erasmus+

SZKOLNICTWO WYŻSZE

www.erasmusplus.org.pl

frse
Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji

Erasmus+

erasmus+

Webinarium

„Europejski Obszar Szkolnictwa Wyższego. Nowe wyzwania w świetle komunikatu i dyskusji podczas konferencji ministrów w Rzymie, listopad 2020 r.”

Warszawa, 9 grudnia 2020 r.

PLANOWANY PRZEBIEG WYDARZENIA

10:00 - 10:05	Otwarcie i powitanie w imieniu organizatorów dr Paweł Poszytek, Dyrektor Generalny Fundacji Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji
10:05 - 10:35	Wprowadzenie w tematykę webinarium: główne tezy Komunikatu Rzymskiego: wartości ERA (Europejskiego Obszaru Badawczego) i EHEA (Europejskiego Obszaru Szkolnictwa Wyższego), autonomia akademicka oraz stanowisko KRASP i RGNiSzW wobec Komunikatu prof. dr hab. Wiesław Banyś (Przewodniczący Zespołu Bolońskiego KRASP)
10:35 - 11:00	Panel dyskusyjny: Co nowego wnosi Komunikat Rzymski do EHEA (Europejskiego Obszaru Szkolnictwa Wyższego)? ▪ dr inż. Dorota Piotrowska (Politechnika Łódzka): szkolnictwo wyższe wobec wyzwań technologicznych przyszłości; ▪ dr hab. Ewa Chmielecka, prof. SGH (Szkoła Główna Handlowa): odpowiedzialność uczelni za otoczenie społeczne, nowy model współpracy pomiędzy nimi; ▪ Jakub Grodecki wiceprzewodniczący Europejskiej Unii Studentów: Komunikat Rzymski z punktu widzenia studenta ▪ Jolanta Urbanik, pełnomocnik rektora ds. Procesu Bolońskiego na Uniwersytecie Warszawskim: Komunikat Rzymski punktu widzenia uczelni jako instytucji oferującej kształcenie.
11:00 - 11:25	Komentarze i odpowiedzi na pytania zgłaszane przez uczestników
11:25 - 11:30	Podsumowanie spotkania

OTWARCIE I POWITANIE W IMIENIU ORGANIZATORÓW

dr Paweł Poszytek

Dyrektor Generalny Fundacji Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji

WPROWADZENIE W TEMATYKĘ WEBINARIUM: GŁÓWNE TEZY KOMUNIKATU RZYMSKIEGO: WARTOŚCI ERA (EUROPEJSKIEGO OBSZARU BADAWCZEGO) I EHEA (EUROPEJSKIEGO OBSZARU SZKOLNICTWA WYŻSZEGO), AUTONOMIA AKADEMICKA ORAZ STANOWISKO KRASP I RGNISZW WOBEC KOMUNIKATU

prof. dr hab. Wiesław Banyś

Przewodniczący Zespołu Bolońskiego KRASP

Wiesław Banyś

KONFERENCJA REKTORÓW AKADEMICKICH SZKÓŁ POLSKICH
KRASP

Rada Główna Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Webinarium bolońskie, 9 grudnia 2020

Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji, Zespół Boloński KRASP

Plan prezentacji

- Background przedkonferencyjny – wybrane elementy
- Komunikat Rzymski
- Aneksy I,II i III do Komunikatu
- Stanowiska KRASP i Rady Głównej Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego
- Universities for Enligthenment

GUC Hamburg
Global University Leaders
Council Hamburg

The Hamburg Declaration
"Rebuilding University – Society Relationships"

A statement adopted by the Global University Leaders Council Hamburg – a meeting of 45 university leaders from around the world invited for discussion in Hamburg from 5 to 7 June 2019 at the invitation of the German Rectors' Conference, the Körber Foundation, and Universität Hamburg.

As the Global University Leaders Council Hamburg, we met to address the critical relationship between the university and the society it serves. Universities have a dual responsibility for leading changes and responding to emerging needs and expectations of society. Currently, we face challenges from some who contest the mission and role legitimacy of the university. We answer these challenges, providing direction from our historic strength of seeking objectivity through evidence and grounded expertise. Exercising leadership, we strive with honesty to engage society in its various forms through constructive dialogue.

We begin with the following observations:

- Our universities are embedded in the society they serve, and the fulfilment of their mission inevitably depends upon this fact. We benefit from the insights and best practices of the global community of scholars.
- No society is unified or uniform. There are differences and inequalities among groups as well as among individuals. Different strands of society have different claims on universities, affecting access to education, curricular emphases, and the personal and social benefits arising from teaching and research. These claims produce uncomfortable, but also productive tensions between universities and their society.

- We pledge to develop continually as actors for the common good.
- The autonomy of universities to define their mission and profile and set goals and targets for their academic task is a critical precondition for their very existence. This is not license for isolation. Seeking and maintaining a good balance between independence, political preferences, and expectations from partners in society are the responsibility of all involved.
- It is our responsibility to be high performers in education and research. Guaranteeing that we are good at these tasks enhances our intrinsic value to society. True academic excellence is best achieved when a university is an authentic civic institution.
- Definition of university mission and profile as well as performance review, setting incentives, and assessment of universities should explicitly address interaction with and impact upon society. The development of mission and profile should be specific to the institution and its unique social setting.
- University – society engagement is happening in various spaces: local, regional, national, international. No single institution can be everything to all and for all purposes. A balanced practice among institutions of different mission and profile will best be supported by society. Measuring or ranking performance should reflect and promote such variety among universities rather than suppress it.
- We should develop and maintain updated maps of our ever-changing societal environment. To respond properly to these changes, we should as necessary rethink and reset our study and research programmes.

- We develop intellectual capital for all who engage us. We are not a haven for particular social elites. To remain acknowledged resources of great value, we aim to reflect society as a whole and to maintain an agility and responsiveness to it.
- As actors for social inclusion and mobility, we should mobilize our research capacity, adapt our learning formats, and reach out to schools and communities to remove hurdles hindering access to and completion of university study.
- Universities themselves are not homogenous communities. A variety of backgrounds, opinions and values characterize faculty and students. We promote and celebrate this diversity, fostering spaces of openness and respectfulness, and thus aspire to be a model for society.
- We will more effectively practice intense and open ongoing communication and engagement, internally within our own deliberations and externally with all elements of society. For efficient dialogue, we will use multiple methods to interact with specific audiences.
- In strengthening our relationship with society, we will naturally form partnerships and collaborations with a variety of stakeholders and communities.
- As actors for the common good and champions of academic freedom we constitute a platform for all in society.

To implement these recommendations, a governmental framework with appropriate incentives and strong support is essential. Furthermore, this can only be done if political actors and other stakeholders in society actively engage to make this relationship a success.

We as the Global University Leaders Council intend to move forward, sustaining an ongoing dialogue and building strong relationships with society into the future.

Bonn Declaration on Freedom of Scientific Research

Adopted at the Ministerial Conference on
the European Research Area
on 20 October 2020 in Bonn

eu20

The relevance of freedom of scientific research for the progress of our societies

The freedom of scientific research is a universal right and public good. It is a core principle of the European Union and as such anchored in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. It is also protected by the United Nations' International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ratified by more than 170 states. It has constitutional or legal status in most EU Member States. The freedom of scientific research applies to all types of research organisations[1] and scholarship and to all academic disciplines. Freedom of thought and intellectual creativity require also freedom and security of individuals. Freedom of scientific research stands for openness, exchange, excellence, internationalism, diversity, equality, integrity, curiosity, responsibility and reflexivity. It is therefore a pillar of any democracy.

Research and the freedom to conduct research are indispensable prerequisites for our social, cultural, political and economic resilience and progress. Scientific research benefits the people and society through the advancement of knowledge. Freedom of scientific research is a necessary condition for researchers to produce, share and transfer knowledge as a public good for the well-being of society. Our hopes and our ambitions to achieve a better future also depend on the freedom of scientific research.

