

Lublin, 20 May 2016

Dr Piotr Tosiek
Department of Human Rights
Faculty of Political Science
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University

Summary of Professional Accomplishments

1. Name and surname: Piotr Tosiek.

2. Diplomas, scientific degrees with place and year of their obtaining and the title of doctoral thesis.

- (a) Scientific degree of doctor of humanities in the area of political science, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (UMCS), Faculty of Political Science, 24.03.2006, title of doctoral thesis: *Comitology Decision-Making in the European Community*, supervisor: Prof. dr hab. Grzegorz Janusz (till 2004 Prof. dr hab. Ziemowit Jacek Pietraś), reviewers: Prof. dr hab. Marek Pietraś (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University), Prof. dr hab. Zbigniew Czachór (Adam Mickiewicz University);
- (b) Professional title of master of law, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Faculty of Law and Administration, 26.03.2002, title of master thesis: *The European Parliament in the Institutional System of the European Union*, supervisor: Prof. dr hab. Ewa Gdulewicz;
- (c) Professional title of master of political science and social sciences (specialization: international relations), Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Faculty of Political Science, 19.04.1999, title of master thesis: *Inter-Party Relations in the European Parliament*, supervisor: Prof. dr hab. Ziemowit Jacek Pietraś;

3. Information on employment in academic institutions.

- (a) From 1.10.1999 – Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Faculty of Political Science (till 30.09.2006 assistant in Department of International Relations,; from 1.10.2006 till 30.09.2010 assistant professor in Department of International Relations; from

1.10.2010 till 30.11.2012 assistant professor in Department of Theory of Politics and Methodology of Political Science; from 1.12.2012 assistant professor in Department of Human Rights) – my constant basic workplace in terms of Polish act on higher education;

(b) From 1.10.2007 till 14.08.2014 (interrupted from 1.10.2011 till 30.09.2012) – Department of Political Science of the State School of Higher Professional Education (PWSZ) in Zamość (lecturer) – my additional workplace in terms of Polish act on higher education;

(c) From 1.10.2006 till 30.06.2007 – High School of Business in Radom (lecturer) – my additional workplace in terms of Polish act on higher education;

(d) In framework of civil contracts: National School of Public Administration KSAP (2008-2010), High School of Social and Technical Sciences in Radom (2009-2010), Inter-Academic Institute of Journalism and Social Sciences in Lublin (2009-2010), High School of Economy and Innovation in Lublin (2008-2009); High School of Entrepreneurship and Administration in Lublin (2003-2008).

4. Accomplishment in terms of Art. 16.2 of the Act of 14 March 2003 on scientific degrees and the scientific title and degrees and title in the area of arts (Dz. U. no. 65, 595, with amendments).

a. the title of scientific accomplishment, author, title of publication, year of publication, publisher's name.

Monograph: P. Tosiek, *Administracja rządowa państwa członkowskiego w organach przygotowawczych Rady Unii Europejskiej. Perspektywa politologiczna [The Governmental Administration of a Member State in Preparatory Bodies of the Council of the European Union. A Political Scientific Perspective]*, Lublin 2016, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press, pp. 493.

b. Elaboration of scientific goal of the above-mentioned work, its effects and possible utility.

There are five phenomena that create the reason for political scientific studies on governmental administration in preparatory bodies of the Council of the European Union. Firstly,

this subject is important from the viewpoint of political theories of European integration. It refers to identification of key features of the EU as an international organization with simultaneous intergovernmental, supranational and multilevel elements. Secondly, a great role in the research is played by the possibility of evaluation of real experience of the officials of Polish governmental administration after first years of Poland's EU membership. The experience connected with preparation and performance of Polish presidency in the Council also plays its role. Thirdly, the effects of research elaborated in the above-mentioned monograph can positively influence the progress of Polish and European research on political scientific aspects of the functioning of public administration. The empirical fragment of research allows to widen the perspective adopted by majority of Polish scholars exploring this problem. Fourthly, this work should be placed in intergovernmental stream of research on European integration that both in Poland and Europe seems to be underestimated. For many years the most important role in this research has been played by neo-functionalism and lastly it is dominated by constructivism. Fifthly, the original character of author's research should contribute to verification of previous views and state of the art: decision-making centres explored are usually found marginal but they exert a big real impact on political decisions.

In substantial terms the research encompasses four problems. The first and the general problem is the characterization of the EU decision-making system in respect of the balance between member states and the Union. Of the utmost importance is the analysis of the structure and functions of this system in view of theoretical approaches dominating the research on Council's preparatory bodies. The second problem is an internal structure of the Council of the European Union analysed from the viewpoint of decision-making centres composed of representatives of member states at the level of civil service officials. Both qualitative and quantitative dimensions of this phenomenon need to be explored. The third problem is the functioning of Council's preparatory bodies in the perspective of their impact on decisions adopted by the Council at ministerial level. The real way of preparation of positions and their subsequent consideration by political bodies are main analytical subjects. The fourth problem is the self-perception of the role of governmental administration in decision-making process in the Council by members of preparatory bodies. In empirical sphere the research on experience of Polish officials sitting in this organs had to be analysed.

The objective dimension of the work is fully reflected in monograph's title. In a logical sense it consists of four categories. The first is "governmental administration", i.e. the part of public administration directly subordinated to central state's government or governments of territorial units of a federal state. In case of Poland – a unitary state – the composition of gov-

ernmental administration includes the officials of ministries and central offices at national and regional levels, both subordinated to Polish Council of Ministers. In this perception the governmental administration is organically separated from the local self-governmental administration and the supranational administration. The governmental administration is an element of executive apparatus but at the same time it actively participates in shaping of directions of state's policies and preparation of legal instruments of their accomplishment (A.Z. Kamiński). In case of the EU member state the governmental administration represents the state externally by participation in supranational decision-making processes and takes part in making decisions binding to the whole Union. The second category is the "member state". The experience of all EU member states have been taken into account in the monograph. In prevailing part the distinctions among them have been ignored and the notion of an "abstract member state" has been proposed instead. The third category are "Council's preparatory bodies" understood identically with an approach to be found in legal language (e.g. the Council's rules of procedure). They create an intrinsic part of the most important intergovernmental legislative EU institution and are composed of representatives of member states at the level of civil service officials. Their main task is preparation of final decisions adopted at Council's ministerial level. The fourth category is "the perspective of political science" to be found at monograph's subtitle. The starting point of the reasoning is created by political theories of European integration rooted in theory of international relations and a political approach to empirical phenomena. The governmental administration is perceived as a part of member state's political system exercising the tasks delegated by centres of political power. Preparatory bodies are seen in this perspective as agents assisting the Council in making political decisions. It has to be underlined that perspectives of legal and administration sciences have been used in the monograph only marginally and supplementary (to present the full explanation of the political character of the phenomena analysed).

