

**Iryna Degtyarova**

Polish Rectors Foundation – Institute  
of Knowledge Society

Warsaw University of Technology, Poland

irina.degtyarova@gmail.com

**Jerzy Woźnicki**

Polish Rectors Foundation – Institute  
of Knowledge Society

Warsaw University of Technology, Poland

# Competition vs. Searching as a Mechanism of the Rector's Selection in Higher Education Institutions in Poland

**ABSTRACT**

**Objective:** This paper aims at looking at the mechanisms of rector's appointment in public higher education institutions in Poland based on the analysis of the legislation binding since 2005 with reference to the latest changes.

**Methodology:** Legislative analysis of the past and current regulations on the models of rector's election was conducted, including mechanisms of nominating candidates in the Act on Higher education 2005, its amendments in 2011 and the Act on Higher education and Science in 2018. Literature review and empirical analysis of good practices were used.

**Findings:** The issue of strengthening a rector's position and professionalizing university management in the system of higher education is very important and being widely discussed in terms of governance reforms. Changes, new regulations, reforms depend on how they are implemented on the institutional level in terms of their strategical development and how they are supported and promoted by the executive head.

The model of nominating and appointing the rector determines his relationship with the university board, senate and with academic community as well. In public higher education institutions in Poland the competition model is more burdensome than the model of election, it has numerous disadvantages and threats, and wasn't applied by any university.

New regulations in Poland make the process of nomination more important than before. In general, there are two main models of nominating candidates: an open procedure (open competition) and a closed one (e.g. searching, headhunting for senior executive staff in HR, in business sphere), each has their own strengths and weaknesses. In case of HEIs, both respect the principles of institutional autonomy, guaranteed to universities by the Polish Constitution and the law. It is an autonomous right of the academic community, of the university itself to define their own framework and nomination procedure. The model of executive search in nominating candidates can become more feasible and effective for professionalizing and improvement of the rector's governance.

**Value Added:** The model of rector's appointment has a significant impact on the whole university performance. By professionalizing appointment mechanisms at all its stages, universities will improve university governance and introduce new quality of management.

**Recommendations:** New regulations in higher education create possibilities for introducing into the academic practice the executive search as a mechanism for nominating candidates for a rector's position in Polish universities.

**Key words:** rector, higher education, governance, autonomy, searching, competition, nomination

**JEL codes:** I230

## Introduction

The rector is an executive head of higher education institution, the highest single-authority governing body, the person managing its functioning as a whole in cooperation with other collegial governing bodies. According to findings of the European University Association EUA (2015) rector is first and foremost a political and academic leader, who manages a complex

community (one the most complicated, multidimensional and multifunctional organization, fosters the HEI development enhancing its capacity to respond to numerous challenges and holds the full personal responsibility, and for financial sustainability as well. Rector engages in the broader policy dialogue with public authorities and stakeholders (University Leaders' Perspectives, 2015). That means the university leader must "drive the professionalization of management and governance of the institution" (University Leaders' Perspectives, 2015) and he/she can push it forward or backwards. Thence in the public debate and expert discussions about higher education development the issues connected with the models of university governance and mechanisms of appointment/selection/election of the executive head as well as other high governing bodies constantly appear to be very important.

The Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education argue their intention implemented in the draft proposal of the Act 2.0 (Act 2.0 – the Act on Science and Higher Education, 2018) to entrust more powers but together with more responsibility to a rector by modern European trends asserting that "recently ongoing reforms of higher education systems in European countries strengthen the position of the rector towards collegiate bodies." (Ustrój uczelni w wybranych państwach, online). By Eurydice (2007) "the position of the executive head has changed dramatically throughout most of Europe: the head of the institution now assumes more diverse duties in terms of governance and decision-making than before."

The model of appointing the executive head significantly affects the operation of a whole university for years, it determines the conditions for development, structural changes and governance mechanisms of a higher education institution. The rector's election campaign is the same political process and has much similarity with the election of the President of state. As in politics, the quality of execution of rector's power, positive impact of his decisions onto strategic development of the university and amount of his independence in decision-making after occupying this position strongly depends on the process preceding the appointment and on the model of selection or nomination.