A shared definition of freedom of scientific research

Freedom of scientific research is related to freedom of expression, freedom of association, the freedom of movement and the right to education, among other rights. It encompasses the right to freely define research questions, choose and develop theories, gather empirical material and employ sound academic research methods, to question accepted wisdom and bring forward new ideas. It entails the right to share, disseminate and publish the results thereof openly, including through training and teaching. It is the freedom of researchers to express their opinion without being disadvantaged by the system in which they work or by governmental or institutional censorship and discrimination. It is also the freedom to associate in professional or representative academic bodies. Freedom of scientific research needs opportunities for physical and virtual mobility in pursuit of one's research work, requires a culture of gender equality and the freedom to interact with students and colleagues. Freedom of scientific research is informed by the standards of academic disciplines. At the same time,

democratic society. Freedom of scientific research is inseparable from a plurality of voices. We recognise the importance of having strong legal frameworks in place, based on the rule of law and guaranteeing and protecting the scientific freedom of research organisations as well as of individual researchers. We are committed to preventing and confronting any interference that endangers the full application of the freedom of scientific research in our research organisations and will support our research organisations in their efforts to counteract the distortion of facts and disinformation campaigns.

We highly value the full circle of knowledge production, dissemination and use to maximise the overall performance, relevance and impact of the European Research Area. We therefore consider a healthy equilibrium between bottom-up and top-down research and innovation policy approaches necessary; this is in line with the freedom of scientific research, in particular with respect to an effective contribution of scientific research to wider policy goals, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

We encourage close cooperation between the European Research Area and the European Higher Education Area, in particular with regard to adequate and interoperable academic careers. We acknowledge and support the development of more effective instruments,

MINISTERIAL DECLARATIONS AND COMMUNIQUÉS

Every two or three years there are Ministerial Conferences organised in order to assess the progress made within the EHEA and to decide on the new steps to be taken.

MINISTERIAL CONFERENCES

Ministers decide at Ministerial Conferences about the central aspects of the EHEA, including its further developments and commitments by its member countries. The Ministerial Conference also decides on new applications for membership to the EHEA as well as any other main changes to the process.

A communiqué is adopted at each Ministerial Conference that outlines decisions taken by the Ministers.

Rome Ministerial Conference, virtual, 19 November 2020

- 2020 Rome Communiqué
- 2020 Rome Communiqué Annex I - Statement on Academic Freedom
- 2020 Rome Communiqué Annex II - Principles and Guidelines to Strengthen the Social Dimension of Higher Education in the EHEA
- 2020 Rome Communiqué Annex III - Recommendations to National Authorities for the Enhancement of Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the EHEA

Latest Communiqué

2020 Rome Communiqué

2020 Rome Communiqué Annex I

2020 Rome Communiqué Annex II

2020 Rome Communiqué Annex III

EHEAROME2020

Rome Ministerial Communiqué

19 NOVEMBER 2020

Our Vision

We envision the EHEA as an area where students, staff and graduates can **move freely** to study, teach and do research. **The EHEA of our vision will fully respect the fundamental values of higher education and democracy and the rule of law**. It will encourage creativity, critical thinking, free circulation of knowledge and will expand the opportunities offered by technological development for research-based learning and teaching. It will ensure that our higher education systems offer all learners equitability of opportunities in accordance with their potential and aspirations. We recognize that accomplishing this will require enacting policies and implementing measures in our national frameworks, some of which will go beyond our higher education systems and will entail alignment of wider national economic, financial and social strategies.

To achieve our vision, we commit to building an inclusive, innovative and interconnected EHEA by 2030, able to underpin a sustainable, cohesive and peaceful Europe:

- **Inclusive**, because every learner will have equitable access to higher education and will be fully supported in completing their studies and training;
- **Innovative**, because it will introduce new and better aligned learning, teaching and assessment methods and practices, closely linked to research;
- **Interconnected**, because our shared frameworks and tools will continue to facilitate and enhance international cooperation and reform, exchange of knowledge and mobility of staff and students.

Higher education institutions have the potential to drive major change – improving the knowledge, skills and competences of students and society to contribute to sustainability, environmental protection and other crucial objectives. They must prepare learners to **become active, critical and responsible citizens** and offer lifelong learning opportunities to support them in their societal role.

Higher education will be a key actor in **meeting the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030**. We commit to supporting our higher education institutions in bringing their educational, research and innovation capacities to bear on these fundamental global objectives and to deploying resources to ensure that our higher education systems contribute to the achievement of **the SDGs**. Moving towards climate neutrality is essential for all of us, and learners must be prepared for new "green" jobs and activities. They must be offered up-skilling and reskilling opportunities in a lifelong learning perspective, and enabled to develop and apply new technologies and approaches.

Quality education will continue to be the hallmark of the EHEA. A robust culture of **academic and scientific integrity** that blocks all forms of academic fraud and distortion of scientific truth, will be supported by all higher education institutions and all public authorities.

Fundamental Values

We reaffirm our commitment to promoting and protecting **our shared fundamental values in the entire EHEA through intensified political dialogue and cooperation** as the necessary basis for quality learning, teaching and research as well as for democratic societies. We commit to upholding institutional autonomy, academic freedom and integrity, participation of students and staff in higher education governance, and public responsibility for and of higher education.

We ask the BFUG to develop a **framework** for the enhancement of the fundamental values of the EHEA that will foster self-reflection, constructive dialogue and peer-learning across national authorities, higher education institutions and organisations, while also making it possible to assess the degree to which these are honoured and implemented in our systems. We adopt the **definition of academic freedom** as freedom of academic staff and students to engage in research, teaching, learning and communication in and with society without interference nor fear of reprisal (**Annex I**).

We reaffirm our commitment to fostering ethics, transparency and integrity in and through education and research and note that the Council of Europe's Platform on Ethics, Transparency and Integrity in Education (ETINED) offers the possibility for all EHEA members, consultative members and partners to cooperate to reach this goal.

Building the Future

An inclusive EHEA

Socially inclusive higher education will remain at the core of the EHEA and will require providing opportunities and support for equitable inclusion of individuals from all parts of society. Learners with diverse socio-economic, professional, cultural and educational backgrounds must have the possibility and the tools to seek out and avail themselves, at any time of life, of the educational options most useful for them.

We commit to reinforcing social inclusion and enhancing quality education, using fully the new opportunities provided by digitalisation. While our societies increasingly rely on innovative technologies, including artificial intelligence, we must ensure that these observe ethical standards and human rights and foster inclusion. We recognize that digitalisation does not offer 'one size fits all' solutions, and ask the BFUG to propose ways in which all learners can benefit from the new technologies.

We adopt the "**Principles and Guidelines to Strengthen the Social Dimension of Higher Education in the EHEA**" (**Annex II**) based on a broadened understanding of the social dimension, and commit to implementing them in our systems. We will engage in wide-ranging policy dialogue on how to implement the principles and guidelines fully at national level. We will support our higher education institutions in integrating them into their institutional culture and core missions: learning and teaching, research and innovation, knowledge circulation and outreach, institutional governance and management. We ask the BFUG to report back to us in 2024 on the steps taken and the related monitoring measures to assure evidence-based follow-up.

We recognize the importance of safeguarding student rights through legislation; we commit to developing and supporting them in our national systems through dedicated measures and structures, such as student

An innovative EHEA

We support our higher education institutions in intensifying their search for **solutions to the challenges our societies face**. The **social, human and creative sciences and arts** must continue to play their vital role, giving depth to our lives and enabling us to understand and act in a changing world. Our higher education institutions must engage with their communities to undertake mutually beneficial and socially responsible joint activities.

Swift up-dating of knowledge, skills and competences will be required to respond to the challenges and develop the opportunities that the new decade will bring. Higher education institutions will continue to diversify their learning offer and innovate in contents and modes of delivery in order to respond to growing needs for innovative and critical thinking, emotional intelligence, leadership, teamwork and problem solving abilities, as well as enterprising attitudes.

Flexible and open learning paths, part of the original inspiration for the Bologna Process, are important aspects of **student-centred learning** and are in increasing demand in our societies. In addition to full degree programmes, many higher education institutions offer or plan to offer **smaller units of learning**, which enable learners to develop or update their cultural, professional, and transversal skills and competences at various stages in their lives. We ask the BFUG to explore how and to what extent these **smaller, flexible units, including those leading to micro-credentials**, can be defined, developed, implemented and recognised by our institutions using EHEA tools.

We adopt the "**Recommendations to National Authorities for the Enhancement of Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the EHEA**" (**Annex III**) and commit to follow them, supporting higher education institutions in further implementing student-centred learning and teaching. The recommendations comprise increased support for all learners, and for teaching and non-teaching staff. Academic staff, including junior academics, require stable employment and career opportunities, parity of esteem for teaching and research, attractive working conditions, access to up-to-date staff development, and recognition of their achievements. In all these respects we will foster dialogue and collaboration on learning and teaching in our national systems and at EHEA level.

