

**The  
Quality Assurance Regulations of the Doctoral  
Programme  
of the Corvinus University of Budapest**

Budapest, 2020

# Quality assurance regulation of the doctoral programmes of the Corvinus University of Budapest

## Purpose of regulation

**Article 1** (1) As the highest level of degrees, the University may award a doctoral (PhD) degree. This degree certifies a high-level of expertise in the given branch of science and the studying of it in a way that brings new results, as well as the competency to conduct independent research work. This way the University is a base for educating future generations of scientists, and this is realised in an organised way in the doctoral schools. Consequently, when establishing the quality assurance system of the doctoral programme, it is necessary to enforce some principles and work out some processes and methods which - in line with the system of requirements set forth by the Act on National Higher Education and the Hungarian Accreditation Committee, as well as the current doctoral strategy of the University - offer satisfactory guarantees to make sure that the academic performance of PhD students reaches the standard of authors who obtained their degrees in the leading international workshops of their branches of science.

(2) These regulations form the basic document of the quality assurance system of the doctoral programme of the University. The regulations define the system of quality assurance activities related to doctoral programmes on the basis of and as an addition to external requirements and expectations, as well as the regulations of the University, especially the University Doctoral Regulations (EDSZ).

## Quality policy principles of doctoral programmes

**Article 2** (1) In the course of operating the doctoral schools - in line with its quality assurance system - the University attempts to enforce the following quality policy principles.

- a) *Partner focus*: the management of the doctoral programme attempts to define and satisfy the requirements of the stakeholders of the doctoral programme. To this end, the management identifies specific and measurable objectives, determines the responsibilities, and uses the feedbacks for the improvement of the doctoral programmes. The management attempts to involve stakeholders in the preparations for decisions related to doctoral programmes and in the development of proposals. We wish to establish mutually beneficial relations with our partners and stakeholders.
- b) *Supportive management and staff involvement*: the management of the doctoral programme - by enforcing the principle of equal treatment - attempts to involve staff members in the definition of the objectives related to doctoral programmes, in decision-making, in the implementation of the objectives and

in the development of processes. The management attempts to provide the necessary conditions for all that.

- c) *Process approach and system approach*: the activities related to the doctoral programme are described with processes that transform the inputs - with a prescribed method - into outputs, in order to produce added value. In this approach, emphasis is given to the management of resources, continuous metering and evaluation, the revision of the process, and the definition of diversions from the ideal position, and in the case of any diversions, the definition of the way of correction and its repeated revision. Related processes form a system, and the whole operation of the doctoral programme can be regulated by regulating the relations among processes.
- d) *Fact-based decision-making*: we collect and analyse data related to doctoral programmes and suitable for the definition of the effectiveness of the quality assurance system and for laying the foundations of development measures.
- e) *Continuous development*: in the frames of the doctoral training, we attempt to continuously train our staff, regularly improve processes, and in connection with that, to determine and backtest objectives and recognise and award developments.

(2) In the course of assuring the quality of doctoral programmes, the University strives for the enforcement of the following quality policy principles:

- a) *Principle of professional control*. The control by the international and domestic professional and scholarly public opinion shall be exerted in the whole doctoral training.
- b) *Principle of taking ethical requirements in science into consideration*. In the course of establishing and operating the quality assurance system, the positions of the Science Ethics Committee of the MTA shall be fully enforced.
- c) *Principle of benchmarking*. In the whole process of quality assurance, we continuously monitor doctoral programmes conducted in leading foreign and domestic workshops of similar profiles and the academic performance of PhD students studying there.
- d) *Principle of publicity*. Our objective is to make expectations related to the doctoral programme and the decision-making processes and criteria transparent, and to provide the professional and scholarly public with information in each step of the decision -making.
- e) *Principle of feedbacks*. By establishing and operating the quality assurance system, we intend to make sure that lecturers and supervisors involved in the doctoral programme, as well as the members of the Council of Doctoral School get continuous feedbacks on the standard of their activities.
- f) *Principle of focusing on quality*. By establishing and operating the quality assurance system, we wish to make sure that both our PhD students and our lecturers have higher and higher expectations against themselves and their environment, and, at the same time, humility to science should be an integral part of their values, and initiative and creativity should become basic pillars of their way of thinking. The achievement of new scientific results is one of the basic requirements against doctoral dissertations.

- g) *Principle of protecting intellectual property.* The development of the quality assurance system should also contribute to the fact that the doctoral training at the University continues to be fully in line with the attempts of the European Union and Hungary regarding the protection of intellectual property.
- h) *Principle of enforcing personal responsibility.* The establishment and the operation of a scientific school is a teamwork, but its success depends on the clear definition of individual tasks and responsibilities in the process of training and research.
- i) *Principle of process documentation.* Each decision-making point related to the doctoral training should be documented. The auditing of the documentation is one of the basic tasks of the quality assurance system. Within the doctoral programme, it is a key objective to make sure that the administrative burdens on lecturers involved in the training are not increased with the establishment and the operation of the quality assurance system.
- j) *Principle of cost-efficiency.* Cost-efficiency should be a high priority in the doctoral programmes, too. This includes the continuous monitoring of costs and the analysis of the profit/cost relation.
- k) *Principle of practical application.* In the course of the evaluation of doctoral schools, we consider whether the topics selected for the doctoral dissertations and the results of the research would assist in answering economic and social questions.

