the United States and, or the State of New York (if legally required), or of Hungary, whichever is determined by legal counsel to be applicable.

Signed by *CEU President and Rector John Shattuck*.

The original document is filed at the Office of the Academic Secretary.

<b>Document information</b>	
<b>Type</b>	Policy
<b>Number</b>	P-1105-1 v 1605
<b>Title</b>	Academic Staff Handbook
<b>Distribution</b>	Internal
<b>Filename</b>	P-1105-1v1505 Academic Staff Handbook_final.doc
<b>Notes</b>	
<b>Related documents</b>	
<b>For final documents</b>	
<b>Approved by:</b>	Senate
<b>Date of approval</b>	May 13, 2011, amended September 8 and October 21, 2011 further amended November 23, 2012, May 31, 2013, April 4, 2014, May 18, 2015, and May 27, 2016
<b>Enters force</b>	This version enters into force on August 1, 2016

# Appendix 1: Handout on Reviewing Applicants

## Study on Bias and Assumptions

*Reprinted with permission from WISELI*

*Copyright © 2006 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System*

We all like to think that we are objective scholars who judge people solely on their credentials and achievements, but copious research shows that every one of us has a lifetime of experience and cultural history that shapes the review process.

**“To evaluate other people more accurately we need to challenge our implicit hypotheses ... we need to become explicitly aware of them.”**

VIRGINIA VALIAN

The results from controlled research studies demonstrate that people often hold implicit or unconscious assumptions that influence their judgments. Examples range from expectations or assumptions about physical or social characteristics associated with race, gender, and ethnicity to those associated with certain job descriptions, academic institutions, and fields of study. It is important to note that in most studies examining evaluation and gender, the sex of the evaluator was not significant; both men and women share and apply the same assumptions about gender. Recognizing biases and other influences not related to the quality of candidates can help reduce their impact on your search and review of candidates.

### **Examples of common social assumptions or expectations:**

- When shown photographs of people of the same height, evaluators overestimated the heights of male subjects and underestimated the heights of female subjects, even though a reference point, such as a doorway, was provided (Biernat et al.).

**“To evaluate other people more accurately we need to challenge our implicit hypotheses ... we need to become explicitly aware of them.”**

VIRGINIA VALIAN

- When shown photographs of men with similar athletic abilities, evaluators rated the athletic ability of African American men higher than that of white men (Biernat and Manis).
- When asked to choose counselors from among a group of equally competent applicants who were neither exceptionally qualified nor unqualified for the position, students more often chose white candidates than African American candidates, indicating their willingness to give members of the majority group the benefit of the doubt (Dovidio and Gaertner).

These studies show that we often apply generalizations that may or may not be valid to the evaluation of individuals (Bielby and Baron). In the study on height, evaluators applied the statistically accurate generalization that on average men are taller than women to their estimates of the height of individuals who did not necessarily conform to the generalization. If generalizations can lead us to inaccurately evaluate characteristics as objective and easily measured as height, what happens when the qualities we are evaluating are not as objective or as easily measured? What happens when the generalizations are not accurate?

**“Even the most well-intentioned person unwittingly allows unconscious thoughts and feelings to influence apparently objective decisions.”**

MAHZARIN R. BANAJI

### **Examples of assumptions or biases that can influence the evaluation of applications:**

- When rating the quality of verbal skills as indicated by vocabulary definitions, evaluators rated the skills lower if they were told an African American provided the definitions than if they were told that a white person provided them (Biernat and Manis).
- Randomly assigning different names to résumés showed that job applicants with “white-sounding names” were more likely to be interviewed for open positions than were equally qualified applicants with “African American-sounding names” (Bertrand and Mullainathan).

**“To respond without prejudice ... an individual must overcome years of exposure to biased and stereotypical information.”**

PATRICIA DEVINE ET AL.

- When symphony orchestras adopted “blind” auditions by using a screen to conceal candidates’ identities, the hiring of women musicians increased. Blind auditions fostered impartiality by preventing assumptions that women musicians have “smaller techniques” and produce “poorer sound” from influencing evaluation (Goldin and Rouse).
- Research shows that incongruities between perceptions of female gender roles and leadership roles cause evaluators to assume that women will be less competent leaders. When women leaders provide clear evidence of their competence, thus violating traditional gender norms, evaluators perceive them to be less likeable and are less likely to recommend them for hiring or promotion (Eagly and Karau; Ridgeway; Heilman et al.).

