



Theses of the election programme of the candidate for Rector of UP for the period 2025-2029

Ivo Jirásek

Introducing the candidate and motivation for applying

From my family upbringing, I have taken into my life two values in particular that have shaped my professional endeavours: that I am responsible for myself and my actions and therefore can jump up to my salary; and that we are not alone in the world, so it is right to give some of my capacity and attention to other people. I was also significantly shaped by the troop education turning into self-education, without which I would not have embarked on further adventures in life, nor would I have probably become a professional supervisor of a Master's degree program in *recreology*. And also the reading, among others, of Jaroslav Foglar's books and comics, which much later grew into a professional interest. I cannot conceal these ideological roots, which also shape my presence. To some extent, I thus obeyed Schiller's words, "*Tell him to cherish the dreams of his youth when he is a man.*"

I have been at UP for four decades. In the second half of the 1980s I studied at the *Faculty of Education* (Czech language and civics), in the first half of the 1990s at the *Philosophical Faculty* (philosophy and political science), since 1995 I have been a lecturer at the *Faculty of Physical Culture* (I was habilitated and appointed professor in the field of kinantropology). Both my education and my publishing activity are in the semantic field of philosophy, pedagogy and kinantropology. With knowledge of different faculty backgrounds, I also approach some of the impulses that I believe are worthy of prominence in the coming years.

Let me also mention three different awards that point not only to the thematic background of my academic career, but especially to the procedural and decision-making practices that would undoubtedly be reflected in my potential fulfilment of the role of rector.

1. In 2007, the *Vacation School of Lipnice* (PŠL, www.psl.cz) awarded me the *Gold Instructor's Certificate*. This was due not only to my work in teams and leading courses, contributing to the education of the next generation of volunteer leisure educators, but also to the founding of *Gymnasion* journal, of which I was editor-in-chief until 2016. The periodical is still being published today, which makes me - understandably - very happy as the initiator of the idea (www.gymnasion.org). At the time of my involvement, the specific subculture of the PŠL was an extraordinarily creative community, a body of extraordinary "colourful souls", connected by an **extraordinary demandingness and emphasis on quality**. The unusually sharp discussions were conducted in a spirit of open criticism and the

need for firm argumentation. I do not intend to be subject to *ad hominem* justifications in the future either, but will strictly demand *ad rem* arguments.

2. In the academic year 2023/24, I was honoured by the *International Association for the Philosophy of Sport* with the Distinguished Scholars Award ([Warren Fraleigh Distinguished Scholars – IAPS](#)). I think this is a sign of some international renown or disciplinary prominence, which I am of course delighted about. But for a possible rectorship, what I take from here is a particular appreciation for the **disciplinary diversity of criteria for evaluating academic performance**. Indeed, the marginal field of philosophy of sport does not have a plethora of impact journals. The methodology of published papers does not follow the usual IMRaD approach. Scientometrics is telling only to a certain extent. But even with this understanding for small disciplines, I cannot promise anything other than that we must continue to adhere to *Module 1* for the evaluation of outstanding performance and *Module 2* for a quantified overview of overall production in the university-wide evaluation of scholarly performance. Having previously served as Vice Dean for Science and Research for six years, I accept that funding flows to UP on the basis of creative outputs assessed in this way.
3. At the end of the year just ended, I received the *Fast Arrows Badge of Honour* from the *Jaroslav Foglar Scout Foundation* for my long-term support of Foglar's legacy ([Čestný odznak Rychlých šípů](#)). The Scout writer, educator, editor and comic book author strove by all means to achieve one thing: to make children and teenagers grow up to be good people. He was able to develop morality without being moralistic. UP needs emphasis on the **field of ethics** like salt in the years to come. Because, as Tomas Bata mentioned almost a century ago, "*Moral misery is the cause, economic decline is the effect*". If we have seen the recent decline in productivity performance, we must ask whether one of the causes is also a lack of ethical sensitivity.

