

## **Rules of Procedure of the Habilitation Committee for the Humanities**

1. The Rules of Procedure (hereinafter: Rules) of the Habilitation Committee for the Humanities (hereinafter: BTHB) have been formulated in accordance with the Habilitation Policy of the University of Debrecen (hereinafter: HP), based on Section (6) of 3§ of the latter, which declares: “The Habilitation Committee of a certain academic field defines its own rules of procedure.”
2. The Rules record the BTHB’s past practice as protocol. The Rules do not go into details about questions already regulated by the HP and by the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen: Supplement for the Field of Humanities (hereinafter: Supplement).
3. BTHB has ten internal and five external members. The ten internal members are representatives of the ten PhD programmes respectively in the four doctoral schools at the Faculty of Humanities. The chair of BTHB is chosen from the members of the committee. (As for the composition of BTHB, see HP 3§ (1–3).)
4. The work of BTHB is assisted by a secretary, who is the current office manager of the Dean’s Office (Management Office) at the Faculty of Humanities.
5. Meetings are convened by the chair of BTHB on a schedule determined by the ongoing procedures, but possibly no more frequently than once a month. Departures from the schedule may be allowed in duly justified cases. Members are sent an invitation to a meeting a week before the scheduled time; the invitation should also contain the meeting’s agenda. Documents pertaining to the meeting should become available on the secure platform ideally a week prior to the meeting, but at least 48 hours beforehand.
6. A (non-verbatim) minutes is prepared about the meetings, which is signed by the minutes secretary, the chair of BTHB, as well as two members of BTHB as verification. The minutes is then approved during the next session by members of BTHB, in an open vote.
7. If at all possible, the official habilitation process should be preceded by a preliminary evaluation, which is carried out by an internal member of BTHB who is the representative of the respective field (or, in certain cases, an external member or an invited external assessor). This assessor is also going to be the given case’s referent during the habilitation process. After consulting the chair, BTHB’s secretary invites an internal member to carry out the preliminary evaluation. The preliminary evaluation can take different forms, depending on the customary practices of the relevant programme (e. g. the referent may personally consult the candidate or the preliminary evaluation may be carried out as an institutionalized process).
8. The official habilitation process begins with the submission of the habilitation application form (HP §4). The thus submitted habilitation documentation is made available to the members of BTHB by the secretary, the representative of the relevant field (hereinafter: referent) reports to BTHB about the habilitation material, based on the criteria detailed in the Supplement. BTHB votes by ballot (yes/no/abstain) whether to commence the habilitation process, then they vote openly about the assessors suggested by the referent (see HP 3§ (4)). (Prior to this, the referent consults the assessors whether or not they are willing to accept this task.) At this point, the referent can also suggest members for the complete committee of experts (whom the referent has also consulted beforehand), and BTHB can also vote openly about the members of this committee.

9. The secretary of BTHB notifies the candidate in a letter written by the chair about the commencement of the habilitation process and, at the same time, invites the assessors – also in a letter written by the chair – to formulate their evaluation (see HP 5§ (2)). The assessors have to report in detail whether each criterion listed in the Supplement has been fulfilled or otherwise. The work of the assessors is aided by a template (see Appendix IV), the use of which is not compulsory but BTHB can only accept an evaluation if it discusses every criterion listed in the Supplement.
10. Once the evaluations have been submitted, the secretary makes them available to the members of BTHB, while the referent prepares a written summary of the evaluations and reports this summary at a BTHB meeting, where the committee votes by ballot (yes/no/abstain) about the commencement of the public phase of the proceedings. If the composition of the five-member committee of experts have not been finalized before, then at this point BTHB finalizes the composition of the committee (see HP 5§ (1)), while also voting on the topic of the habilitation lectures (HP 5§ (5)) in an open vote.
11. The chair of BTHB notifies the candidate – in a letter sent by the secretary – about the commencement of the public phase, and the chair also officially invites the members of the committee of experts to participate in the public phase of the habilitation process.
12. It is the responsibility of the chair of the committee of experts to coordinate the public phase of the habilitation (time and date, place). If necessary, the chair’s coordinating efforts may be aided by the referent or by the secretary of the relevant doctoral programme. As a result of their coordinating efforts, BTHB appoints the time and place of the public phase.
13. By default, BTHB carries out the habilitation proceedings in person, unless that proves impossible due to unusual circumstances. When specifically requested and the respective programme can provide the necessary technical equipment, a hybrid process is possible.
14. The public events of the habilitation process and the evaluation thereof is carried out by the committee of experts and BTHB, based on the provisions of HP 8§. The case referent prepares a short summary for the meeting of BTHB and presents it at the session.
15. After the meeting of EDHT (the University’s Doctoral and Habilitation Council), the secretary of BTHB notifies the candidate – in a letter written by the chair – about the conclusion of the process.
16. Keeping the Rules is aided by a flowchart (protocol) (Appendix I).
17. Further appendices to the Rules are as follows: Appendix II: Self-evaluation form for candidates and pre-evaluation form for committee members; Appendix III: The list of documents to be submitted by the candidates, the ways and forms of submission.
18. The current rules of procedure of BTHB, with all its appendices shall be published on the appropriate website of the Faculty of Humanities, UD (<https://btk.unideb.hu/hu/node/142>), while Appendices II and III, as well as the application form and the sample cover page for the thesis booklet will also be published as separate documents on the same website.
19. The Rules can be amended if such an amendment is proposed by any member of BTHB. The amendment can be added to the Rules if a simple majority of the members present at the meeting discussing the amendment votes for it.
20. Final provision: the current Rules are based on the rules of procedure accepted on 9 November 2022, BTHB voted on its amended version on 18 January, 2023 and it shall come into force on 19 January, 2023.

