Code of Procedure for the Research Board of Charles University


Code of Procedure for the Research Board of Charles University of 14 December 2016

Under sections 9 (1) (b) and 17 (1) (k) of Act No. 111/1998 Sb., to regulate higher education institutions and to change and amend other laws (the Higher Education Act), as amended, the Academic Senate of Charles University has adopted the following Code of Procedure for the Research Board of Charles University as an internal regulation:

Introductory Provision

Article 1

This Code regulates the activities of the Research Board of Charles University ("the University") referred to in section 12 of the Higher Education Act and in the Constitution of the University.¹

General Provisions

Article 2

1. The schedule of meetings of the Research Board of the University (the "Research Board") for an academic year is set out by the Rector.
2. The meetings of the Research Board are convened by the Rector at least five times per academic year. The schedule of meetings of the Research Board, a brief record of the meetings of the Research Board, and the content of the resolution are published in the usual manner. The Rector is required to convene a meeting of the Research Board if at least one third of the members of the Research Board request it.
3. For each meeting, an invitation in writing, with an agenda and the relevant documents for individual items on the agenda, will be sent electronically to the members of the Research Board ("Member"/"Members") no later than seven days in advance. Exceptionally, particularly due to time constraints or in matters of urgency, the relevant documents may, upon the decision by the Rector, be transmitted later or distributed during the opening of the meeting.
4. If warranted by the nature of the matter discussed, the Rector may invite other persons to the meeting.

Article 3

1. The meetings of the Research Board are chaired by the Rector or a Vice-Rector authorised by the Rector.
2. The agenda of the meeting of the Research Board is set out by the Rector.
3. A Member or a body of the University may propose an item for the agenda. The Member or the body will transmit the relevant written documents to the Rector well in advance if such documents are necessary for the consideration of an item.

Article 4

1. The following persons may speak at a meeting of the Research Board: a Member, a member of the Board of the Academic Senate of the University ("the Senate"), or a member of the Senate authorised by the Senate, a Vice-Rector, the Chief Financial Officer, a dean, and an honorary member of the Research Board. Unless otherwise provided in this Code, other persons may speak at the meeting only if the Research Board agrees to it.
2. The Research Board may decide to hold the whole meeting or a part thereof as a closed meeting if the openness of the meeting could jeopardise the personality rights of an individual, or an important interest of the University; in that case the Research Board will determine who may participate in the closed meeting.

¹ Translator’s note: Words importing the masculine include the feminine, and unless the context otherwise requires, words in the singular include the plural and words in the plural include the singular.
3. The vote is public. In cases stipulated by the law or by an internal regulation, or where agreed by the Research Board, the Research Board votes by secret ballot.

4. The Research Board is quorate if an absolute majority of its Members are present; unless otherwise provided in the Higher Education Act\(^2\), a resolution is passed if an absolute majority of the persons present voted in its favour.

**Special Provisions**

**Article 5**

1. A nomination for full professorship\(^3\) or, where appropriate, associate professorship\(^4\), will not be considered if fewer than two thirds of all Members of the Research Board attend the meeting, unless the candidate for full professor or, where appropriate, for associate professor, challenges this procedure.

2. The Rector will invite the candidate for full professor to the relevant meeting of the Research Board\(^5\). The Rector or the Research Board may invite the candidate for associate professor to attend the relevant meeting. The nomination proposal need not be considered if the invited candidate fails to attend the meeting.

3. The Rector will invite to the relevant meeting of the Research Board the chair of the commission for full professorship appointment or the chair of the associate professorship commission. The nomination need not be considered if the invited chair or a member of the commission designated by the chair fails to attend the meeting.

4. The Rector will invite the dean who proposed the relevant nomination for associate professorship or full professorship to the Rector to participate in the consideration of the proposal.

5. During the voting and, where appropriate, the debate on the nomination for associate professorship or full professorship, the meeting of the Research Board is closed.

**Article 6**

The Research Board considers the nomination proposals for full professorship that have been returned by the Minister of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic.

**Article 7**

Upon a proposal by the Rector, the Research Board considers and approves, by secret ballot, nomination proposals for extraordinary professors (professores extraordinarii) if such post has been created.

**Article 8**

1. The Research Board considers and approves, by secret ballot, nomination proposals for the degree of honorary doctor.

2. The degree of honorary doctor (abbreviated as "Dr.h.c.") may be awarded to persons who have made, on the international level, significant contributions to science or culture or otherwise contributed to the benefit of mankind.