The monograph is based on three theoretical approaches. The first is the liberal-intergovernmentalist approach rooted in two well-developed and precise frameworks: the liberal intergovernmentalism elaborated by A. Moravcsik to analyse integration process in Europe in a general way and the principal-agent theory (PAT) rooted in economic research. The latter is used here as a supplementary point of view. The first approach is a state-centric one serving as a tool of explanation of the role of the state in EU decision-making system, the way of creation of states' positions and representation in international relations. The second approach is called "deliberative-supranationalist" and stems from the concept of deliberative supranationalism in version suggested by C. Joerges and J. Neyer. The most important ele-

ments of this concept come from the philosophy of law but the basic assumption is to create a “middle-range” framework focused on analysing objective and procedural dimensions of EU decision-making. The approach in this version is successfully used in explaining the activities of EU committee-style organs, including Council’s preparatory bodies. The third theoretical line used in the monograph is the “fusion approach” based on fusion theory proposed by W. Wessels and – supplementary – on theoretical analyses of Europeanization. This proposal is also perceived as a “middle-range” one aimed at explanation of structural evolution of the EU and the role of European integration in socialization processes. In the fusion approach the specific role is played by research on administrative integration and its effects on political processes.

At the background of the above-mentioned approaches the goal of the monograph is the qualification of the real role of member state’s governmental administration (perceived as a part of state’s political system) in decision-making in the Council of the European Union (perceived as the most important EU legislative institution). The first supplementary goal is – in the general perspective – the qualification of the role of the member state in EU decision-making system, while the second – in the perspective of own empirical research – the qualification of Poland’s role in this system.

The general thesis of the monograph is the view that basic role in decision-making in the Council is played by the interests of an abstractly understood member state, which is reflected not only at the stage of final decision-making but also in preparatory phase. The accomplishment of objectives rooted in state’s interests is the basis for both the structural and functional context of EU decision-making system activity. At the same time in both respects some concessions seemingly aimed at solutions taking into account the realization of all-European interest can be noticed.

Three research questions have been posed and three general hypotheses have been verified in the monograph. The substantial problem has been solved by the following questions: (a) what role in decision-making in Council’s preparatory bodies is played by the interests of an abstractly understood member state; (b) what kind of procedural model of decision-making prevails in Council’s preparatory bodies; (c) what role in decision-making in Council’s preparatory bodies is played by the all-European interest.

The hypotheses are based on theoretical approaches used in the monograph. In a logical form they look as follows: H1 – if the Council has a purely intergovernmental character (an independent variable stemming from the liberal-intergovernmentalist approach), decision-making in Council’s preparatory bodies is totally subordinated to member states’ interests; H2

– if decisions are to be substantially correct (an independent variable stemming from deliberative-supranationalist approach), the deliberative, i.e. based on essential and apolitical arguments, model of decision-making dominates in Council's preparatory bodies; H3 – if the Council is a hybrid institution (an independent variable stemming from the fusion approach), the all-European interest is included in decisions made by Council's preparatory bodies.

All the above-mentioned elements are reflected in the construction of the monograph. It is divided in two parts: the theoretical and the empirical one. Both consist of three chapters with three subchapters each. The division of all parts is consequently based on the criterion of substance. The first chapter includes an in-depth analysis of the liberal-intergovernmentalist approach in European integration research. The internal structure is based on extraction of three basic elements of this approach: states' preferences, international negotiations and institutions (the latter perceived as effects of interactions of preferences of states willing to negotiate). The second chapter consists of analysis of the deliberative-supranationalist approach with identification of three basic elements: deliberation, justification and legalization (the latter understood as creation of legal frameworks of deliberation). The third chapter encompasses the analysis of the fusion approach with internal structure based on three contexts: hybridity, evolution and Europeanization. The fourth chapter – initiating the empirical part of the monograph – deeply elaborates the methodological dimension of research on activity of member states' governmental administration in Council's preparatory bodies. The general methodological context (referring to analysis of the EU political system), the specific methodological context (referring directly to methods and techniques used in empirical research on Council's preparatory bodies) and the in-depth elaboration of methodology of author's own studies (on experience of Polish officials) are discussed. In the fifth chapter the cognitive dimension of activities of the organs analysed is elaborated. Two general contexts are identified here: the structural (referring to static relations of preparatory bodies with other decision-making centres and relations inside the preparatory bodies) and the functional one (pointing at the role of dynamic relations oriented on the effects of the activity of preparatory bodies). The last part of the chapter includes an analysis of the results of author's own empirical study. In the sixth chapter the evaluation of empirical data in view of theories adopted in a monograph is carried out. The structural and the functional contexts of the activity of preparatory bodies are discussed, while in both respects the reference to basic elements of theoretical approaches identified in the first chapter is made. The last part of the chapter consists of conclusions from author's own research and the verification of operational hypotheses presented in the fourth chapter.

The essential role in the monograph is played by methodological aspects. The assumptions on the *macro* level are connected with the above-mentioned theoretical approaches, which calls for the combination of methods used in comparative politics and methods used in international relations research. The main task of EU decision-making system is making decisions in the sphere of public policies, while international factors have decisive impact on those decisions. The latter can accelerate or delay integration processes and influence the policies by institutional changes. As an effect of variations in international relations new problems can be inserted into EU political agenda, while this agenda can contribute to inserting of new problems into state's internal policies and their transferring to EU level at another stage. In respect of the approach typical for international relations the abandoning of some basic assumptions must be taken into account, since there is no clear logical and legal distinction between "internal" and "international" spheres. Traditional imperatives of power and security are still valid but many aspects of international system (including the very perception of the EU) cannot be understood in terms of anarchy. The latter must be perceived as a "complicated system of governance". The differentiation between internal politics (order, state governing and development) and inter-state politics (war and conflict) proves more problematic. The present international system is featured with erosion of state power in many regions of the world and in many technical areas, which leads to the growing interdependence and the high "density" of inter-state institutions (A. Hurrell, A. Menon).