## Models of rector's appointment across Europe

European countries have different systems of higher education as well as various models of university governance and different features of the organizational autonomy as one from among four key dimensions of the university autonomy according to the EUA. Consequently, there are different models of appointment of a university executive head in Europe. The University Autonomy Scorecard consider the model of the university governance and executive leadership fundamental for organization autonomy, and it includes the selection of the executive head, qualification required (Bennetot Pruvot, Estermann, 2017), there are two main models of appointing an executive head in the European universities:

- 1) rector appointed by election – two selection procedures: “elected by a specific electoral body, which is usually large, representing (directly or indirectly) the different groups of the university community (academic staff, other staff, students), whose votes may be weighted; elected by the governing body, which is democratically elected within the university community (usually the senate, i.e. the body that decides on academic issues)”;
- 2) rector appointed by a direct assignment to a position – two selection options “(appointed by the council/board of the university (i.e. the governing body that decides on strategic issues), appointed through a two-step process in which both the senate and the council/board are involved).” (Bennetot Pruvot, Estermann, 2017).

Internal appointment is being practiced in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Croatia, Ireland, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, United Kingdom, while formal validation is required in Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Latvia, the Netherlands, Sweden, Slovakia. According to EUA findings, law specifies validation/non-validation the elected rector by the government authority, qualification requirements which must fulfil the candidate for the rector, and exact term of office in majority of countries, including Poland (EUA

University Auto, online). Rector's dismissal procedures are much more diversified in European countries.

Brief analysis of the procedures of rector's election prepared by the experts from the Hungarian Conference of Rectors (Election Procedures of Higher Education Institution Rectors / Executive Heads, online) shows that "higher education institutions in most countries vote on the executive head's appointment with a large group/electoral body or via the Senate and/or Council... About two thirds of Universities can select the Rectors without confirmation and with little or no selection procedures prescribed by law", and the final decision on the appointment of the selected (elected) rector to the position can be taken by different bodies: senate, council, board, electoral body, ministry, or jointly in various combinations (e.g. senate and the board).

The appointment of an executive head reflects the general higher education framework, and can be more collegial or more managerial. The preliminary selection and nomination processes also vary across different systems and institutions. Nomination can be open or closed, by self-application or submitting by particular groups of academic community, by a competition model (open call) or searching, etc. The process of the executive head election in many systems, e.g. in the American universities is based on the managerial model with the exclusive decisive role of the external governing board and using the executive search as the major mechanism for nominating candidates. Recruitment the right person to the senior leadership position at the university as well as CEO in the business sphere is the unique process in which all stages must be professionally and thoroughly conducted. The preselection searching and nomination process is as valuable and important as the final election. We will pass to it later, first let us pass to the analysis of the recently binding regulations on rector's election in Poland.

## Analysis of the regulations of the models of rector's appointment in Poland in 2005–2018

*The Act on Higher Education 2005 with amendment in 2011* allows for two options to appoint the rector of the HEI: *the model of election* by the university college of electors or the *model of competition*. The Act does not differentiate the qualification requirements imposed on candidates for each of these models. Both in the case of rector's election of and selection by the competition, at least a doctorate degree is required, unless the statute may specify higher requirements, for example, the requirement to hold a habilitation (so called dr hab. degree), which usually takes place. The eligibility condition in applying for a position of rector in both cases is the age restriction, which is explicitly defined in the law, and employment at the same university at the moment of election is not required. The two paths of appointing the rector therefore differ in the subjective nature of the decision-making bodies, and, in turn, the rules and regulations for their appointment and operation.

The electoral college, if chosen at the university, comes from the election itself, with the requirement of qualified presence of students and doctoral candidates, and its composition as set out in the statute usually reflects the diverse nature of the academic community, which ensures that this body has a high level of representativeness. The electoral college model is "in line with the self-government principle whereby the academic community must be represented in collegial bodies, including collegial electoral bodies electing single-person authorities" (Woźnicki, 2009).

The competition committee (commission) is to be appointed in the manner specified in the statute, which also defines the conditions and procedure for conducting the competition. The law did not impose restrictions here and did not specify any detailed requirements to be met in this regard. However, it is clear that if the competition model was chosen at the university, conditions and decisions would have to consider and respect the general cultural rules of the competition itself. This solution has more grounded position at uni-

versities, because it is used in the process of staffing of academic teachers' positions, also used in other institutions with public status.