### **Examples of assumptions or biases in academic job-related contexts:**

- A study of over 300 recommendation letters for medical faculty hired by a large U.S. medical school found that letters for female applicants differed systematically from those for males. Letters written for women were shorter, provided “minimal assurance” rather than solid recommendation, raised more doubts, portrayed women as students and teachers while portraying men as researchers and professionals, and more frequently mentioned women’s personal lives (Trix and Psenka).
- In a national study, 238 academic psychologists (118 male, 120 female) evaluated a curriculum vitae randomly assigned a male or a female name. Both male and female participants gave the male applicant better evaluations for teaching, research, and service experience and were more likely to hire the male than the female applicant (Steinpreis et al.).
- A study of postdoctoral fellowships awarded by the Medical Research Council of Sweden found that women candidates needed substantially more publications to achieve the same rating as men, unless they personally knew someone on the panel (Wennerås and Wold).

**When we assume “that cultural, racial, ethnic, and gender biases are simply nonexistent [in] screening and evaluation processes, there is grave danger that minority and female candidates will be rejected.”**

CAROLINE S.V. TURNER

### **Advice for minimizing the influence of bias and assumptions:**

- **Strive to increase the representation of women and minorities in your applicant pool.** Research shows that gender assumptions are more likely to negatively influence evaluation of women when they represent a small proportion (less than 25%) of the pool of candidates (Heilman).

- **Learn about and discuss research on biases and assumptions and consciously strive to minimize their influence on your evaluation.**

Experimental studies show that greater awareness of discrepancies between the ideals of impartiality and actual performance, together with strong internal motivations to respond without prejudice, effectively reduces prejudicial behavior (Devine et al.).

- **Develop evaluation criteria prior to evaluating candidates and apply them consistently to all applicants.**

Research shows that different standards may be used to evaluate male and female applicants and that when criteria are not clearly articulated before reviewing candidates evaluators may shift or emphasize criteria that favor candidates from well-represented demographic groups (Biernat and Fuegen; Uhlmann and Cohen).

- **Spend sufficient time (at least 20 minutes) evaluating each applicant.**

Evaluators who were busy, distracted by other tasks, and under time pressure gave women lower ratings than men for the same written evaluation of job performance. Sex bias decreased when they were able to give all their time and attention to their judgments, which rarely occurs in actual work settings (Martell).

- **Evaluate each candidate's entire application; don't depend too heavily on only one element such as the letters of recommendation, or the prestige of the degree-granting institution or postdoctoral program.**

Recall the study showing significant patterns of difference in letters of recommendation for male and female applicants (Trix and Psenka).

- **Be able to defend every decision for eliminating or advancing a candidate.**

Research shows that holding evaluators to high standards of accountability for the fairness of their evaluation reduces the influence of bias and assumptions (Foschi).

- **Periodically evaluate your judgments, determine whether qualified women and underrepresented minorities are included in your pool, and consider whether evaluation biases and assumptions are influencing your decisions by asking yourself the following questions:**

Are women and minority candidates subject to different expectations in areas such as numbers of publications, name recognition, or personal acquaintance with a committee member? (*Recall the example of the Swedish Medical Research Council.*)

Are candidates from institutions other than the major research universities that have trained most of our faculty being undervalued?  
(*Qualified candidates from institutions such as historically black universities, four-year colleges, government, or industry, might offer innovative, diverse, and valuable perspectives on research and teaching.*)

Have the accomplishments, ideas, and findings of women or minority candidates been undervalued or unfairly attributed to a research director or collaborators despite contrary evidence in publications or letters of reference? (*Recall the biases seen in evaluations of written descriptions of job performance.*)

Is the ability of women or minorities to run a research group, raise funds, and supervise students and staff of different gender or ethnicity being underestimated? (*Recall social assumptions about leadership abilities.*)

Are assumptions about possible family responsibilities and their effect on a candidate's career path negatively influencing evaluation of a candidate's merit, despite evidence of productivity? (*Recall studies of the influence of generalizations on evaluation.*)

Are negative assumptions about whether women or minority candidates will "fit in" to the existing environment influencing evaluation? (*Recall students' choice of counsellor.*)

## References:

- M.R. Banaji et al., *Harvard Business Review* 81(2003).
- M. Bertrand, S. Mullainathan, *American Economic Review* 94(2004).
- W.T. Bielby, J.N. Baron, *American Journal of Sociology* 91(1986).
- M. Biernat et al., *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 60(1991).
- M. Biernat, M. Manis, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66(1994).
- M. Biernat, K. Fuegen, *Journal of Social Issues* 57(2001).
- P. Devine et al., *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82(2002).
- J.F. Dovidio, S.L. Gaertner, *Psychological Science* 11(2000).
- A.H. Eagly, S.J. Karau, *Psychological Review* 109(2002).
- M. Foschi, *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(1996).
- C. Goldin, C. Rouse, *American Economic Review* 90(2000).
- M.E. Heilman, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 26(1980).
- M.E. Heilman et al., *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(2004).
- R.F. Martell, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 21(1991).
- C.L. Ridgeway, *Journal of Social Issues* 57(2001).
- R. Steinpreis et al., *Sex Roles* 41(1999).
- F. Trix, C. Psenka, *Discourse & Society* 14(2003).
- C.S.V. Turner, *Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees* (Washington, DC: AACU, 2002).
- E.L. Uhlmann, G.L. Cohen, *Psychological Science* 16(2005).
- V. Valian, *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999).
- C. Wennerås, A. Wold, *Nature* 387(1997).