On the *meso* level the basic research method is the decisional analysis in the systemic variant identified by Z.J. Pietraś. The "system" is defined here as a unit composed of integrated elements creating a cohesive whole (integrity) able to maintain the equilibrium with its environment. The "system of political decision making" is a special model with five elements: decisional situation (entry), actor of decision, decision making process (intra-systemic conversion), political decision (exit), decision implementation (exit). The first element, the decisional situation, is a status of political reality that makes the actor of decision enforced to solve a problem. In case of the European Union the decisional situation is treated as a dependent variable being the function of activities of many players (member states, EU institutions and bodies, external actors). In fact this is an aggregate transnational situation linking domestic and international situations. The second element, the actor of decision, is defined as an object of political activity creating the subsystem that makes decisions on behalf of the political system and aims at maintaining the equilibrium with its environment. The European Union can be described as a system of multiple players (actors) building the institutional system. The third element, the decision making process, is a nexus of cause-effect relations inside the

actor of decision that are linked to the entry of the system, the structure of the actor and objectives of decision makers. In the European Union there are many formal and informal decision making patterns. The political decision, the fourth element, is an act of non-accidental choice of political activity or inactivity. Political decisions made at the level of the European Union have usually the form of legal acts directly applicable in member states. The decision implementation, the last element, can be defined as the process of fulfilling of decision's objectives by means of various and specifically created methods of activity. In the European Union the implementation is connected with incorporation of legal acts into member state legal systems. There are two patterns of implementation: an EU level and a member state level one.

In combination of the *macro* and the *meso* levels the assumption is made that the research on Council's preparatory bodies is not directly connected with any developed specific theory. According to F.M. Häge the confirmative and the explorative methodological approach to relation between theories and empirical research can be identified. The confirmative approach means that the student takes one or a few theories as granted, while empirical data are used to test the congruence of theory to reality. The deductive logics dominates here. On the other hand, the explorative approach connects deduction with induction: the student tests the theory in respect of its congruence first and then – in case of its inadequacy – modifies the theory to adapt it to real phenomena and events. This process can be repeated and often leads to creation of new theories. Thus the explorative approach in its essence includes the mutual adaptation of theory and evidence. In research on Council's preparatory bodies the quantitative analysis should create the starting point. This allows to find an initial description of reality (and is a confirmative element) and facilitates the selection of problems analysed in further qualitative analysis.

On the *micro* level the ground for conclusions is an explorative methodological approach based on comparative analysis. In the monograph this can be seen in exploitation of results of previous research and in conducting author's own empirical study. The first part of the latter – the quantitative one – is based on Internet questionnaire encompassing the group of officials of Polish governmental administration taking part in activities of Council's preparatory bodies. The questionnaire has been sent to officials working in Poland and participating in sittings on basis of one- or two-day delegations, as well as to officials working in Poland's Permanent Representation in Brussels. The results of the questionnaire have been supplemented by in-depth qualitative interviews with representatives of Polish government in Council's preparatory bodies. The interviewees have been encouraged to freely discuss their experience.

From a general viewpoint the quantitative and qualitative analyses have been made to identify basic structural and functional features of Council's preparatory bodies. In a structural respect the research was aimed at explanation of the following specific elements: (a) composition of the bodies analysed, including the representation of non-state subjects; (b) frequency of changes in the composition; (c) balance of representation of respective states; (d) size of delegations of respective states; (e) recurrence of the composition of various decision-making centres; (f) stability of the composition of preparatory bodies; (g) creation of personal ties; (h) the level of member states' representation in preparatory bodies; (i) co-operation with other decision-making centres and the probability of creation of networks. In a functional respect the research was aimed at explanation of the following specific elements: (a) way of making decisions in Council's preparatory bodies; (b) qualitative features of formal and informal procedures; (c) frequency of sittings; (d) duration of sittings; (e) agenda of sittings; (f) time needed to adopt final solutions; (g) impact of other decision-making centres on shaping the final solutions; (h) impact of respective states on final solutions; (i) creation of inter-state and interinstitutional coalitions. As the basis for the monograph has been the literature and own research, the analysis of documents and statistical analysis have been used only in a limited way. The first has been applied to analyse legal regulations of the functioning of Council's preparatory bodies at the level of EU primary and secondary law, while the latter – to elaboration of strictly cognitive dimension of results of empirical research.

The essential role in the monograph is played by results of own empirical study made by the author in 2013. The goal of this research was the pioneer analysis of attitudes and behaviours of Polish governmental officials and the comparison with results of previous research made by other scholars from 1993 in Western Europe with pointing at similarities/differences and the possible continuity of phenomena empirically analysed. Author's own research has been conducted in the framework of individual research project financed by Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (then National Science Centre NCN) entitled *Committee-Style Decision-Making Centres in the European Union: the Experience of Polish Governmental Administration* (NN 116 191139). The part referring to theoretical questions results from research connected with realization of the first part of individual research project financed by the National Science Centre NCN entitled *The Member State in Decision-Making System of the European Union. Case of Poland* (2014/13/B/HS5/01308).

The verification of hypotheses presented in the monograph allows to assume that the first of them (stemming from the liberal-intergovernmentalist approach) has been confirmed. The activity of national officials is subordinated to accomplishment of states' interests, while the

relative power of states is taken into account in negotiations. The most important role is played by the interest of the state as abstractly understood. Decisions are usually made in a consensual manner allowing to include the interests of a maximal number of (or even all) member states and makes the identification of losers impossible. The consensual mode of decision-making points at frequent usage of strategic behaviours by member states complying the institutional durability of EU decision-making system.

The second hypothesis (stemming from deliberative-supranationalist approach) has not been confirmed. National officials representing member states have great knowledge at their disposal, being usually prominent experts (in their state's scale) but their background is subordinated to state's interests. A purely deliberative model of decision-making does not exist in Council's preparatory bodies, while some elements of this model can be seen in internal discussions conducted by groups of states. Most often such groups are composed of states not directly interested in results of negotiations and shape of final solutions, since they do not have clear interests in the sphere given. The discussion is dominated by states with such interests or (rarely) by representatives of supranational institutions.

The third hypothesis (stemming from the fusion approach) in principle has not been confirmed but the full analysis of this problem depends on defining of the "all-European interest". The majority of theoretical assumptions as well as the political practice do not allow to identify any substantial (material) all-European interest resulting from the aggregation of interests of all member states or being an independent supranational interest. In this perspective the hypothesis has been surely negatively verified. However, the all-European interest can be analysed in purely formal (procedural) categories. It is then understood as "*meta-interest*", i.e. the willingness of member states to accomplish their particular interests. The model of decision-making in Council's preparatory bodies is based on taking into account of an all-European interest perceived in this way. As a such it is not inconsistent with an interest of a member state as abstractly understood, being – on the contrary – its direct consequence.

