



The Code

Good Practices in Universities



CONFERENCE OF RECTORS OF ACADEMIC SCHOOLS IN POLAND
POLISH RECTORS FOUNDATION

The Code
Good Practices in Universities

developed by
the Polish Rectors Foundation

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

Wrocław, October 2007

DRAWN UP BY:
team chaired by Rev. Prof. Andrzej Szostek

TRANSLATED BY:
Dariusz Więclawski, Leonard Garczyński

COVER DESIGN:
Tadeusz Kłodowski

TYPOGRAPHIC DESIGN, LAYOUT:
Tadeusz Kłodowski

ISBN 978-83-7493-356-8

© Copyright by CRASP and FRP, Kraków 2007

This document has been developed as part of the strategic partnership between the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland and the Polish Rectors Foundation.

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

PUBLISHED BY:
Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej
Wybrzeże Wyspiańskiego 27, 50-370 Wrocław

The Code *Good Practices in Universities* was developed on the initiative of the Polish Rectors Foundation, supported by the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland in June 2005. A draft of the Code was drawn up by a Committee, appointed by and working within the Polish Rectors Foundation from October 2005 to December 2006, 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. The members of the Committee did not receive any remuneration for their work on the Code, treating their task as a *pro publico bono* activity.

The Code was twice discussed during 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 Code was submitted to the Presidium of CRASP and – after the amendments suggested during consultations with the academic community were incorporated – 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

Genesis

Universities belong to the institutions whose social prestige and effectiveness to a large extent depend on their ethos. The ethos does not come down to the postulate of respecting the law and rules listed in the statutes of the individual universities and in other specific regulations. Good manners in science, reflecting the centuries-long tradition of academic life, unite the formal and informal prescriptions and rules relating to issues of key significance for the shaping and maintenance of the ethos. It is because of the concern for the cultivation and spreading of the manners that attempts to formulate the basic principles determining the standard of good manners have been made.¹ These important and needed documents mainly relate to the personal behaviour of the members of academic and research staff working at universities. However, also the university governance bodies play an important part, as they make decisions of major significance. For this reason, the documents drawn up so far need to be supplemented with a catalogue of good practices that the bodies governing universities should follow.

This made the Polish Rectors Foundation feel inclined to undertake the initiative of developing a new document relating to universities. First of all, the document should include rules and requirements regarding the governance of universities by single-person authorities and collective bodies. The initiative was supported by CRASP, as expressed in the resolution of 23 May 2005 with the following content: "The Plenary Assembly of the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland, aiming to consolidate the traditional academic values in the life of universities, indicates the need to develop and announce a document called *The Code of Good Practices in Universities*. The Code would contain the rules of proceeding for single-person authorities and collective bodies of universities and their departments, as well as academic teachers and students. The Plenary Assembly 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 an attempt was made, among others, by the Committee for Ethics in Science, appointed in 1992 by PAN (Polish Academy of Sciences), which in 1994 issued a set of principles and guidelines, under the title *Good Manners in Science*; the document was twice amended (latest edition 2001). Many universities developed similar, brief ethical codes (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 *Good Practices in Scientific Research* (adopted by the Committee for Scientific Research).

In September 2005, the Polish Rectors Foundation appointed a committee for the development of the Code *Good Practices in Universities*. The committee was composed of: Rev. Prof. A. Szostek (Chairman), Prof. E. Chmielecka (Secretary), Professors: W. Gasparski, A. Koźmiński, Z. Szawarski and J. Woźnicki, and M. Chałupka, MA – a representative of the Students' Parliament of the Republic of Poland, (members). The initial draft prepared by the committee was brought under public debate at universities and among rectors. The editorial team discussed in detail the amendments proposed. The amended version of the draft was then submitted to the Plenary Assembly of CRASP, which accepted the Code *Good Practices in Universities* 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 Senates to declare its adoption, in part or in its entirety, along with providing a justification for the decision. The establishment of a *Committee for Good Practices in Universities* by CRASP will properly complement the implementation of the Code. The Committee will consider requests concerning both possible amendments to the Code and cases of its violation. The Code has also been presented to the Conference of Rectors of Post-Secondary, Non-University Vocational Schools 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 seek and document it in a reliable way (research aims), to educate the young generation in the methodical acquisition of truth, to support their intellectual and moral development, and to prepare the future graduates for holding public and professional functions in a democratic state (educational and upbringing aims), as well as to support the cultural and civilisation development of the entire society (social aims). In pursuing these aims, universities must be open and enterprising and, in this respect, they should seek ways to implement the fundamental humanistic values, 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. By fulfilling these tasks, universities shape their own, particular institutional culture. Its standard and influence depend on the attitude 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 appropriate extent – to lower level single-person authorities and collective governance bodies (deans and faculty councils, directors and councils of the individual institutes, etc.). Their culture of activity contributes, to a large extent, to the culture of the entire university, shapes its image, integrates the academic community, has a positive effect on the environment of the university. Therefore, it is very important to lay down the fundamental rules and good manners in university governance that go beyond the requirements of the common law and other regulations relating to universities.

