

EDITORIAL TEAM:

Team headed by Rev. Prof. Andrzej Szostek

COVER DESIGN:

Mariusz Luterek

TYPOGRAPHIC DESIGN, TEXT MAKEUP:

Tomasz Szatkowski

ISBN 978-83-60993-12-5

© Copyright by KRASP and FRP, Kraków 2007

This document has been drawn up within the framework of strategic partnership between the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland and the Polish Rectors Foundation.

Neither the entirety nor any part of the document may be reproduced or disseminated by electronic, mechanical, copying, recording or other means without the written consent of the copyright owner.

PUBLISHED BY:

Fundacja dla Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego
ul. Karmelicka 34, 31-13 Kraków
Tel./fax 012 632 38 30

CONFERENCE OF RECTORS OF ACADEMIC SCHOOLS IN POLAND
POLISH RECTORS FOUNDATION

The Code
GOOD PRACTICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

developed by
the Polish Rectors Foundation

adopted by
the Plenary Assembly
of the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland
on 26 April 2007

Kraków, June 2007

The *Good Practices in Universities Code* was developed on the initiative of the Polish Rectors Foundation, endorsed by the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland (CRASP) in June 2005. A draft of the Code was drawn up by a Committee composed of: Rev. Prof. A. Szostek (Chairman), Prof. E. Chmielecka (Secretary), Prof. W. Gasparski, Prof. A. Koźmiński, Prof. Z. Szawarski, Prof. J. Woźnicki, and M. Chałupka, MA. appointed by and working within the Polish Rectors Foundation from October 2005 to December 2006. The Committee members did not receive any remuneration for their work on the Code, treating their task as a *pro publico bono* activity.

The Code was discussed during two meetings of the Assembly of the Founders of the Polish Rectors Foundation and the Institute of Knowledge Society in September 2005 and September 2006. The work on the Code had been preceded by a debate by the members of the Founders Assembly, in which Prof. G. Domański and Prof. M. Grabski, among others, had taken part, presenting reports opening the discussion.

In January 2007, the draft of the Code was submitted to the Presidium of CRASP and – upon the incorporation of the amendments following from consultations with the academic community – it was adopted on 26 April, 2007, by the Plenary Assembly of CRASP, which decided to solemnly announce it on 8 June, 2007, at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków during the celebrations of the 10th anniversary of the establishment of CRASP.

GOOD PRACTICES IN UNIVERSITIES

Origins

Universities are among the institutions whose social prestige and effectiveness to a large extent depend on the ethos they follow. The ethos does not come down to the requirement of respecting the law and standards provided in the statutes of the individual universities and in other specific regulations. Good practices in academia, reflecting the multi-centennial tradition of academic life, integrate the formal and informal recommendations and principles regulating issues of significance for the shaping and maintenance of the ethos. It is because of the concern for the cultivation and promulgation of good practices that the formulation of fundamental principles determining their standard has been attempted.¹ These important and needed documents primarily concern individual behaviour of academic teachers and other faculty members employed at universities. Their governance bodies, however, also play an essential part making decisions of prime importance. Therefore, the documents drawn up so far need to be supplemented with a catalogue of good practices that the universities' governance bodies should follow.

This made the Polish Rectors Foundation undertake the initiative of developing a new document with reference to universities. This document should stipulate rules and requirements regarding the governance exercised over universities by single-person authorities and collective bodies first and foremost. The initiative was fostered by CRASP, as expressed in the resolution of 23 May, 2005, reading as follows: “[t]he Plenary Assembly of the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland, striving to consolidate the traditional academic values in the life of universities, points to the need to draw up and announce a document entitled *The Code of Good Practices in Universities*. The Code would stipulate the rules of proceeding for single-person authorities and collective bodies of universities and their departments, as well as academic teachers and students. The Assembly gladly welcomes the commencement of work on such a Code by the Polish Rectors Foundation and appeals to the future CRASP authorities to support this valuable initiative.”