We commit to supporting our higher education institutions in using digital technologies for learning, teaching and assessment, as well as for academic communication and research, and to investing in the **development of digital skills and competences for all**. We commit to the development of open science and education to facilitate the exchange of knowledge and **openly licensed materials** that can be easily shared among higher education stakeholders, who can adapt and repurpose them for their needs.

An interconnected EHEA

Cooperation and mobility connect our systems and foster the development of intercultural and linguistic competences, broader knowledge and understanding of our world. Direct contacts and synergies among our diverse cultures and higher education systems through mobility of staff and students contribute to the excellence and relevance of higher education in the EHEA, making it attractive and competitive on the global scale. We acknowledge the importance and the benefits of physical mobility for students, doctoral candidates and staff. Notwithstanding the current difficulties related to the COVID-19 pandemic, we reaffirm our target that at least **20% of those graduating in the EHEA** should have experienced a study or training period abroad, and **further commit to enabling all learners** to **acquire international and intercultural competences through internationalisation of the curricula** or participation in **innovative international environments** in their home institutions, **and to experience some form of mobility**, whether in physical, digitally enhanced (virtual) or blended formats.

Digital solutions will facilitate secure, efficient and transparent **exchange of data**. Joint digital approaches to enhance

Implementation

We take note of the results described in the **Bologna Process Implementation Report** on the progress made over the past two decades. The achievements are impressive. Nevertheless more work is required to ensure that the EHEA is built on strong foundations, capable of supporting interconnected, innovative and inclusive higher education in the coming decade.

We count on the continuous support of the Erasmus Programme and other mobility and cooperation programmes to support our commitments.

In the 2018 Paris Ministerial Conference we decided to devote special effort to completing implementation of three "**Key Commitments**" essential for the functioning of the EHEA: the Qualifications Frameworks and ECTS, the Lisbon Recognition Convention and the Diploma Supplement, and Quality Assurance according to the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

We reconfirm our determination to see the Key Commitments fully implemented. We ask the BFUG to continue to employ the **peer support method** to achieve this. We commit to the continued participation in and contribution to this effort.

We commit to completing and further developing the **National Qualifications Frameworks** compatible with the **Overarching Framework of Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (QF-EHEA)** and ask the BFUG to update the criteria for self-certification to include a stronger element of peer review of national reports. We mandate the **Network of QF correspondents** to continue its work, contributing to the further development of the QF-EHEA and the self-certification of national qualifications frameworks against it.

We will strengthen the implementation of the **Council of Europe/UNESCO Lisbon Recognition Convention** and apply its principles to qualifications and periods of study outside the EHEA, using common assessment criteria and reports, in collaboration with the Lisbon Recognition Convention Committee and the ENIC and NARIC Networks.

We will ensure **automatic recognition of academic qualifications and periods of study within the EHEA** so that students, staff and graduates are able to move freely to study, teach and do research. We will make the necessary legislative changes to guarantee automatic recognition at system level for qualifications delivered in EHEA countries where quality assurance operates in compliance with the ESG and where a fully operational national qualifications framework has been established. We also encourage the application of agreed and secure systems of digital certification and communication such as blockchain, as well as the further development of the Database of External Quality Assurance Results (DEQAR) to facilitate automatic recognition.

We commit to reviewing our own legislation, regulations, and practice to ensure fair recognition of qualifications held by refugees, displaced persons and persons in refugee-like situations, even when they cannot be fully documented, in accordance with Article VII of the Lisbon Recognition Convention. We welcome the **European Qualifications Passport for Refugees** and will support further broadening its use in our systems.

We acknowledge the progress made in the development of **quality assurance systems** aligned with the ESG, and we commit to removing the remaining obstacles, including those related to the cross-border operation of EQAR-registered agencies and the application of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes. We commit to ensuring that our external quality assurance arrangements cover transnational higher education in the EHEA with equal standards as for domestic provision. In view of the need for increased flexibility and openness of learning paths, smaller units of learning and greater synergies among higher education institutions, we encourage

EHEAROME2020

Rome Ministerial Communiqué

ANNEX I

Statement on Academic Freedom

This text, developed by the BFUG in consultation with a range of experts and stakeholder organisations, aims to outline a shared understanding of academic freedom for the EHEA, and to provide a first basis for the future development of indicators.

Academic freedom is an indispensable aspect of quality learning, teaching and research in higher education as well as of democracy. It is a necessary condition for higher education institutions to produce and transmit knowledge as a public good for the benefit of society. It guarantees academics and students the freedom of thought and inquiry to advance knowledge through research and to exchange openly, as well as the freedom to communicate the results of research within and outside of the framework of academic institutions and programmes.

Academic freedom is a distinct, fundamental democratic right in part grounded in the right to education, and shares elements with freedom of thought, opinion and expression. Academic freedom must be framed by rigorous scientific and professional standards, respect for the rights of others, ethical conduct and the awareness of the impact of research on humans and their environment. It is crucial in order to advance the standards of academic disciplines and fields of enquiry. As such, academic freedom protects not only individual scholarship and expression but also the free functioning of academic institutions in democratic societies. Institutional autonomy is constitutive for academic freedom.

Academic freedom designates the freedom of the academic community - including academic staff and students - in respect of research, teaching and learning and, more broadly, the dissemination of research and teaching outcomes both within and outside the higher education sector. In essence the concept ensures that the academic community may engage in research, teaching, learning and communication in society without fear of reprisal.

Academic freedom is also an essential element of democracy. Societies cannot be genuinely democratic without honouring academic freedom and institutional autonomy. At the same time, the fundamental values of the EHEA cannot be fully realised except in democratic societies. Academic freedom is similar to freedom of expression and is both informed by the standards of academic disciplines and provides the condition for challenging these standards based on the results of research.

The concept, although seemingly simple, is in reality highly complex, and intricately related to other fundamental values such as institutional autonomy and public responsibility for and of higher education. Academic freedom is a universal value rooted in the pursuit of knowledge and truth. Its core tenets cannot be understood and interpreted differently in different national contexts or types of higher education institution. But academic freedom is not an absolute value, and its exercise is shaped by the institutions in which we work and the societies in which we live. Thus the range of conduct and boundaries of enquiry and expression which academic freedom protects are often a source of debate.

Academic freedom can be understood to comprise the freedom to learn, to teach and to research, with each of these freedoms entailing the freedom to think, to question, and to share ideas, both inside and outside the higher education sector. Giving meaning and life to these freedoms in the reality of the academic environment automatically opens up a number of issues. The freedom to teach can only be realised concretely in combination with public and social responsibility and institutional autonomy. Public authorities have the responsibility to ensure that relevant higher education programmes are offered to citizens, while autonomous higher education institutions assume a

large responsibility for research underpinning programmes, and for how programmes are taught. Academic staff also exercise a strong responsibility in setting the curriculum and programme components, and developing the teaching methods employed.

Higher education governance also has an impact on the freedoms to learn, teach and research, and should be organised consciously in ways that respect academic freedom. Different governance models co-exist in Europe with academic staff and students differently represented in governing and decision-making bodies. Participation in governing bodies may favour the teaching and research missions of the institution and may reflect the goal of broader societal engagement. Whatever the particular model, academic staff and students should participate meaningfully in decision-making processes and have the right to express their views on their institution's policies and priorities without fear of reprisals.

Values are inter-connected, and the freedom to teach also raises the question of who is to be taught and is thus intimately linked to the freedom to learn. In turn these values relate to equitable access, with a range of issues on criteria and conditions for access to higher education needing to be addressed through societal dialogue and administrative procedures.

Similarly questions also need to be asked about who is doing the teaching and research, and the kind of decision-making process in place for academic staff recruitment and retention. It is essential to ensure that academic staff benefit from sufficiently secure employment conditions to be able to exercise academic freedom. Academic staff should never suffer threats, dismissal, or other sanctions in relation to the content of their research, teaching or stated professional views.

The freedom to research includes the right, consistent with professional standards of the respective discipline, to determine: what shall (or shall not) be researched; how it shall be researched; who shall research, with whom and for what purpose research shall be pursued; the methods by which, and avenues through which, research findings shall be disseminated.

These questions cannot be addressed in a vacuum. Determining which research programmes or disciplines are offered at any given institution is a complex question involving public authorities and institutions in difficult, strategic choices. Research requires financing – which may come from both public and private sources – and in many cases also requires careful consideration of ethical issues.

Although academic freedom is intrinsic to quality higher education, it is not a value that can be automatically assumed. Rather the interaction of the different elements and conditions that ensure that academic freedom is operationalised need to be constructed, regularly assessed, protected and promoted.