That is also why, after careful consideration of all the circumstances, I have decided to accept the offer to be a candidate for rector. It is not enough just to criticize selected wrongs of university life. I see it as a responsible approach to expose myself to this situation and therefore offer a variant of the possible direction of our common alma mater. I am used to accepting the challenges that come to me:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S3YkN-GZTz0>

Analysis of the current state of the UP

An external and unbiased view may rightly point out the pride we can still feel when we identify with UP as the second oldest university in the Czech Republic. We are one of the top 5 Czech research universities, with an amazing history and rich traditions. We have institutional accreditation, so we are free to implement study programmes (SP) as we see fit. We co-founded the European university alliance Aurora. Our activities are complemented by a number of successful university facilities. There are many academic and student societies and organisations, as well as an unmissable concentration of exceptionally capable individuals. The rarely strong intellectual enrichment combined with a kindly humanity in many of the university departments allows optimism about the open future to be satiated.

Yet today's UP can - and must - also be evaluated with a critical eye. By comparing the previously formulated electoral programmes of previous rectors and the situation we now find ourselves in, we can see a radical discrepancy. I will pick out a few points that I personally consider to be the most pressing:

- The most painful ulcer, which hinders potential development and blocks natural university-wide communication, is of course the **murderous duel between the PŘF and VŠŮ Catrin**. It requires a lot of energy, time and money and completely unproductively undermines the sources of potential university prosperity. The ulcer must be cut out and cleaned up. This is always painful, but it is necessary for the university organism to continue to develop in a healthy way.

- I find the **longstanding disrespect for ethics** completely incomprehensible. The shocking disparagement of personalities, the unbalanced presentation of UP in the local and national media, the appalling statements damaging the reputation, the inflation of criminal charges, the problems of publication discrepancies and inadequate purchases of outputs are just a sample of the miserable state we are currently going through at UP. If we continue in this moral misery, we are bound to face - according to Bata's view mentioned above - economic decline.

- The traditional idea of *universitas* has been lost, not only in inter-faculty competition and the struggle to get the biggest possible share of the common financial pie, but also in the transformation of the **perception of students as clients and sources of resources, not colleagues**.

- For many years there has been great dissatisfaction and divergence among faculties in their approach to the way **university funds are redistributed**. Student and KEN numbers, societal need, and debates over the evaluation of scholarly output always result in disagreement over the budget model.

- Hence the growing discontent among academics in the form of **offensive pay disparities**. I do not think it is right for a professor to receive a salary of 55,000 crowns in one area and 200,000 crowns in another. I regard as absolutely scandalous the remuneration of CZK 35 000 for colleagues with Ph.D. qualifications, obtained after a period of hard study and many years of renunciation. I see the arguments that claim that higher salaries are the result of greater diligence, hard work and effort as not entirely true in the university context.

- The consequence is a **woeful failure to use the potential** that UP might otherwise have. It is not only the fact that not enough suitable candidates apply for the vacant positions because the salary offered is undignified and totally uncompetitive. It is especially evident in the fact that a large group of academic staff devotes the minimum necessary to work for UP and then engages in other spheres, more economically lucrative.

- From the point of view of university management, the **dysfunctional management of investments and immovable property** at UP is deplorable. There is even the threat of colossal embarrassment in the possible return of unspent investments without any discussion of the problem and possible solutions.

In summary, the current situation at UP can be described as a **crisis of trust**, manifested by **unclear and unbending communication**, thus characterized by **ideological polarization of opinions**. The crisis is becoming visible in the indicators of **declining performance**, i.e. in the decline of scientific output, but also in the lower positions in international rankings evaluating universities according to various parameters. Internal contradictions and mismanaged communication **weaken the prestige of UP** in the eyes of the expert community and the general public. This is not only in the Czech Republic, but also internationally, as evidenced by the foreign reflection of the selection procedure for the director of Catrin.

That is why I approach the formulation of the programme's theses mainly from the **point of view of the values and attitudes** of my possible work. I am sure that the top representative of UP does not guarantee the theses of the election programme only by their **content**, but also (and probably especially) by his **personality**. The rector's persona must bear the burden of questioning the meaning of his or her action. To be an authentic personality, not subject to the opinion of a crowd characterized by mediocrity. I tried to introduce the concept of authenticity, as well as the meaning of accepting challenges, some time ago as follows:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nSiMhdv2fmA>

Specific priorities and objectives for the term of the mandate

In the coming period, UP faces two fundamental processes that will determine the perception of the University in the near future:

1. SP reaccreditation and maintaining **institutional accreditation**.
2. Evaluation of research potential and maintaining its position among excellent **research universities** (A).