Fundamental principles

1. *The public service principle.* In accordance with 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 key social importance endeavours to ensure that, both through the reliability of the conducted research and through the education of the future cultural and political elite, it contributes to enhancing the common good of the country and to strengthening the mature democracy.
2. *The impartiality in public affairs principle.* Universities enjoy the privilege of a respected public institution. The activity of a university involves 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 legalism principle.* In their activity, universities not only obey the law, to which they are obliged in a law-observing state, but also they promote, among students and the entire academic community, a culture of respect for law and impartial application of its rules and procedures. Also, possible discontent with the binding regulations should be demonstrated in a way that complies with the law.
4. *The autonomy and responsibility principle.* The autonomy due to every university, defined in the statutory law, includes the right to an independent adoption of its mission and the consequential individual aims and tasks, as well as other regulations relating to the university policy. In exercising its autonomy, however, the university must construe the consequential rights so as to take responsibility, in its own way and in the best possible and most effective manner, for the common good.
5. *The authority division and balance principle.* An important element of good practices in university governance are the bylaws 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, which are independent in giving verdicts. With 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 separation of the two bodies is reflected 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 conditions, 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 activity of the both bodies.

6. *The creativity principle.* Managing the university or its organisational unit (faculty, institute, etc.) requires creativity. The latter does not allow one to confine oneself to passively upholding the existing directions of activity, while it expresses itself in undertaking initiatives aimed at university development. The initiatives should be of strategic character, should be undertaken responsibly, and should consistently aim at the completion of the tasks assumed. They are determined by the university bodies after considering their merits, the university financial and personnel capabilities, as well as the prospects of cooperation with other institutions. Creativity, confirmed by previous achievements, should be an important criterion in elections or competitions for executive functions.
7. *The transparency principle.* 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 that all procedures relating to education or research tasks and initiatives, competitions for various functions, promotion and awards for the employees, admission and distinctions for students, should be overt and just.
8. *The subsidiary principle.* The authorities should conform to the subsidiary principle which obliges to respect the competences and initiatives of the lower level authorities and individual employees. At the same time, this principle requires all parties to use the official channels when arranging an issue, always with retaining the right for appeals when a disputable matter arises. The appeals institution is obliged to give timely and factual replies to the objections raised by the employees.
9. *The tolerance and respect for dignity principle.* In view of the dignity and reputation of all members of the academic community, universities follow the rules of trust, respect, and tolerance for all views, attitudes, and lifestyles that are in conformity 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 accept each other's rights.
10. *The universalism of research and education principle.* The traditional and contemporary mission of the University requires it to be a public institution contributing, through research and education, to the achievements of science on a global scale 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 character. International contacts of the universities should be encouraged and efforts to ensure their due position in the international academic community should be made.

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

 proper understanding of and respect for the division of competences and the rules of cooperation between the Rector and the Senate play a key part in the appropriate and effective management of the university. The division of competences is reflected, *inter alia*, in the following:

- a. the Rector's activity is subject to assessment by the Senate;
- b. the Rector *ex officio* presides over the Senate and retains the right to suspend the execution of a Senate resolution if, in his/her opinion, it violates key interests of the university;
- c. the Senate expresses the opinion of the university academic community, but it is the Rector who presents this opinion to the public;
- d. the Rector represents the university and is the superior of the staff, students and doctoral students;
- e. the Senate's resolutions are binding for the other bodies of the university, as well as for its staff, students, and doctoral students, when they have been adopted within its scope of competences which are open to the public and strictly defined in the Law and in the Statutes, but it is the Rector who makes decisions on all matters concerning the university, with the exception of matters reserved, either in the Law or in the Statutes, for other bodies or the head of finance and administration (and in this sense, the competence presumption rule applies to the Rector).