¹ Such standards were drawn up, among others, by the Committee for Ethics in Science, appointed by Polish Academy of Sciences in 1992, which issued a set of principles and guidelines, entitled *Good Manners in Science*, in 1994; the document has been amended twice since (latest edition in 2001). Many universities have developed concise ethical codes in a similar vein (cf. Academic Code of Values, adopted by the Senate of the Jagiellonian University on 25 June, 2003). Finally, the Committee for Ethics in Science, appointed at the Ministry of Scientific Research and Information Technology in 1998, published the recommendations entitled *Good Practices in Scientific Research* (adopted by the Committee for Scientific Research in its fourth term).

In September 2005, the Polish Rectors Foundation appointed a Committee for the Development of the *Good Practices in Universities Code*. The Committee was composed of: Rev. Prof. A. Szostek (Chairman), Prof. E. Chmielecka (Secretary), Professor W. Gasparski, Professor A. Koźmiński, Professor Z. Szawarski, Professor J. Woźnicki, and M. Chałupka, MA – a representative of the Students' Parliament of the Republic of Poland (members).² The initial draft developed by the Committee was brought under public debate at universities and among rectors. The editorial team discussed in detail the amendments submitted. The reviewed version of the draft was then submitted to the Plenary Assembly of CRASP, which accepted the *Good Practices in Universities Code* on 26 April, 2007, and decided to announce it during the celebration of the CRASP 10th Anniversary Jubilee in Kraków. The Code will be presented to the individual universities with a request for their respective Senates to declare its adoption, in part or in its entirety, along with a justification for the decision. The procedure of implementing the Code will be properly complemented by CRASP appointing a *Committee for Good Practices in Universities* which will consider motions concerning both improvements to the Code and cases of its violation. The Code has also been presented to the Conference of Rectors of Non-University Higher Education Institutions in Poland (KRZaSP), so as to serve the entire academic community.

Preamble

Truth is the fundamental value of the academic ethos. The vocation of universities is to genuinely seek it and document the results of this search (research aims), to educate the young generation in the methodical acquisition of truth, to facilitate their intellectual and moral development, and to prepare future graduates for responsible holding public and professional functions in a democratic state (educational and upbringing aims), as well as to facilitate the cultural and civilisation development of the entire society (social aims). In pursuing these aims, universities must be open and enterprising and they should seek ways to implement the fundamental humanistic values in this vein, while collaborating with other social entities, taking the traditions of their respective countries and regions into consideration, and meeting the challenges of the changing world in their own way. By fulfilling these tasks, universities form their own, particular institutional culture. Its standard and influence depend on the demeanour of the entire university community. However, this institutional culture should be of special concern to those who govern the university: the Rector, the Senate, and – to an

² The editorial team was composed of E. Chmielecka, A. Szostek and J. Woźnicki.

appropriate extent – to lower level single-person authorities and collective governance bodies (deans and faculty boards, directors and boards of individual institutes, etc.). Their culture of operations to a large extent contributes to the culture of the entire university, shapes its image, integrates academic community and has a positive effect on the university's surroundings. Therefore, it is of crucial importance to lay down the fundamental principles and good practices in university governance that go beyond the requirements of the common law and other regulations relating to universities.

Fundamental principles

1. *The principle of public service.* Following the best academic traditions, the vocation of universities is to fulfil the mission of investigating and spreading the truth. A properly construed university culture requires that this mission be fulfilled *pro publico bono*. A university aware of its essential social importance endeavours to ensure that it contributes to enhancing the common good of the country and to strengthening the mature democracy both through the reliability of the conducted research and through the education of future cultural and political elite.
2. *The principle of impartiality in public affairs.* Universities enjoy the privileges of respected public institutions. The activities of a university involve great social responsibility. This requires universities to behave in an impartial and objective way when participating in public life, and especially when taking a position on important social issues.
3. *The principle of legalism.* In their activities, universities not only obey the law, to which they are obliged by the rule of law, but they also promote among students and the entire academic community a culture of respect for law and impartial application of rules and procedures defined by respective bodies. Possible discontent with the binding legislation concerning universities should be manifested in a way that complies with legal standards.
4. *The principle of autonomy and responsibility.* The autonomy due to every university, defined in the statutory law, entails the right of each university to defining its mission and the consequential individual goals and tasks, as well as numerous regulations pertaining to the university policy in an independent manner. In exercising its autonomy, however, the university must interpret the consequential rights so as to take responsibility for the common good, in its own way and in the best possible and most effective manner.