For full references please see: [http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/hiring/BiasBrochure\\_References.pdf](http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu/hiring/BiasBrochure_References.pdf)



<http://wiseli.engr.wisc.edu>

Preparation of this document was made possible by grants from the National Science Foundation (NSF #0123666 and #0619979). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Reproduced with permission from WISELI  
Copyright © 2006 by the Board of Regents of the  
University of Wisconsin System  
Written for WISELI by Eve Fine and Jo Handelsman



*Central European University*  
*Nador u. 9.*  
*1051 Budapest, Hungary*  
[www.ceu.hu](http://www.ceu.hu)

## Appendix 2: Individual Academic Activity Reports (IAAR)<sup>16</sup>

IAARs should be submitted every year by every resident academic staff member **by August 15**.

(This document can be found in word format in the University Policies repository at <https://documents.ceu.edu/documents/f-1105-1v1605>)

- Every resident **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, University Professor, and every resident Associate Research Fellow, Research Fellow, Senior Research Fellow** should submit a report containing [at least and not limited to] the following information (research staff members only in the applicable categories):
- An approximate percentage of time spent on research, teaching, service, and outreach activities
- publications (including accepted forthcoming publications) – please fill out table 1 for the Hungarian Central Statistical Office
- distinguished invitations and awards
- involvement in research projects – please fill out table 2 for the Hungarian Central Statistical Office
- courses taught, with syllabi and/or comprehensive course websites (e.g., course sites on the CEU Moodle) that may include additional course materials, media, and other documentation of teaching activities; and the average grade for the course as a whole in the student evaluation, together with the unit mean, if available
- discussion of students’ evaluation and comments in relation to future courses, if applicable
- current status of PhD students under supervision (both primary and secondary); number of MA students supervised
- service to the unit and the university (major administrative positions, committee work) and to the international community (leadership of professional organizations, refereeing, etc.)<sup>17</sup>
- work with other academic units, including courses that have been cross-listed or co-taught with other units.
- brief description of current research activity and plans for the near future (including planned publications)

Every resident **lecturer, senior lecturer, practitioner in residence or Professor of practice**<sup>18</sup> is asked to submit a report annually which indicates their achievements since the last report in the areas listed below:

- courses taught, with syllabi, and/or comprehensive course websites (e.g., course sites on the CEU Moodle) that may include additional course materials, media, and other documentation of teaching activities; and the average grade for the course as a whole in the student evaluation, together with the unit mean, if available<sup>19</sup>
- discussion of students’ evaluation and comments in relation future courses, if applicable
- overview of consultation work, if applicable
- service to the unit and the university (major administrative positions, committee work) and to the international community (membership in professional organizations, refereeing, consultancy, etc.)<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Faculty Activities Report (FAR) in the CEU Business School. Some additional requirements may apply, please refer to the Business School FAR Guidelines.

<sup>17</sup> “Service” may be defined differently in the Schools, please refer to the relevant School guidelines.

<sup>18</sup> The Schools may choose to apply additional evaluation criteria for the ranks of practitioner in residence and professor of practice, please refer to the relevant School guidelines.

<sup>19</sup> In case of the Center for Teaching and Learning, copies or links to online course evaluations and other documentation of student feedback, as available.

<sup>20</sup> Faculty Activities Report (FAR) in the CEU Business School and the School of Public Policy. Some additional requirements may apply, please refer to the relevant School guidelines.

- other supporting materials (e.g. publications, awards), if applicable

Every resident **instructor** is asked to submit a report annually which indicates their achievements since the last report in the areas listed below:

- courses taught, with syllabi and/or comprehensive course websites (e.g., course sites on the CEU Moodle) that may include additional course materials, media, and other documentation of teaching activities; and the average grade for the course as a whole in the student evaluation, together with the unit mean, if available
- discussion of students' evaluation and comments in relation future courses, if applicable
- overview of consultation work.