### **Requirements regarding the quality assurance systems of doctoral programmes**

**Article 3** (1) The quality assurance system of the University shall be established according to the quality-oriented requirements of the „Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area” (Brussels, 2015, hereinafter as: ESG), in line with the current quality assurance regulations of the University and with the relevant recommendations of the Hungarian Accreditation Committee.

(2) The enforcement of ESG standards and other requirements can be ensured by regulating tasks, responsibilities and competences belonging to the related processes, therefore the related key processes need to be determined for each standard. As one particular key process may support the implementation of multiple standards, the key process shall be indicated under the standard to which it is closest in contents.

### **Quality policy and strategy (ESG 1.1)**

**Article 4** (1) Pursuant to the ESG 1.1 standard, the University should have a quality assurance policy for doctoral programmes that is made public and forms part of its strategic management, as well as a matching institutional strategy worked out by internal stakeholders with the involvement of external stakeholders if necessary.

(2) The processes that ensure the implementation of the standard are as follows:

- a) clear regulation of the scope of duties and powers related to the quality assurance system,
- b) order of producing and reviewing regulatory documents (quality policy, strategy, quality assurance regulations, quality objectives).

**Article 5** (1) The quality assurance system of the doctoral programme of the University - based on Article 36 (1) of the Organisational and Operational Procedures of the University - is coordinated by the Corvinus Doctoral Schools and its Director General.

**Article 6** (1) The order of producing and reviewing regulatory documents is as follows.

(2) The quality assurance regulations of doctoral programmes are accepted by the University Doctoral Council on the recommendation of the Director General of Corvinus Doctoral Schools. These regulations shall be updated at least in every five years.

(3) The quality policy and the quality policy principles of doctoral programmes are accepted by the University Doctoral Council on the recommendation of the General Director of the Corvinus Doctoral Schools, within the frames of the quality assurance regulations. The quality policy and the quality policy principles shall be updated at least in every five years.

(4) The strategy related to the doctoral programmes is accepted by the University Doctoral Council on the recommendation of the Director General of Corvinus Doctoral Schools. The strategy related to doctoral programmes shall be updated at least in every five years.

(5) The doctoral strategy shall contain:

- a) the evaluation of the implementation of the strategy of the previous period,
- b) the objectives for the next period, including the objectives related to the quality of the doctoral training (quality objectives),
- c) the actions planned to facilitate the implementation of the objectives (action plan) and
- d) Indicators that allow for the monitoring of the implementation of the objectives.

(6) Each doctoral school produces its own action plan, and, as part of that, its quality assurance plan.

- a) The action plan should match the objectives and indicators included in the doctoral strategy, but it is possible to add additional objectives and indicators, too. The action plan shall include the list of actions through which the doctoral school contributes to the implementation of the objectives and indicators identified in the doctoral strategy. The quality assurance plan forms part of the action plan, and defines the way of implementing the quality objectives.
- b) Based on the proposal of the Head of Doctoral School, the Council of Doctoral School accepts the action plan and reviews it under the annual report.

## **Planning, acceptance and regular monitoring of doctoral programmes (ESG 1.2 and 1.9)**

**Article 7** (1) Based on ESG standards 1.2 and 1.9, the University should have processes in place for the establishment, approval and continuous monitoring of doctoral programmes. As part of that - in line with the relevant laws and regulations and the qualifications framework of the European Higher Education Area - it is necessary to determine the study results of doctoral programmes. The achievement of learning outcomes and the satisfaction of the demands of students and society should be regularly monitored. Any measures planned and took on the basis of that shall be notified to the stakeholders.

(2) The processes that ensure the implementation of the standard are as follows:

- a) the process of establishing the doctoral school;
- b) the monitoring of the operation of the doctoral school;
- c) the development of the training structure, as well as the subject syllabuses and the order of progress checks.

**Article 8** (1) Doctoral programmes are implemented in the frames of doctoral schools. The process of the establishment of the doctoral school is specified in Article 5 of the University Doctoral Regulations.

(2) In the course of establishing the doctoral school, it is necessary to define the learning outcome of the trainings in the doctoral school. The Council of Doctoral School shall regularly review the learning outcome.

**Article 9** (1) The operation of the doctoral school is regularly evaluated by the Council of Doctoral School according to Article 6 (2) of the University Doctoral Regulations.

(2) The report that serves as the basis of the evaluation is produced and presented to the Council of Doctoral School by the Head of Doctoral School annually.

(3) The report shall contain the following:

- a) the objectives identified in the action plan for the given year, and the presentation of their implementation;
- b) the position of the doctoral school compared to its Hungarian and international competitors;
- c) The number of students and the trends in the effectiveness of the doctoral school (admission, progress, dropouts, successful completion), and the evaluation of the admission process;
- d) provision of lecturers for the doctoral school: number of core members, lecturers, issuers of doctoral topics and supervisors, evaluation of recruiting efforts;
- e) evaluation of supervisors' activities;
- f) review and evaluation of experiences related to the training structure;
- g) key lessons from students' and lecturers' feedbacks about the training
- h) proposed changes and definition of objectives for the next year (review of action plan)

(4) The report is accepted by the Council of Doctoral School. The Head of Doctoral School sends the accepted report to the Director General of the Corvinus Doctoral

Schools. The report should be made accessible for the lecturers and students of the doctoral school.