However, the analysis described above also suggests other specific themes that require increased attention. To address the seven areas of criticism, I offer the following approaches:

- **Sorting out the relationship between the PŘF and Catrin:** I am one of those who see the cause of the dismal state of affairs in the way the VŠÚ was *hastily established*. A lofty idea that was not accompanied by detailed contracts and a clear way of coexistence has proved fundamentally insufficient to function successfully. No solution is good and the bitter aftertaste will always remain. We have been stuck in place for many years, even though the problem was already named at the last elections, with the hope that it would soon be solved.

o I am not choosing winners and losers here, but in the current situation I see the *fourth option* from the so-called Horáček report as the rationally justified way forward: a fair settlement between the two units.

o If hope proves to be a futile endeavour within an adequate timeframe of at most a year, I would proceed to the *third option*, which is the existence of Catrin under the PŘF. The current situation of years of futile haggling that preserves an untenable situation is absolutely the worst of all possible options. There is no time to negotiate further, to pay for more mediators and external assessors. Action must be taken. Quickly and vigorously.

- **Highlight the ethical imperative:** I agree with Zimbardo that the problem of good and evil is not dispositional (we are good, others are evil) but situational - *good people commit evil acts*. Recent university history shows that opening oneself to self-reflection and listening to the voice of conscience cannot be enforced by litigation. To look squarely at one's shadows requires personal courage and depth of life. Therefore, it makes no sense to return to the issue of published and purchased texts (although I fully agree with the conclusions of the Ethics Committee), but to ensure such conditions so that similar cases do not occur at UP in the future.

o Academic ethics **in science and research** is a topic that is currently being well reflected and adequate measures are being prepared (data management plan, data repositories, open science, etc.). It is true that we have neglected many things, but

better late than never. There must no longer be a situation where the source data for published outputs cannot be traced. Any fraud must be firmly rejected.

o However, I must express my fundamental disagreement with the efforts of the current UP leadership to achieve the desired shift in the **university rankings**. The current effort to pander to the evaluators by sending out emails asking for positive feedback within the framework of the reputation criterion is, in my view, not only *unethical*, but clearly *lacking an adequate level of self-confidence*. UP is supposed to strive to be evaluated without our input, to make a meaningful assessment of our success in *meeting defined indicators*, but not to humiliate ourselves with foreign colleagues, even though many other universities have embarked on such dubious races. The false game of betting on PR and not on the idea and purpose of the university is undignified. More sympathetic is the example of the Swiss University of Zurich, whose management has decided to get out of this merry-go-round of external pressure, which for the sake of international ranking positions has turned into a publishing machine churning out quantum of dubious outputs and turning universities into commercial and profit-oriented institutions. The new leadership should initiate a national meeting to distance research universities in the Czech Republic from such practices and to ensure that evaluation (and the allocation of funding that may be linked to it) is carried out exclusively using objective criteria that cannot be unethically influenced in this way.

o Ethics in education can be enhanced by thematising **character development** in the context of SP reaccreditations. I was struck by the results of last year's survey of teachers and parents: 87% of parents report that it is more important for their children to develop character than to get good grades; 86% of teachers report the same preference. However, both groups assume that the other prioritizes the importance of grades. This is a situation we should respond to in preparing future teachers - and perhaps not only them.

- ***The Universitas magistrorum et scholarium***, the traditional self-governing association of masters and students, is represented by completely different approaches and procedures in the individual faculties or departments. Greater blending and increased respect for the interests of students would undoubtedly help:

o A higher degree of SP permeability, i.e. a *greater choice of C courses*. Currently, economic competition and the principle that students are the source of funding prevail. In the case of a possible change in the financial contribution not for student numbers but through other indicators, the barrier of openness would fall. It is the possibility of extension courses that makes a study a university (universal, general), not just a specialised one.

o Feedback through *evaluation of the study* is still dysfunctional given the small percentage of participating students. One reason may be the excessive time of the whole process, another may be the idea of a blanket evaluation. I would like to initiate a discussion about reducing evaluation times and focusing on the evaluation of 4-5 key (addressing or problematic) subjects for the individual student, of course with the possibility to express an opinion on all of them.

o *Suitable spaces for study and rest areas* are standard at some faculties, but many faculties are lacking and some dislocated workplaces (e.g. at Třída Svobody) do not have local branch libraries, canteen, cafeteria or suitable spaces for student stay in between classes. The development of the university's investment priorities should also take into account these student needs.