**Table 1. Publications report (for the Hungarian Central Statistical Office)**

	Author(s)	Title	Publisher	(Expected) publication date	Hard copy or electronic publication
<b>In Hungarian:</b>					
Books					
Book chapters					
Articles in peer-reviewed journals					
Conference proceedings					
Patents (registered in Hungary)					
<b>In other languages:</b>					
Books					
Book chapters					
Articles in Hungarian peer-reviewed journals					
Articles in non-Hungarian peer-reviewed journals					
Conference proceedings					
Patents (registered outside of Hungary)					

**Table 2. Ongoing research projects (for the Hungarian Central Statistical Office)**

*Please enter your ongoing research projects into the table below. The research classification is provided by the Hungarian Statistical Office. Detailed description of each category is available in the footnotes. Please note that most research conducted at CEU will fall under the ‘basic research’ category.*

Basic Research <sup>21</sup>	Applied Research <sup>22</sup>	Experimental Development <sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> **Basic research** is an academic activity, which is primarily aimed at the increase of scientific knowledge without aspirations for any concrete practical application or utilization thereof. Basic research analyses features, structures and connections in order to establish new theories. Basic research is the general increase of scientific knowledge base, which is not connected with industrial or commercial targets. Basic research can be divided into two groups: - pure basic research - or applied basic research.

<sup>22</sup> **Applied research** also means original research, which is conducted in order to add to the body of knowledge. However, it is primarily aimed at the realization of some practical goals or the achievement of practical targets. Applied research serves either the utilization of the outcomes of the basic research, or the realization of new methods and procedures necessary for some concrete and pre-defined achievement. Applied research gives the idea a form that is practically applicable. Research of this kind is expected to produce outcomes that are useful for one single or a limited number of products, processes, methods or systems.

<sup>23</sup> **Experimental development** is a systematic activity which is aimed at the production of new materials, products or tools, introduction of new procedures, systems and services, or the fundamental development of such products and tools already produced or introduced, based upon knowledge gathered from research and/or practical experience. In the field of social sciences, experimental development can be defined as a process which is aimed at the transformation of information collected through research into practical programs, including demonstration tasks with testing and evaluating goals. In the field of human sciences this activity is less significant or not at all applicable.

## Appendix 3: Schedule for the promotion and re-appointment process

### In academic departments:

The dates below assume a contract starting on the 1<sup>st</sup> of August. If the contract started some other date, a different schedule needs to be agreed in good time. All dates are approximate and can be treated flexibly in a given academic year, depending for example on the distribution of weekends or holidays.

**By 2 November**, the head of department submits his or her nominations of members of the internal committee to the Provost.<sup>24</sup>

**By 20 November**, the Provost appoints the internal committee, after receiving a recommendation from the head of department. The candidate is notified by the chair of the internal committee that he or she is to submit the relevant materials by 15 December.

**By 15 December** the candidate submits the following materials to the chair of the internal committee, who forwards them to the other members of the internal committee without delay:

- Current CV of the candidate
- Candidate's own statement on research, teaching and service, with particular attention to fulfilling the relevant criteria for promotion or reappointment
- Data from student evaluations for the relevant period (either since start of employment or previous promotion)
- Four pieces of representative pieces of work (six for promotion to the rank of full Professor), in paper and in electronic copy. In case of promotion to the rank of full Professor, the pieces should represent research done after the last promotion. The candidate should select works that best represent his or her research: these can include published pieces, submitted work, work in progress.
- Names of external referees the candidate does NOT wish to participate in the review.

In addition to these, the candidate may submit any material that he or she thinks could be relevant for the assessment.

**20 January** is the deadline for the internal committees for submitting their report to the Provost. There are different procedures depending on whether external review is required.

**By 20 January**: the internal committee sends the report to the Provost, together with a list of recommended external reviewers, in case external review is required or recommended, along with those names (if any) the candidate indicated as her or his not wishing to participate in the process.

**By 5 February** The Provost selects the external reviewers for cases where external reviews are automatically required, and sends their names to the chair of the internal committee. The Provost may veto reviewers nominated by the department, and also, upon consultation with the chair of the internal committee, suggest one additional reviewer. Usually it is advisable to contact more than the required number of candidates (three for junior faculty and four for promotion to the rank of full Professor), because of delays or turning down requests.

**Also by 20 January**: the internal committee sends the report to the Provost for reviews that normally don't require external reports (reappointment of Associate Professors and Professors, and promotion of junior faculty within 1-3 years after receipt of a permanent contract, unless an external review was required at the time of contract renewal), together with the materials listed below the next paragraph If,

---

<sup>24</sup>In case of Interdisciplinary Programs, the head of program assumes the responsibilities of the head of department.

exceptionally, the internal committee proposes an external report for one these cases, this should be specifically flagged by the sender of the package.

Further, in cases where the internal committee's recommendation is against promotion or reappointment, or the committee could not reach a unanimous decision supporting promotion or reappointment, the following package should be sent to the Provost at this point.