**Article 10** (1) The structure of the doctoral programme is defined by the Council of Doctoral School according to the University Doctoral Regulations. The structure of the doctoral programme shall be regularly reviewed.

(2) The Council of Doctoral School may set up a training development committee for the regular review and assessment of the structure of the doctoral programme. The committee may include students, lecturers, graduated students and representatives of external partners (not academic employers).

(3) The production of the subject syllabuses for the training - containing the definition of the desired learning outcomes of the subjects and the order of evaluation and progress checks - is mandatory in the form defined in the University's Study and Examination Regulations.

(4) The syllabuses of subjects starting in a given semester shall be updated by the lecturers before the start of the semester. The Head of Doctoral School is responsible for checking the updates.

#### **Student-oriented approach and regulation of the processes of the PhD student's career (ESG 1.3 and 1.4)**

**Article 11** (1) According to ESG 1.3 and 1.4 standards, the University shall regulate all the key processes of the student "life-cycle" in a transparent way, and it shall be made accessible. The doctoral programme of the University shall be established in a way that it encourages students to play active roles in the creation of the learning process, and this should be reflected in students' evaluation, too.

(2) The processes that ensure the implementation of the standard are as follows:

- a) selection and announcement of doctoral topics;
- b) announcement of the programme, preparing for and conducting the admission examinations;
- c) assessment of applicants wishing to acquire a degree through individual preparation;
- d) assigning supervisors to PhD students, relation between students and supervisors;
- e) relation between the PhD student and the host department (research location);
- f) foreign study trip during the training;
- g) work during the training;
- h) monitoring and regularly checking the progress made by the PhD student;
- i) preparing for and conducting the complex examinations;
- j) submission and defence of the thesis proposal;
- k) submission and defence of the doctoral dissertation;
- l) conferral of the doctoral degree;

**Article 12** (1) The selection and the announcement of doctoral topics (portfolios) are of high importance for the quality of the doctoral programme. Pursuant to Article 6 of the University Doctoral Regulations, the topic (portfolio) is recommended by the Council of Doctoral School.

(2) The issuers of doctoral topics are subject to the same quality expectations as supervisors.

**Article 13** The process of announcing the training and preparing for the entrance examinations is included in Article 14 of the EDSZ and the operational regulations of doctoral schools.

**Article 14** The admission procedure of students applying for a degree through individual preparation is regulated by Article 16 of the EDSZ.

**Article 15** The relation between supervisors and PhD students are governed by the following rules:

- a) at the start of the training, a mentor-supervisor, then a supervisor shall be assigned to each PhD student. This process is determined by the University Doctoral Regulations and the operational regulations of doctoral schools.
- b) the frequency, the nature and the way of documenting the relationship between the PhD student and the supervisor shall follow the operational regulations of doctoral schools.

**Article 16** The relation between the PhD students and the host institution (research centre) - in the lack of other provisions - shall be governed by the following rules:

- a) at meetings regarding the operation of the institution (research centre), and at events (e.g. meetings), the PhD student may participate and express his/her opinion according to the rules of operation of the institution (research centre).
- b) depending on his/her free capacity, the PhD student is free to undertake tasks and commitments (e.g. deliver lessons, supervise Scientific Students' Association activities, assess theses) according to the valid regulations of the University, to an extent that does not jeopardize his/her progress in the training. In relation to the participation in the training and being overloaded, the rules of complaint management are included in Article 20 of the University Doctoral Regulations.

**17.8** The application for and the consideration of a foreign study trip during the programme is included in the operational regulations of the Doctoral Schools<sup>1</sup>.

**Article 18** The rules of employment of PhD students during the training are included in the operational regulations of doctoral schools.

**Article 19** The processes of monitoring and regularly checking the progress of PhD students are as follows:

- a) In each semester, the PhD student produces a brief report about his/her activities completed under the doctoral programme in the academic year, the frequency of meeting the supervisor, the progress made for the acquisition of

---

<sup>1</sup> For more details on study trips, see the Regulations on Student Fees and Benefits (HTJSZ), Article 43 Scholarship to support PhD students' participation in foreign study trips..

the degree, possible difficulties, the achievement of objectives set for the given period, the plans for the next period, and updates his/her publications in the MTMT database.

- b) The report is discussed at the meeting where the semester is evaluated.
- c) The supervisor attaches a brief supervisory evaluation to the report, based on Article (4) d) of the University Doctoral Regulations, by filling in the relevant form<sup>2</sup>. In the case of double supervision, the supervisors define the evaluation together. The supervisor's evaluation is not public for the student.
- d) The supervisor shall send the PhD student's report and the supervisor's evaluation to the Head of Doctoral School and to the track director (if any).
- e) The Head Doctoral school incorporates the lessons learned from the reports and the supervisor's evaluation into the annual report of the doctoral school.

**Article 20** The process related to preparing for and conducting the complex examination is included in Article 23 of the University Doctoral Regulations.

**Article 21** The process related to the submission and the discussion of the thesis proposal is included in Article 24 of the University Doctoral Regulations.