In the case of the rector's election, every voter as a person holding an active electoral right under the Act has the possibility to submit candidates, including those not employed at the university at the moment of elections (art. 71 of the Law 2005). Alternatively, the Act provides for the possibility for any academic teacher who meet the same eligibility requirements and age restriction to participate in the competition for a rector's position. In the case of both models provided by the Act, the same restrictions apply as for the rector's period of office.

When comparing the two discussed ways of appointing a rector, we can draw the following features. To begin with *the election model*, we would like to assume, that rector appointed by election model, in a social perception, has a stronger title to perform his function. The appointment is made in an electoral act by an authority with a strong university mandate, resulting from its socially recognized legitimacy, which is representative of and for the whole academic community at the given university. Let us note that it is no coincidence that it is the college of electors and not the senate who elects the rector. The university electoral college acts on behalf of the whole community of HEI, and all its members can take part in its election, which is generally accepted as good practice. A feature of election as the model of appointing a rector is therefore the democratic character of election process as a whole, which strengthens the rector's mandate in the eyes of employees, students and doctoral candidates. This model provides the rector with a sense of greater identification with the academic community.

Sometimes, however, the elected rector confronts members of the university community as a person burdened with certain obligations before them, these obligations/promises often though not always, are expressed publicly in his election campaign. If this happens, it can significantly limit the room for manoeuvre for the elected rector, possibly even be harmful for the interests of university development. This can be a serious limitation when it comes to the

need to take unpopular actions required in the circumstances of increasing challenges faced by HEIs. Often this happens in the situation of dynamic and not always favourable changes in their environment. It should be stressed, however, that the model of election offers a psychologically greater comfort of action to the elected rector, who heads the senate which is also emerged from the election. In a subjective sense, this may help to secure the independence of the rector as a single-person authority from the senate, which – what needs to be emphasized – is not subordinated to or not a superior to the rector, and vice versa. Law on Higher Education guarantees that the rector as a single-person authority and the senate as a collegial body of a university are two separate and mutually independent bodies with distributed and different competences. This principle is not affected by the rector's *ex officio* being the chairman of the senate. An exception to this rule may be considered only the fact of approving the rector's report on the University's performance, which is carried out along with the evaluation once a year by the senate.

It should be noted that the election of the rector, preceded by the search of potential candidates by the university community in informal conversations and discussions, allows verification of the candidate's ability to acquire supporters, his ability to find compromises, as well as obtain and receive opinions and views other than his own. The model of election requires conducting of an electoral campaign, within the framework of which electoral programs can be and are generally presented and discussed at open electoral meetings. There is therefore a serious debate about the future of the university. This promotes the increasing of the program activation of members of the university community and self-identifying of the electors with the views, plans and activities of the rector appointed in this model. However, the rector by election is easier to accuse the lack of professional preparation to perform this such a difficult management function. Such accusation is often expressed by politicians or representatives of business, media, etc.

Let us pass on to analysing of the *competition model*. The Rector appointed by the competition model can meet the highly-requested requirements of



strong legitimacy and identification with the university and its community. The competition committee which is established to select a rector would act as a professional body, in a way that is more backstage, lobbying, and without any reference to the process and results of the public debate, nevertheless this committee would not have such a strong mandate to appoint the rector in the university as the university electoral college. It is much easier in these circumstances to come up with conspiracy theories, accuse members of the committee of acting in collusion, yield to group influences of an informal, internal or external character, as well as to succumb to non-subject matters. The required and implemented, transparent process of the competition committee activity would not have to fully prevent the negative spontaneous, but also emerging in the situation of rivalry of the nominated candidates, negative feelings, guesses, rumours and the spread of false information. This could have a clearly detrimental effect on the atmosphere at the university and on the social perception of the result of the competition committee's work, regardless of the person appointed to the rector's position.

A favourable condition for the rector elected by the competition could be ensuring by this procedure of a kind of confirmation of his professional skills and experience in the management / governance sphere, related to performing the function of the rector of the university. Let us note that a university is a large institution, often one of the largest local employers, which, in addition to its academic mission, conducts investments and business activities as well as interacts and cooperates with its social environment. The rector elected in this way would have a weaker democratic mandate, but a stronger professional identity. However, this would only be possible if the rules and procedure for setting up a competition committee (as a selection board), which is not easy to establish at the university, would give priority to the professional competencies of its members, at the expense of the representativeness of different groups of academic community in this body. And that would not have happened. A counterargument to the assumption of a stronger professional legitimacy could also be a possible

candidacy for the rector by persons with the same qualifications and experiences, or even the same – regardless of the accepted model of election or competition. Often supporters of the competition model emphasize, that a strong side of the competition model is its openness and equality for all candidates, and that a competition enables and give more chances for the candidates from outside to apply for the position of a rector. Some of them would be able to prove their skills, competence, experience and achievements from outside academia, which might, however not mustn't, be beneficial for the way the university is managed.