The results of research allow to present six general groups of conclusions. The first group refers to the liberal-intergovernmentalist approach to integration processes where dominating EU political actors are member states' governments willing to fulfil their preferences articulated by essential intra-state (mostly economic) interest groups. States' positions represented at the EU level reflect requests stemming from state's level, while during inter-state negotiations in the Council the governments have some free hand resulting from the lack of direct control by other actors of intra-state politics. This freedom allows them to manipulate over internal state environment and further strengthen their status in national politics. EU negotia-

tions are held in the framework of institutions rooted in inter-state agreements (having at the same time some decisional autonomy), which makes member states have at their disposal the skills of mobility in a complex international environment. The most important EU decision-making centres are intergovernmental institutions, while the Council is the head EU legislator. Decisions of the Council's ministerial level result from earlier decisions made in its preparatory bodies. There is a strong politico-administrative feedback here, since officials attending the sittings of those bodies fulfil only a non-autonomous function of agents of their political principals.

The second group of conclusions stems from the deliberative-supranationalist approach to European integration analysis. Decision-making processes are here aimed at efficient accomplishment of results effective for the whole EU political system. Efficiency and effectiveness – the central categories from this viewpoint – make the open discussion based on rational arguments the basic feature of EU negotiations, including the Council. The deliberative character of the decision-making process does not need to be equal with participation of all subjects interested in the shape of final decisions, since the sufficient condition of high quality of the final effect is the potential possibility of using the all arguments substantially justified. The need to justify is more important than democratic representation of social views. Democracy is not a necessary condition featuring the EU political system that does not have the characteristics of the state. The democratic character of main actors of deliberation (i.e. member states) results in transparency of procedures at the EU level. The only effective solution is a developed legal regulation of formal dimension of political decision-making. An essential role in the process of accomplishment of beneficial substantial results is played by officials representing the governments of member states in Council's preparatory bodies. Their representative function is here of minor importance, since their expertise is more decisive.

The third group of conclusions results from the fusion approach to European integration. The crucial context here is the perception of the EU as a hybrid organization dynamically merging intergovernmental, supranational and multilevel elements. This is reflected not only in immanent EU features but also in its decision-making system encompassing both political and strictly administrative institutions and bodies. The elements of fusion are seen in the lack of unequivocal separation of administrative and political spheres as well as in exposure of the whole EU political system to evolutionary processes. The evolution – as a sustainable process stemming from concurrent needs – results in adaptation of the system to actual decisional situations defined substantially and formally. The goal of evolution is not undisputedly settled but the progress seems to deepen the “fusion” characteristics of the system aiming at weaken-

ing of impact of the state as traditionally understood. The important element of evolution is a permanent mutual adaptation of respective ingredients of decision-making system, which is called the Europeanization. It is not only the political system of the state as abstractly understood but also the EU political system that are subject to that phenomenon. One of the most important elements of the “fusion” EU political system is created by Council’s preparatory bodies, in which the officials being the part of national political systems participate in sittings of the institution that makes decisions binding internationally. The possible transfer of loyalties from state to EU level is becoming the challenge there.

The fourth group of conclusions refers to methodological dimension of research on member state’s governmental administration in Council’s preparatory bodies. The latter are the fragment of the EU decision-making system that as a such is posing a challenge to students of political processes. The EU decision-making system with its effects does not have features typical for international organizations and – at the same time – is not to be characterized in strict categories of the state. State’s European policy is – together with internal and foreign policies – the third element of basic state activity. The research on decision-making processes at the interface of the state and the Union requires the usage of methodological tools stemming from both comparative politics and international relations. This is actual also in case of Council’s preparatory bodies acting directly at this interface. Research questions and hypotheses must take into account the specific characteristics of this organs and – dependent on theoretical perspective accepted – underline their intergovernmental or supranational features. Given the closed process of decision-making in the Council, the only possibility to deeply analyse it must be based on quantitative and qualitative research rooted in direct contact with participants of the decision-making process. However, their attitudes are subjective, which requires that research is made on relatively big or medium samples.

The fifth group of conclusions refers to strictly cognitive dimension of activities of Council’s preparatory bodies. The most important in this respect is an in-depth analysis of their structure and functioning. The research on the structural context allows to conclude that political decision-making in the Council at the level of civil service officials is featured with a strong impact of relations of the Council with other EU institutions and bodies, including the Commission and the European Parliament. It is characterized by co-operation between representatives of governmental administrations with various levels of officials and politicians representing supranational institutions. Decisions made in preparatory bodies have great impact on final decisions made at ministerial level. Creating of inter-state and interinstitutional coalitions requires the specific working atmosphere based on taking into account of interests of

many political actors. This has some influence on shaping the views and attitudes of national officials but does not result in weakening of their national loyalties. The research on the functional context allows to identify three main functions of preparatory bodies influencing the role played in them by member state's governmental administration. The primary function refers to representation by national officials of state's interests (in substantial terms) and their political principals (in objective terms). The next and related function is connected with negotiations and the willingness to make decisions including interests of all or main political actors. The characteristics of preparatory bodies is also the strategic approach to consensus as the main mechanism of making the final decisions. The last function is connected with Europeanization of both national and supranational officials. This process is understood as creating and usage of joint patterns of decision-making process and does not include the convergence of substantial (material) interests.

The sixth group of conclusions is connected with evaluation of activities of Council's preparatory bodies and the role played in them by governmental administrations at the background of three theoretical approaches used in the monograph. The analysis of the structural context allows to identify some analytical directions related to each of three approaches but the main part of conclusions in this sphere is tied with fusion and liberal-intergovernmentalist approaches. Preparatory bodies have essential intergovernmental features expressed in a strong inclusion in Council's structure, imperative representation of states' interests and creating of coalitions based purely on those interests. Decision-making style, with some deliberative and technocratic elements, points at the existence of important fusion features leading to *quasi*-supranationalism of some ingredients of Council's structure, perception of preparatory bodies as essential elements of administrative integration, multidimensional internal structure of the Council, participation of preparatory bodies in decisional networks, as well as the limited (with no loyalty transfer) socialization of national officials. The analysis of the functional context can be made by categories of each of three theoretical approaches. However, analytical instruments of liberal-intergovernmentalist approach and the fusion approach allow to analyse two functions (representation and negotiations or representation and Europeanization, respectively), while deliberative-supranationalist instruments are useful in case of one function only (negotiation). The more general conclusion can be stated as follows: the most congruent to reality and best-suited to explain the phenomenon of activity of governmental administration in Council's preparatory bodies is the liberal-intergovernmentalist approach, the lesser congruence offers the fusion approach and the least useful is the deliberative-supranationalist approach. Own empirical study has confirmed the existence of the dilemma

of ambiguity of conclusions and made the author suggest another methodological approach. It should be based on the designation of different scopes of respective approaches and the attempt of creation of the conjunctive approach encompassing some elements of each of the starting-point approaches (new vision is called the “deliberative intergovernmental fusion”).