- Adjust the budget model:

o **The approach to indicator A** cannot be unfairly changed so that faculties that respected the fixation and did not recruit students above the agreed threshold will be penalized and funding transferred to faculties that did not respect the agreement (even though they declared that they had sufficient infrastructure, staffing and financial capacity when the new SPs were approved). We can put pressure on the MŠMT to ensure that the contribution to social need (**indicator P or F**) also reflects the needs of non-medical health disciplines, possibly engineering and others (e.g. the warning shortage of physicists). In the future, the view of the cost of labour and therefore the redistribution of funds will probably change: not according to student credits, but according to hours taught (in regional education, teachers are also not rewarded according to the number of pupils).

o We cannot completely abandon **KEN**, as the MŠMT still allocates it to newly accredited SPs (December 2023) and calculates the budget accordingly - we can only distribute what the MŠMT provides.

o However, the **budget** will have to be **adjusted** in connection with the necessary transformation of the wage regulation and the quantification of work activities at UP. It is possible that the allocated funds will be reallocated separately to salaries (same cost of labour) and separately to operations and other costs (e.g. in relation to KEN). However, at the moment, not all the background information (including the implementation of the European Directive) is known in order to propose a new model - no doubt the change will have to be prepared during 2025 and 2026.

o Possible **bonuses** can be seen, for example, for interest in the field (number of applicants, number of entrants), evaluation not by number of students but by academic workload or other parameters, if there is a university-wide consensus on them.

o **Emphasis on external resources**, especially project activities. The IGA can use not only specific research funds as before, but also part of the DK RVO funds, which are counted as scientific output but are intended to support further (future) research activities. Thus, they can be dedicated e.g. to support two new types of projects, namely a) preparation of Horizon and ERC projects; b) motivation of external outstanding scientists to work at UP. This is what GAMU in Brno and Primus in Prague do. Then, an increased rate of submissions and an inflow of additional project funding can be expected. Each faculty has the potential to form working groups or research teams and in cooperation with the Project Service, the current optics of approaching these projects, which are still perceived as suitable exclusively for selected disciplines and faculties (PřF, LF, Catrin), can be radically transformed.

- **Develop an entirely new wage regulation:** it is not just a matter of *raising the existing tariff* to a rational competitive value of labour, but of calculating the *overall efficiency of workplaces*. We are facing an as yet unprepared *implementation of the EU directive on transparent remuneration and combating discrimination in pay*. UP will have to publicly share information on wages paid (salary level and pay range for the same positions, criteria used to determine pay and promotion) and take action if the pay gap exceeds 5%. An assistant professor at the FZV must have the same salary (including personal assessment and bonuses) as an assistant professor at the PřF. If UP is unable to justify the difference (the burden of proof is now on the employer), it will pay compensation and fines. The implementation of this directive (within a maximum of 3 years) will radically change not only the wage policy but also the

evaluation of all workplaces. In addition to the wage regulation itself, it will be necessary to:

- o Develop a job catalogue, including the expected number of hours devoted to specific activities for all categories of academic staff.

- o Restrictions on direct teaching can be expected in the reaccreditation of a number of SPs, again we will be forced to discuss duplication of disciplines - not in the sense of necessary abolition (specifics have e.g. physics at the PŘF and the didactic concept of physics at the PdF, as well as philology at the FF and the language teacher at the PdF), but in the principles of inter-faculty cooperation: if the key factor in the distribution of funds is not the different salary strategies of the faculties, but the uniform price of work throughout the university, a more open inter-faculty cooperation will radically enter the consideration. Instead of a vertical view (sharing money), we can use a horizontal view (cooperation in teaching).

- **Increase the university's potential:** this can only be done by fair real rewards for honest work. Today we are largely deluding ourselves that we all work 5 days a week and are paid accordingly. UP is a place with an extraordinary concentration of educated, creative and stimulating personalities. However, the vast majority of them are rewarded for their work in a totally insulting way. I am not surprised, if one does not earn a decent living through academic work, that one fulfils only basic duties and then engages elsewhere. I am sorry that members of the academic community do not see the university as an opportunity to make themselves financially secure, and therefore flee to more lucrative jobs. In direct relation to the new pay code, it will be necessary:

- o Deepen the IS HAP functions into finer quantification of activities with specification of expected FTE fulfillment. Some model has been used in the past by FTK, an alternative recalculation is currently used by FF even with the possibility of a republic-wide comparison of performance at the level of departments and individuals.

