



Podgorica, 3 November 2010

ELECTIONS WITH LATENT AMBITIONS

Centre for Civic Education (CCE) expresses its concern over the continuing problems that the Faculty of Law is undergoing, and urges again the Rector Prof. dr Predrag Miranović, the Chairman of the Administration Board Prof. Zoran Rašović, and the Minister of Education and Science Slavoljub Stijepović to engage in the process of problems solving in this institution.

This especially applies to the latest problems related to the implementation and conduct of students elections, for which indications exist that their legitimacy is seriously threatened by the leadership of the faculty, especially the Dean Ranko Mujović.

Student elections which were scheduled for 11 November have even before the announcement turned into a battle of "for or against the Dean", thus losing its meaning. Elections at all faculty units and the University of Montenegro are scheduled for 11 November, and the students are choosing representatives of their academic year, as well as the student trustee within their faculty who will be delegated to represent the faculty in the Student Parliament of the University of Montenegro. The role of student representatives is to work on improvement of the student standards and the quality of academic live at their respective faculties, but also at the entire University of Montenegro, within their possibilities. Involvement of the faculty leadership in the autonomous right of students to choose their own representatives questions the expediency of the election from the perspective of students' interests and their protection.

Several students of the Faculty of Law have contacted the CCE stating that the dean Mujović is actively engaged in the process, beyond his mandate, trying to influence it. The CCE reminds that the Senate, at the latest session, made the decision by which student representatives have 5 seats in the Council, the highest authority at the faculty, which is precisely the reason that the Dean and certain employees are taking advantage of students for their self-interest which are threatened, making the right of students to their own choice meaningless. Therefore, it is clear the interest of the controversial Dean Mujović, who fills newspaper pages and additional features with scandals that are related to his work, to find "his" candidates for these elections, because the same could have potential to help with their votes to acquire a majority at the Faculty Council, where he has lost the support long before.





In addition, even some professors close to the Dean engaged themselves for the purpose of "their" students winning the election, which was confirmed by their support through various Internet social community groups, but also by other statements of students themselves.

These events represent merely a continuation of monthly long agony in which the Faculty Council has not been in session for a longer period of time, the Dean is acting inappropriately towards his opponents among the employees and students, and the State Audit Institution has found that the Faculty of Law's financial funds were spent for the benefit of individuals, who have already been the subject of numerous scandals.

Furthermore, the Faculty of Law doesn't comply with the law even in terms of providing information under the Law on Free Access to Information, and the public definitely needs to know what has recommended one of the assistants to be a member of 11 committees, based on which she has, in the past 3 years, received an income of more than 37,000 EUR.

A small number of students who nominated for election at the Faculty of Law represents a clear picture of students fear from "retaliation" in the event of nomination and publicly spoken word, as evidenced by the pressure that suffer those students who are nominated by the Students Council, which has denied support to the Dean Mujović at the Council's sessions.

Named persons need to, with their actions, prevent any further illegality that is damaging the University and the elections need to be conducted in a fair and transparent manner. Otherwise, the further silence will be interpreted as a sign of support for dishonorable actions in favor of those that support does not belong to, or to purposes contrary to the public interest.

Snežana Kaluđerović, Legal Advisor