Debrecen, 18 January, 2023

## **Appendix I**

### **Protocol based on BTHB's Rules of Procedure (flowchart)**

1. The candidate expresses their interest
2. A referent is appointed for preliminary evaluation (chair/secretary)
3. Assessing whether the candidate fulfils all the criteria set by the evaluation process used by the given doctoral programme (the referent consults with the candidate or an institutionalized process is applied)
4. The habilitation application form is submitted (candidate)
5. The preliminary evaluation referent is appointed as referent (chair/secretary) or, if no preliminary evaluation has taken place, a referent is appointed (chair/secretary)
6. A BTHB meeting is convened (chair/secretary), a report is prepared after the referent has coordinated with the assessors or even with the entire committee of experts (both: referent)
7. The entirety of the habilitation documentation and the referent's report are made available to the members of BTHB (secretary)
8. The referent presents their reports at a BTHB meeting
9. Vote by ballot (yes/no/abstain) about the commencement of the habilitation process
10. Open vote about the two assessors (and, if it has already been formed, about the entire committee of experts)
11. Preparing the minutes of the meeting (minutes secretary)
12. The candidate is notified about the commencement of the process (chair/secretary)
13. Assessors are invited to prepare their evaluation within three months; appendices: HP; Supplement; Appendix I to Rules (chair/secretary)
14. Once the evaluations are submitted, the referent and the chair are notified (secretary)
15. A summary is prepared (referent)
16. The next meeting is convened (chair/secretary)
17. Evaluations and the summary thereof is made available to the members of BTHB (secretary)
18. Referent presents their report at the meeting of BTHB (summary of the evaluations, suggestions about the committee of experts and the topic of the lectures)
19. Vote by ballot (yes/no/abstain) about the commencement of the public phase of the process
20. Open vote about further members of the committee of experts (if it has not taken place yet)
21. Open vote about the topic of the habilitation lectures
22. Preparing the minutes of the meeting (minutes secretary)
23. The candidate is notified about the commencement of the public phase of the process (chair/secretary)
24. Members of the committee of experts are invited to participate in the public phase of the habilitation process. At the same time, the chair of the committee is invited to coordinate about the time and place of the lectures with the members of the committee; the referent or the secretary of the respective doctoral programme may aid this coordination process (chair/secretary)
25. The public phase of the process is announced and organized: invitations, thesis booklets, time and place, technological details, informing the committee of experts about the protocols of the public phase etc. (chair/secretary/respective doctoral programme/technician)

26. Submitting the minutes of the public phase (chair of the committee of experts) to the secretary
27. The chair and the referent are notified about the conclusion of the process (secretary)
28. A summary is prepared (referent)
29. The next session is convened and the vote is organized (chair/secretary)
30. The minutes of the public phase of the process and the summary thereof are made available to the members of BTHB (secretary)
31. The referent presents their report at the meeting of BTHB
32. Vote by ballot (on a scale of 1 to 5) at the meeting of BTHB about the conclusion of the public phase of the process
33. The minutes of the meeting are prepared (minutes secretary)
34. Filling out the minutes about the public phase of the habilitation process, sending the necessary habilitation documentation, as well as a notice about the vote of BTHB to EDHT (chair/secretary)
35. After the vote of EDHT, the candidate is notified about the conclusion of the process (chair/secretary)