The general thesis of the monograph is the view that the basic role in decision-making in the Council is played by the interests of an abstractly understood member state. The results of the research confirm that view. Even at the stage of preparation of decisions eventually made at ministerial level the interests of member states create the substantial axis of negotiations. The structure and the functioning of Council’s preparatory bodies are subordinated to the accomplishment of goals resulting from member state’s interests. In the negotiations the states take into account the all-European interest as understood in formal respect only.

The results of research presented in the monograph can be used in both theoretical and practical terms. Theoretically, three important research postulates connected with activities of governmental administration in Council’s preparatory bodies must be mentioned. The first of them is the necessity of continuation of empirical research. Research teams that divide their duties in theoretical and empirical analysis should be appointed. The objective is exploring the great number of officials allowing to achieve relatively objective results. The second postulate is expansion of data bases consisting of large amount of information on activities of Council’s preparatory bodies. Those bases should include not only the results of questionnaires and interviews but also decisions resulting from the activities of the Council and other institutions co-operating in legislative process (the Commission and the European Parliament). The tactical goal is to allow to reconstruct in a possibly best way the progress of decision-making process in selected cases, while the strategic goal is to create a totally open base to be used by scholars to contribute to theoretical conclusions. The third postulate is connected with necessity of developing the theoretical approaches. The activities of Council’s preparatory bodies cannot be seen as limitation: their analysis should create the starting point to the evolution of existing and creation of new theories of European (or international) integration. In respect of new theories in methodological sense two main ways of the realization of this postulate can be noticed. The first is the foundation of new approaches on existing theories and attempts to create conjunctive or even eclectic approaches. The second way is an experiment with completely new approaches based on developing theories of international relations, strictly political scientific theories and theories stemming from other human and social sciences (S. Princen).

In practical dimension it has to be recalled that the monograph is based on author's own empirical study including the real (and not only normative) elements of problems analysed. Such research is made in European scientific institutions and – to a lesser extent – in Poland, while the results of research presented in the monograph can be added to the wide scientific circulation of ideas and serve as a starting point to further empirical studies. The practical value of the monograph is in principle secondary but author's experience in training the officials during courses organized by the National School of Public Administration (KSAP) and the Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) – including the Presidency corps – allows to conclude that the fragments of the monograph can be used to improve the performance of Polish officials. There is a feedback here between scientific activity in social sciences and political and administrative practice. Politicians and officials have at their disposal the professional experience that is difficult to translate into scientific language and then, again, into praxeology. The co-operation between those two groups is for sure a desirable social phenomenon that widens the horizons of their reflections.

5. Elaboration of other scientific and research accomplishments.

In quantitative terms my academic achievements after obtaining the doctor degree include (with a habilitation book) 40 published positions: 3 author monographs, 1 co-author monograph, 1 edited monograph, 3 co-edited monographs, 22 book chapters (1 co-author), 5 articles in scientific periodicals and 5 other positions (conference articles, analyses and reviews). The 14 of these works have been published in English: 1 author monograph, 2 co-edited monographs, 6 book chapters, 1 article in a scientific periodical and 4 others. Additionally, 3 book chapters (in Polish) have been admitted to printing. According to *Publish or Perish* base (as at 9 May 2016) my h-index is 3, while the number of publications in the base is 19 and the number of citations – 24.

In substantial terms my scientific and research activity was focused in this time on three areas: (a) the functioning of the EU political system; (b) the position of the member state in EU decision-making system; (c) the role of public administration in EU decision-making system. My research can be clearly situated in the field of European studies being the part of political science. In some cases a limited role is played by secondary application of the perspective of legal studies.

In the first area (the functioning of the EU political system) the academic works concerning the following research problems should be underlined:

- (a) constitutive features of the EU political system (*The European Union after the Treaty of Lisbon – Still a Hybrid Legal and Political System*, [in:] *Beyond Borders. External Relations of the European Union*, ed. by J. Janczak, Poznan 2008, Faculty of Political Science and Journalism Press, AMU, pp. 127-140; *Demokratyczna perspektywa systemu Unii Europejskiej [Democratic Perspective of the European Union System]*, [in:] *Europa XXI wieku. Perspektywy i uwarunkowania integracji europejskiej [Europe of the 21st Century. Perspectives and Factors of European Integration]*, ed. by M. Musiał-Karg, Poznan 2007, Faculty of Political Science and Journalism Press, AMU, pp. 33-45; article admitted to printing: *Przyszłość Unii Europejskiej – model międzyrządowy, deliberatywny czy fuzyjny? [The Future of the European Union – the Intergovernmental, Deliberative or Fusion Model?]*, Sejm Publishing House);
- (b) external aspects of the functioning of the EU political system (*Wewnętrzny model rządzenia a pozycja Unii Europejskiej w stosunkach międzynarodowych [Internal Model of Governance and the Position of the European Union in International Relations]*, [in:] *Plaszczyzny integracji europejskiej [Perspectives of European Integration]*, ed. by A. Doliwa-Klepacka, Ostrowiec Świętokrzyski 2009, Nauka-Edukacja-Rozwój Publishing House, pp. 61-78; the extended English version of this article: *Democratic Governance in the European Union – Model for the United States?*, [in:] *Quo Vadis America? Conceptualizing Change in American Democracy*, ed. by B. Szklarski, Frankfurt am Main 2011, Peter Lang Verlag, pp. 209-225);
- (c) continuity and discontinuity of the EU political system (*Dynamika kryzysu Unii Europejskiej. Proba analizy systemowej [The Dynamics of the European Union's Crisis. A Systemic Analysis Attempt]*, [in:] *Teoria i praktyka stosunków międzynarodowych. Dziedzictwo intelektualne Profesora Ziemowita Jacka Pietrasia [Theory and Practice of International Relations. Intellectual Heritage of Professor Ziemowit Jacek Pietras]*, ed. by M. Pietras, H. Dumala, B. Surmacz, A. Zietek, Lublin 2014, UMCS Press, pp. 425-437; *Deliberatywna fuzja międzyrządowa – (post-)kryzysowe podejście w badaniach integracji europejskiej [Deliberative Intergovernmental Fusion – a (Post-)Crisis Approach in European Integration Research]*, „Rocznik Integracji Europejskiej” 2014, no. 8, pp. 213-224);
- (d) the functioning of institutional elements of the EU political system (*Parlament Europejski. Prawo i polityka [The European Parliament. Law and Politics]*, Lublin