EHEAROME2020

Rome Ministerial Communiqué

ANNEX II

Principles

1. **The social dimension should be central to higher education strategies at system and institutional level, as well as at the EHEA and the EU level.** Strengthening the social dimension of higher education and fostering equity and inclusion to reflect the diversity of society is the responsibility of a higher education system as a whole and should be regarded as a continuous commitment.

Guidelines:

> Strategic commitment to the social dimension of higher education should be aligned with concrete targets that can either be integrated within existing higher education policies or developed in parallel. These targets should aim at widening access, supporting participation in and completion of studies for all current and future students.
>
> In the process of creating strategies there should be a broad-based dialogue between public authorities, higher education institutions, student and staff representatives and other key stakeholders, including social partners, non-governmental organisations and people from vulnerable, disadvantaged and underrepresented groups. This broad-based dialogue is to ensure the creation of inclusive higher education strategies that foster equity and diversity, and are responsive to the needs of the wider community.

2. **Legal regulations or policy documents should allow and enable higher education institutions to develop their own strategies to fulfil their public responsibility towards widening access to, participation in and completion of higher education studies.**

Guidelines:

> Legal regulations and administrative rules should allow sufficient flexibility in the design, organisation and delivery of study programmes to reflect the diversity of students' needs. Higher education institutions should be enabled to organise full-time and part-time studies, flexible study modes, blended and distance learning as well as to recognise prior learning (RPL), in order to accommodate the needs of the diverse student population.
>
> Public authorities should promote recognition of prior non-formal and informal learning (RPL) in higher education, because it has a positive impact on widening access, transition and completion, equity and inclusion, mobility and employability. RPL enables flexible modes of lifelong learning in the entire education sector, including higher education. Implementing RPL will require effective cooperation amongst the higher education system, employers and the wider community and to enable this national qualifications frameworks should facilitate transparent recognition of learning outcomes and reliable quality assurance procedures.

3. **The inclusiveness of the entire education system should be improved by developing coherent policies from early childhood education, through schooling to higher education and throughout lifelong learning.**

Guidelines:

It is important to create synergies with all education levels and related policy areas (such as finance, employment, health and social welfare, housing, migration etc.) in order to develop policy measures that create an inclusive environment throughout the entire education sector that fosters equity, diversity, and inclusion, and is responsive to the needs of the wider community.

The social dimension policies should not only support current students, but also potential students in their preparation and transition into higher education. Participation in higher education has to be a lifelong option, including for adults who decide to return to or enter higher education at later stages in their lives. An inclusive approach needs to involve wider communities, higher education institutions and other stakeholder groups to co-create pathways to higher education.

Equity, diversity and inclusion should play a key role in the training of pre higher education teachers.

4. **Reliable data is a necessary precondition for an evidence-based improvement of the social dimension of higher education.** Higher education systems should define the purpose and goals of collecting certain types of data, taking into account the particularities of the national legal frameworks. Adequate capacities to collect, process and use such data to inform and support the social dimension of higher education should be developed.

Guidelines:

In order to develop effective policies, continuous national data collection is necessary. Within the limits of national legal frameworks, such data collection should provide information on the composition of the student body, access and participation, drop-out and completion of higher education, including the transition to the labour market after completion of studies, and allow for the identification of vulnerable, disadvantaged and underrepresented groups.

In order to make such data collection comparable internationally, work on categories for administrative data collection that are relevant for the social dimension should be developed at the EHEA level through Eurostudent or similar surveys. With the aim to rationalize the process and avoid administrative burden on public administration and higher education institutions, this development should take account of existing national practices and relevant data collection processes.

Such national data collection exercises could, where relevant and necessary, be complemented by higher education institutions undertaking additional surveys, research and analysis to better understand vulnerability, disadvantages, and underrepresentation in education, as well as transitions of students across the education system.

5. **Public authorities should have policies that enable higher education institutions to ensure effective counselling and guidance for potential and enrolled students in order to widen their access to, participation in and completion of higher education studies.** These services should be coherent across the entire education system, with special regard to transitions between different educational levels, educational institutions and into the labour market.

Guidelines:

Public authorities should create conditions that enable collaboration between different public institutions that provide counselling and guidance services together with higher education institutions in order to create synergies and omit duplication of similar services. These services should uphold the principles of clarity and user-friendliness, because end users must be capable of understanding them easily.

Within a diverse student body, special attention should be directed towards students with physical and psychological health challenges. These students should have access to professional support to secure their success in accessing and completing higher education studies. Special focus should be placed on prevention of psychological challenges caused by the organisation of study and students' living conditions.

Public authorities should also consider setting up ombudsperson-type institutions that will have the capacity and knowledge to mediate any conflicts, particularly related to equity issues that may arise during accessing or participating in higher education, or conflicts that hinder the completion of studies.

6. **Public authorities should provide sufficient and sustainable funding and financial autonomy to higher education institutions enabling them to build adequate capacity to embrace diversity and contribute to equity and inclusion in higher education.**

Guidelines:

Higher education funding systems should facilitate the attainment of strategic objectives related to the social dimension of higher education. Higher education institutions should be supported and rewarded for meeting agreed targets in widening access, increasing participation in and completion of higher education studies, in particular in relation to vulnerable, disadvantaged and underrepresented groups. Mechanisms for achieving these targets should not have negative financial consequences for higher education institutions' core funding.

Financial support systems should aim to be universally applicable to all students, however, when this is not possible, the public student financial support systems should be primarily needs-based and should make higher education affordable for all students, foster access to and provide opportunities for success in higher education. They should mainly contribute to cover both the direct costs of study (fees and study materials) and the indirect costs (e.g. accommodation, which is becoming increasingly problematic for students across the EHEA due to the increased housing, living, and transportation costs, etc.).

7. **Public authorities should help higher education institutions to strengthen their capacity to respond to the needs of a more diverse student and staff body and create inclusive learning environments and inclusive institutional cultures**.

Guidelines:

Public authorities should support and provide adequate means to higher education institutions to improve initial and continuing professional training for academic and administrative staff to enable them to work professionally and equitably with a diverse student body and staff.

Whenever possible, external quality assurance systems should address how the social dimension, diversity, accessibility, equity and inclusion are reflected within the institutional missions of higher education institutions, whilst respecting the principle of autonomy of higher education institutions.

8. **International mobility programs in higher education should be structured and implemented in a way that foster diversity, equity and inclusion and should particularly foster participation of students and staff from vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented backgrounds.**

Guidelines:

International experiences through learning mobility improve the quality of learning outcomes in higher education. Public authorities and higher education institutions should ensure equal access for all to the learning opportunities offered by national and international learning and training mobility programmes and actively address obstacles to mobility for vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented groups of students and staff.

Besides further support to physical mobility, including full portability of grants and loans across the EHEA, public authorities and higher education institutions should facilitate the use of information and communications technology (ICT) to support blended mobility and to foster internationalisation at home by embedding international online cooperation into courses. Blended mobility is the combination of a period of physical mobility and a period of online learning. Such online cooperation can be used to extend the learning outcomes and enhance the impact of physical mobility, for example by bringing together a more diverse group of participants, or to offer a broader range of mobility options.

9. **Higher education institutions should ensure that community engagement in higher education promotes diversity, equity and inclusion.**

Guidelines:

Community engagement should be considered as a process whereby higher education institutions engage with external community stakeholders to undertake joint activities that can be mutually beneficial. Like social dimension policies, community engagement should be embedded in core missions of higher education. It should engage with teaching and learning, research, service and knowledge exchange, students and staff and management of higher education institutions. Such engagement provides a holistic basis on which universities can address a broad range of societal needs, including those of vulnerable, disadvantaged and underrepresented groups, while enriching their teaching, research and other core functions.

Community stakeholders (e.g. local authorities, cultural organisations, non-governmental organisations, businesses, citizens) should be able to meaningfully engage with higher education actors through open dialogue. This will enable genuine university-community partnerships, which can effectively address social and democratic challenges.

10. **Public authorities should engage in a policy dialogue with higher education institutions and other relevant stakeholders about how the above principles and guidelines can be translated and implemented both at national system and institutional level.**

Guidelines:

Such policy dialogue should allow to develop fit for purpose policy measures, which should respect institutional autonomy, avoid any unnecessary administrative burden, and thus enable concrete progress towards diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education.