The competences of the Senate, which is not superior to the Rector, include determining the principles, instructions, and guidelines for faculty councils, as well as consenting to decisions of substantial significance for the university, laid down in the relevant regulations, whereas the Rector is concerned with the execution thereof. Thus, on the one hand, the Senate should not take over the Rector's competences and on the other hand, 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. At the same time, the Rector's activity should always be based on the university activity directions, as well as on the decision-making rules and procedures concerning the decisions made by single-person authorities or their plenipotentiaries, adopted by the Senate.

It should be borne in mind, however, that governing, managing, and representing the university is not all that is required from the Rector. 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 activity 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 activity 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 activity 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 areas of responsibility of his/her deputies (Vice-rectors) and the authority granted to them. A similar procedure is applied in the case of his/her plenipotentiaries. By respecting their competences determined in this way (in accordance with the subsidiary principle), the Rector intervenes only in extraordinary cases and only after notifying the Vice-rector or plenipotentiary, as the case may be, and after explaining 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 irrespective of the accepted procedure;
 - b. presents the Senate members with document drafts early enough and ensures the opportunity for a factual discussion;
 - c. welcomes the initiatives and comments of the Senate members, even if they are critical of his/her own opinions and intentions;
 - d. observes the rule that in personal cases, a secret ballot is held, whereas in substantive cases, a public voting is held.
4. *Financial liability.* The Rector, while respecting finance discipline rules, 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 in agreement 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 reputation. 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 oneself.* The Rector does not make decisions in matters concerning himself/herself. Acting within his/her authority, the Rector does not misuse the competence presumption principle and does not favour the organisational unit that he/she works in as an academic teacher. The Rector should not be a member of any group of stakeholders 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 in activities outside the university that would substantially hinder fulfilling his/her duties, even if they are not performed under full employment. 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. In the same way, persons holding functions as single-person authorities and their deputies undertake to restrain from activity that would be in competition to the activity of the 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 post-secondary, non-university vocational schools, this rule is also applied, unless contrary to the law in force.
7. *Concern for research quality.* The strength of a university is determined by its creative, original and high quality research. The Rector supports it, ensuring appropriate conditions for conducting such research, avoiding overloading academic teachers with teaching duties and supporting researchers by looking for 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 doctoral students. The Rector opposes pathologies in the university, as well as in the entire science community. To this end, he/she promotes the standards established in the ethical codes for the entire Polish academic community² in his/her university, as well as supports initiatives by individual universities aiming to create 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 does this, *inter alia*, by ensuring proper teaching staff selection criteria 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. To fulfil these obligations effectively, the Rector initiates the establishment of and supervises the university's education quality assurance system that introduces standards and procedures securing effective fulfilment of the objectives.
9. *Supporting student organisations.* Bearing in mind that an important role of the university is to ensure personal development of the students and prepare them for active and responsible participation in a democratic society, the Rector supports not only student scientific circles, but also organisations established by the students and doctoral students which aim to develop a prosocial attitude in their members and

² This especially concerns the two documents mentioned earlier: *Good Manners in Science* and *Good Practices in Research*.

allow them to acquire organisational skills and widen their cultural interests. The Rector also encourages students to submit projects with such aims and supports their implementation.