5. *The principle of division and balance of authority.* An important element of good practices in university governance is constituted by legal and cultural rules that apply in practice the principle of division and balance of competences between the Rector, as a single-person authority, the Senate, as a collective body, and the peer tribunal and disciplinary committees that enjoy the power of issuing independent verdicts. In this regard, it should be emphasised that in particular the Rector and the Senate are two separate and distinct bodies and neither of them has authority over the other. The distinctiveness and equality of these two bodies are manifested and confirmed in the statutory regulations, pursuant to which neither the Rector is entitled to appoint members of the Senate, nor is the Senate authorised to elect the Rector; this is done by the appropriate election bodies. In fulfilling their tasks, both the Rector and the Senate should rely on formal and legal determinants, but also on the prerequisites arising from the institutional culture of the particular university, the observance of which requires respecting the good practices in the activities of either body.
6. *The principle of creativity.* Governance of the university or its organisational unit (faculty, institute, etc.) requires creativity. The latter does not allow one to be confined to passively upholding the existing directions of activities, and expresses itself in undertaking initiatives aimed at university development instead. The initiatives have to be of strategic nature, they should be undertaken in a responsible manner and consistently aim at the completion of the tasks assumed. They are determined by the university bodies which consider their merits, the university financial and personnel capabilities, as well as the prospects of co-operation with other entities. Previously confirmed creativity should be an important criterion in elections or competitions for executive functions.
7. *The principle of transparency.* In order to consolidate the university reliability, especially in the rational use of funds, and to avoid nepotism, corruption and other cases of abuse of power, it is necessary for all procedures relating to research or education tasks and initiatives, competitions for various functions, promotion and awards for the employees, admission and recognition of students to be overt and just.
8. *The principle of subsidiarity.* Individual authorities should conform to the subsidiarity principle which requires that the competences and initiatives of the lower level authorities and individual employees be respected. At the same time, this principle requires all parties to follow the chain of command when dealing with an issue and always retain the right for appeals when resolving disputable matters. The appeals institution is obliged to respond in a factual and timely manner to the objections raised by the employees.

9. *The principle of respect for dignity and tolerance.* In view of the dignity and good name of all members of the academic community, universities follow the rules of trust, respect, and tolerance for all views, attitudes, and lifestyles that comply with the law. The right to privacy should be respected and disputes should be settled by way of debates between parties which should respect each other and acknowledge each other's rights.
10. *The principle of universalism of research and education.* The traditional and contemporary mission of the university requires it to be a public institution contributing, through research and education, to the achievements of global academia and to the concern for the well-being of mankind. University authorities – the Rector and the Senate – should endeavour to ensure that all the enterprises and tasks undertaken are of such nature. International contacts of the universities should be encouraged and efforts to ensure their due position in the international academic community should be undertaken.

Good practices in the activities of the Rector and the Senate. Introduction

In order to manage the university in the appropriate and effective manner it is essential to properly understand and respect the division of competences and the principles of co-operation between the Rector and the Senate. The division of competences is manifested, *inter alia*, in the following:

- a. the Rector's activities are assessed by the Senate;
- b. the Rector *ex officio* presides over the Senate retaining the right to suspend the execution of a Senate resolution if, in his/her opinion, it violates significant interests of the university;
- c. the Senate expresses the opinion of the university academic community, whereas the Rector presents this opinion to the public;
- d. the Rector represents the university outside and is the superior of the staff, students and doctoral students;
- e. the Senate's resolutions are binding for other bodies of the university, its staff, students, and doctoral students, provided that they have been adopted within its scope of competences which are overt and strictly stipulated in the statutory law and in the Statutes, whereas the Rector makes decisions on all matters concerning the university, with the exception of matters reserved, either in the statutory law or in the Statutes, for other

governance bodies or the Chancellor (and in this sense, the rule of competence presumption applies to the Rector).