Within the scope of the above principles and guidelines, peer support and exchange of good practices are crucial among EHEA countries in order to facilitate progress towards the inclusiveness of higher education systems.

EHEAROME2020

Rome Ministerial Communiqué

ANNEX III

Recommendations to National Authorities for the Enhancement of Higher Education Learning and Teaching in the EHEA

Prepared by the BFUG Advisory Group 2 on Learning and Teaching

In the 2018 Paris Ministerial Communiqué, Ministers announced the addition of "cooperation in innovative learning and teaching practices as another hallmark of the EHEA".

To this purpose the present recommendations for action, in order to enhance collaboration and partnership within and between the European higher education systems, are proposed to Ministers and national authorities.

The recommendations fully respect the fundamental values of the EHEA, most recently expressed in the Paris Communiqué of 24-25 May 2018 as follows: "Academic freedom and integrity, institutional autonomy, participation of learners and staff in higher education governance, and public responsibility for and of higher education form the backbone of the EHEA."

The context of the Covid-19 health crisis further underlines the importance of the Group's recommendations in several regards. Particularly relevant are those on the need for pedagogical innovation and further development of online education and open educational resources, as well as that on strengthening the link between educational research and teaching.

The recommendations summarized below are structured around the need for student-centred learning, the enhancement of teaching, and the overarching importance of national and international dialogue involving all stakeholders. These three themes are interconnected and equally important.

The recommendations also underline the crucial importance of reinforcing the Bologna tools, especially ECTS, to indicate achieved learning outcomes and their associated workload, and the other Bologna key commitments.
Public authorities in charge of higher education should commit:

1. To make student-centred learning a reality, by:

   - supporting higher education institutions in their efforts to start or maintain a structured dialogue on innovation and enhancement of learning and teaching, involving students, teachers and also relevant external stakeholders. The issues addressed should include the development of curricula, learning outcomes, assessment and quality assurance, with due consideration for the skills needed to address current and future challenges of society;
   - promoting, within disciplinary courses, the development of soft skills, and the skills necessary for the enlightened citizen of the 21st century, in order to understand the challenges of a complex world and respect others and the environment;
   - exploring ways to stimulate the cross-border exchange of good practices for supporting the enhancement of quality learning and teaching, emphasizing active methods;
   - creating a supportive environment, both in terms of funding and regulation, that enables higher education institutions to tailor education provision to the needs of different types of learners (lifelong learners, part-time

learners, learners from underrepresented and disadvantaged groups), and to build a culture for equity and inclusion. This includes creating flexible learning pathways (including micro-credentials) on institutional and national levels and across the EHEA, and to explore opportunities offered by digital technologies to do so;

encouraging and supporting the development and implementation of national and institutional strategies and approaches for Open Education and the use of Open Educational Resources;

stimulating students to be mobile beyond predefined university-to-university agreements.

2. To foster continuous enhancement of teaching, by:

promoting the establishment of educational teams including both academics and staff responsible for helping or training them in their missions (institutional and/ or inter-institutional teams);

supporting higher education institutions in enhancing the continuous professional development (CPD) of teachers and (cross-border) exchange of good practices. Inter-institutional staff development measures and creation of cooperative national structures may be considered as ways to enhance CPD;

supporting higher education institutions in creating a sustainable and supportive environment at institutional and national levels for the transformation, especially digital, of quality teaching and learning. Such an environment should be created in collaboration with staff responsible for teaching, and include a framework with decent working conditions and a manageable teaching workload as well as attractive tenure opportunities;

assuring, in collaboration with the higher education institutions (which are expected to involve all those responsible for teaching), structural measures to assure the parity of esteem for teaching and research. If needed, academic career schemes should be revised to ensure a better recognition for teaching in academic careers;

exploring, in collaboration with the higher education institutions, ways to foster new and innovative teaching methods, with a focus on inter- and multidisciplinary approaches, research-based learning and teaching, appropriate use of learning analytics and open education, among other innovative approaches.

3. To strengthen higher education institutions' and systems' capacity to enhance learning and teaching, by:

including the enhancement of learning and teaching in national higher education strategies and approaches. The design and implementation of such strategies and approaches should serve as a basis for a structured and continuous dialogue with higher education institutions and other stakeholders in the learning and teaching community;

supporting the strategic development and innovation capacity of learning and teaching at both national and institutional levels, through empirical education research, projects and pilots, and the collection and use of data about education, while respecting data privacy;

exploring ways to stimulate and support cross-border exchange of good practice at national level and throughout the EHEA, for instance with platforms for exchange and cooperation;

allocating appropriate and stable funding and resources, and adopting fit for purpose regulatory frameworks when needed, in order to enable higher education institutions to develop innovative and high-quality teaching

Stanowiska:

KRASP

Rada Główna Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

KRASP
www.krasp.org.pl

Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich

Przewodniczący:

prof. dr hab. inż. Arkadiusz Mężyk
Rektor
Politechniki Śląskiej
president@krasp.org.pl

Biuro KRASP:

Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28
00-927 Warszawa
tel.: 22 55 20 352
fax: 22 55 21 567
biuro@krasp.org.pl

Dokument nr 6/VIII
Konferencji Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich

Stanowisko Zgromadzenia Plenarnego KRASP
z dnia 20 listopada 2020 r.
w sprawie wolności akademickich

W nawiązaniu do propozycji wprowadzenia w szkolnictwie wyższym tzw. pakietu wolnościowego, Zgromadzenie Plenarne KRASP przedstawia następujące stanowisko wraz z jego uzasadnieniem.

Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polski wyraża przekonanie, że uczelnie w ramach swej autonomii i istniejącego porządku prawnego, w tym Konstytucji RP, gwarantującej wolność i prawa obywatelskie, zapewniają respektowanie wolności akademickich w sposób i w stopniu wynikającym z utrwalonych tradycji uniwersytetu. Oznacza to brak uzasadnienia dla podejmowania przez ustawodawcę prób wkraczania w tę sferę, czemu KRASP musiałaby się zdecydowanie przeciwstawić.

Każda nowelizacja ustawy powinna zostać przygotowana i przeprowadzona przy poszanowaniu zasady partycypacji i dialogu z instytucjami przedstawicielskimi, w ramach inicjatywy obejmującej w sposób kompleksowy, a nie incydentalny, regulacje wymagające zmiany.

Dostrzegając potrzebę promowania zasad etycznych o charakterze akademickim, Zgromadzenie Plenarne Konferencji Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich przyjęło w dniu 7 czerwca 2007 r. przedłożone przez Fundację Rektorów Polskich opracowanie „Kodeks Dobre praktyki w szkołach wyższych", nakładające ograniczenia i zobowiązania o charakterze kulturowym na organy uczelni. W ślad za tym powołany został Komitet Dobrych Praktyk KRASP.

Uznajemy dziś za celowe powierzenie temu Komitetowi misji promowania w uczelniach pożądanych regulacji statutowych i rozwiązań organizacyjnych, także nowych, dotąd nie wszędzie istniejących, mających na celu zapewnienie poszanowania wolności akademickich. Wśród takich inicjatyw mogłoby znaleźć swoje miejsce powołanie przez senat, działającej w sposób w pełni niezależny, uczelnianej komisji ds. poszanowania wolności akademickich.

Rektorzy reprezentujący uczelnie członkowskie KRASP przyjmują postanowienie o wszczęciu debaty poświęconej wartościom akademickim, powierzając Komitetowi Dobrych Praktyk KRASP przygotowywanie i przedstawianie propozycji konkretnych działań, tak aby zapewnianie respektowania wartości i wolności akademickich mogło następować przy poszanowaniu autonomii uczelni i bez prawnej ingerencji zewnętrznej o charakterze ustawowym.

Zgromadzenie Plenarne KRASP kieruje do Ministra Edukacji i Nauki zaproszenie do udziału w naszej debacie.

Przewodniczący KRASP

KRASP
www.krasp.org.pl

Konferencja
Rektorów
Akademickich
Szkół
Polskich

Przewodniczący:

prof. dr hab. inż. Arkadiusz Mężyk
Rektor
Politechniki Śląskiej
president@krasp.org.pl

Biuro KRASP:

Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28
00-927 Warszawa
tel.: 22 55 20 352
fax: 22 55 21 567
biuro@krasp.org.pl

Warszawa, 2 grudnia 2020 r.