**Article 22** The process related to the submission and the discussion of the doctoral dissertation is included in Articles 25-28 of the University Doctoral Regulations.

**Article 23** The process related to the conferral of the doctoral degree is included in Article 29 of the University Doctoral Regulations.

#### **Operation of lecturers and supervisors participating in the doctoral programme (ESG 1.5)**

**Article 24** (1) According to the ESG 1.5 standard, the University shall make sure that lecturers involved in the doctoral training have proper skills. The University shall apply fair and transparent procedures for the selection, evaluation and further training of supervisors and lecturers participating in the doctoral programme.

(2) The processes that ensure the implementation of the standard are as follows:

- a) provision of lecturers required for the maintenance of the doctoral school,
- b) selection of issuers of doctoral topics and supervisors,
- c) selection of the lecturers of the doctoral school
- d) The supervisor's evaluation,
- e) incentives for supervisors,
- f) training of supervisors and supervisors-to-be.

---

<sup>2</sup> At the end of the semester in which the PhD student takes his/her complex examination, the supervisor's evaluation may be replaced by the supervisor's evaluation forming part of the documentation of the complex examination.

**Article 25** (1) The provision of lecturers required for the maintenance of the doctoral school - depending on the available resources - is the responsibility of the Head of Doctoral School.

(2) In the annual report, the Head of Doctoral School presents the number of core lecturers, lecturers, issuers of doctoral topics and supervisors, and any changes in these.

(3) In the annual report, the Head of Doctoral School presents the actions and measures required for the maintenance of the number of lecturers of the doctoral school and for the improvement of the quality.

**Article 26** (1) The general considerations and the process of selecting the issuers of doctoral topics and supervisors are included in Article 9 of the University Doctoral Regulations, which says that the person “shall do continuous and high level research in his/her academic area, and shall publish his/her results in prestigious scientific publications”.

(2) Unless the operating regulations of the doctoral schools provide otherwise, the above condition is satisfied by people in the following cases:

- a) the indicators of their scientific publications in the 5 years preceding the announcement of the topic significantly exceed the publication requirements specified for acquiring a degree in the doctoral school, and
- b) the supervisory activities of the issuer of the doctoral topic were qualified at least as satisfactory in the past year.

(3) The Council of Doctoral School may divert from the above rules by producing a justification.

**Article 26** The selection criteria and process of the lecturers of the doctoral school are specified in Article 3 f) of the University Doctoral Regulations.

**Article 27** (1) The regular evaluation of supervisors is carried out by the Doctoral School Councils as specified in Article 6 (2) c) and Article 9 (9).

(2) At the end of each academic year, the supervisor produces a supervisory report on the tasks completed in the given academic year as a supervisor, and sends it to the Head of Doctoral School. The system of considerations for the report is defined by the Doctoral School Councils.

(3) Unless the OOR of the doctoral school specifies it otherwise, the supervisor’s report is extended with the following information by the secretariat of the doctoral school.

- a) the average evaluation of the supervisor by his/her PhD students and students graduated in the doctoral school in the past five academic years, if the assessments of at least 3 PhD students are available from the past 4 years (otherwise this information should not be submitted),
- b) the progress made by the PhD students of the supervisor in the proportion of the time, in meeting the conditions of acquiring the degree,
- c) how many of the PhD students working with the supervisor passed the complex examination successfully, how many acquired a pre-degree certificate or a degree, and what were the qualifications of the complex examinations and degrees.

(4) The supervisors' evaluations are used by the Head of Doctoral School in assigning supervisors to PhD students and for the production of the annual report of the Doctoral School. If the Head of Doctoral School finds it necessary, he/she initiates the development of supervisors.

**Article 28** (1) The process related to the financial incentives provided to supervisors is included in Article 9 (12)-(15) of the University Doctoral Regulations.

(2) The Corvinus Doctoral Schools announces the "Excellent Supervisor" prize every year. The relevant rules are published by the Corvinus Doctoral Schools, and the applications are processed by the Corvinus Doctoral Schools.

**Article 29** (1) The formal frames of training supervisors and supervisors-to-be are established by the Corvinus Doctoral Schools.

(2) For all the applicants who did not work as doctoral supervisors before, a training is organised every year, where they can learn the current rules and procedures related to doctoral training, as well as the challenges and solutions related to the role of supervisors.

(3) If possible, the doctoral schools should make sure that the first supervision by a lecturer should be carried out jointly with an experienced co-supervisor (in the form of double supervision). If that is not possible, somebody should be appointed to assist the supervisor.

(4) The Corvinus Doctoral Schools organises discussions for supervisors and supervisors-to-be every year to discuss topics, challenges and possibilities and exchange experiences related to doctoral trainings.

#### **Provision of the conditions of the doctoral programme, student services (ESG 1.6)**

**Article 30** (1) Based on ESG 1.6, the University shall ensure that doctoral programmes have proper financing sources for the learning and teaching activities, and shall attempt to make sure that - in addition to services usually available to university students - learning support conditions and student services are also available to students participating in the doctoral programme.

(2) The processes that ensure the implementation of the standard are as follows:

- a) career consultancy
- b) mentoring services for PhD students
- c) keeping in touch after graduation

**Article 31** (1) The Corvinus Doctoral Schools - in cooperation with the Student Services Centre - makes sure that career consultancy services are available for students in the doctoral programmes. Students shall be informed of the contact data and the conditions of career consultancy services.