It should be noted in this context that the alternative to the competition, the procedure of the election of a rector allows that persons from outside the university can also run for this position. Furthermore, it is not a self-nomination procedure, as is case of the competition, but they would be submitted by authorized persons from the group of voters from the university itself, which would provide these candidates with a higher level of comfort to apply for the rector's position.

So here we are coming up to the key question regarding the very idea of the competition as a staffing method, model of recruiting persons for the certain positions. The competition as a rule, alongside its advantages such as openness, referring to defined criteria of a substantive nature, the presumption of objectivity in the process of indicating the winner, etc., is an imperfect form of selecting people for functions and positions in Poland due to the following features:

- potential candidates can be uncertain if the competition in practice isn't a tool of a limited or even simulated nature, what would be in the case if another person as a favourite was de facto informally predetermined as a winner even before the competition was announced. Such uncertainty comes from the experience of many other competitions, especially of those for academic promotion, which we are witnessing in Poland;
- Knowing university reality and practices, there could be a lack of applications from candidates with the highest competences and, consequently,

high academic and professional positions, outstanding achievements and prestige and significant position in the academic community or in public life (top staff). Such candidates, even if potentially interested, withdraw from the candidacy fearing the negative consequences of a possible failure for them, especially when they themselves (!) apply for a position. By self-nomination they would act in a situation where there is no possibility to exclude that the competition committee and its principals will be guided by a predetermined, different personal intention. Therefore, such person would accept the proposal in case of informally declared guarantees *de facto*, which would however be in conflict with the idea of a truly open competition.

One more disadvantage in the competition path of appointing the rector in Poland is that by the law the competition committee will join two functions: a selection function and the nomination of the selected winner of the competition. Currently in practice in other cases, these two functions are usually entrusted to separate bodies. It would be difficult for the university because it would require entrusting this role to the senate, which would not be appropriate, or to another body, which could complicate the procedure. The presented analysis argues that in public higher education institutions, in real university conditions, the competition model is more burdensome than the model of election with numerous disadvantages and threats. For these reasons, during the 7 years since the possibility of the model of competition was introduced to the Act in 2011, it wasn't supported by universities and was never practiced.

## Model of rector's election in the Act 2.0 – Act on Science and Higher Education 2018

The reform of higher education called as Act. 20, or Constitution for Science, which was announced by the Minister of Science and Higher Education in 2016, was intended to be created by the academic community, together with the academic community. Wide public consultations and 2-year long debates were held, and different models for rector's selection were proposed.

Three expert teams led by H. Izdebski, A. Radwan, M. Kwiek resigned from the current mechanism of rectors' appointment and proposed options of open competition or searching (by nomination committee):

- 1) proposal of **H. Izdebski**: the rector should be elected by the senate, with the possibility if provided for in the statute, the election would take place between the candidates selected in the competition. Research universities choose between at least two candidates selected in a competition or submitted by a nomination committee, rector is jointly appointed by the senate and a collegial body representing external stakeholders.
- 2) proposal of **A. Radwan**: a rector is elected by the senate from candidates positively evaluated by the Board of Trustees, while the president is elected by the Board of Trustees from among candidates nominated by the nomination committee, an open competition for candidates from the university and from outside, including from abroad is allowed.
- 3) proposal of **M. Kwiek**: rector should be elected in an open competition for the position, which is organized and carried out by the board of trustees.

**Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland (CRASP)** in the Strategy of Higher Education Development in 2010 emphasized, that the rector of HEI, being its highest representative, harmonizes 2 spheres in the field of governance – implementation of the university mission and management of resources. The election model should also launch both ideas. The model of appointing the rector should be regulated by the statute. CRASP proposed creation of the search committee by the senate, which will be responsible for searching the best candidates for a rector for a particular HEIs (depending on the type, location, profile, etc.). Search committee submits candidates for rector to the electoral college, and it is the electoral college to finally elect the rector. Another option to do final election is applicable to the universities where the Board of Trustees exists: a rector is being appointed jointly with the Senate in the mode and on the principles set out in the statute.