- Current CV of the candidate
- Candidate's own statement on research, teaching and service, with particular attention to fulfilling the relevant criteria for promotion or reappointment
- Data from student evaluations for the relevant period (either since start of employment or previous promotion)
- Internal report

**By 15 February** After the receipt of the reports by the internal committees on the 20th of January, the RP Committee needs to consider those cases which as a rule don't require an external review or where the question of whether an external review is needed is not settled. These include: promotion of junior faculty within 1-3 years of their reappointment, the reappointment of Associate Professors and Professors, and those cases where the internal committee is either unanimously against promotion or reappointment, or could not reach a consensual decision. By the 15th of February, the Provost needs to decide, based on the advice of the RP committee, if any of these cases need external reports. If external reports are deemed necessary, the reviewers are selected without delay and the chair of the internal committee is notified of the need to collect reports from them. From here, the cases will be treated with other cases requiring external reports.

In those cases where no external report is deemed necessary, after due deliberations by the RP Committee, the Provost sends a recommendation to the Rector by the **5th of March**. The Rector makes a decision by the **20th of March**. Before making the final decision, the Rector may request collecting external reports even if this was not recommended by the Provost before he or she makes a final decision. In those cases, the process needs to be adjusted so that a final decision can be reached by the relevant deadline.

Starting from the appointment of external reviewers (around **the 5th of February**) with no delay, **but by 20 February** the latest: the chair of the internal committee contacts referees by using a sample letter, with a two-months deadline. Following up with the referees is the task of the chair of the internal committee. Referees are sent

- the candidate's CV
- Four pieces of representative pieces of work (six for promotion to the rank of full Professor). The pieces are usually the same as those submitted by the candidate at the beginning of the promotion or reappointment process; however, the candidate may request, exceptionally and upon his or her own initiate, that some pieces are replaced. The request has to be sent to the Provost in due time. The Provost decides, after consultation with the chair of the internal committee, whether to grant the request or not. If no such request is submitted, the assumption is to proceed with the pieces initially submitted.
- the candidate's statement about research
- a sample letter specifying the purpose of the review. The appropriate sample letters are available from the Provost's Office, and these must be used when contacting the external referees. The internal committee may request minor additions or modifications to the sample letter.

Once all external reports arrived, the chair of the internal committee shares the report with the members of the internal committee without delay, and the committee forms a view whether they want to reflect on the content of the external reports. (This is relevant if there is a discrepancy between the external and

internal reports. In case the external reports coincide with the internal committee's recommendation, this extra step of reflection may be omitted.)

**Starting around the 30th of April, but by May 10 the latest:** assembly of all materials for consideration by the RP Committee. These include

- the candidate's updated CV
- Candidate's own statement on research, teaching and service, with particular attention to fulfilling the relevant criteria for promotion or reappointment
- Data from student evaluations for the relevant period (either since start of employment or previous promotion)
- external reports. At least three for re-appointment of junior faculty and promotion to Associate Professor, and at least four for promotion to Professor.

In addition to these, the candidate and the internal committee may submit any material that they think could be relevant for the assessment, and the RP Committee can also take into account additional relevant material of their choice.

**By June 15** (or by 1.5 months before the expiry of the contract): based on consultations with the RP Committee, the Provost formulates a recommendation to the Rector. In case there is a divergence from the conclusions of the internal committees or external reports, or if the case was deemed controversial in the discussions of the RP Committee, the Provost's recommendation should be supported by a reasoned report. The recommendation should, with all relevant materials, sent to the Rector.

**By 15 July** (or 0.5 months before the expiry of the contract): final decision by the Rector

**July 31:** end of contract.

### **In Schools:**

The dates below assume a contract starting on the 1<sup>st</sup> of August. If the contract started some other date, a different schedule needs to be agreed in good time.

The Schools conduct their promotion and reappointment process according to their own schedules.

**Between 30 April and May 10:** Schools submit all relevant materials and the recommendation of the Dean to the Provost.

**By June 15** (or by 1.5 months before the expiry of the contract): based on consultations with the SRP Committee, the Provost formulates a recommendation to the Rector. In case there is a divergence from the recommendation of the Dean, or if the case was deemed controversial in the discussions of the RP Committee, the Provost's recommendation should be supported by a reasoned report. The recommendation should, with all relevant materials, sent to the Rector.

**By 15 July** (or 0.5 months before the expiry of the contract): final decision by the Rector

**July 31:** end of contract.

## **Appendix 4: Principles for evaluation of lecturers, senior lecturers, practitioners in residence, professor of practice, and writing instructors**

### **Lecturers and Senior Lecturers**

Lecturers and senior lecturers are evaluated on an annual basis by the head of the respective unit. Lecturers and senior lecturers as a rule have significant responsibilities for teaching, but may also engage in research and other academic activities, as appropriate to the individual school or unit. The exact breakdown of responsibilities is laid down in the job description.

The evaluation is based on the staff member's IAAR<sup>25</sup>, and performed according to the procedures and criteria adopted at the respective academic unit, within the general evaluation framework specified in Appendix 2.

The evaluation process has to be concluded by the end of the academic year. After the evaluation, the unit head issues a memorandum that is filed in the staff member's Academic Staff File. Staff members may submit a request to the Provost to review the memo and may submit their written comments to the memo. Such comments are also to be filed in the staff member's academic file.