## Appendix II

### Self-evaluation form for candidates and pre-evaluation form for committee members

(The self-evaluation form for candidates is NOT to be included in the submission package)

#### I. Habilitation thesis criteria:

(See: <https://btk.unideb.hu/hu/node/142>,

<https://mad-hatter.it.unideb.hu/portal/displayDocument/id/3319783>

and

[https://btk.unideb.hu/sites/default/files/upload\\_documents/a\\_debreceni\\_egyetem\\_habilitacios\\_szabalyzatanak\\_bolcseszettudomanyi\\_teruleti\\_kiegeszitesi.pdf](https://btk.unideb.hu/sites/default/files/upload_documents/a_debreceni_egyetem_habilitacios_szabalyzatanak_bolcseszettudomanyi_teruleti_kiegeszitesi.pdf)):

Habilitation thesis	Requirement	Requirement fulfilled (describe in detail how the thesis fulfills the given requirement)	Requirements met (yes/no)
Length	400,000 n without appendices, supplements and inserts		
	<b>Psychology:</b> in case of “empirical/experimental” books/volumes, the description and documentation (figures, images, tables) of hypotheses and results closely connected to the experiment, as well as the formulas of the applied statistical methods are to be included in the 400,000 n length		
	<b>Classical studies:</b> if the source text under analysis is not a classical one, the minimum required length for accompanying papers written alongside the author’s critical reading of the text: 200,000 n		
Genre	Monograph or a collection of papers which presents in its referencing style and use		

	of language a coherent whole		
	<p>Classical studies:</p> <p>a. a translation of ancient authors with text editing and/or a critical edition of a text;</p> <p>b. in the case of an analysis of a non-classical source text, the length of the accompanying study(s) written in addition to the author's critical treatment of the text: a minimum of 200,000 n</p>		
Format of thesis	Manuscript or a book published at most two years prior to the submission of the thesis		
Overlap with PhD thesis	<p>In case of a monograph, the habilitation thesis should be at least 80% different from the PhD thesis;</p> <p>In case of a collected volume, at least 80% of the papers should be published (if they have already been published) after the PhD title was awarded</p>		
Co-authoring	Monograph written with a co-author: in case the authorship of individual chapters is clear from the manuscript and/or published volume, and the combined length of these chapters is at least 400,000 n		

## II. Criteria regarding the candidate's academic achievements

(See: <https://btk.unideb.hu/hu/node/142>,

<https://mad-hatter.it.unideb.hu/portal/displayDocument/id/3319783>

and

[https://btk.unideb.hu/sites/default/files/upload\\_documents/a\\_debreceni\\_egyetem\\_habilitacios\\_szabalyzatanak\\_bolcseszettudomanyi\\_teruleti\\_kiegeszitesi.pdf](https://btk.unideb.hu/sites/default/files/upload_documents/a_debreceni_egyetem_habilitacios_szabalyzatanak_bolcseszettudomanyi_teruleti_kiegeszitesi.pdf)):

**1. Criteria for supervision on graduate and undergraduate level and academic collaboration (out of the 9 criteria listed below, at least 5 must be fulfilled, as per Section 1§ (4/b) of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen and Section 2§ of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen):**

<b>Supervision, other academic commitments</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Requirement fulfilled</b> (describe <b>in detail</b> how the given requirement was deemed to be fulfilled / not fulfilled)	<b>Requirements met</b> (yes/no)
Doctoral programme	Teaching		
PhD supervision	at least co-supervision, 0.5 person		
Thesis supervision	on BA and/or MA level		
TDK (Hungarian Student Research Society) supervision	at least co-supervision, 0.5 person		
International and domestic academic commitments	International and domestic grants and e. g. committee and/or editorial board memberships		
Editorial activities	multi-author volumes, conference proceedings, editing thematic journal issues		
Conference presentations	at international and/or domestic academic events		
More significant academic visits/trips			
Awards/professional recognition			

