

**CODE OF ETHICS
OF ACADEMIC TEACHERS
OF UNIVERSITY OF RZESZOW**

1. The code of ethics of the academic community of the University of Rzeszow is based on respect for universal ethical principles: truth, justice, honesty, reliability, tolerance, freedom, responsibility, kindness, loyalty.
2. Adhering to ethical principles, reliability and objectivity in interpersonal relations and in science standards, as well as good practices, is the foundation of proper functioning of the University of Rzeszow as a trustworthy social institution forming intellectual elites.
3. Academics are aware of their special responsibility to society and harmoniously combine the continuous deepening of knowledge with a dignified attitude that promotes the Ethical and Civic virtues.
4. Scientific research undertaken at the University of Rzeszow is aimed at expanding the state of knowledge and it should not serve to particular personal or commercial purposes.
5. Academics shall maintain independence in their research and conduct from external influences and forms of pressure from institutions, individuals commissioning them to conduct research or expertise, and political, ideological and economic circles.
6. Conduct and scientific research and artistic creation are characterized by: reliability, credibility, criticality, meticulousness, diligence, and transparency in presenting research results.
7. Maintaining a special responsibility towards research objects, especially when they are living beings - they obey the applicable law, respect human dignity, protect animals, plants and the environment.
8. Academics respect and defend traditional academic freedoms: freedom of scientific research, freedom of expression, freedom of teaching and autonomy of the University.
9. They evaluate and review the work and achievements of other researchers fairly and honestly, they honestly indicate sources, honour and recognize participation in scientific achievements.
10. They constantly improve their competence and quality of teaching, ensure that the content of classes teaching corresponded to the current state of knowledge.
11. They are kind teachers, mentors and educators of students and young people - adepts of science, respect their right to free expression, evaluate reliably and fairly, based on transparent, uniform criteria, and strive to instill applicable ethical standards and norms.
12. Behaviour contrary to good practices of scientific work and artistic creativity should be considered all forms of harassment, discrimination and mobbing of colleagues, doctoral students or students, as well as protectionism while hiring new employees and not disclosing conflicts of interest.

GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICES

1. Analysis of risks and impacts prior to research activities.
2. Due diligence in the implementation of the study.
3. Confidentiality of data and results in accordance with applicable legal regulations.
4. Cost-effectiveness in the use of funds.
5. Taking care of employee safety.

6. Diligence in archiving and documenting research results and taking care of them security in accordance with the adopted regulations.
7. Obtaining approval from the appropriate committee when implementing studies requiring such regulations.
8. Autonomy, impartiality and full transparency in the case of cooperation with research sponsors with detailed provisions of the contracts about cooperation.
9. Care of the credibility of science in the public sphere based on own competence.

GOOD AUTHORIZING PRACTICES

1. Reliability, transparency, accuracy and verifiability of research results.
2. Authorship based on actual participation in research.
3. Indicating sources of research funding.
4. Zero tolerance and acceptance of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, unauthorized use of sources, results or studies.

DEFINITION OF AUTHOR AND AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Attribution of authorship entails scientific, social responsibility and can lead to financial and legal implications. Authorship must be treated as total responsibility for the published scientific work or created work of art (literary, music, art, film, theatre, etc.).

In order to facilitate unambiguous identification which of the contributors in the formation of the work should be the author, and which should not, use certain criteria, which are outlined below. Contributors to the work should understand what duties and responsibilities this entails.

1. A person may be considered the author of a scientific work or work of art who has contributed a original creative contribution and its activities have led to the creation of a perceived third parties and fit for use as a whole, which is a scientific work or a work of art.
2. Recognition of a person as an author first requires that the fact be shown creation of an object that meets the prerequisites of a scientific work or a work of art, on the other hand while the parties- establish the existence of a causal link between the activities of that person and the creation of a scientific work/work of art, with only these aspects in mind activities that can be attributed with the characteristics of creative and individual contributions.
3. The author of a work of art is therefore a person who has expressed within a certain unity creative elements that did not previously exist, such as the shape and layout of a painting or musical work of art.
4. The author of an article or scientific monograph shall be considered the person who made the selection of the components and put them in order, conducted research and analysis according to its concept, assuming there is a choice of other components or order them differently under conditions of non-determination of choice by factors independent of that person.
5. The name of author and co-author can only be attributed to the person who is the source of the elements of a creative nature. The fact that the creative activity of a person led to the creation of a scientific work or work of art can be said then, when that person has contributed an essential element in the formation of the whole, and when that element

without the unity, as well as the whole without this part do not have the independent attribute of a scientific work or artwork.