### **Practitioners in Residence and Professors of Practice**

Practitioners in Residence and Professors of Practice should be evaluated on an annual basis by the head of the respective unit.

The evaluation is based on the staff member's IAAR<sup>26</sup>, and performed according to the procedures and criteria adopted at the respective academic unit, within the general evaluation framework specified in Appendix 2.

The evaluation process has to be concluded by the end of the academic year. After the evaluation, the unit head issues a memorandum that is filed in the staff member's Academic Staff File. Staff members may submit a request to the Provost to review the memo and may submit their written comments to the memo. Such comments are also to be filed in the staff member's academic file.

### **Criteria to be used in Evaluation of Writing Instructors**

#### **A. Teaching Duties**

##### **1. Student feedback**

The principal evaluation criterion for teaching will be student feedback over the previous two years or since employment started, whichever is shorter. Satisfactory performance will be not less than 10% below the average for the unit overall. Explicit student complaints (e.g. regarding lateness or inappropriate behaviour) will be considered individually.

##### **2. Observation of Classes**

Two lessons will be observed, if possible with two different groups. The criteria in evaluating are that the instructor:

- was well prepared for the lesson

---

<sup>25</sup> Faculty Activities Report (FAR) in the CEU Business School and the School of Public Policy. Some additional requirements may apply, please refer to the relevant School guidelines.

<sup>26</sup> Faculty Activities Report (FAR) in the CEU Business School and the School of Public Policy. Some additional requirements may apply, please refer to the relevant School guidelines.

- showed competence in the subject of academic writing
- created an atmosphere encouraging learning
- encouraged discussion and active student participation
- achieved the goals of the lesson, which were also appropriate

Normally both observations will be carried out by the director. The observations should be both evaluative (adequate competence should be established) and developmental (the instructor should have a say in the agenda setting and should receive helpful feedback). An individual may request that a further observation be carried out by a peer to provide a second opinion.

## **B. Consultation Duties**

### 1. Consultation statistics

This will be a quantitative criterion based on statistics for the previous two years or since employment started, whichever is shorter. For 2010, the questions on consultations used in CAW feedback questionnaires until 2008 will be added to the centrally issued questionnaire.

How many consultations have you had with your instructor so far?  
How did you benefit from these meetings? Please explain or give examples.

In future, a system will be used that allows students to reflect on the usefulness of consultations in January after they have submitted their term papers.

### 2. Observation of Consultations

Two consultations with two students from different departments and with different abilities/needs will be observed. The criteria in evaluating are that the instructor:

- was well prepared for the consultation
- showed competence in the subject of academic writing
- created an atmosphere encouraging learning
- encouraged discussion and active student participation in the consultation
- achieved the goals of the consultation, which were also appropriate

Normally both observations will be carried out by the director. An individual may request that a further observation be carried out by a peer to give a second opinion.

## **C. Publications & Conference Presentations**

Optional element. Publications and presentations closely related to academic writing will be seen as evidence of self development and scholarly engagement in the debates of the discipline. Publications and presentations outside the field of academic writing will be seen as general scholarly engagement and experience in the areas we aim to encourage our students in.

## **D. Special services provided to the department and the university**

Optional element. These include involvement in work of other units or departments, services to other units other than the provision of AW courses and consultations.

## **E. Services provided to other institutions in relation to CEU's mission**

Optional element. Mostly outreach, but could include any relevant services to the wider community.

## Appendix 5: Procedures for Course and Supervision Evaluation

**For courses evaluations, the following procedure should be observed:**

- The Manager of the evaluation system at the Institutional Research Office will create, manage and close surveys in close coordination with the Unit.
- The course evaluation surveys will open in the last week of classes and will remain open until the grades are distributed.
- The evaluation surveys should be opened as early as possible and remain open for as long as possible, with the aim of reaching a response rate of at least 85%. It is the responsibility of the Program Coordinator to monitor response rates and send reminders to students as needed.
- The Program Coordinator chooses the dates for opening and closing the survey in consultation with the Unit Head. The principal factor in deciding when to close the survey should be an assessment of whether the response rate is sufficiently high, 85% being the target for all Units. Unit Heads may consider leaving surveys open for an extended period of time in order to reach the target.
- It is the responsibility of the Program Coordinator to make sure that no grades are announced to the students until the survey is closed.
- Once the course evaluation survey is closed and all the grades are announced to the students, faculty members will receive invitations to view their course evaluations on the website.
- Faculty members will have access only to their individual course evaluations.
- Unit Heads and Coordinators will have access to all evaluation results for their respective units.
- The Provost, the Pro-Rector for Social Sciences and Humanities and the Academic Secretary will have access to all evaluation results for all units.
- The System Manager at the Institutional Research Office will have access to all results and all enrolment and course registration data and is authorized to create and manage evaluation surveys.