**2. Teaching activities (See Section 1§ (4/e) of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen and Section 3§ of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen (Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities))**

<b>Teaching activities</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Requirement fulfilled</b> (describe <b>in detail</b> how the given requirement was)	<b>Requirements met</b> (yes/no)



		deemed to be fulfilled / not fulfilled)	
In the candidate's own institution	At least 8 semesters of teaching – in BA, MA or doctoral programmes – per full semesters (2 hours / 12–14 weeks)		

**3. Publications (See Section 1§ (4) of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen and Sections 4§ a-d. of the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities, UD; the following paragraph designations refer to sections of the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities)**

<b>Publication</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Requirement fulfilled</b> (describe <b>in detail</b> how the given requirement was deemed to be fulfilled / not fulfilled)	<b>Requirements met</b> (yes/no)
<i>Book</i> (Section 4§ a.)  <i>Special criterion for Psychology:</i> (Section 4§ c.)	at least one peer-reviewed monograph or single-author, coherent volume of papers  <i>Psychology:</i> en lieu of a monograph, at least two papers with impact factors		
<i>Papers, book chapters</i> (> 20,000 n, peer-reviewed) (Section 4§ a.)	at least 18		
– incl. papers in a foreign language (Section 4§ a.) – <i>Special criterion:</i> modern philologies (Section 4§ b.)	at least 3  <i>Modern philologies:</i> at least 9		

<p>– incl. papers published since the PhD title was awarded (Section 4§ a.)</p>	<p>at least 9</p>		
<p><i>No. of citations</i>  a quarter of the minimum number of independent citations required for the MTA academic doctorate in the candidate's discipline (Section 4§ d.) – for each discipline, see the regulations of the relevant Department of the MTA (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)</p> <p>incl. reviews:</p>	<p>Please, <b>provide</b> a quarter of the citations required for the “Doctor of MTA” title as specified by the relevant MTA committee</p>		

### **Appendix III**

**Candidates should submit the following documents in the manner specified below to the postal/electronic addresses associated with the habilitation process**

Document	No. of copies	Document format	Print/Electronic	Delivery method
Application	3	on green paper, A/4, 2 pages at most	both in print and electronic format	In person and in email OR By post and in email
Attachments to the application	3	on white paper, A/4	both in print and electronic format	In person and in email OR By post and in email
Habilitation thesis	1	A/4, bound or spiral bound	both in print and electronic format	In person and in email OR By post and in email
Habilitation booklet	5	A/5, cover page as specified, no specifications for internal pages	both in print and electronic format	In person and in email OR By post and in email
PhD booklet	1		both in print and electronic format	In person and in email OR By post and in email

Beyond the documents listed above, further information about the habilitation processing fees can be requested from Mrs. Károly Kotricz, the secretary of BTHB (the Habilitation Committee of the Faculty of Humanities, UD) in email at [kotricz.karolyne@arts.unideb.hu](mailto:kotricz.karolyne@arts.unideb.hu).

Candidates are, in their best interest, strongly advised to contact the secretary of BTHB, Mrs. Károly Kotricz before they submit their documentation so that they can take part in a pre-evaluation process. The aim of the pre-evaluation process is to filter out such candidates who do not qualify for the criteria of the habilitation process as specified by BTHB, before any processing fees are paid and the habilitation process begins. Pending the approval of the Chair of BTHB, the secretary of BTHB will refer the candidate to the committee member responsible for the candidate's specific discipline.

## **Appendix IV**

### **Habilitation proposal about**

**(name of habilitation candidate)’s**

**evaluation and about the formal and substantive compliance of the habilitation thesis**

**titled**

**(...)**

#### **I. Expert statement:**

I (...) declare that, during the habilitation process, I shall accept and follow the provisions set out by the University of Debrecen’s Habilitation Regulations (<https://maddock-hatter.it.unideb.hu/portal/displayDocument/id/3319783>) and the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen: Supplement for the Field of Humanities ([https://btk.unideb.hu/sites/default/files/upload\\_documents/a\\_debreceni\\_egyetem\\_habilitacios\\_szabalyzatanak\\_bolcseszettudomanyi\\_teruleti\\_kiegeszitese.pdf](https://btk.unideb.hu/sites/default/files/upload_documents/a_debreceni_egyetem_habilitacios_szabalyzatanak_bolcseszettudomanyi_teruleti_kiegeszitese.pdf)).