For the Act 2.0 CRASP supported the model of election of a rector by the electoral college, but at the same suggests introducing new model of

nominating candidates. The model of searching is consequently considered the most relevant by CRASP to find the best candidates. This searching could be held by the university board or existing convent in its new formula. In the case if the board fail to submit appropriate candidates for a rector's, its term of office expires. Thus, it would be one of the main tasks for the board to which the board should be well-prepared (Woźnicki, 2017).

*The National Council of Science and Higher Education of Poland (NCS&HE)* in its report concerning the draft law Act 2.0 (Analysis of selected elements of the assumptions to the Act 2.0. Report No. 5/2017 of the National Council of Science and Higher Education, online) welcomes the idea of introduction of professional managerial mechanisms into the process of governing the university and strengthening the position of the rector, which could be elected by the board of trustees of university senate. National Council supported the idea of open competitions for the rector's position, but at the same time there is a big concern in the forming of the competition committees (or boards of trustees if they conduct the competition), because of the risk of politicization and possible influence from the political parties, politicians. Thus, the competition procedures should prevent such practices properly by guaranteeing the superiority of candidates from academia, though not necessarily from the home university.

Independent *panel of experts of the European Commission* head by Georg Winckler (2017) proposed that the university board could select a rector via open call for candidates (Peer Review of Poland's Higher Education and Science System, online) along with the establishment of a separate search committee with wide participation of the university internal stakeholders, which will present recommendations about the candidates to the board. Denmark practice was proposed as a learning model.

As we can see the major trends in the process of debating on the new regulations presented by the academic community and international experts is to entrust the role of search or nominating committee to the university board. But the final decision (election) should be made by the electoral college according to the deeply-rooted academic tradition.

It should be noted, that a model of rector's selection was changing at different stages of the legislative process. In the final version of the Act, adopted on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2018, a rector will be elected by the electoral college from among the candidates nominated by the university board or other bodies authorized by the statute (art. 24) after senate gives their opinion. That means that the process of nomination (searching or open call, competition model) becomes much more important than before. Let us pass to analysing the mechanism of searching candidates for a rector's position.

## The method of searching candidates for a rector's position

Procedure conducted by an authorized body aiming at selection of the best candidates for a given position, formally used by universities in the USA and UK, as so-called "executive search or searching" is devoid of the fundamental drawbacks of the competition model. The executive search in academic sector is based on a modern method of recruitment of the senior executives, top-managers and highly qualified professionals widely used in business. It is a professional service which can be delivered outside the institution which hiring, but by external organization, typically consultative or headhunting agency. We should stress, that in business world, recruitment of highly qualified and senior leadership professionals is conducted differently because of "the job market for the top talent" is being operated on specific priorities, which cannot be met in case of open calls and open recruitment competitions.

The process of executive search in business can include the following stages: appointing the search committee, inviting or not external professional agency, preliminary data (persons) searching – senior data analysis, initial screening of the candidates, research the availability of suitable qualified candidates working for competitors or related businesses or organizations; identifying the shortlist of qualified candidates who match the requirements, negotiations on remuneration and benefits, and preparing the employment contract. Studying executive search as a general recruitment

tool, Meriläinen et al. (2015) argue that "executive search consultants or head-hunters play a prominent role in determining what constitutes an 'ideal' executive body." The US. Universities prove that "while an executive search is typically the domain of businesses looking to initiate change, university officials see it as the surest route to improving its practices, not least with regards to high level appointments" (Chicago State University).