KRASP/188/2020

Szanowny Pan
dr hab. Przemysław Czarnek, prof. KUL
Minister Edukacji i Nauki

Szanowny Panie Ministrze,

w ostatnią sobotę, 28 listopada 2020r., doszło do wydarzenia, które - zdaniem Prezydium Konferencji Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich (KRASP) - wymaga zajęcia przez Pana Ministra stanowiska i podjęcia stosownych działań w obronie autonomii uczelni oraz przestrzegania przepisów Konstytucji i ustawy *Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce* (PSWiN).

Zgodnie z obowiązującym prawem, wejście na teren uczelni służb państwowych odpowiedzialnych za utrzymanie porządku publicznego i bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego może odbywać się tylko przy spełnieniu następujących warunków: a) na wezwanie rektora; b) bez wezwania rektora – w przypadku bezpośredniego zagrożenia życia lub zdrowia ludzkiego lub klęski żywiołowej (art. 50 ust. 3 PSWiN). Żaden z tych warunków nie został spełniony 28 listopada podczas wejścia Policji na teren Politechniki Warszawskiej.

Środowisko akademickie z ogromnym niepokojem przyjęło informację o bezprawnych działaniach Policji na terenie Politechniki Warszawskiej. Dalecy jesteśmy od generalizowania tego incydentu i wnioskowania na jego podstawie o stosunku służb państwowych do przestrzegania prawa i poszanowania autonomii uczelni. Jednak równie daleko jesteśmy od jego lekceważenia, mając świadomość, że brak reakcji przełożonych i osób kierujących odpowiednimi resortami prowadzi do poczucia przyzwolenia na tego typu działania w przyszłości.

Wierzymy, że reakcja Pana Ministra będzie adekwatna do poziomu niepokoju środowiska akademickiego i wagi tego naruszenia prawa. Liczymy także, że w tej sprawie przedstawiciele rządu i służby państwowe będą działali wspólnie w obronie autonomii uniwersytetów.

KRASP

www.krasp.org.pl

Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich

Przewodniczący:

prof. dr hab. inż. Arkadiusz Mężyk
Rektor
Politechniki Śląskiej
president@krasp.org.pl

Biuro KRASP:

Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28
00-927 Warszawa
tel.: 22 55 20 352
fax: 22 55 21 567
biuro@krasp.org.pl

Warszawa, 2 grudnia 2020 r.

KRASP/188/2020

Szanowny Pan
gen. insp. dr Jarosław Szymczyk
Komendant Główny Policji

Szanowny Panie Komendancie,

w ostatnią sobotę, 28 listopada 2020r., doszło do wydarzenia, które - zdaniem Prezydium Konferencji Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich (KRASP) - wymaga zajęcia przez Pana Generała stanowiska i podjęcia stosownych działań w podległych służbach w obronie autonomii uczelni oraz przestrzegania przepisów Konstytucji i ustawy *Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce* (PSWiN).

Zgodnie z obowiązującym prawem, wejście na teren uczelni służb państwowych odpowiedzialnych za utrzymanie porządku publicznego i bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego może odbywać się na warunkach określonych w art. 50 ust. 3 PSWiN. Żaden z tych warunków nie został spełniony 28 listopada podczas wejścia Policji na teren Politechniki Warszawskiej, a środowisko akademickie uczelni zrzeszonych w KRASP z ogromnym niepokojem przyjęło informację o podjętych działaniach Policji.

Dalecy jesteśmy od generalizowania tego incydentu i wnioskowania na jego podstawie o stosunku służb państwowych do przestrzegania prawa i poszanowania autonomii uczelni. Jednak równie daleko jesteśmy od jego lekceważenia, gdyż brak reakcji może prowadzić do poczucia przyzwolenia na tego typu działania.

Wierzymy, że reakcja Pana Generała będzie adekwatna do poziomu niepokoju środowiska akademickiego i wagi tego wydarzenia. Liczymy także, że przedstawiciele rządu, służby państwowe oraz instytucje przedstawicielskie środowiska szkolnictwa wyższego i nauki będą działali wspólnie w obronie autonomii uniwersytetów.

Z wyrazami szacunku,

Przewodniczący

Konferencji Rektorów Akademickich

Szkół Polskich

Pan prof. dr hab. inż. Arkadiusz Mężyk

Szanowny Panie Profesorze,

Odpowiadając na pismo Pana Profesora z dnia 2 grudnia 2020 r., dotyczące informacji o zaistniałym w dniu 28 listopada 2020 r. na terenie Politechniki Warszawskiej incydencie z udziałem funkcjonariuszy Policji, pragnę poinformować, co następuje.

W dniu 28 listopada 2020 r. na terenie m.st. Warszawy zorganizowany został protest (demonstracja) osób niezadowolonych z wyroku z dnia 22 października 2020 r. Trybunału Konstytucyjnego w sprawie tzw. „aborcji eugenicznej". Mając na względzie wyprzedzająco zamieszczane w mediach informacje na temat tej demonstracji, w Komendzie Stołecznej Policji zaplanowane zostały działania zmierzające do zapewnienia ochrony życia i zdrowia ludzi oraz mienia przed bezprawnymi zamachami naruszającymi te dobra, ochronę bezpieczeństwa i porządku publicznego, w tym zapewnienie spokoju w miejscach publicznych na terenie m.st. Warszawy, w szczególności w miejscu planowanych demonstracji.

W trakcie realizacji wyżej wskazanych działań, doszło do krótkotrwałego wejścia przez policjantów na teren należący do Politechniki Warszawskiej, mieszczący się przy ul. Waryńskiego 1 w Warszawie. Powyższe zdarzenie nie było działaniem zaplanowanym, wynikało z dynamiki sytuacji jaka zaistniała w trakcie zabezpieczanego protestu, a policjanci opuścili teren uczelni niezwłocznie po tym, gdy zostali poinformowani o fakcie przebywania w jej obrębie.

Z uwagi na fakt, iż powyższe działania nie były w żadnym zakresie skierowane przeciw społeczności akademickiej ani autonomii Politechniki Warszawskiej, Komendant Stołeczny Policji skierował w tej sprawie do Rektora Politechniki Warszawskiej pismo, w którym wyjaśnił zaistniałą sytuację, jak również przekazał wyrazy ubolewania z jej powodu.

Niezależnie od powyższego informuję, że mając na uwadze regulacje ustawy z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce, poleciłem komendantom wojewódzkim oraz Komendantowi Stołecznemu Policji, by przy planowaniu działań policyjnych, uwzględniano usytuowanie terenów należących do uczelni.

Jednocześnie pragnę zapewnić Prezydium Konferencji Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich, iż zaistniała sytuacja miała charakter incydentalny, a ze strony kierownictwa polskiej Policji nie ma przyzwolenia na działania, które mogłyby naruszać autonomię uczelni.

Pozdrawiam,

gen. insp. Jarosław SZYMCZYK

Stanowisko Nr 28/2020 Rady Głównej Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 19 listopada 2020 r. w sprawie równego traktowania oraz wolności w polskich uczelniach

poniedziałek, 23 listopada 2020

Autonomia, stanowiąca fundament idei uniwersytetu, wymaga przede wszystkim wolności badań oraz nauczania, nakładając jednocześnie na wspólnotę akademicką każdej szkoły wyższej szczególne zobowiązanie — troskę o dobre relacje wewnątrz wspólnoty. Z tej perspektywy niedopuszczalna jest jakakolwiek forma dyskryminacji, w szczególności ze względu na płeć, wiek, niepełnosprawność, rasę, religię, narodowość, pochodzenie etniczne, przekonania polityczne, wyznanie, orientację seksualną, status społeczny lub przynależność związkową.

Należy uczynić wszystko, co możliwe, by przestrzeń akademicka była wolna od wszelkich form dyskryminacji, zaś jej przejawy były szybko i skutecznie eliminowane. Rada odnotowała informacje o przypadkach naruszania powyższych zasad w polskich uczelniach. W skrajnych, choć odosobnionych, przypadkach dochodziło do molestowania studentek i studentów na tle seksualnym, co powinno skutkować wykluczeniem z grona nauczycieli akademickich osób winnych takich czynów, bez względu na ich pozycję naukową.

Rada dostrzega, że w uczelniach, w których dobrze działają związki zawodowe, organizacje pracownicze i studenckie a także rzecznicy akademiccy, udaje się problemy dyskryminacji rozwiązywać sprawniej i bez zbędnej zwłoki, z zastosowaniem takich środków jak mediacja, postepowanie wyjaśniające, interwencja w danej jednostce, rekomendacje zmian systemowych, czy wreszcie — przewidziane prawem instytucjonalne działania dyscyplinujące.