- o The basic principle should be to encourage activity and diligence, not averaging and simple Janosik-like intentions of "taking from the rich faculty and giving to the poor". We need to make a clear distinction between which positions are effective and where we are potentially tolerating false overemployment today by not using the full potential of academic staff.

- **Introduce strategic management of investments and property:** not only the somewhat impulsive approach to the potential purchase of Hanácké kasárna, but especially the experience from the completely unmanaged reconstruction of the UP Sports Hall points to the complete absence of any strategy or system of real estate management at UP. For more efficient management it is necessary:

- o **Formulate university investment priorities,** including the utilisation of existing immovable assets. UP pays considerable sums for the lease of commercial premises, it is not at all clear what the real needs of individual departments are, for what and why specific property is to be acquired into UP ownership, for what means it is to be operated and for what purpose it is to be used. We have no idea to what extent the university infrastructure can be shared between faculties.

- o **Set up crisis management** and strictly manage the Sports Hall renovation project. At this point, there is a non-negligible risk of time slippage, risk of under-spending of allocated funds and repayment. The impact on reduced investment opportunities in the future is quite obvious. In addition, there is a demand (without any discussion) for co-financing from the FTK funds, although this is not the case for any other

investment. Large university projects really cannot be managed in such a chaotic manner.

Strategy of management and management of the Rectorate

I support the basic ideological approach with a nod to the style of two of the most important and extremely famous representatives of the Rector's Office in the post-war history of UP. I would like to build on **J. L. Fischer** with reference to his notion of compositional order, i.e., an interest in structure, system and order, resisting the mechanical orientation of measurable quantification. The university, in the compositional conception, creates a *structured unity*, creating a whole in its quality that transcends the mere sum of its parts. From here I take the emphasis on *quality*, on the *functionality of relationships* and - I add - the *meaningfulness* of all action. From **J. Jařab**, I would like to take the unobtrusive gentility of the office's leadership and, in particular, the *willingness to listen* and, at the same time, to *make a principled stand*. To act with the essential respect for *democratic ideals* that the idea of a university deserves.

The university is a type of institution that can inspire us with its medieval roots, among other things, in that it emphasizes the unity of the community. At present, however, we do not feel or experience such unity in Olomouc. When I identified the greatest pain of our university's present as the failed establishment of Catrin, I must also point out the very unfortunate attitude of the university's leadership towards the PŘF. What cannot be remedied must at least be loudly named. Such Munichian manners, where a university unit is discussed without its presence and without regard to its opinion, I would have to reject on principle if elected rector. Likewise, I announce in advance that I would not listen to the lobbying interests of influential groups, which we witnessed in the causal context of the "Friday meeting", which was immediately followed by the fearfully hasty illegal actions of the Rector against the Dean of the PŘF. Such a thing is frowned upon in polite society, with reference to university traditions that prefer democratic styles of management.

I understand the disadvantages that complicated negotiations entail, because it is lengthy, managerially inefficient, blocking many decisions. That is also why some of the rectors have sought centralization, direct management and individual decision-making, so functional in the economic sphere. On the one hand, if I accentuate the idea of the university, I cannot take democratic decision-making out of it just because it does not suit the personality at the head and problematizes its activities.

- The role of the rector and the UP management is to set the rules and enforce them, negotiate with the MŠMT and communicate with other universities at the national level. The Rector's Office carries out agendas related to the university-wide unit (one ID number), especially management of investment projects, centralized governance, administration. It is the kind of service it provides to the implementers of teaching and research activities.

- Leave the financial and personnel management powers to the faculties and other units, as this is where the purpose of the university (teaching and research) is realised.

- International cooperation must also be based on specific projects and co-authorship by individual academics or departments. The UP management's beautiful rides to nearer or more distant foreign countries do not have a direct impact on the real internationalisation of the university's basic activities. Involvement in the Aurora consortium and possibly other types of institutional support is appropriate.

- Communication should be set as clear and distinct. There is no need for 16-page legal analyses attempting to defend the indefensible. There seems to be more importance placed on legality and not legitimacy, the emphasis is on the diction of the law and not its spirit, the focus is on the accidental form and not the substantive content. This communicative emphasis should change.

- A process of further digitalisation and reduction of bureaucracy is essential. A good example of this is the excellently functioning administration of travel orders. Similarly, other systems and modules should be digitised and IT should be made more user-friendly. Small things like the introduction of electronic signatures in all the agenda can help a lot.