6. In the case of multi-author works, in order to avoid conflicts arising from the usurpation of labour rights or any conflict of interest task authors is a fair determination of their contribution to the work.
7. Corresponding author is always the person who takes primary responsibility for the work presented, and contacts the publisher on matters concerning every aspect related to the publication of the result. It provides all the necessary permits, agreements, approvals and is responsible for the completeness of the documentation. Some of these responsibilities can be ceded to other co-authors.
8. Corresponding author should be available throughout the publication process of the work, as well as after its publication, especially in terms of responding to criticism. If warranted, he should make available data related to the publication and provide, if required, additional information. It is recommended that the corresponding author, in the event that work-related questions arose, sent out the entire related correspondence to all its co-authors.

GOOD REVIEWING AND OPINION PRACTICES

1. Resigning to perform reviews or opinions beyond one's own competence.
2. Resigning to perform a review or opinion in case of conflict of interest (between other non-professional ties to members of committees and panels that allocate funds, financial, ownership and managerial relationships with contracting companies services and research).
3. Reliability, accuracy, objectivity, honesty and confidentiality in the preparation of reviews and opinions.

UNRELIABILITY IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND ARTISTIC CREATION

1. Academic teacher is guided by principles of integrity, respects norms related to copyright and intellectual property in scientific research and artistic creation and in the dissemination of their results. They oppose all attempts to falsification and fabrication of the results of scientific research and artistic creation, including misappropriating other people's achievements.
2. The most important behaviors contrary to the ethics of a scientist include fabricating and falsifying research results and committing plagiarism, as well as drafting unreliable reviews.
3. Fabrication of research results shall be understood as inventing them and presenting them as real. It is unacceptable to pose as experiments, observations or modify the data in a manner consistent with the prediction of the research hypothesis.
4. Falsification of test results amounts to altering or omitting inconvenient data. They are also any methodological abuses involving the manipulation of the data and the research hypothesis, and in the development of a scientific publication, the lack of a conscientious discussion of the results.
5. Committing plagiarism involves appropriating someone else's views, research results or concepts without properly citing the source, as well as deliberately omitting to cite the other people's or one's own works. Plagiarism is committed by the one who appropriates someone else's work or a fragment of it, regardless of its size, by completely omitting the information about the source or providing it in a form that does not allow for identification of borrowed elements. Such behaviour constitutes a violation of Intellectual property rights.

6. Conduct contrary to the principles of ethics of an academic staff shall be deemed to be preparation of unreliable reviews of doctoral dissertations, habilitation dissertations, applications for professor degrees and any applications for employment in scientific institutions, periodic evaluations of subordinates, as well as reviews of research projects. Violation of principles of scientific integrity is also the evasion of an opinion or its refusal, where the assessment, in the opinion of the assessor, should be negative.
7. Unacceptable behaviour in scientific research is the use of contributions of other people (colleagues, doctoral students, students) without subsequent reference to their co-authorship in the publication and to authorize co-authorship of individuals, who did not participate in the creation of the work.
8. Inappropriate behaviour includes failure to use research funds correctly. The ethical obligation incumbent on all participants in grant procedures (researchers submitting proposals, reviewers, and experts) is reliable, honest, competent and fair evaluation of submitted applications, as well as conscientious supervision of the execution of grant agreements and accountability completed projects.

RULES OF CONDUCT IN CASE OF DETECTION OF UNRELIABILITY

1. An academic staff member shall be subject to disciplinary liability for misconducting the duties or dignity of the profession. In particular, he is subject to disciplinary responsibility for committing acts contrary to the law and ethics professional.
2. All allegations of unreliability in the conduct of scientific and artistic research should be promptly and duly explained. In the situation of confirmation of the legitimacy of all facts and circumstances should be thoroughly investigated by the responsible persons indicated in the Statute of the University of Rzeszów for taking appropriate corrective and disciplinary actions.
3. Ethical violations committed by students should be promptly corrected by academic supervisors, Deans or the Vice President for Student Affairs and Education.
4. Procedure in cases of unreliability in the conduct of scientific research is defined in detail by the Law of July 20, 2018. Law on higher education and science and regulations approved by the Rector of the University of Rzeszow.