The competences of the Senate, which is not superior to the Rector, include determining the assumptions, directions and guidelines for faculty boards, as well as expressing consent to decisions of substantial significance for the university, stipulated in the relevant regulations, whereas the Rector is in charge of their execution. Thus, the Senate should not take over the Rector's competences and the Rector should not shift the responsibility for decisions belonging to him/her onto the Senate, even in the form of a request for the Senate's opinion, which might be construed as binding for the Rector. On the other hand, the Rector's activities should always be based on the directions for university activities as well as on the rules and procedures for decision making by single-person authorities or their plenipotentiaries, adopted by the Senate.

It should be borne in mind, however, that the office of the Rector requires not only governing, managing, and representing the university but he/she should also, maybe to an even larger extent, be the leader of the academic community. In this sense, the Rector is a guard of the ethos of the academic community, stimulating its efforts to ensure and maintain high quality of the university work and to attain ambitious developmental objectives.

Good practices in the activities of the Rector

1. *Responsibility for university development.* The Rector, as a single-person authority responsible for the governance of the university and for planning its development, at the beginning of his/her term of office presents the Senate with an action plan that he/she commits himself/herself to fulfil, which is then defined in detail at the beginning of each academic year. The objective of such an action plan, accepted by the Senate, is to solve the essential problems of the university and encourage the development of the university in accordance with its mission. For a non-public university, this rule applies if it does not infringe the statutory rights of the founder.
2. *The division of competences.* The Rector determines, by means of an order, the scope of responsibility of his/her deputies (Vice-rectors) and the authority vested in them. A similar procedure applies with respect to his/her plenipotentiaries. By respecting their competences determined in this way (in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity), the Rector intervenes only in extraordinary cases and only upon having notified the Vice-

rector or plenipotentiary to this effect and having explained the reasons for such an intervention.

3. *The conduct of Senate sessions.* The Rector, as the chairperson of the Senate, takes care of the order and conduct during Senate sessions, and in particular:
 - a. follows the session agenda, rejecting items submitted regardless of the accepted procedure to establish said agenda;
 - b. presents the Senate members with document drafts in sufficient advance time and ensures the opportunity for a thorough discussion;
 - c. is open to the initiatives and comments submitted by the Senate members, even if they are critical of his/her own opinions and intentions;
 - d. observes the rule that a secret ballot is held in personal matters, whereas a public voting applies in substantive matters.
4. *Financial liability.* While respecting the principles of discipline, the Rector assigns funds and makes other university resources available in accordance with the rules adopted by the Senate. If no such rules exist, the Rector requests for such rules to be established. The rules of funds distribution (including funds for research) should be aligned with the strategic development plan of the university. The Rector takes due care to ensure diverse sources of financing (including the financing of development projects and scientific research projects): national and international, public and private, ensuring, however, that the collaboration with other entities does not make the university dependent on them or jeopardise its good name. The Rector ensures sustainable development of the university, creating conditions that allow its organisational units to look for external sources of financing.
5. *Avoiding decisions in matters that concern himself/herself.* The Rector does not make decisions in matters concerning himself/herself. Acting within his/her authority, the Rector does not abuse the principle of competence presumption and does not favour the organisational unit where he/she works as an academic teacher. The Rector should not be associated with any group at the university.
6. *Avoiding conflicts of norms and interests.* The sense of responsibility for the office held obliges the Rector to avoid such forms of involvement outside the university, even if they are not performed under full employment, that would substantially hinder fulfilling his/her duties. The Rector and the Vice-rectors submit a declaration to the Senate that there is no conflict of norms or interests between the university and their outside activities, or that such conflict will be avoided. In the same way, those serving as other single-person

authorities and their deputies undertake to restrain from activities that would be competitive towards their own university. A proved concealment of the truth in this matter or a violation of this commitment constitutes a sufficient reason to dismiss the person from the function. In public non-university higher education schools, this rule is also applied, unless contrary to the statutory law in force.