(2) The career consultant produces a short report every year for the Director General of the Corvinus Doctoral Schools about the typical problems he/she met during the academic year, and if necessary, makes a proposal for the modification of the rules and services of the doctoral programme.

**Article 32** (1) The Corvinus Doctoral Schools - in cooperation with the Student Services Centre - arranges for the availability of one or more mentors with experiences in the doctoral training, to whom students may turn in addition to their supervisors and the Head of Doctoral School in the case of life skills, learning or any problem related to the training. Students shall be informed of the contact data and the conditions of mentoring services.

(2) The mentor produces a short report every year for the Director General of the Corvinus Doctoral Schools about the typical problems he/she met during the academic year, and if necessary, makes a proposal for the modification of the rules and services of the doctoral programme.

**Article 33** (1) In the frames of keeping contact after graduation, in cooperation with the organisation responsible for the university alumni services, the Corvinus Doctoral Schools provides the services to graduated alumni.

### **Collection and sharing of information (ESG 1.7 and 1.8)**

**Article 34** (1) Pursuant to the ESG 1.7 and 1.8 standards, the University has to continuously collect and analyse all the relevant information related to doctoral programmes, and use that information in making decisions about doctoral programmes. The University publishes clear, exact, objective, up-to-date and easily accessible information for the general public about the doctoral programmes.

(2) The processes that ensure the implementation of the standard are as follows:

- a) establishment and operation of the registration system related to PhD students;
- b) PhD student opinions (DHaVel),
- c) operation of the PhD student forum;
- d) assess the opinions of graduated students;
- e) ensure the openness of doctoral programmes in society, scope of data to be posted openly on the website;
- f) ensure the internal openness of doctoral programmes, scope of data to be published for university citizens.

**Article 35** The establishment and the operation of the registration system related to PhD students is the task of the Corvinus Doctoral Schools. In the frames of that, it is necessary to process the rules of document management, the rules of recording in the Neptun system, and the rules of keeping the Neptun, the doktor.hu and the DEMO systems up-to-date.

**Article 36** The system of PhD student assessments (DHaVel) is set up and operated by the Corvinus Doctoral Schools with the quality assurance system of the University, and in line with the student assessment system, along the following rules:

- a) PhD students give feedbacks in every semester through the Assessment System of PhD students
- b) In the frames of assessment, the students evaluate

- a. the subjects and the related lecturers,
  - b. the frequency and the quality of their relation with the supervisor,
  - c. the availability of research conditions, and
  - d. the administration of the doctoral programme and the student services.
- c) Opinions on the frequency and the quality of the relation with the supervisor are not public. The Director General of the Corvinus Doctoral Schools has full access to these opinions, the heads of doctoral schools have access regarding their own doctoral schools, while the Doctoral School track directors have access to opinions regarding their own programmes (except for the opinions of their own students).
- d) The results of the rest of the questions may be published in a summarised form.
- e) The results of student assessments shall be summarised and presented to the Council of Doctoral School, together with the proposed recommendations related to the emerging problems.
- f) The report accepted by the Doctoral School shall be made accessible to the university citizens and sent to the Director General of the Corvinus Doctoral Schools.

**Article 37** The management of the Doctoral School, in cooperation with the Student Union, shall hold a forum at least once a year for the students of the doctoral school, so that a direct dialogue could be conducted between the students and the management of the doctoral school, emerging issues could be directly discussed, and the problems of PhD students could be explored and identified. At the forum, it is advantageous to present the results of the PhD students assessments, and to discuss the related experiences.

**Article 38** (1) The Corvinus Doctoral Schools conducts regular surveys on the development of the careers of graduated students, and on their opinions about the training. To this end, the Corvinus Doctoral Schools - considering the university regulations and the operation of the alumni system - collects and updates the contact data of graduated students.

(2) The Corvinus Doctoral Schools reports the results of surveys and career monitoring of graduated students at least annually to the University Doctoral Council, and the results are incorporated into the development of doctoral schools, and the establishment of the doctoral strategy.

**Article 39** Scope of data to be openly posted on the website of doctoral programmes.

- a) Informative efficiency data related to the doctoral programme, summary of results of career monitoring.
- b) Regulations related to the doctoral programme
- c) Names and contact data of the heads of doctoral schools
- d) Names of members of the body

**Article 40:** The scope of minimum data to be published for the university citizens are as follows:

- a) The strategy of the doctoral programme
- b) Annual reports and action plans of Doctoral Schools.

### **Regular external evaluation (ESG 1.10)**

**Article 41** (1) Pursuant to ESG 1.10 standard the University has its doctoral programmes and their quality assurance systems evaluated by external evaluators with regular frequency.

(2) The doctoral accreditation procedures conducted by the Hungarian Accreditation Committee are to be considered as external quality controls.

## Appendix 1

### Doctoral quality assurance reports, evaluation sheets and feedbacks - overview

The PhD student and the supervisor regularly report on their activities performed in the given period. The purpose of reports and evaluations is to

- support students and supervisors in the planning and monitoring of progress,
- provide the student and the supervisor with a framework to discuss the frames and the effectiveness of the co-operation from time to time,
- give an insight for the management of the doctoral school to the progress made by the student, so that they could assist in solving the factors and problems that hinder progress,
- give a feedback to the management of the doctoral school about the assessment of lecturers, supervisors and subjects.