2007, UMCS Press, pp. 162 [with M. Wicha]; *Europejska inicjatywa obywatelska. Analiza prawno-politologiczna [European Citizens' Initiative. A Legal and Political Analysis]*, [in:] *Europa Srodkowo-Wschodnia w procesie transformacji i integracji. Wymiar spoleczny [Central-East Europe in the Process of Transformation and Integration. A Social Dimension]*, ed. by H. Chalupczak, M. Pietras, E. Pogorzala, Zamosc 2013, Officina Simonidis, pp. 59-80).

The research in the first area has been consequently connected with intergovernmentalism and its results have been noticed in Polish and international literature. The book chapter on “intergovernmental hybridity” of the legal and political system of the EU after the Treaty of Lisbon has been repeatedly cited (e.g. in: *The EU's Lisbon Treaty: Institutional Choices and Implementation*, ed. by F. Laursen, Farnham-Burlington 2012, Ashgate, pp. 328). I was also invited to prepare a peer review for “Journal of European Integration” and a review for “West European Politics”. The conclusions from this part of research can be summarized as follows: (a) the structural and functional model of the EU political system is relatively stable and resistant to crises; (b) the unequivocally federal direction of reforms of this system is not apparent; (c) EU democratic deficit is a constant and non-negative feature of this system; (d) intergovernmental theories of integration and concepts of differentiated integration should be combined with each other; (e) a new conjunctive approach called the “deliberative intergovernmental fusion” should be proposed and further analysed.

In the second research area (the position of the member state in EU decision-making system) the following academic works should be mentioned:

- (a) the feedback between states' political practice and creating and development of theoretical approaches to European integration (*Panstwo w systemie Unii Europejskiej [The State in the System of the European Union]*, “*Politologia i Stosunki Miedzynarodowe*” 2007, no. 2, pp. 115-128; *Germany's European Policy in the 21st Century in the Light of Liberal Intergovernmentalism*, Warszawa 2013, Natolin European Centre Press, pp. 253 – Polish and English version);
- (b) the formal and the real role of new member states after 2004 and 2007 enlargements (*Nowe panstwa czlonkowskie w systemie instytucjonalnym Unii Europejskiej [New Member States in the Institutional System of the European Union]*, [in:] *Europa Srodkowo-Wschodnia w procesie transformacji i integracji. Wymiar polityczny [Central-East Europe in the Process of Transformation and Integration. A Political Dimension]*, ed. by H. Chalupczak, M. Pietras, P. Tosiek, Zamosc 2010, Officina Simonidis, pp. 433-451; *Challenges of Europeanization in New EU Member States*, [in:] *European*

Integration. Models, Challenges, Perspectives, ed. by H. Chalupczak, J. Misiagiewicz, P. Tosiek, Zamosc 2012, Officina Simonidis, pp. 169-183; article admitted to printing: *Polska w Unii Europejskiej – lider regionalny czy panstwo peryferyjne? [Poland in the European Union – Regional Leader or Peripheral State?]*, PWSZ Gorzow Wlkp. Publishing House);

- (c) the legal dimension of state's functioning in the EU with the analysis of possibilities of strengthening this position (*Prawne gwarancje pozycji panstwa czlonkowskiego w systemie decyzyjnym Unii Europejskiej [Legal Guarantees of the Position of Member State in the Decision-Making System of the European Union]*, [in:] *Unia Europejska po Traktacie z Lizbony. Pierwsze doswiadczenia i nowe wyzwania [The European Union after the Treaty of Lisbon. First Experiences and New Challenges]*, ed. by P. Tosiek, Lublin 2012, UMCS Press, pp. 27-51; *Traktat z Lizbony w swietle orzecznictwa Trybunalu Konstytucyjnego RP w sprawach europejskich [The Treaty of Lisbon at the Background of the Case-Law of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Poland in European Matters]*, [in:] *Unia Europejska po Traktacie...*, pp. 99-127; article admitted to printing: *Bezpieczenstwo panstw czlonkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Wymiar konstytucyjny [Security of the Member States of the European Union. A Constitutional Dimension]*, Officina Simonidis);
- (d) possibilities of using the formal position of the state in time of its Council's presidency to accomplishment of its interests (*Apolityczna prezydencja Polski w Radzie Unii Europejskiej [Apolitical Poland's Presidency in the Council of the European Union]*, [in:] *Prezydencja Polski w Radzie Unii Europejskiej. Bilans osiagniec [Poland's Presidency in the Council of the European Union. Achievements' Overview]*, ed. by S. Konopacki, Torun 2012, Adam Marszalek Publishing House, pp. 37-56; *State's Influence on EU's Policy: the Case of Polish Presidency*, [in:] *European Integration. Models, Challenges, Perspectives*, ed. by H. Chalupczak, J. Misiagiewicz, P. Tosiek, Zamosc 2012, Officina Simonidis, pp. 133-150; *Wewnetrzne polityczne uwarunkowania przygotowania i wykonania prezydencji [Internal Political Conditions of the Preparation and Implementation of the Presidency]*, [in:] *Prezydencja w Unii Europejskiej. Praktyka i teoria [Presidency in the European Union. Practice and Theory]*, ed. by A. Nowak-Far, Warszawa 2011, SGH Press, pp. 249-285);
- (e) methodological aspects of the research on member state's position in the EU decision-making system (*Poland in the EU Decision-Making System. Linking the Perspectives of Law and Political Science*, [in:] *Poland in the European Union. Ten Years of Active*

Membership, ed. by H. Chalupczak, E. Pogorzala, P. Tosiek, Zamosc 2014, Officina Simonidis, pp. 27-36).

Main conclusions from the research in the second area reflect, again, the acceptance of intergovernmental approach and can be summarized as follows: (a) the relative politico-economic position of the state is the main factor of its impact on EU decisions; (b) there exists the mechanism of “self-restraints” of bigger states in decision-making process in institutions and bodies of the European Union; (c) an abstract functional pattern of member state’s behaviour in the EU decision-making system can be identified; (d) there is an empirical evidence that new member states are being incorporated into EU decision-making system in a durable process; (e) the contradictions between declared and real goals of states’ European policies can be identified.