7. *Concern for research quality.* The strength of a university consists in its creative, original and high quality research. The Rector supports it, ensuring appropriate conditions for conducting such research, protecting academic teachers from being overloaded with teaching duties and supporting researchers by seeking proper financing, as well as inspiring and facilitating their collaboration. The Rector should also be concerned about the development conditions of the young research staff, and in particular of doctoral students. The Rector withstands pathologies in the university, as well as in the entire academic community. In this vein he/she promotes the standards established in the ethical codes for the entire Polish academic community³ in his/her university, as well as supports initiatives by individual universities aiming to develop and adopt their own ethical codes which take the university-specific conditions into account.
8. *Concern for the quality of teaching.* The educational mission of the university obliges the Rector to be concerned about the high quality of teaching. The Rector performs this task, *inter alia*, by ensuring proper selection criteria concerning research and teaching staff and an adequate system of teaching quality control, respecting the Ministry requirements, as well as by promoting creative and useful initiatives in this area, undertaken by academic teachers. In order to perform these tasks effectively, the Rector initiates the implementation of and supervises the university's education quality assurance system that introduces standards and procedures securing effective fulfilment of these tasks.
9. *Supporting student organisations.* Bearing in mind that important roles of the university include ensuring personal development of the students and preparing them for active and responsible participation in the democratic society, the Rector supports not only student reading groups, but also organisations established by the students and doctoral students which allow their members to develop prosocial attitudes, acquire organisational skills and broaden their cultural interests. The Rector also encourages students to submit projects to this end and fosters their implementation.

³ This especially concerns the two documents mentioned earlier: *Good Manners in Science* and *Good Practices in Research*.

10. *Respect for university traditions.* Making decisions in untypical and unprecedented cases, the Rector takes into consideration existing university institutional policy, reinforcing its best traditions and avoiding solutions in clear conflict with them.
11. *Contacts with the university community.* In contacts with members of the university community, the Rector endeavours to reconcile a welcoming openness to new ideas with the respect for order and with the strategic plans for the development of the entire university; firmness in exacting the fulfilment of duties with sensitivity to personal problems of the employees; impartiality in settling disputes with concern for the protection of the weaker party; concern for the common good of the university with the respect for the dignity of each member of the academic community. By virtue of his/her function, the Rector obtains access to extensive personal information about the staff and students, which is unrelated to their professional activities, either from themselves, or from third parties. Such information may not be disclosed to outsiders or used for university management. Denunciations, especially anonymous ones, should, depending on their content, either be ignored or sensibly handed to the person they concern.
12. *Election campaign.* In order to prevent a contemptible bidding of promises that are unfeasible or harmful to the university, made by candidates to the Rector post to various electorates, including students, during the election campaign the Rector should be especially active in disseminating reliable information on the situation of the university, its achievements, prospects, and limitations. The Rector should not abuse his/her position in the election campaign for the new authorities of the university, neither against his/her opponents (if he/she runs for a consecutive term of office), nor when he/she definitely ceases to hold the function. In particular, the Rector may not use the information available solely to him/her to enhance his/her own election chances or the chances of a candidate favoured by him/her. This rule is in force provided that it is applicable in the light of the statutory provisions in force.
13. *Election of the Rector by the Assembly of Electors.* The election of the Rector requires special concern for proper conduct. This includes, *inter alia*, the following:
 - a. *the principle of the election campaign transparency.* Candidates for the Rector post should not make promises concerning only a specific part of the academic community which is the only party aware of such promises having been made. This entails the obligation to announce the commitments made during secret or closed meetings with the particular elector groups, including students. Respecting this condition is of utmost importance in the case of commitments the fulfilment of which could infringe the vital

interests of the university, as well as the principles and rules of proceeding, arising from this Code.