The key forms of feedback are as follows:

Document	Title	Contents	Produced by	Received by/ Accepted by	Frequency / Schedule
Questionnaire to reconcile requirements	Cooperation requirements regarding supervision - evaluation sheet	Framework of cooperation between the PhD student and the supervisor	student and supervisor separately, then jointly	Head of Doctoral School / track manager	During the start of supervision
PhD student's report	Semi-annual report and work plan for PhD students	progress publication planning	PhD student (in agreement with the supervisor)	Head of Doctoral School / track manager	semi-annual, before the next semester, as a condition of starting that
Assessment of the PhD student's report by the supervisor	Supervisor's evaluation in connection with the PhD student's report, work plan, and progress	evaluation in connection with the student	supervisor(s) (not visible for students)	Head of Doctoral School / track manager	semi-annual, before the next semester, as a condition of starting that
Student's assessment of subjects and lecturers, infrastructure, administration	Student evaluation sheet (about subjects, lecturers, research conditions, administration)	student's opinion on subject	PhD student	Head of Doctoral School / track manager	semi-annual, at the end of the study period
Supervisors' evaluation by students	Student's evaluation sheet (about supervision)	opinions about supervisors	PhD student (not visible to supervisors)	Head of Doctoral School / track manager	semi-annual, at the end of the study period
Supervisor's report	Supervisor's self-assessment/report	annual activity of supervisor	supervisor	Head of Doctoral School / track manager	in every academic year, at the end of the spring semester

## Appendix 2

### Cooperation requirements regarding supervision - evaluation sheet

The following questionnaire helps the clarification of requirements regarding supervision. The proposed procedure of reconciling the requirements is as follows:

1. At the time of agreeing on the doctoral supervision, the supervisor and the student both fill in a copy of the questionnaire, independently of each other.
2. Then the two parties get acquainted with each other's evaluations and discuss their feelings about the differences, whether they will generate any conflict in the future, in what way they could cooperate, and what compromise is acceptable to them.
3. The mutually agreed expectations will be recorded in a jointly completed questionnaire, which they sign.
4. The signed questionnaire shall be forwarded to the track director / Head of Doctoral School.

Completion of the questionnaire:

Please read the pairs of statements in the following tables. Each point expresses an opinion that is represented by the supervisor or the PhD student. Please indicate your opinion. Number 1 means you fully agree with the statement on the left side, while 5 means you fully embrace the statement on the right side.

No.		Evaluation	
1	The supervisor is responsible for selecting a research topic for the PhD student.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student is responsible for defining the topic.
2	It is primarily the supervisor who decides what kind of theoretical framework and/or method suits the examination of the research question best.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student shall determine what theoretical framework and/or methods he wishes to use to answer the research question
3	The supervisor shall work out the time schedule for the research by the PhD student (time schedule).	1 2 3 4 5	The supervisor shall allow the PhD student to work out the time schedule for the research (time schedule).
4	The supervisor is responsible for making sure that the PhD students is aware of the services provided by the University (e.g. research data, availability of software, application for software, library services).	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student is responsible for making inquiries about the use of services provided by the University (e.g. research data, availability of software, application for software, library services) and for accessing them.
5	The supervisor is responsible for giving advice on the requirements to be met by the PhD student, how and when to meet these requirements, and how to reach the point of defending his/her thesis.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student is responsible for making inquiries on the requirements to be met by him/her, how and when to meet these requirements, and how to reach the point of defending his/her thesis.
6	The relationship between the PhD student and the supervisor is of purely professional nature, and there is no need to develop a personal relationship between them.	1 2 3 4 5	A close personal relationship is necessary for a successful supervision.

No.		Evaluation	
7	The supervisor shall initiate regular discussions with the PhD student.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student should decide when he/she wishes to meet his/her supervisor.
8	Supervisor No. 1 shall coordinate all communications among the supervisors and the PhD student.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student shall coordinate all communications among the supervisors and the PhD student.
9	The supervisor shall regularly check whether the PhD student is working on the task with the proper intensity and in the proper way.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student shall work independently, and it is not necessary to check how and where he/she spends his/her time.
10	The supervisor shall determine the deadline of submitting the thesis.	1 2 3 4 5	As long as the PhD student works continuously, he/she can spend as much time on the writing of the dissertation as he/she finds necessary.
11	The supervisor should have access to all the works of the PhD student in progress, so that he/she could make sure that the student is on the right track in the doctoral procedure.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student shall send his/her draft to the supervisor only when he/she wants to get constructive criticism from the supervisor.
12	If necessary, the supervisor should help in the wording and writing of the thesis, and he/she should make sure that the presentation about the doctoral thesis is clear.	1 2 3 4 5	The wording and the writing of the thesis should reflect the student's work only, and he/she should take full responsibility for the presentation on the doctoral thesis.
13	The supervisor is responsible for the decisions affecting the standard of the thesis, e.g. exact definition of research questions and hypotheses, selection of methodology and checking of implementation, interpretation of results).	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student is responsible for the decisions affecting the standard of the thesis, e.g. exact definition of research questions and hypotheses, selection of methodology and checking of implementation, interpretation of results).
14	The supervisor is responsible for the way he/she recognises the contribution of the PhD student and the supervisor to the writing of the publications.	1 2 3 4 5	The PhD student shall determine the extent of his/her own contribution to the publication written jointly with the supervisor.