Należy przy tym przypomnieć za *Magna Charta Universitatum*, podpisaną przez 388 rektorów uczelni europejskich w 900. rocznicę utworzenia Uniwersytetu Bolońskiego, że „*uniwersytet (…) dba o tworzenie wiedzy uniwersalnej, a realizując swoje powołanie, przenika granice geograficzne i polityczne oraz potwierdza konieczność poznawania i wzajemnego oddziaływania na siebie różnych kultur*”. Oznacza to, że uniwersytet jest miejscem, w którym — w zwyczajowo ukształtowanych formach — następuje wymiana poglądów wywodzących się z różnych koncepcji, kultur czy pozycji światopoglądowych. Wolność badań wymaga pełnej wolności wypowiedzi, które mieszczą się w granicach metody naukowej, a zarazem są zgodne z uniwersalnymi zasadami i wartościami etycznymi, w tym z Kodeksem Etyki Pracownika Naukowego (2020). To ważne zastrzeżenie powinno dotyczyć zarówno badań i wykładów prowadzonych przez kadrę uczelni, jak też aktywności innych osób lub podmiotów, które chcą głosić swoje poglądy w szkole wyższej.

Niektóre wypowiedzi, zwłaszcza te o charakterze aksjologicznym, mogą stać w sprzeczności z poglądami innych członków wspólnoty akademickiej. Ograniczanie prawa do takich wypowiedzi pozostawałoby w sprzeczności z ideą uniwersytetu, jako miejsca poszukiwania prawdy. W opinii Rady jedyną poprawnością, jakiej mamy prawo domagać się w szkołach wyższych, jest poprawność metodologiczna z zachowaniem zasad etosu akademickiego.

Konfrontacja poglądów może prowadzić do napięć, z którymi można sobie skutecznie radzić tylko w obrębie wspólnoty akademickiej, w której powstały. Doświadczenie wielu uczelni dowodzi, że osoby należycie przygotowane do pełnienia funkcji rzeczników akademickich potrafią skutecznie rozładowywać takie napięcia — nawet wtedy, gdy podłożem sporu są fundamentalne różnice światopoglądowe.

Dlatego Rada apeluje, by polskie uczelnie wykorzystały dobre praktyki do rozwiązywania sporów w duchu konstytucyjnie zagwarantowanej równości traktowania oraz wolności badań i nauczania.

Stanowisko otrzymuje Minister Edukacji i Nauki.

Przewodniczący Rady Głównej Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Prof. Zbigniew Marciniak

Fragmenty:

Stanowisko Nr 29/2020 Rady Głównej Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego z dnia 27 listopada 2020 r. w sprawie tez referatu wygłoszonego przez ministra Przemysława Czarnka dotyczących aktualnych wyzwań szkolnictwa wyższego w Polsce

piątek, 27 listopada 2020

Po zapoznaniu się z treścią referatu wygłoszonego w dniu 19 listopada 2020 r. przez Ministra Edukacji i Nauki Przemysława Czarnka pt. *„Aktualne wyzwania szkolnictwa wyższego w Polsce”*, prezentującego kierunkowe wytyczne dla zmian legislacyjnych, Rada przedkłada swoje stanowisko w odniesieniu do zawartych w treści referatu myśli dotyczących nauki i szkolnictwa wyższego.

Skwitowanie aktualnie wdrażanej reformy, poprzedzonej wieloma poważnymi analizami i wielomiesięczną dyskusją w środowisku akademickim stwierdzeniem, że *„ani nadmierna regulacja, ani komercjalizacja, ani biurokratyzacja, ani powielenie rozwiązań z importu nie przyniosło efektów zadawalających”* stanowi nonszalanckie zlekceważenie intelektualnego zaangażowania wielu polskich uczonych na rzecz poprawy warunków działania polskiej nauki i szkolnictwa wyższego. Ani sama reforma, ani wysiłki na rzecz jej wdrożenia z pewnością nie zasługują na tak arbitralną ocenę – nie przywołano żadnych prac diagnostycznych dotyczących wdrażania Ustawy 2.0. Ponadto wiele przepisów tej ustawy obowiązuje zbyt krótko, by odpowiedzialnie ocenić ich konsekwencje.

Rada zdecydowanie nie podziela przedstawionej w referacie interpretacji procesu ewaluacji. Mechanizm, którego celem jest porównanie siły naukowej instytucji polskiej nauki i szkolnictwa wyższego w poszczególnych dyscyplinach nauki i sztuki został bezpodstawnie przedstawiony jako narzędzie bezpośredniej oceny dorobku indywidualnych badaczy („*punktoza i grantoza*”). Supozycja, że wprowadzenie ewaluacji powoduje, że polscy naukowcy porzucają uprawiane dotychczas obszary badań i *„sięgają po zagadnienia niby uniwersalne lub modne, podyktowane często polityczną poprawnością*” aby zdobywać punkty jest zarówno gołosłowna, jak i krzywdząca.

Wyjątkowo niewłaściwe i bardzo szkodliwe jest – ujęte w referacie – przeciwstawienie badań mających na celu poszukiwanie prawd uniwersalnych badaniom stosowanym, bezpośrednio służącym polskiemu społeczeństwu. Poszukiwanie prawd naukowych jest podstawową racją istnienia uniwersytetów i instytucji badawczych. Dlatego w każdej dyscyplinie nauki prowadzone są prace w skali globalnej, przez aktywnie współpracujące ze sobą międzynarodowe grupy badawcze, wzajemnie

Referat zawiera jeszcze dwie kwestie, które szczególnie zaniepokoiły członków Rady Głównej.

W referacie przedstawiono wysoce kontrowersyjną tezę: *„Błąd antropologiczny, fałszywa wizja człowieka, przynosiła zawsze nieszczęścia na świecie. Jak można nazwać inaczej genderyzm, jeśli nie wpajaniem młodym osobom, młodym ludziom fałszywej wizji człowieka, a zatem ugruntowanie w nich błędu antropologicznego, niezwykle niebezpiecznego dla nich samych i dla całego społeczeństwa."*

Dr hab. Przemysław Czarnek, jak każdy polski obywatel, ma konstytucyjne prawo do posiadania i głoszenia w przestrzeni publicznej swoich poglądów. Pełniąc funkcję Ministra Edukacji i Nauki powinien jednak taką tezę opatrzyć zastrzeżeniem, że podczas pełnienia przez niego funkcji publicznych jego prywatne poglądy nie będą miały wpływu na ustawowo zagwarantowaną wolność badań oraz kształcenia w polskich uczelniach.

Kwestia wolności słowa, której referat poświęca sporo uwagi, została dogłębnie przeanalizowana przez Radę Główną w osobnym stanowisku, przyjętym na posiedzeniu w dniu 19 listopada 2020 r. Najważniejsza teza tego dokumentu głosi, że wspólnota akademicka uczelni jest jedynym właściwym miejscem dla rozwiązywania napięć, które mogą powstać m.in. na tle różnic światopoglądowych. Podobny punkt widzenia zawiera niedawny list Prezydium KRASP do Ministra Edukacji i Nauki oraz Stanowisko Zgromadzenia Plenarnego KRASP z dnia 20 listopada 2020 r. w sprawie wolności akademickich.

Kolejna niepokojąca teza jest zawarta w zdaniu: *„Celem polskich uczelni powinna być zatem praca formacyjna, intelektualna i wychowawcza"*. Pojawienie się „pracy formacyjnej" obok pracy wychowawczej sugeruje, że w tym pierwszym przypadku chodzi o wpajanie światopoglądu religijnego; wszak referat wskazuje studia nad Biblią jako narzędzie pracy formacyjnej. Także zawarte w referacie sugestie, że uczelnie katolickie wskażą wszystkim uczelniom jak usunąć zagrożenia współczesności potwierdzają ten kierunek myślenia. Wymienione inne elementy „pracy formacyjnej", takie jak zajęcia o charakterze humanistycznym są już przecież obowiązkowo obecne w kształceniu na każdym kierunku studiów.