- b. *the statutory requirement of the confidentiality of the election act.* To meet this requirement, proper voting conditions should be ensured, including providing the appropriate ballot paper content and the ways of marking the candidate by each voter. A voting mode should be adopted that prevents violation of voting confidentiality as a result of the collusion of voters or exerting group pressure on them.
 - c. *refraining from debate during the election session of the Electoral College.* In accordance with the statutory law, the elections are indirect and the individual members of the Electoral College should make a free choice, in accordance with their conscience. This does not restrict the possibility of communication between the electors before voting. At the election meeting of the Electoral College, a substantive debate is not conducted and the sole aim of such a meeting is to perform the very act of electing the Rector or, at the Rector's request, the Vice-rectors, in accordance with the election procedures agreed upon earlier. An election debate, open to all members of the academic community, may be held no later than on the day preceding the election meeting of the Electoral College.
 - d. *observing the pre-election silence required in the entire university, at least on the election day.* Debates on respective election platforms may, and in accordance with the electoral law even should, be conducted in the period directly preceding the election day. The pre-election silence on the election day should enable the electors to assemble without any accompanying agitation or pressure from the supporters of the respective candidates.
 - e. *abstaining from voting on the matter concerning themselves by candidates for the Rector post.* If the candidate is a member of the Assembly of Electors, he/she should not actively participate in the meeting convened with the purpose of electing the Rector. If he/she takes part in such a meeting, he/she should abstain from voting.
 - f. *retaining the Rector elect's right to nominate candidates for Vice-rectors.* Pursuant to the statutory law, candidates for all Vice-rector functions are nominated by the Rector elect. In the case of the Vice-rector for student affairs, the Rector seeks acceptance by the appropriate group of students for his/her candidate. However, under no condition should he/she leave the choice to students.
14. *Co-operation with predecessors.* Acting to respect the continuity of rule over the university, which requires maintaining a balance between the need for continuation and

the necessary changes in the functioning of the university, the Rector acknowledges the achievements of his/her predecessors with due respect and asks them for advice and support whenever required. At the same time, a former Rector avoids informal interference in the activities of his/her successor. In this way, the successive Rectors contribute to the development of the institutional culture of the university and to the formation of good practices in the process of handing over and assuming all executive functions in the university.

15. *The Rector as a representative of the university.* In public appearances, the Rector guards the good name and position of his/her university, including its properly understood competitiveness, avoiding, however, the use of contemptible methods of rivalry against other universities. The Rector does not intertwine the interests of the university with his/her own personal involvement in social issues and does not take advantage of the university authority to enhance his/her public image. All the more, the Rector may not take advantage of his/her university to run any political campaign.
16. *Concern for the appropriate position of the university in public life.* Taking into consideration the social significance of the university and its inherent political neutrality, the Rector, on the one hand, encourages social sensitivity of the university staff and students, and even their active participation in public life, and, on the other hand, complying with the principle of impartiality and political neutrality of the university, he/she ensures that this sensitivity is not used for political purposes. Speeches by politicians and political debates at the university premises are allowed only if they are of academic nature (lectures, seminars, academic sessions, meetings). In particular, the dissemination of all forms of xenophobia, as well as imposing political ideologies, religious fundamentalism, and fanatic attitudes that exclude debate should be avoided. The Rector may consent to political meetings being held at the university premises on condition, however, that they are used under general rules which does not bind the university with any political faction. The Rector endeavours to ensure that political views are not exposed during classes and does not allow slogans and posters of political nature to be displayed in the university, protecting also university symbols from being used to this end.