Source:: Kiley & Cadman, 1997, Advisory Centre for University Education, The University of Adelaide

“I am aware of and I accept the set of values and the position held by the future PhD student / supervisor, and I am ready to cooperate according to the above points.”

Budapest, 20. .... ..

.....  
Supervisor

.....  
PhD student

## Appendix 3

### Semi-annual report and work plan for PhD students

The following form facilitates the planning and the monitoring of the work of the PhD student. The report is filled in by the PhD student at the end of the semester, and shall be reconciled with the supervisor. The reconciled report shall be submitted to the track director / Head of Doctoral School.

Name of PhD student: .....

Name of supervisor(s): .....

Semester: .....

#### Progress in research work: summary table

	Title of study in progress	Co-authors	Targeted journal	Journal Alp value (eigenfactor.com)	Scimag o Q1-Q4 best rating	Category reflecting the area of the MTA (Hungarian Academy of Sciences) doctoral School (A-D)	Is it recorded by the Web of Science? (Y/N)	Number of points that can be obtained with the publication in the doctoral school	The readiness of the study is in this phase*	Progress made in the past six months**	Major challenges that hindered progress in the previous semester**	PLANNING Steps planned for the next semester**	PLANNING The readiness of the study is expected to be in this phase in half a year's time:
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													

\* idea, work-in-progress paper, (conference-ready) working paper, submitted to journal, under review, under revision / major revision, minor revision, revise and resubmit/, accepted

\*\* keywords only

In an "ideal" case there is 1 idea, 1 study in the work-in-progress phase, 1 conference-ready study, 1 study submitted to journal and 1 study under revision at the end of the second year after registration for the semester. It is mandatory to specify 3 items, but if there are more than 5 items, the 5 works in the most advanced status should be specified.

**Progress in research work and miscellaneous activities: text additions**

What has been realised from the plans, that cannot be indicated in the table?

- E.g. acquisition or production of database, planning, recording, evaluating questionnaire, development of methodology, creation of models (as a list, 1-3 sentences)  
.....
- E.g. lecture at conference, research seminar, or collection of feedbacks in any other way (as a list, 1-3 sentences)  
.....
- E.g. participation in thematic or methodological workshop related to the topic (as a list, 1-3 sentences)  
.....

What other activities related to the workshop (department) did you perform during the semester?

- E.g. teaching activity, teaching support activity, subject development:  
.....
- E.g. other activities at the department: .....

What unexpected developments occurred in the past semester? (risks, difficulties, 1-3 sentences)  
.....

**Research work plan: text additions**

What are your plans for the next semester in connection with the given study project?  
(For the last two columns of the table, regarding the planning, please add your commitments in 5-8 sentences):

.....  
.....  
.....

Is there any obstacle that hinders the completion of the work plan? (1-3 sentences)

.....

If you have any other comments, requests, support demands, please indicate them here! (1-3 sentences)

.....

Budapest, 20. .... ..

.....  
Supervisor

.....  
PhD student

## Appendix 4

### Supervisor's evaluation about the PhD student's report, work plan, and progress

The supervisor's evaluation shall be submitted together with the student's semester report. The supervisor's evaluation is **not known** by the student, it is **not public**.

Please evaluate the PhD student's work in the past semester according to the following questions.

Name of PhD student: .....

Evaluated semester: .....

#### Regarding the student's progress and completion in time:

How many times did you meet the student during the semester to discuss doctoral issues?

- We did not meet
- On 1-2 occasions
- On 3-4 occasions
- On 5 or more occasions

If you met on less than two occasions, what is the reason for that?

.....

How well is the student's research topic and research focus defined at the moment?

- He/she has well defined (relevant and focused) research questions
- The topics of the research are well defined, but relevant and focused research questions have not been found yet
- The topic of the research is still uncertain, or there are still multiple research topics not closely related to each other
- Other comments, namely: .....

What is the likelihood of the student's finishing his/her studies within the prescribed period?

- It is very likely that he/she will finish it in time
- The student is expected to finish his/her studies with a delay of one or two semesters
- It is difficult to assess the time when the student finishes his/her studies, because of the following risk factors: .....

#### Regarding the evaluation of the past semester

How satisfied are you with the activity and the approach of the PhD student seen in the past semester?

- I am very much satisfied

- I am rather satisfied
- I am partly satisfied, and partly not satisfied
- I am rather not satisfied
- I am not satisfied at all

If you are (rather) not satisfied, what is the reason for that?

.....

How satisfied are you with the student's performance and results achieved in the past semester?

- I am very much satisfied
- I am rather satisfied
- I am partly satisfied, and partly not satisfied
- I am rather not satisfied
- I am not satisfied at all

If you are (rather) not satisfied, what is the reason for that?

.....

**Regarding the work plan for the semester:**

How feasible do you think the student's work plan for the semester is?