Ta sugestia referatu pozostaje w jawnej sprzeczności z ideą uniwersytetu, zdefiniowaną przez europejski świat akademicki w *Magna Charta Universitatum*: „*uniwersytet (…) dba o tworzenie wiedzy uniwersalnej, a realizując swoje powołanie, przenika granice geograficzne i polityczne oraz potwierdza konieczność poznawania i wzajemnego oddziaływania na siebie różnych kultur*”. Każdy student to dorosły człowiek; ma zatem prawo, podobnie jak każdy profesor, do swojego światopoglądu. Uniwersytet buduje instytucjonalne ramy przyjaznej koegzystencji ludzi reprezentujących różne światopoglądy. Jest to możliwe dzięki ogólnie przyjętej zasadzie, że wykładane treści i stawiane studentom wymagania są zgodne ze standardami naukowymi. Dlatego Rada Główna będzie się stanowczo przeciwstawiać ewentualnym próbom tworzenia zapisów prawnych, sankcjonujących formowanie studentów do jakiegokolwiek konkretnego światopoglądu, np. związanego z konkretną religią, gdyż naruszałoby to rażąco zasadę neutralności światopoglądowej państwa.

Rada Główna chciałaby wierzyć, że zreferowane powyżej tezy referatu mają charakter poglądów osobistych i nie będą tożsame z programem działań Ministra Edukacji i Nauki. Rada Główna oczekuje, że zgodnie z deklaracją złożoną przez pana ministra na spotkaniu z Prezydium Rady, Minister Edukacji i Nauki wypracuje w dialogu ze środowiskiem akademickim korektę tych przepisów ustawy, które utrudniają szkołom wyższym właściwy rozwój. Rada deklaruje wolę współdziałania w identyfikowaniu i usuwaniu tych trudności.

Stanowisko otrzymuje Minister Edukacji i Nauki.

Przewodniczący Rady Głównej Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Prof. Zbigniew Marciniak

Universities for Enlightenment

Workshop Vienna 13/14 January 2020

Hotel Regina
Rooseveltplatz 15
1090 Vienna
Room: "Votiv Saal"

Public transport: *Wiener Linien*

Agenda

Monday, 13 January 2020

19:30 Opening Dinner

Salonplafond: Stubenring 5; 1010 Vienna

Tuesday, 14 January 2020

8:30 Tour de table on the current state in the participating countries

10:00 U4E update: What happened during the last year?

10:30 Drafting the activities workplan for 2020

- Project: content, partners, finances, feasibility, …
- U4E activities 2020: lecture series, events, workshops, summer schools, …

12:00 Buffet lunch

12:45 Broadening the institutional/geographical scope of the U4E initiative?

- Relations/cooperation of the U4E initiative with other networks/initiatives (e.g. EUA; universities; research institutions, …)
- Inclusion of non-European countries

HRK

Initiatives for monitoring and supporting academic freedom

Vienna, 14 January 2020

Marijke Wahlers
German Rectors' Conference

- EUA University Autonomy Tool
- Academic Freedom Index (GPPi)
- Magna Charta Observatory

Urgent appeal of six European Rectors' Conferences to the Hungarian government

Solidarity with the Budapest University of Theatre and Film Arts (SZFE): The Rectors' Conferences of the Czech Republic (CRC), Germany (HRK), Poland (KRASP), Slovenia (RKRS) and Austria (uniko, FHK) are seriously concerned about the threat to university autonomy.

The six Rectors' Conferences express their concern about the Hungarian government transferring all of the management powers of the Budapest University of Theatre and Film Arts (SZFE) to a new board of trustees, which is appointed directly by the government.

After the forced move of the Central European University and the withdrawal of the autonomy of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences last year, these measures are a further step toward silencing critical positions by reducing the political independence of art, culture and science in Hungary.

This action violates internationally accepted and generally valid principles of academic freedom and self-government of academic institutions. The six Rectors' Conferences refer to their Vienna Declaration, signed in 2018, which identifies academic freedom and institutional autonomy as key elements for the functioning and development of higher education institutions. Autonomous universities are an essential element of democratic societies, because they are a place of free discourse on current social and political developments.

The Rectors' Conferences therefore urge the Hungarian government to restore full autonomy of the university and they declare their solidarity with the resigned university management and the protesting students.

14 September 2020

University Autonomy in Europe

HOME ABOUT DIMENSIONS COUNTRIES

In order to be successful, universities need to be able to take their own decisions. The University Autonomy Tool lets you compare university autonomy in 29 European higher education systems. It focuses on four autonomy areas and ranks countries according to the level of autonomy they have in each of these. The site has been updated and describes the state of university autonomy in 2016.

4 Dimensions:

Organisational Autonomy
7 Indicators

Financial Autonomy
11 Indicators

Staffing Autonomy
8 Indicators

Academic Autonomy
12 Indicators

29 European Countries:

Austria, Brandenburg, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Flanders, France, Hesse, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, North Rhine-Westphalia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Wallonia.

Poland

Recent developments:

- Introduction of the National Qualification Framework
- Possibility to undergo faculty-level accreditation instead of programme accreditation
- Lifting of restrictions on degree programme provision
- Abolition of salary bands and removal of upper limit on salaries

→ continue reading

15th in Organisational

21st in Financial

9th in Staffing

14th in Academic

Organisational

weighted 67% unweighted 64%

Selection procedure for the executive head	100%
Selection criteria for the executive head	50%
Dismissal of the executive head	60%
Term of office of the executive head	0%
External members in university governing bodies	57%
Capacity to decide on academic structures	100%
Capacity to create legal entities	80%

Financial

weighted 54% unweighted 47%

Length of public funding cycle	60%
Type of public funding	60%
Ability to borrow money	80%
Ability to keep surplus	80%
Ability to own buildings	60%
Tuition fees for national/EU students at Bachelor level	0%
Tuition fees for national/EU students at Master's level	0%
Tuition fees for national/EU students at doctoral level	0%
Tuition fees for non-EU students at Bachelor level	60%
Tuition fees for non-EU students at Master's level	60%
Tuition fees for non-EU students at doctoral level	60%

Staffing

weighted 84% unweighted 84%

Recruitment procedures for senior academic staff	67%
Recruitment procedures for senior administrative staff	100%
Salaries for senior academic staff	92%
Salaries for senior administrative staff	92%
Dismissal of senior academic staff	20%
Dismissal of senior administrative staff	100%
Promotion procedures for senior academic staff	100%
Promotion procedures for senior administrative staff	100%

Academic

weighted 68% unweighted 78%

Overall student numbers	60%
Admissions procedures at Bachelor level	100%
Admissions procedures at Master's level	100%
Introduction of programmes at Bachelor level	100%
Introduction of programmes at Master's level	100%
Introduction of programmes at doctoral level	80%
Termination of degree programmes	100%
Language of instruction at Bachelor level	100%
Language of instruction at Master's level	100%
Selection of quality assurance mechanisms	0%
Selection of quality assurance providers	0%
Capacity to design content of degree programmes	100%

Dziękuję za uwagę !

PANEL DYSKUSYJNY: CO NOWEGO WNOSI KOMUNIKAT RZYMSKI DO EHEA (EUROPEJSKIEGO OBSZARU SZKOLNICTWA WYŻSZEGO)?

dr inż. Dorota Piotrowska

Politechnika Łódzka

szkolnictwo wyższe wobec wyzwań technologicznych przyszłości

PANEL DYSKUSYJNY: CO NOWEGO WNOSI KOMUNIKAT RZYMSKI DO EHEA (EUROPEJSKIEGO OBSZARU SZKOLNICTWA WYŻSZEGO)?

dr hab. Ewa Chmielecka, prof. SGH
Szkoła Główna Handlowa

odpowiedzialność uczelni za otoczenie społeczne, nowy model współpracy pomiędzy nimi

PANEL DYSKUSYJNY: CO NOWEGO WNOSI KOMUNIKAT RZYMSKI DO EHEA (EUROPEJSKIEGO OBSZARU SZKOLNICTWA WYŻSZEGO)?

Jakub Grodecki
wiceprzewodniczący Europejskiej Unii Studentów

Komunikat Rzymski z punktu widzenia studenta

PANEL DYSKUSYJNY: CO NOWEGO WNOSI KOMUNIKAT RZYMSKI DO EHEA (EUROPEJSKIEGO OBSZARU SZKOLNICTWA WYŻSZEGO)?

Jolanta Urbanik

pełnomocnik rektora ds. Procesu Bolońskiego na Uniwersytecie Warszawskim

Komunikat Rzymski z punktu widzenia uczelni jako instytucji oferującej kształcenie

SESJA PYTAŃ I ODPOWIEDZI

PODSUMOWANIE WYDARZENIA

prof. dr hab. Wiesław Banyś

Przewodniczący Zespołu Bolońskiego KRASP

DZIĘKUJEMY ZA UWAGĘ I UDZIAŁ W WYDARZENIU ☺