Good practices in the activities of the Senate

1. *Co-operation of the Senate with the Rector.* Exercising their authority, members of the Senate collaborate with the Rector for the benefit of the entire university. This co-operation requires that the attendance as well as thoughtful and active participation in the Senate sessions be treated as a priority obligation. In particular, members of the Senate are obliged to prepare for the sessions, which includes acquainting themselves with the materials prepared.
2. *Co-operation of the Senate with faculty boards.* Faculty boards enjoy considerable independence in performing the fundamental tasks of the university. This autonomy should however be motivated by concern for the common good of the university as a whole. Exercising its statutory right to set down guidelines for faculty boards on performing fundamental tasks of the university, the Senate supports useful initiatives. The Senate should, however, prevent actions that aim to transform the university into a federation of faculties guided by their respective particular interests, which constitutes a threat to the unity of the academic community and to implementing the university mission.
3. *Participation of students in the Senate sessions.* Students are full members of the Senate and the self-governance of students and doctoral students is a constitutive element of the academic self-governance. Students participate in making all decisions pertaining to the university (not only on student matters) and the Rector, as the chairperson of the Senate, as well as all the members of the Senate, endeavour to provide the students with appropriate conditions for the full and real participation of student Senators in the proceedings of the Senate and its committees. Student Senators and the university student government bodies are obliged to participate actively and responsibly in the work of the Senate.
4. *Responsibility for curricula.* Exercising its statutory authority, the Senate supports, as well as supervises, the initiatives undertaken by faculties and institutes that aim to adjust the curricula to the state of knowledge to date and to strengthen the university specialisations. All should ensure, however, that such changes really promote high quality of studies and are not justified solely by the interest of the individual academic teachers.
5. *The Senate initiative.* Members of the Senate, bearing the responsibility for the university along with the Rector, exercise their authority to submit their own initiatives for the benefit of the university. When undertaking such initiatives on significant matters, they should, however, notify the Rector to this effect and become acquainted with his/her opinion before raising them at the forum of the Senate. Initiatives raised during a session

of the Senate without prior notification of the Rector, may be included in the minutes and be the subject of appropriate actions before the successive session of the Senate.

6. *Respecting the accepted session agenda.* The Senate adopts resolutions on issues included in the agenda accepted at the beginning of the session. Cases of extending the agenda require a formal acceptance by the Senate. Proposing changes to the agenda at the end of the Senate session should be avoided, especially if some members have already left the session for justified reasons. At the beginning of the session, a member of the Senate may motion for the agenda to be extended; however, he/she should notify the Rector to this effect before the session, as well as present all the members of the Senate with a draft resolution if the proposed amendment to the agenda envisages voting on it.
7. *Voting methods.* In accordance with the Statutes, resolutions are adopted by a public vote or a secret ballot. Voting against a given draft resolution should be preceded by a presentation of the reasons for rejecting it. A practice of collective avoiding of discussion followed by requesting a secret ballot to reject the draft resolution is to be considered unacceptable.
8. *Assessment of the Rector's activities.* The rule of real debate preceding the adoption of a resolution applies especially in the case of substantial issues, which specifically include the assessment of the Rector's activities. Members of the Senate should properly prepare themselves for the debate about the Rector's report and should take an active part in its substantive and directional evaluation, not confining themselves to suggesting editorial and procedural remarks.
9. *The principle of confidentiality.* The academic community is entitled to obtain information about the course of the Senate session, with the exception of statements concerning personal issues not included in the official minutes of the session, which the parties involved might be presumed not to wish to disclose.

Final provisions

1. *The scope of applicability of the Code.* The above fundamental rules and good practices in university governance apply also to respectively the lower-level single-person authorities and collective bodies (deans and faculty boards, institute directors and institute boards, etc.), accounting for competence differences following from the Statutes or other regulations.

2. *The university committee for good practices.* It is postulated that in the universities which have adopted by way of a Senate voting a part of this Code or its entirety, the Senate should appoint – on the Rector's motion – an adequate committee whose task will be to monitor the compliance of the university authorities with the Code; alternatively, the Senate may also assign this task to an already existing committee of appropriate competence. The committee should submit periodical reports on its activities to the Senate and could also propose amendments to the Code.
3. *Amending the Code.* It is presumed that the Code will be periodically amended on the initiative of individual universities, Rectors' conferences (CRASP, KRZaSP), the Students' Parliament of the Republic of Poland or the National Representation of PhD Candidates (KRD). The amendments shall be effected by the Committee for Good Practices, appointed by CRASP.