We see the main difference of the searching model is in *the issue of application (submission) initiative*. In the case of a competition, own initiatives are expected from the interested persons, which makes them applicants for a given position. But applicants cannot always be sure if the position is really open. In case of "searching", from the beginning to the end, the initiative remains on the side of the institutionally authorized group of people constituted as the so-called "search committee." Their job is to find good candidates, reach them with an invitation to give their pre-consent – not necessarily the final – only to place their names on the list of potential candidates for further analyses carried out by these bodies under conditions of confidentiality. At this stage the candidates may feel that they do not apply for the position but only agree to proceed with the use of their names. Only if a given candidate passes through the process of further analyses and will be placed on the short list of just a few candidates (so-called "short list"), a declaration of consent is required for the final decision. Even at this stage, the candidate feels that he is not seeking a job or function, but that the institution is seeking his agreement to propose him a certain position. This reversal of roles is of fundamental importance for recruitment of the best candidates, especially on top-management positions. In the USA supervision over the process of filling the post of the university president is the mission of the body that is generally called the board of trustees (its names differ across the states), which appoints a "search committee" and makes a final decision. Thus, the function of selection and function of nomination are performed by different bodies. In American universities, it consists exclusively or with larger participation of people from outside the university, and professional head-hunters advice, support, take part or even conduct all the procedures required.

Otherwise, the model of searching (or competition) will become more important in terms of the new law, which comes into force on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018. So, in 2020 rectors of Polish HEIs will be elected by a new model, the procedures of election have to be specified in the statutes by 1<sup>st</sup> October 2019, that means universities have only a year to discuss and choose the best regulation for their institution. Because of changing the procedures of nominating candidates and submitting them for further elections, universities need to choose the way they would like to nominate candidates. New model makes the process of nomination more important than before. To our mind, searching is the best model to be used. The university board in its current formula, having members from outside, including the chairman, and also having representatives of the university community, is the best body to perform the function of the search committee. Therefore, the university statutes may choose also another nominating bodies – groups of professors, senate itself, competition committee announcing open call, etc. But what's important, that it is the strategic task for each university to choose the model which will meet the university traditions and goals in the best way. The academic communities themselves have to answer a number of questions to find the most appropriate mechanism to nominate candidates for a rector's position:

- *Whether the process of nominating should have a model of competition (an open call) or searching (closed process)?*
- *What procedure should be selected by the university board, open selection procedure, competition or closed procedure of searching? What are the criteria and mechanism of selection?*
- *How to gain the consensus between the senate and the board in terms of the model of searching and submitting of candidates for a rector?*
- *Who will be the other bodies/groups of academic community who can nominate the candidates?*
- *Whether external nomination allowed? Or only internal nomination: by any elector or group of electors, by any employee or group of university employees, by any member of the academic community or a group of such*



*persons, by a decision of a group debate (or organized by the electoral commission), balloting in the vote of the college of electors? Is self-nomination (own decision) allowed?*

- Are there hidden risks of indirect interference of the politicians to the rector's appointment?*
- If competition model is chosen, who will select/appoint a competition committee? What procedures for competition should be accepted? Will open call be published and advertised widely nationally and internationally?*
- How the senate will assess candidates and in what way opinion them?*
- What if the university would like to give the right to submit candidates to the current rector or to the senate itself? Etc.*

For the universities it is crucial to reconsider their internal policies to improve the university governance as well as to professionalize academic management. Debating and answering these questions, each HEIs will choose the best option for themselves, which open a possibility for the diversity of internal regulations.

## Conclusions

The model of university rector's appointment has a significant impact on the development and scope of reforms (reform implementation) undertaken at the university, it influences the scale of changes. These changes – even if they would bring benefits to the university in the nearest future – may not always well accepted by the academic community, which may lobby different solutions and make a pressure onto a rector via the collegial body (university senate) as well. Therefore, we consider, that the model of nomination and selection of the rector, and in particular his pre-election campaign determines his relationship with the senate as a collegial governing body. And the question is who, what authority/body and on what basis should nominate and elect a rector still causes discussions in all countries, and in particular in Poland. It is worth to consider two main models of nominating candidates: an open procedure

(open competition) and a closed one (e.g. searching, like head-hunting for senior executive staff in business sphere, in HR), their strengths and weaknesses. Both analysis of the rectors' appointment in terms of the university autonomy and open/close internal procedures for nominating and searching candidates are important for analysing higher education governance.

Each of the analysed models of appointing the rector has its own pros and cons in Poland. Their common advantage is that each of them respects the principles of the institutional autonomy, guaranteed to universities by the Constitution and the law. In both cases, the rector's appointment is conducted by the internal body of the university. It is an autonomous right of the academic community, of the university itself to define their own framework, features and procedures of the model of selection the rector of this particular university. The model of searching undoubtedly gives many chances to the universities, but also hides many threats and risks. What is evident, to succeed in implementing new regulations effectively and use them for development, but not for stagnation, to open new possibilities, the universities will have first to search and elect highly qualified and engaged university board. And those features can also be applied to the searching and election of the members of the university board as a new collegial governing body in Polish public universities.