3. A nomination for the degree of honorary doctor in a particular academic branch may be proposed by the dean of the faculty where the academic branch is being pursued. The nomination may also be proposed by the Rector on his own motion.

4. The nomination proposed by the dean must include, in addition to the basic personal details about the candidate, a detailed justification in accordance with paragraph 2.

5. The dean submits the nomination proposal for the degree of honorary doctor to the Rector together with the opinion of the research board of the faculty.

6. The degree of honorary doctor may be awarded subject to the candidate’s consent.

7. The degree of honorary doctor is awarded at an honorary doctor ceremony. If the candidate cannot attend the ceremony for serious reasons, the degree may be awarded without a ceremony.

**Article 9**

The Research Board gives its opinion on the intention to appoint a professor in memoriam.

**Article 10**

The Research Board considers proposals for the institutional organisation of research activities at the University.

**Article 11**

The Research Board proposes to the Rector the nominations for one third of members of the Internal Evaluation Board of the University.

**Article 12**

1. The Rector may direct that the vote be taken outside the meeting of the Research Board ("Remote Voting") if the matter is urgent, or if with respect to the proposal it is not possible or appropriate to convene the meeting of the Research Board. It is not possible to conduct Remote Voting with respect to nominations for full professorship, proposals to appoint extraordinary professors, nominations for associate professorship, or nominations for the degree of honorary doctor.

---

\(^2\) S. 72 (10) and (11), and s. 74 (6) of the Higher Education Act.

\(^3\) S. 74 (6) of the Higher Education Act.

\(^4\) S. 72 (11) of the Higher Education Act.

\(^5\) Article 15 (2) of the Code of Procedure for the Granting of Associate Professorship and Full Professorship of the University.
2. The notice of the voting, the text of the proposal, and a ballot paper will be sent to Members via closed electronic conference. The notice will stipulate the time limit for voting which is not less than five days.

3. A Member will send electronically a completed ballot paper including the name and surname of the voter, the actual vote, i.e., approval, disapproval, or abstention, within the time limit under paragraph 2, otherwise his vote is invalid. A Member may refuse Remote Voting in the same manner and within the same time limit.

4. A proposal is considered to be approved if an absolute majority of all Members voted in its favour; this does not apply if no less than one third of all the Members refused to vote on the proposal through Remote Voting.

5. The record of Remote Voting is an integral part of the minutes of the next meeting of the Research Board.

**Article 13**

The Rector will invite, to the meeting concerning accreditation of associate professorship and full professorship appointment procedures, the dean(s) of the respective faculty (faculties), as well as, where necessary, persons empowered to provide a detailed explanation about the draft application for accreditation. These persons will answer the questions of Members and will have the right to speak in the debate.

**Article 14**

The Rector will invite the respective dean to the meeting concerning a faculty or concerning an issue raised by the body of a faculty. The dean will answer the questions of Members and will have the right to speak in the debate.

**Commissions of the Research Board**

**Article 15**

1. The Research Board may, upon a proposal by the Rector, establish a commission of the Research Board ("Commission").

2. Commissions are advisory bodies of the Research Board and they may be permanent or temporary.

3. The composition of a Commission is approved by the Research Board, upon a proposal by the Rector.

**Common and Final Provisions**

**Article 16**

1. The minutes of the meeting of the Research Board are verified by the Rector.

2. After the minutes of the meeting of the Research Board are approved at the subsequent meeting of the Research Board, they are published on a publicly accessible part of the University website.

**Article 17**

1. The Code of Procedure for the Research Board of Charles University in Prague registered by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports on 24 September 1999, as amended, is hereby repealed.

2. The Code for Awarding Degrees of Honorary Doctors of Charles University in Prague registered by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports on 28 January 2000 is hereby repealed.

3. This Code was approved by the Senate on 25 November 2016.

4. This Code comes into force on the date of registration by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.  

5. This Code becomes effective on the first day of the calendar month following the date of coming into force.

PhDr. Tomáš Nigrin, Ph.D.  
President of the Academic Senate

Prof. MUDr. Tomáš Zima, DrSc.  
Rector

---

6 S. 36 of the Higher Education Act. The registration was completed on 14 December 2016.