

Ulm University Statute

on Quality Assurance in Appointing and Evaluating Tenure-Track Professors

of 21 November 2018

The Ulm University Senate adopted the following statute on 14 November 2018 pursuant to § 51b (2) sentence 1 in connection with §19 (1) sentence 10 of the State Higher Education Act Baden-Württemberg (*Landeshochschulgesetz – LHG*) of 1 January 2005 (law gazette, p.1), last amended by Art. 1 of the Higher Education Law Development Act (*Hochschulrechtsweiterentwicklungsgesetz*) of 13 March 2018 (law gazette, p. 85 ff).

§ 1 Scope of application

This statute applies to tenure-track professors in accordance with § 51b LHG. Pursuant to § 51b (1) sentence 1 LHG, tenure-track professors are junior professors whose appointment is connected with a guarantee to be considered for later promotion to a professor position with comparable denomination in a higher salary bracket, here W3, upon successful completion of the probationary period (in the following referred to as "junior professors").

§ 2 Statute objective

The objective of this statute is to stipulate the basic principles of quality assurance in selecting and evaluating junior professors. These appointments and evaluations are carried out in a transparent, fair and scheduled process.

§ 3 Duration of a junior professor appointment

(1) The employment contract for a junior professor is generally limited to a period of 6 years. At the end of the appointment, an evaluation is conducted to determine whether the junior professor has proven to be a suitable candidate for the agreed W3 professor appointment. His or her performance will be evaluated to this end.

(2) If a person who has been appointed a W1 junior professor has secured an externally evaluated junior research group (Emmy Noether Programme, ERC Starting Grant, Sofja Kovalevskaja Prize, Helmholtz Young Investigator Group), the junior professor can apply to have the Board reduce the length of his or her W1 appointment accordingly by awarding credit for the time served as junior research group leader, providing that the budget allows for the promotion to W3 professor with a comparable denomination immediately following. The promotion will then take place at the end of the shortened appointment period, following an established probationary period.

(3) Legal rights to an extension of the junior professor appointment will remain unaffected.

§ 4 Gender equality standards in the selection and evaluation process

In the spirit of gender equality in higher education, special attention is paid to the implementation of equal opportunities and active recruitment of female scientists. When evaluating biographies and academic achievements, care is taken to ensure that, where appropriate, specific personal circumstances that may have had an effect on professional development are taken into account. This applies, in particular, to the consideration of career interruptions for purposes of starting a family or caring for relatives. Periods in which the applicants took a leave of absence due to family obligations are also taken into account in the evaluations.

§ 5 Bias

(1) During the selection and evaluation process, care is to be taken to ensure that no persons who are to be excluded on the grounds of bias participate in the decision-making process. §§ 20, 21 of the State Administration Procedures Act Baden-Württemberg (*Landesverwaltungsverfahrensgesetz*) are to be observed.

(2) If a reviewer or member of the committee falls under one of the following categories, the respective member of the committee or the reviewer is to be excluded (absolute grounds for exclusion):

1. applicants,
2. persons who stand to gain either a direct advantage or a direct disadvantage due to the activity or the decision,
3. relatives of applicants ¹,

¹ Relatives are defined as:

1. fiancé or fiancée,
2. spouse/partner,
3. relatives and in-laws related by direct descent,
4. siblings,
5. children of siblings,

4. persons who receive financial compensation from an involved party for services provided or who provide service to an involved party as a member of a board of directors, supervisory board or a similar body,
5. persons who are submitting reviews concerning the same matter outside of their participation in the appointment committee.

(3) Concerns of bias (possible grounds for exclusion) are to be investigated in particular in the following cases:

1. primary supervision of a doctorate or a professional dependency for up to 5 years following termination of the professional relationship,
2. close scientific cooperation, e.g. jointly submitted applications, joint publications, joint projects in the last 5 years,
3. direct competition with his or her own projects or plans,
4. financial interest in the decision on the position to be filled,
5. a close personal relationship.

Here the specific circumstances of the individual case are to be taken into account.

§ 6 Job description for and announcement of tenure-track professor openings

(1) The concerned faculty submits the subject-specific evaluation criteria to the Board, along with the application for a vacancy release and specification of the job description for the positions of both tenure-track professor and subsequent W3 professor. The faculty specifies these criteria by clearly defining and presenting in a transparent fashion the subject-specific requirements of the final evaluation for the promotion to W3 professor based on, and, if necessary, supplementing, the evaluation criteria listed under § 12. For professors with medical duties, requirements for health care are taken into account. The specific evaluation criteria for this purpose are defined by the Medical Faculty, in consultation with the University Hospital. The Gender Equality Officer is to be given the opportunity to comment on this list first.

(2) Following the approval of the job description and the subject-specific amendments to the evaluation criteria, positions for tenure-track professors are generally advertised internationally. The text for the announcement contains a reference to the tenure track in accordance with this statute. The special requirements determining suitability, competence and professional performance for

6. siblings' spouses or partner and siblings of one's own spouse or partner,

7. parents' siblings,

8. persons who are connected within a common household as parent and child due to a long-term care arrangement (foster parents and foster children).