#### **II. Evaluation:**

**1. Compliance with criteria regarding doctoral engagements, supervision and academic collaboration (out of the 9 criteria listed below, at least 5 must be fulfilled, see Section 1§ (4/b) of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen and Section 2§ of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen):**

<b>Supervision, other academic commitments</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Requirement fulfilled (describe <u>in detail</u> how the given requirement was deemed to be fulfilled / not fulfilled)</b>	<b>Requirements met (yes/no)</b>
Doctoral programme	Teaching		
PhD supervision	at least co-supervision, 0.5 person		
Thesis supervision	on BA and/or MA level		
TDK (Hungarian Student Research Society) supervision	at least co-supervision, 0.5 person		

International and domestic academic commitments	International and domestic grants and e. g. committee and/or editorial board memberships		
Editorial activities	multi-author volumes, conference proceedings, editing thematic journal issues		
Conference presentations	at international and/or domestic academic events		
More significant academic visits/trips			
Awards/professional recognition			

**II.1 Summary (strengths and potential weaknesses, at least five lines):**

**2. Teaching activities (See Section 1§ (4/e) of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen and Section 3§ of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen (Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities))**

<b>Teaching activities</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Requirement fulfilled (describe <u>in detail</u> how the given requirement was deemed to be fulfilled / not fulfilled)</b>	<b>Requirements met (yes/no)</b>
In the candidate's own institution	At least 8 semesters of teaching – in BA, MA or doctoral programmes – per full semesters (2 hours / 12–14 weeks)		

**II.2 Summary (strengths and potential weaknesses, at least five lines):**

**3. Publications (See Section 1§ (4) of the Habilitation Regulations of the University of Debrecen and Sections 4§ a-d. of the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities, UD; the following paragraph designations refer to sections of the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities)**

<b>Publication</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Requirement fulfilled (describe <u>in detail</u> how the given requirement was deemed to be fulfilled / not fulfilled)</b>	<b>Requirements met (yes/no)</b>
<p><i>Book</i> (Section 4§ a.)</p> <p><i>Special criterion for Psychology:</i> (Section 4§ c.)</p>	<p>at least one peer-reviewed monograph or single-author, coherent volume of papers</p> <p><i>Psychology:</i> en lieu of a monograph, at least two papers with impact factors</p>		
<p><i>Papers, book chapters</i> (&gt; 20,000 n, peer-reviewed) (Section 4§ a.)</p>	<p>at least 18</p>		
<p>– incl. papers in a foreign language (Section 4§ a.)</p> <p>– <i>Special criterion:</i> modern philologies (Section 4§ b.)</p>	<p>at least 3</p> <p><i>Modern philologies:</i> at least 9</p>		
<p>– incl. papers published since the PhD title was awarded (Section 4§ a.)</p>	<p>at least 9</p>		
<p><i>No. of citations</i> a quarter of the minimum number of independent citations required for the MTA academic doctorate in the candidate's discipline (Section 4§ d.) – for each discipline, see the regulations of the</p>	<p>Please, <b>provide</b> a quarter of the citations required for the “Doctor of MTA” title as specified by the relevant MTA committee</p>		

relevant Department of the MTA (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)			
incl. reviews:			

**II.3 Summary (strengths and potential weaknesses, at least five lines):**

**Collective summary about sections II.1–3 (strengths and potential weaknesses, at least five lines):**

**III. Statement about the formal compliance of the submitted habilitation thesis, detailing the criteria set out in Sections 4§ a–f. of the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities, UD (length, the genre of the submitted habilitation thesis, (co-)authorship, in the case of already published works: year of publication, potential overlap with the PhD thesis)**

**IV. Summative statement declaring that the candidate’s professional achievements and the submitted habilitation thesis together formally comply with the provisions set out in the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities, UD (see the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities, UD 7§)**

**V. Evaluation of the contents of the habilitation thesis at least in two pages, a statement declaring that the substance of the habilitation thesis complies with the regulations, detailing the new scientific results presented in the thesis (see the Habilitation Supplement for the Field of Humanities, UD 5§)**

**VI. Summative statement declaring that the submitted habilitation material (the candidate’s professional achievements, as well as the form and content of the habilitation thesis) fulfill the criteria of the habilitation requirements.**

**(Date)**

**(Signature)**