The activity in the third research area (the role of public administration in EU decision-making system) allows to identify the following main paths:

- (a) an in-depth and updated elaboration of the phenomenon of comitology (the book based on extended and updated doctoral thesis: *Komitologia. Szczegolny rodzaj decydowania politycznego w Unii Europejskiej [Comitology. A Specific Type of Political Decision-Making in the European Union]*, Lublin 2007, UMCS Press, pp. 389);
- (b) the reform of comitology after entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon and the general regulation of 2011 (*Delegacja uprawnień w systemie decyzyjnym Unii Europejskiej – komitologia a reforma instytucjonalna [Delegation of Powers in the Decision-Making System of the European Union – Comitology and Institutional Reform]*, [in:] *Unia Europejska w XXI wieku. Polityczno-prawna wspólnota interesów [The European Union in the 21st Century. Politico-legal Community of Interests]*, ed. by R. Riedel, Torun 2010, Adam Marszalek Publishing House, pp. 55-77; *Komitologia – wyzwanie dla prezydencji Rady? Analiza prawno-politologiczna [Comitology – a Challenge for the Council Presidency? A Legal and Political Analysis]*, [in:] *Prezydencja w Unii Europejskiej. Praktyka i teoria [Presidency in the European Union. Practice and Theory]*, ed. by A. Nowak-Far, Warszawa 2011, SGH Press, pp. 327-433);
- (c) the structure and functioning of “non-comitology” committee-style EU bodies (*Komitetowe ośrodki decyzyjne w pierwszym filarze Unii Europejskiej [Committee-Style Decision-Making Bodies in the First Pillar of the European Union]*, “Facta Simonidis” 2008, no. 1, pp. 67-84; *Making Public Policy in EU Committees: the Role of Polish National Officials*, “The Copernicus Journal of Political Studies” 2014, issue 2 (6), pp. 168-187);

(d) the role of governmental administration at the level of officials in decision-making of EU institutions and bodies (*Polska administracja rządowa w systemie decyzyjnym Unii Europejskiej. Metodologia projektu badawczego [Polish Governmental Administration in Decision-Making System of the European Union. Methodology of the Research Project]*, [in:] *Metodologia badan europejskich [Methodology of Research on Europe]*, ed. by K. A. Wojtaszczyk, T. Kownacki, Warsaw 2011, Aspra-JR Publishing House, pp. 153-172; *Wspolpraca administracji rządowych panstw czlonkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Delegacja czy europeizacja? [Cooperation of Governmental Administrations of Member States of the European Union. Delegation or Europeanization?]*, [in:] *Europeizacja polityk publicznych w Polsce [Europeanization of Public Policies in Poland]*, ed. by R. Riedel, Opole 2015, University of Opole Press, pp. 95-109).

Activity in the third area allowed me to be perceived as expert in a relatively narrow field of comitology. I was included to the team of experts invited by the National School of Public Administration (KSAP) and the Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) to train the officials of Polish governmental administration (also in the framework of preparation of Poland's Council presidency). Analytical effort has been here translated into politico-administrative practice. The evolution of research led to the extension of my interests to areas beyond the comitology and increase of interest in the field of empirical research on widely understood role of officials belonging to governmental administration in EU decision-making process, which is crowned by the habilitation book. In strictly scientific terms the conclusions in this area can be summarized as follows: (a) public administration of member states, including governmental administration, is a key element of the EU "amalgamate administration" consisting also supranational officials; (b) the majority of decisions made in EU (also supranational) institutions result from the impact of apolitical officials representing member states; (c) the autonomy of those officials in relation to politicians needs further research; (d) EU institutional reforms do not diminish the role of national officials; (e) an in-depth analysis of an administrative dimension of European integration leads to re-thinking of dominating theoretical approaches.

The special case is my analytical publication concerning the security of information systems in Europe (*Bezpieczenstwo systemow informatycznych w Europie. Wymiar prawny [Security of Information Systems in Europe. A Legal Dimension]*, [in:] *Haktywizm (cyberterrorizm, haking, protest obywatelski, cyberaktywizm, e-mobilizacja) [Hacktivism (Cyberterrorism, Hacking, Civil Protest, Cyberactivism, E-Mobilization)]*), ed. by M. Marczevska-Rytko, Lublin 2014, UMCS Press, pp. 51-82).

My academic activity in three above-mentioned areas has been connected with research projects financed by Polish and foreign institutions, as well as the realization of study visits. After obtaining the doctor degree my most important achievements in this respect are:

- (a) an individual grant of Polish National Science Centre NCN (OPUS 7) for years 2015-2017 entitled "The Member State in the EU Decision Making System. The Example of Poland" (grant no. 2014/13/B/HS5/01308);
- (b) an individual grant of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland for years 2010-2013 entitled "Committee-Style Decision-Making Bodies in the European Union. Experience of Polish Governmental Administration" (grant no. N N 116 191139);
- (c) participation in the grant of Polish National Science Centre NCN (OPUS 7) for years 2015-2017 entitled "The Analysis of Polish European Policy 2004-2014. Assumptions, Actors, Challenges and Evaluation", grant leader: Prof. dr hab. Zbigniew Czachór, Adam Mickiewicz University (grant no. 2014/13/B/HS5/01942);
- (d) participation in the grant of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland for years 2008-2011 entitled "Polish Presidency 2011", grant leader: Prof. dr hab. Artur Nowak-Far, Warsaw School of Economics (grant no. N N110110 336 MNiSW);
- (e) an individual grant of the Natolin European College (*European Laboratory Programme*) – research in the European University Institute, Florence, July-August 2012;
- (f) a didactic grant (with a research element) of the European Union in the *Jean Monnet Programme* for years 2011-2013; European Module "European Union in the 21st Century. Summer School for Teachers" (grant no. 176532-LLP-1-2010-1-PL-AJM-MO) – grant supervisor (with Irma Slomczynska and Pawel Frankowski as co-executives);
- (g) an individual didactic grant (with a research element) of the European Commission in the *Jean Monnet Programme* for years 2003-2006; European Module „The European Parliament in the Institutional System of the European Union" (grant no. C03/0014);
- (h) an individual grant of Deputy Rector of Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in 2008: "Democracy in the European Union after the Lisbon Treaty. Legal and Political Dimension";
- (i) participation in the grant of the Scholarship and Training Fund for 2010 – cooperation with the University of Iceland, Reykjavik, grant leader: Paweł Frankowski (grant no. FSS/2009/II/D1/W/0008);

- (j) reviewing – as external expert – of scientific projects of National Science Centre (NCN): 3 projects in PRELUDIUM and SONATA programmes in 2013;
- (k) periodic one-week study visits in the Institute of Political Science of Westphalian Wilhelm University in Münster (2006-2008).