- For the possible expansion of the university in the future, it is good to consider the value of teaching economics, which to some extent appears in the accreditations of many SPs (not only management and governance) in various faculties. However, we do not yet have institutional accreditation for these areas of education.

For the fundamental principle of my potential rectorship, I prefer the approach we know from the famous educator Kurt Hahn: few people realize what can be achieved through mutual help and **teamwork**.

If I were to gain the trust of the AS UP, I would surround myself in the leadership with **more experienced and capable** collaborators than myself. With the Heraclitean insight that the most beautiful harmony arises from opposites, I am conducting preliminary consultations with representatives of different currents of opinion. At the moment, I do not have the right to disclose the names of potential vice-chancellors, but I am approaching personalities from different faculties, with different ideological backgrounds, concentrating on two areas: unquestionable **expertise** in relation to the specific domain under guarantee, and **humanity** manifested in the manner of communication and overall personal impact or "emanation".

Vision of the long-term direction of UP

I cannot and do not want to waste this material with soaring images of how in a few years we will completely change the position of our university in the global context. I believe in Masaryk's small daily work and I do not want to use exaggerated euphemisms. The basic direction is aimed at **raising the prestige of the UP** in the eyes of the professional and lay public, as the latter has been particularly badly affected in recent years. The prestige cannot be strengthened only by marketing or PR actions, but especially by a **strong pressure on the quality** of all activities. Quality must therefore prevail over quantity in the basic areas of university activity. And this implies a high degree of **demandingness** in fulfilling the role of academic and other staff. However, we cannot succeed in improving performance, efficiency and financial security unless we are consistent in our fundamental respect for **ethical values**.

I see a very strong dimension in university discussions emphasizing growth, development and efficiency. This is undoubtedly correct. However, I miss the debate on the meaning of such action. If we do not take the time to self-reflect and inquire into the meaning of the activities that UP undertakes, we can get caught up in a tiresome and debilitating merry-go-round of events, with no deeper purpose for society. The sharing of knowledge with colleagues and students should not be clouded by a fixation on economic and bureaucratic criteria, but encouraged by participation in social development in pursuit of the meaning and mission of the university. We should take inspiration from the origins of university education, and even from their ancient predecessors, namely Plato's Academy and Aristotle's

Lykeion, in the basic orientation of university life in the future. Free inquiry should not be confused with the profit-making activities of an economically oriented company, but should be determined by the Platonic understanding of the joyful desire for knowledge, the desire for the good, the whole and the beautiful, the basis of which is the wildly beautiful *eros*. Critical thinking thus cannot be reduced to the *episteme* of theoretical knowledge preferred today. The Aristotelian rational virtues presuppose other paths leading the soul to truth, namely the artistic creativity of *techné*, the practically oriented *phronesis*, the philosophically deepened *sofia*, as well as the *nous*, the intuitive insight of the whole, neglected in the university setting. Only the harmony of all these approaches makes university research and education truly fully human, not to be confused with any of the technical possibilities of AI.

The humanistic orientation of the long-term direction of the UP can also be specified by a more precise name. On the one hand, we can be a **sustainable university**, as is often discussed. In order to be able to rightfully boast this adjective, there is a separate paper, a strategy and action plans. In the long term, it is sufficient to meet the goals already set for us to be able to rightly associate sustainability with UP.

However, we can also claim to be a **healthy university** according to the rules of European certification. This too presupposes certain follow-up processes, e.g. a university-wide concept of sport, overlapping into healthy lifestyles and the promotion of wellbeing for both staff and students (including, for example, physical activity for students within the offer of C courses in all accredited SPs, as is common in other universities).

I confess that I prefer as a fundamental label for UP the one that we must undoubtedly keep: we must remain first and foremost a **research university**. Let us behave in a sustainable way, let us promote health and well-being, but let us understand the main focus, the meaning and the essence of the university mission in quality education and quality research. The long-term direction of UP must strive to ensure that we continue to be one of the top research universities in the country.

Thus, it is evident from the presented theses of the election program that in order to fulfill the purpose of the university in the years to come, I prefer as a necessary condition the restoration of trust and a humble return from managerial visions and ideas of corporate management to the paradigm of democratic coexistence and the realization of the basic idea of the university.