10. *Respect for university traditions.* Making decisions about untypical and unprecedented problems, the Rector takes into consideration the university institutional policy already shaped, 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 kind openness to new ideas with the respect for order and with the strategic plans for the development of the 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. When holding his/her function, the Rector obtains access to personal information about the staff and students, as well as their activities unrelated to the university, either from them personally, or from third parties. Such information may not be disclosed to outsiders or used for university management. Denunciations, and 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, the Rector should actively disseminate during the election campaign reliable information on the situation of the university, its achievements, prospects, and limitations. The Rector should not abuse his/her rights 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 the election chances of himself/herself or a candidate favoured by him/her. This principle is valid if 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:
 - a. *the election campaign transparency principle.* Candidates for the Rector post should not make promises to only a specific part of the academic community and known only to it. 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 election act confidentiality.* To meet this requirement, proper conditions for voting 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 of indirect character 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 applying to the entire university, at least on the election day.* Substantive debates may, and in accordance with the electoral law even should, be conducted in the period directly preceding the election day. The aim of the pre-election silence on the election day is to 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 oneself 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 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 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. *Cooperation with predecessors.* Acting to respect the continuity of rule over the university, which requires a balance between the need for continuation and the necessary changes in the functioning of the university, the Rector treats with due respect the achievements of his/her predecessors and asks them for advice and support if required by the situation. At the same time, a former Rector avoids informal interference in the activity of his/her successor. In this way, the successive Rectors take part in creating the institutional culture of the university, thus contributing to shaping the customary law 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 speeches, the Rector watches over the reputation 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 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 adequate role of the university in public life.* Taking into consideration the social importance of the university and its political neutrality, the Rector, on the one hand, encourages social sensitivity of the staff and students and even their active participation in public life and on the other hand, he/she ensures that this sensitivity is not used for political purposes. Speeches by politicians and political debates at the university are allowed only if they are of academic character (lectures, seminars, scientific 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 in the university on condition, however, that the use of the university premises is performed under general rules and does not bind the university with any political option. The Rector does his/her best to ensure that political views are not exposed during classes and does not allow to display slogans and posters of political character in the university, protecting also university symbols from being used for such a purpose.

Good practices in the activity of the Senate

1. *Cooperation 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 cooperation requires that the attendance as well as thoughtful and active participation in the Senate sessions are treated as a priority duty. In particular, members of the Senate are obliged to prepare for the sessions, which includes acquainting oneself with the materials prepared.
2. *Cooperation of the Senate with faculty councils.* Faculty councils enjoy wide 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 authority to set down guidelines for faculty councils on performing fundamental tasks of the university, the Senate supports useful initiatives. However, the Senate should 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-government of students and doctoral students is a constitutive element of the academic self-government. Students take part in making all decisions pertaining to the university (not only on issues of interest to students) and the Rector, as the Senate chairperson, as well as all the members of the Senate, do their best 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 self-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 specializations. 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, inform the Rector and ask him/her for opinion before raising them during a session of the Senate. Initiatives raised during a session of the Senate without prior notification of the Rector, may be adopted in the protocol and be the subject of appropriate actions before the next Senate session.
6. *Respecting the accepted session agenda.* The Senate adopts resolutions on issues covered by 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 part of the members have already left the session for justified reasons. A member of the Senate may request extending the agenda at the beginning of the session. In such a case, however, he/she should inform the Rector before the session, as well as acquaint all the members of the Senate with a draft resolution if the proposed amendment to the agenda stipulates voting on it.
7. *The voting mode.* In accordance with the Statutes, resolutions are adopted by a public voting or a secret ballot. Voting against a given draft resolution should be preceded by a presentation of the reasons for rejecting it. Non-participation in the discussion and requesting for a secret ballot to reject the draft resolution is to be considered an unacceptable practice.
8. *Assessment of the Rector's activity.* The rule of frank debate preceding the adoption of a resolution applies especially in the case of substantial issues, which include the assessment of the Rector's activity. Members of the Senate should properly prepare themselves for the debate about the Rector's report and should undertake a substantive and directional discussion on it, not confining themselves to suggesting editorial and procedural adjustments.
9. *The confidentiality principle.* The academic community is entitled to obtain information on the matters discussed during the Senate session, with the exception of personal issues not included in the official protocol of the session and which the parties involved might wish not to be disclosed.

Final provisions

1. *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 councils, institute directors and institute councils, etc.), preserving the competence differences stemming from the Statutes or other regulations.
2. *The university committee for good practices.* It is stipulated that in the universities which have adopted, by a Senate voting, a part of this Code or its entirety, the Senate should appoint – on the request of the Rector – a suitable committee whose aim will be to control the compliance of the activity of university authorities with the Code. The Senate may also assign this task to an already existing committee of appropriate competence. The committee should submit periodical reports on its activity 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 Doctoral Students (KRD). The amendments shall be effected by the Committee for Good Practices, appointed by CRASP.