**For supervision evaluation, the following procedure should be observed:**

- For masters' students: As soon as the thesis is submitted by the student/student cohort, the Program Coordinator will notify the Manager of the evaluation system at the Institutional Research Office. For doctoral students: The survey is administered annually, with the last survey administered after dissertation submission. The System Manager will assemble the data and create two surveys for each academic unit (one for masters and one for doctoral students).
- The surveys will remain open until the release of the thesis grades (for masters' students), and for at least one month for doctoral students.
- The Manager of the evaluation system will generate an aggregate supervision evaluation report for each unit (separately for masters and doctoral evaluations) and make it available for the Unit Head by July 31. The report will exclude evaluation results for the Unit Head. A separate doctoral evaluations report will be made available to the Doctoral Program Director. This report will exclude evaluation results of the Doctoral Program Director, but will include the Unit Head's evaluation results. In addition, the System Manager will generate a separate report for all Unit Heads and will send it to the Provost and the Pro-Rector for the Social Sciences and Humanities.
- As a general rule, supervisors will not have direct access to the results of supervision evaluations. The Unit Head will discuss any supervision-related issues during the periodic review, making sure student anonymity is preserved. The Provost or the Pro-Rector for Social Sciences and Humanities will discuss supervision issues during the periodic review of the Unit Heads. In certain cases (e.g. when preparing for re-appointment, promotion, applying for a teaching development grant or being nominated for a teaching award), supervisors may request that their supervision evaluation reports aggregated over a number of years are made available to them. Such requests are submitted to the Manager of the evaluation system, who determines whether a sufficient number of evaluations have accumulated in the system to ensure anonymity of students and graduates (a recommended minimum is 8 for each subsequent report – the number represents students, not evaluations). The System Manager may then release a report with the Provost's approval.

## COURSE EVALUTION FORM *COURSE DETAILS, ETC*

The following questions are to be answered using a 10 point scale where "1" is the lowest and "10" is the highest score. Only one response is allowed for each question.

### Part 1. Your Overall Assessment

1. Please assess the overall quality of the course.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    Don't know/Not applicable

2. Please assess the overall performance of your instructor.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    Don't know/Not applicable

### Part 2. Your Course

3. I clearly understood the course requirements, and what is expected of me in the course.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    Don't know/Not applicable

4. The course has achieved its stated goals.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    Don't know/Not applicable

5. Course materials advanced my understanding of the subject.

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10    Don't know/Not applicable

6. Please assess if the workload was in line with the number of credits?

Too low

About right

Too high

7. What I liked best about this course:

8. What I liked least about this course:

**Part 3. Your Instructor**

9. The instructor was well prepared for the course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't know/Not applicable

10. Presentations by the instructor were clear.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't know/Not applicable

11. The classroom environment encouraged student participation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't know/Not applicable

12. The instructor treated the students in a respectful and professional manner.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't know/Not applicable

13. Feedback was given throughout the course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't know/Not applicable

14. The instructor was available for appointments and consultations outside of class.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Don't know/Not applicable

15. Additional suggestions to the instructor:

## ***SUPERVISION EVALUATION FORMS***

### **Doctoral Supervision Evaluation**

The aim of this questionnaire is to obtain feedback from you about the supervision of your doctoral thesis writing and research. The questionnaire is confidential. Evaluation results will be aggregated for each supervisor on annual basis, and this aggregated report (supervisor-based, not student based), will be shared with the Unit Head and the Doctoral Program Director. If either of these is your supervisor, then only one of them (not the supervisor) will view the results. In addition, evaluation results for unit heads will be viewed by the Provost and/or the Pro-Rector for the Social Sciences and Humanities.

The Doctoral Program and the University will use data obtained from the questionnaire to assess and improve the supervision process. Aggregate data of a general sort will be shared with the faculty while maintaining student anonymity.

*As a rule, only aggregated data will be shared with the faculty to assure that supervision is of a consistently high quality. The Head may wish to share feedback with an individual supervisor, but may do so only with your express written permission.*

The questionnaire is to be filled out annually, and also after students have submitted the final copy of the dissertation but before the defence.

Your responses will be measured on a scale of 1 to 10, with '1' indicating **strong disagreement** and '10' **strong agreement**.

---

Please list the name of your principal supervisor:

Please list the name of your associate supervisor (if applicable):

In which year of your study did you submit your thesis for defence?