Initial and final results of my research have been repeatedly discussed and evaluated during international and national scientific conferences. After obtaining the doctor degree I participated with presentation in 46 scientific conferences, including 26 international events (7 of them were held abroad). To the most important conferences belong:

- (a) 14-15.06.2008 – “Global Conflict. Cooperation and Integration. Eighth International CISS Millennium Conference”, Paris (F), international conference organised by Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Section – International Studies Association, Auburn Montgomery, presentation: “The European Union as a Sui Generis Actor in International Relations”;
- (b) 25-27.09.2008 – “Fourth Pan-European Conference on EU Politics”, Riga (LV), international conference organised by the European Consortium for Political Research, Standing Group on the European Union, presentation: “The European Union after the Lisbon Treaty – Still an Intergovernmental System”;
- (c) 13-15.06.2009 – “Between Hopes and Shadows: Assessing the Global Order – Where We Have Been, Where We Are Now, Where We Are Going. Ninth International CISS Millennium Conference”, Potsdam (D), international conference organised by Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Section – International Studies Association, Auburn Montgomery, presentation: “The Member State in Decision-Making System of the European Union – Challenges of the Lisbon Treaty”, chairing of the panel;
- (d) 9-12.09.2009 – “Fifth ECPR General Conference”, Potsdam (D), international conference organised by the European Consortium for Political Research, presentation: “Comitology Model of Implementation of EU Policies – Implications for EU Constitutional Construction”;
- (e) 4-5.07.2010 – “Global Cooperation: Alliances, Institutions, and International Relations. Tenth International CISS Millennium Conference”, Venice (I), international conference organised by Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Section – International Studies Association, Auburn Montgomery, presentation: “Decision-Making in the European Union – a Newcomers’ Perspective. Experience of Member States from Central and Eastern Europe”; chairing of the panel;

- (f) 17-20.08.2011 – “Third Global International Studies Conference”, Porto (P), international conference organised by the World International Studies Committee, University of Oporto, presentation: “Liberal Intergovernmentalism in Action: Poland in European Union Politics”; chairing of the panel;
- (g) 6-9.08.2014 – “Justice, Peace and Stability: Risks and Opportunities for Governance and Development“, WISC Fourth Global International Studies Conference, Frankfurt/Main (D), international conference organised by the World International Studies Committee (WISC), presentation: “Politics or Administration? The Experience of Polish Officials in Preparatory Bodies of the Council of the EU”.

Fivefold I co-organized international or national scientific conferences, serving as the conference secretary or member of organizational committee:

- (a) 14-15.05.2009 – “Central and Eastern Europe in the Process of Transformation and Integration. A Political Dimension”, Zamosc (PL), international conference organised by the Faculty of Political Science of the Maria Curie-Sklodowska University and the Department of Political Science of the State Higher School of Vocational Education PWSZ in Zamosc, secretary of the conference;
- (b) 22.05.2009 – “Poland in the European Union. Five Years of Difficult Experience”, Lublin (PL), conference organised by the Catholic University of Lublin and the High School of International Relations and Social Communication in Chelm, member of organizational committee;
- (c) 28.05.2010 – “Treaty of Lisbon in Practice. First Experiences and New Challenges”, Lublin (PL), conference organised by the UMCS Faculty of Political Science, Institute of Political Science of the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL), Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, KUL Development Foundation, member of organizational committee;
- (d) 10.12.2010 – “Polish Presidency in the Council of the European Union”, Lublin (PL), conference organised by the UMCS Faculty of Political Science, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, KUL Development Foundation, member of organizational committee;
- (e) 9-10.11.2015 – “The Cultural Dimension of European Integration”, Lublin (PL), international conference organised by the Polish Association of European Studies PTSE, Catholic University of Lublin, Maria Curie-Sklodowska University, Warsaw University, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, member of organizational committee.

The important supplementary role in my academic activity is played by the membership and serving as functionary in international and Polish scientific associations: (a) Polish Association of European Studies (PTSE) – member-co-founder, member of the Court of the East-

ern Region in 2014, member of the Executive Board of the Lublin Region from 2015; (b) Polish Association of Political Science (PTNP) – member; (c) International Studies Association, Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Section (ISA-CISS) – member.

My expert knowledge was used by two politico-administrative bodies: from 2012 till 2015 I participated in the Voluntary Team of Advisors of the Chairman of the European Union Committee in Sejm and from 2010 I am a member of *Team Europe* – the group of experts of the European Commission. In May 2016 I prepared the expert opinion for the Chancellery of Sejm entitled *The Consequences of the Possible Uniform Electoral Procedure in European Parliament Elections for Polish Legal and Political System*. My other activities include: (a) membership from 2007 till 2014 in editorial board of the scientific magazine “Facta Simoni-dis”; (b) co-ordination of external projects at the Faculty of Political Science of Maria Curie-Skłodowska University (2010-2011).

My academic activity is reflected in teaching. After obtaining the doctor degree I held lectures and classes in the following main subjects: (a) EU Law (lectures and classes in Polish and English, UMCS); (b) International Public Law (lectures and classes, UMCS); (c) European Integration (lectures, UMCS); (d) Jurisprudence (classes, UMCS); (e) International Political Relations (lectures, UMCS); (f) Foreign Policy of Poland (lectures, UMCS); (g) Foreign Professional Language – English and German (UMCS); (h) International Relations (lectures, PWSZ); (i) Diploma Seminar (PWSZ). In 2007 and 2008 I held the seminar in the framework of *Erasmus* programme for students of Westphalian Wilhelm University in Münster. The course entitled *Poland in the European Union – a Newcomer’s Perspective (Polen in der Europäischen Union – Perspektive eines neuen Mitgliedstaats)* was held in English and German. I served as supervisor of 52 B.A. theses in political science concluded in 2008-2014 in the State School of Higher Professional Education (PWSZ) in Zamość. In ca. 120 cases I served as reviewer of B.A. and M.A. theses in political science and international relations (UMCS and PWSZ).