- The work plan contains excessive commitments, the objectives in the work plan are not well founded.
- The work plan is properly prepared and feasible
- The work plan strives for too little, not result-oriented enough

Can you see any risks (not mentioned by the student)? (Answer in words)

.....

Do you think that the student should get any special help or support from the doctoral school? If yes, of what kind?

.....

Budapest, 20. .... ..

.....

Supervisor's signature

## Appendix 5

### Student's evaluation sheet (about supervision)

The supervisor's evaluation is sent to the Head of Doctoral School, but not to the supervisor. If the Head of Doctoral School or the track director is the supervisor, the evaluation sheet is sent to the Director General of Corvinus Doctoral Schools.

Name of supervisor(s): .....

Evaluated semester: .....

How many times did you meet the supervisor during the semester to discuss doctoral issues?

- We did not meet
- On 1-2 occasions
- On 3-4 occasions
- On 5 or more occasions

If you met on less than two occasions, what is the reason for that?

.....

How satisfied are you with the supervisor's activities and approach?

- I am very much satisfied
- I am rather satisfied
- I am partly satisfied, and partly not satisfied
- I am rather not satisfied
- I am not satisfied at all

What are the things you find satisfactory about the work of the supervisor?

.....

What are the things in which the supervisor should change or improve?

.....

## Appendix 6

### Student's evaluation sheet (about subjects, lecturers, research conditions, administration)

The subject and lecturer evaluation sheets shall be completed for each subject, while the form on research conditions and administration shall be completed once in every six months.

#### Subject assessment form

Name of subject: .....

Semester: .....

How many times did you have lessons in this subject in the semester?

- According to the information related to the subject, once a week in average
- Less than indicated in the information related to the subject, a few occasions were missed

How much time did you spend studying for a lesson during the semester? (E.g. reading, completing exercises etc.)

- 1 - 1 hours or less
- 2 - 2-3 hours
- 3 - 4-6 hours
- 4 - 7-10 hours
- 5 - 11-15 hours
- 6 - 16 hours or more
- NT - I do not know
- NV - I do not answer

I regularly prepared for the lessons.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The study objectives of the subject and the reasons why this is taught in the doctoral training are clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
Under this subject, we deal with things that are useful for my doctoral programme.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV

The conditions of completing this subject were clear.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
This subject was enjoyable for me.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
If I started the doctoral programme again, and I could select subjects, I would be happy to take this subject again.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV

What did you like in this subject? In what ways did you improve in connection with this subject during the semester?  
 .....

What did you miss or what should be further improved in this subject (contents, examinations, administration etc.)?  
 .....

### Lecturer evaluation sheet

Lecturer's name: .....

The lecturer was well-prepared at the lesson.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The lecturer held the lessons in a way that I understood the material, the explanations were clear.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
I would recommend this lecturer in this course to the students of the next year.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
I feel that I have learned a lot from this lecturer under this subject.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
All in all, I was satisfied with the lecturer.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The lecturer clearly defined the frames of the subject (e.g. frequency of meetings, tasks to be completed).	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The lecturer gave me proper support for the completion of the subject.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The lecturer was available, and responded to the inquiries in good time.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The lecturer gave me effective feedbacks during the semester (e.g. about submitted assignments or solutions).	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV

What did you like in the lecturer's work that you think he should continue in the future, too?  
 .....

What did you miss about the lecturer, in what way should he/she develop or change for the better achievement of study objectives?  
 .....

**Evaluation of research conditions**

I get support for the identification of research questions in the research workshop (department).	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The academic literature can be accessed, and it is available.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The data / software items / surveys (survey, experiment) can be accessed and are available.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
Support for visiting conferences is available.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
There are forums (university workshops, doctoral forums) that give me feedback about my doctoral dissertation under production.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
All in all, I find the research atmosphere of the university motivating.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV

In what areas do you think the research conditions should be improved?

.....

**Assessment of doctoral administration**

The doctoral administrator treats me as a partner.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The doctoral administrator is well-prepared, answers all my questions.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
The opening hours of the doctoral office are satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV
All in all, I am satisfied with the doctoral administration.	1	2	3	4	5	NT	NV

What did you like in the work of the doctoral administrator, that you are satisfied with?

.....

What did you miss about the administrator, in what way should he/she improve or change?

.....

## Appendix 7

### Supervisor's self-assessment/report

Name: .....

Reporting period: .....

My research areas (current issues): .....

I satisfy / do not satisfy the supervisor conditions in the doctor.hu records.

I certify that the publications were uploaded to the MTMT system in the year of the report. Yes/No

Joint work with PhD students:

Name of PhD student:	Ratio of supervision (50%, 100%)	Year of registration for the semester	(Expected) year of getting the pre-degree certificate:	(Expected) date of defending at research centre:	(Expected) date of defending:	Topic of PhD student	Brief description of joint research project and work*

*\*for instance joint study, data collection, preparation of questionnaire, data cleaning, participation in joint H2020 project tender, i.e. any joint work that carries the doctoral procedure further, and that can be described in a text report*

Publications produced jointly with PhD students and published in the actual year (if any, the MTMT link is enough):

.....

Brief report about the cooperation with the PhD students and the development of PhD students in the past year (for each student):

.....

.....

In what way could the doctoral school help in the supervisory activity?

.....

Budapest, 20. .... ..

.....

Supervisor