1<sup>st</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> 5<sup>th</sup> 6<sup>th</sup> Later

Did you receive a CEU Write-Up Grant? YES/NO

Was your study wholly or partially funded by the CEU? YES/NO

If funded by the CEU did you also receive any external grants while a doctoral student?  
YES/NO

## Section 1. Supervision

1. It was easy to get in touch and arrange appointments or interact with my supervisor(s).

Principal Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Associate Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

2. My supervisor(s) provided helpful guidance in managing my doctoral process (e.g. selecting courses, passing exams, preparing chapters of the thesis, submitting documents by relevant deadlines, and following other CEU and Department's/School's rules and procedures).

Principal Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Associate Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

3. My supervisor(s) provided useful support in introducing me to relevant academic or professional communities (e.g. through explaining the structure and functioning of these communities, facilitating networking with other academics/professionals in my field, helping to attend conferences and other events, supporting journal publications, identification of relevant career opportunities).

Principal Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Associate Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

4. My supervisor(s) helped me to develop critical thinking and other competences necessary for academic work in my field (e.g. through providing constructive and critical feedback to my work, pointing to the key theoretical and methodological literature, jointly writing academic papers, training my writing and other skills).

Principal Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Associate Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

5. My supervisor(s) helped me to develop my ability to work as an independent scholar (e.g. through guiding and supporting my choices about the doctoral research, the doctoral process in general, and future career).

Principal Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Associate Supervisor: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

6. What in your view were the strongest aspects of your supervision relationship?
  - With your Principal Supervisor
  - With your Associate Supervisor(s), if applicable
  
7. What in your view were the least strong aspects of your supervision relationship?
  - With your Principal Supervisor
  - With your Associate Supervisor(s), if applicable

**Section 2. Department/School/Program and University**

8. I had the opportunity to present my work to faculty and peers at my Department/School/Unit and received useful feedback.
 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  
9. Please indicate what was the most useful arena for receiving feedback (e.g. colloquia, departmental/school conference, etc.).
  
10. The Doctoral Committee requested regular progress reports from me during the course of my research.
 

YES/NO
  
11. I received appropriate training in research methods.
 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a
  
12. I received appropriate training in research ethics.
 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a
  
13. University and program rules related to my research were easily available.
 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  
14. To the extent that I required it my Unit helped me identify sources of research funding.
 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

15. If you worked as a Teaching Assistant, to what extent do you feel it contributed to your career prospects?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

16. If you worked as a Teaching Assistant, to what extent do you feel it contributed to your thesis research?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

17. If you received a Doctoral Research Support Grant (DRSG), to what extent did it contribute meaningfully to your research?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

18. How helpful was your supervisor in helping you apply for research or travel grants?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

### **Section 3. Overall Comments**

Is there anything you would like to add about your supervision relationship?

## Masters' Supervision Evaluation

The aim of this questionnaire is to obtain feedback from students about the supervision of Masters thesis writing and research. The questionnaire is confidential. Evaluation results will be aggregated for each supervisor, and this aggregated report (supervisor-based, not student based), will be shared with the Unit Head. If the Head is your supervisor then only the Provost and/or the Pro-Rector for the Social Sciences and Humanities will view the reports.

The Department/School will use data obtained from the questionnaire to assess and improve the supervision process. Data of a general sort will be shared with the faculty while maintaining student anonymity.

As a rule, only aggregated data will be shared with the faculty to assure that supervision is of a consistently high quality. The Head may wish to share feedback with an individual supervisor, but may do so only with your express written permission.

The questionnaire is to be filled out after students have submitted the final copy of the thesis to the Department but before the thesis defense or exam.

Your responses will be measured on a scale of 1 to 10, with '1' indicating **strong disagreement** and '10' **strong agreement**.

---

Please list the name of your principal supervisor:

Please list the name of your associate supervisor (if applicable):

### Section 1. Supervision

- The thesis requirements to be met were made known to me and clearly explained in advance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- It was easy to contact my Supervisor.

- Primary Supervisor

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Associate Supervisor

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

3. My supervisor(s) offered useful feedback at appropriate times during the thesis research period.

- Primary Supervisor

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- Associate Supervisor  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a
  
- 4. My supervisor(s) offered useful feedback on draft chapters and on the draft thesis as a whole.
  - Primary Supervisor  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  
  - Associate Supervisor  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a
  
- 5. What, in your view, were the strongest aspects of the supervision process?
  - a) Primary Supervisor
  - b) Associate Supervisor, if applicable
  
- What, in your view, were the least strong aspects of the supervision process?
  - a) Primary Supervisor
  - b) Associate Supervisor, if applicable

**Section 2. Department/School/Program**

- The thesis grading criteria are clear.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  
- Program guidelines on thesis research and writing were clear.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
  
- Program's support, including funding and provision of equipment, for research work was appropriate.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

10. The Department/School provided useful training for conducting thesis research.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

11. The Department/School or your Supervisor was helpful in providing meaningful research ethics training or advice.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 n/a

**Section 3. Overall Comments**

12. Do you have any suggestions about improving your supervision relationship?

13. Do you have any suggestions for improving the supervision process?