The persons listed as relatives in sentence 1 are also considered relatives if

1. in the cases referred to in points 2, 3 and 6, the marriage/partnership which formed the relationship is no longer in existence;

2. in the cases referred to in points 3 to 7, the relationship has ceased to exist due to an adoption as a child;

3. in the case of point 8, the common household no longer exists, provided that the persons continue to be connected as parent and child.

subsequent promotion to a W3 professor with comparable denomination are to be stipulated in the announcement for the junior professor position.

§ 7 Appointment procedure for tenure-track professors

(1) When selecting the reviewers, care is taken to ensure that they are internationally recognised. If appropriate for the profile of the professor position, at least one foreign review is to be solicited.

(2) To ensure compliance with § 48 (2) sentence 2 LHG, members of Ulm University who apply for a position as a tenure-track professor can generally only be considered for the position if they have changed universities since completing their doctoral degree or have worked in a scientific field outside of Ulm University for at least two years, unless the directive of selection of the best in accordance with German Basic Law Article 33 (2) mandates the appointment.

§ 8 Teaching reviews, status reviews, further means of support

Junior professors participate in regular internal course evaluations. A minimum of one course per year should be evaluated. During the second half of a junior professor's appointment, the Dean of Studies conducts a status review with him or her on the quality of teaching. At the same time, the head of the institution to which the junior professor is assigned offers the junior professor a status advising session to discuss his or her performance. The faculty concerned also assigns a mentor to the junior professor who is from another institute or another department.

§ 9 Interim review and feedback

(1) Halfway through his or her appointment, a junior professor receives an interim review from the Dean's Office, providing feedback on his or her performance.

(2) The junior professor is first asked to submit a self-evaluation report in accordance with § 11.

(3) After the junior professor has submitted his or her self-evaluation report, the Dean's Office appoints 3 reviewers, 2 external and 1 internal, at the recommendation of professors from the department, who are asked to submit letters of evaluation on the junior professor's performance. The selected persons must have an adequate overview of the state of scientific knowledge in the junior professor's area of specialisation, and they may not be part of the institute to which the junior professor is assigned. These evaluations should assess and appraise the junior professor's current state of development from a long-term perspective, based on his or her demonstrated

performance and further plans, and assess his or her potential in research, in accordance with the criteria mentioned in § 12 as well as the subject-specific criteria. The letters of evaluation should also include recommendations for improvement.

(4) The Dean of Studies also receives the self-evaluation report and submits a written evaluation on the performance of the junior professor with regard to his or her teaching. The results of the teaching evaluations are included in the reviews.

(5) The Dean's Office evaluates the performance of the junior professor based on these evaluations as a whole and conducts a feedback discussion with him or her. This discussion should include mention of the areas still requiring development or improvement in terms of the requirements detailed in the announcement for the W3 professor position. The feedback discussion should take place no later than three months following submission of the self-evaluation report. The junior professor then receives a copy of the evaluation report in written form.

§ 10 Final evaluation

(1) The final evaluation is initiated approximately one year before the end of a junior professor's appointment. The Board designates an evaluation committee in consultation with the faculty to which the position is assigned, with the task of carrying out the evaluation and, where necessary, preparing a recommendation for promotion. The faculty creates a proposal of members for the committee, which is then forwarded to the Board for a decision. The committee consists of the following members:

- 1 member of the Board or 1 member of the Dean's Office as head,
- the Dean of Studies,
- additional professors from the University,
- a minimum of 2 external reviewers,
- a minimum of 1 student,
- a minimum of 2 qualified women,
- the Gender Equality Officer.

The majority of possible votes within the committee must be reserved for full-time professors. If the professor position to be filled involves duties at the University Hospital, a member of the Hospital Board, along with a further qualified person appointed by the Hospital Board, are entitled to participate in the committee meetings with voting rights. The committee may call in an expert in advisory capacity from the field of university teaching methods and teaching methods for a specific subject.

The following items serve for evaluation purposes:

1. the junior professor's self-evaluation report according to § 11,

2. scientific lecture with subsequent discussion,
3. evaluations on accomplishments in research,
4. evaluation from the Dean of Studies.

The head of the committee invites the junior professor to submit three proposals for topics from his or her field of expertise for the scientific lecture, as well as a current self-evaluation report according to § 11. This is also to include a written statement confirming that the principles for ensuring good scientific practice, which are detailed in the Ulm University statutes, have been followed in their respectively valid form.

(2) The junior professor's performance is evaluated on the basis of the evaluation criteria laid out in § 12, taking into account the subject-specific requirements as defined. The junior professor is deemed to have proven him or herself to be a suitable candidate if the suitability, competence and professional performance in terms of the defined requirements for promotion to the position as W3 professor can be confirmed as incontestably above average. Periods of leave due to family obligations are generally not included in the evaluation. Periods of partial leave are only considered to the extent of the contractual obligation.

(3) The committee invites the junior professor to give a scientific lecture, which is open to the faculty, and selects one of the topics from the proposed list. The scientific lecture serves to enable an assessment of the candidate's ability to engage in scientific discourse and to demonstrate that he or she is able to critically present scientific questions and results in free speech to a professional audience with subject-specific knowledge.