## References

Analysis of selected elements of the assumptions to the Act 2.0. Report No. 5/2017 of the National Council of Science and Higher Education (may 2017). [http://www.rgnisw.nauka.gov.pl/g2/oryginal/2017\\_12/306d2498397a8da19a689fc7b8fec8ea.pdf](http://www.rgnisw.nauka.gov.pl/g2/oryginal/2017_12/306d2498397a8da19a689fc7b8fec8ea.pdf), access: 27.07.2018.

**Bennetot Pruvot, E., Estermann, T. (2017).** University Autonomy in Europe III. The Scorecard 2017. Brussels. <http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University-Autonomy-in-Europe-2017>, access : 27.07.2018.

Election Procedures of Higher Education Institution Rectors / Executive Heads. <http://www.mrk.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Eu-Comparison.pdf>, access: 27.07.2018.

3. EUA University Auto. <http://www.university-autonomy.eu/dimensions/organisational/>, access: 27.07.2018.

**Eurydice (2008).** *Higher Education Governance in Europe. Policies, structures, funding and academic staff.* [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic\\_reports/091EN.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/091EN.pdf), access: 27.07.2018.

*Executive search in academia: University seeks president.* Boyden. <https://www.boyden.com/media/executive-search-in-academia-university-seeks-president-169293/index.html>, access: 30.07.2018.

**Izdebski, H. (ed.) (2017).** *Ustawa 2.0. Założenia systemu szkolnictwa wyższego: Założenia do projektu ustawy.* Kierownik projektu: prof. dr hab. Hubert Izdebski, opracowane przez zespół. Warszawa, styczeń.

**Kwiek, M., Antonowicz, D., Brdulak, J., Hulicka, M., Jędrzejewski, T., Kowalski, R., Kulczycki, E., Szadkowski, K., Szot, A., & Wolszczak-Derlacz, J. (2016).** *Projekt założeń do ustawy Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym*. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza.

**Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J., & Valtonen, A. (2015).** Headhunters and the 'ideal' executive body. *Organization*, 22, pp. 3–22. 10.1177/1350508413496578.

Peer Review of Poland's Higher Education and Science System, European Commission (2017). <https://rio.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/policy-support-facility/peer-review-polish-higher-education-and-science-system>, access: 30.07.2018.

**Radwan, A. (ed.) (2017).** *Plus ratio quam vis consuetudinis. Reforma nauki i akademii w Ustawie 2.0*. Kraków.

Strategia rozwoju szkolnictwa wyższego 2010–2020. Projekt środowiskowy (2009). Konferencja Rektorów Akademickich Szkół Polskich. Warszawa.

The Law Act on Higher Education, (2005). <http://prawo.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU20051641365/U/D20051365Lj.pdf>, access: 30.07.2018.

The Law Act on Science and Higher Education (2018). <http://konstytucjadlanauki.gov.pl/content/uploads/2018/07/2056-0psu.pdf>, access 30.07.2018.

University Leaders' Perspectives (2015). EUA Governance and funding. Brussels/ <http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications-homepage-list/university-leaders'-perspectives-governance-and-funding.pdf?sfvrsn=2>, access 27.07.2018.

Ustrój uczelni w wybranych państwach. MNiSW. <https://nkn.gov.pl/ustroj-uczelni-w-wybranych-panstwach/>, access 27.07.2018.

**Woźnicki, J. (ed.) (2017).** *Raport nr 2.1: Wstępne propozycje do Ustawy 2.0: Ustrój uczelni*. Warszawa: KRASP – FRP, [https://www.krasp.org.pl/resources/upload/dokumenty/dokumenty\\_ro%C5%BCne/Raporty\\_KSPSW/raport\\_nr\\_1\\_kspsw.pdf](https://www.krasp.org.pl/resources/upload/dokumenty/dokumenty_ro%C5%BCne/Raporty_KSPSW/raport_nr_1_kspsw.pdf), access 27.07.2018.

**Woźnicki, J. (2009).** *The University as an Institution of Public Domain: The Polish Perspective*. UNESCO-CEPES.