(4) The committee solicits a minimum of three expert letters of evaluation, at least two of which should be external, on the scientific performance of the junior professor. The reviewers should be scientists of excellent status (full professors or equivalent) and come from different institutions. As a basis for their evaluation, the reviewers receive the self-evaluation report and the defined evaluation criteria. The letters of evaluation are to be submitted in written form. The reviewers are asked to evaluate the performance of the junior professor with regard to the criteria in § 12 as well as the subject-specific requirements for the W3 professor position and general suitability for the position. The reviewers must indicate which facts and which general and specific evaluation standards were used as a basis for the decision, what scientific and professional assumption the evaluation is based on, whether, and if so which, scientific achievements justify the assumption that the junior professor has proven him or herself suitable as well as the justifications for the respective assessment. If the letters of evaluation differ greatly in their recommendations or justifications, the committee may solicit further reviews.

(5) The Dean of Students submits his or her written evaluation on the abilities and experiences of the junior professor in the area of teaching. The basis for this evaluation can include teacher

shadowing, teaching demonstration lessons, discussions with the junior professor, the results of teaching evaluations and, if necessary, the advice from an expert in the field of university teaching methods and/or teaching methods for a specific subject.

(6) For junior professors with medical duties, the expert appointed by the Hospital Board submits a written evaluation on issues concerning health care.

(7) Based on all the documents, evaluations and the scientific lecture, the committee evaluates the performance of the junior professor as a whole. The assessment of the probationary period in terms of whether the junior professor has proven him or herself with regard to suitability, competence and professional performance is the responsibility of the evaluation committee. The committee informs the junior professor in writing of the result of its evaluation.

(8) Providing that the junior professor has been deemed to be qualified for the position, the evaluation committee prepares a recommendation for promotion to professor. The further procedure for appointment to a W3 professor is based on the regulations for the appointment procedure for professors as laid out in the LHG. In the event that the evaluation committee produces a negative final evaluation, the junior professor is given the opportunity to be heard, if necessary, and the Senate then concludes the process with a confirmation of the result, following prior consultation with the Faculty Council. The employment contract for junior professors not being promoted to professor may be extended by up to one year at the recommendation of the faculty, in agreement with the junior professor, and subject to the approval of the Board in accordance with § 51b (2) sentence 5 LHG.

§ 11 Self-evaluation report

The junior professor's self-evaluation report consists of a personal statement, which should not exceed a length of five pages, and documentation as an appendix to the statement in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the appendix to this statute. The personal statement should detail the candidate's activities in the previous years as a tenure-track professor in the areas of responsibility listed under § 12 and, where applicable, defined in terms of the subject areas. The candidate's current teaching philosophy and future research perspectives should also be included. As part of the critical self-evaluation, the junior professor should report on his or her successes, but also on any problem areas that may have arisen.

§ 12 Evaluation criteria

(1) The following areas are assessed within the scope of the interim and final evaluations: research, teaching and other areas of responsibility. The evaluation criteria mentioned below are to be specified with regard to the subject-specific amendments according to § 6 (1).

(2) The following criteria in particular form the basis of the evaluation for the area of research:

- a) Quality and quantity of publications, as evidenced by, for example:
 - Importance of the research in international comparison
 - Reception and evaluation of the publications
 - Prizes and awards
 - Independence of contribution to development of the specific field of research
 - Extension and innovation of research approaches in comparison with dissertation
- b) Securing third-party funding
- c) Supervision of doctoral students

(3) The following criteria in particular form the basis of the evaluation for the area of teaching:

- a) Knowledge of subject
- b) Independence (e.g. preparation of lectures, consideration of new teaching approaches)
- c) Didactics (communication, presentation of knowledge, teaching material, etc.)
- d) Breadth of teaching spectrum

(4) The following criteria in particular form the basis of the evaluation for other areas of responsibility:

- a) Openness to and aptitude for interdisciplinary research and compatibility with research in the department
- b) Participation in University self-governance
- c) Addressing of personnel management issues and participation in personnel management training courses

§ 13 Early appointment to professor in order to block a competing offer of appointment in accordance with § 48(1) sentence 6 LHG

In order to prevent a junior professor from accepting an external offer of appointment, he or she may be offered a life-long position as a professor prior to the end of his or her appointment in accordance with § 48 (1) sentence 6 LHG, providing that a suitable position is available. The procedure is carried out on the basis of the evaluation. The decision to initiate the early appointment process is made by the Board at the request of the faculty concerned.

§ 14 Effective date

(1) This statute comes into effect on the day following its publication in the Ulm University bulletin (*Amtliche Bekanntmachungen*). It replaces the Quality Assurance Concept for Junior Professors with Tenure Track of 24 February 2016.

(2) Divergent from paragraph 1, the Quality Assurance Concept for Junior Professors with Tenure Track of 24 February 2016 continues to apply for all tenure-track junior professors who took up their positions prior to the effective date of this statute.

Ulm, 21 November 2018

signed

Prof Dr-Ing Michael Weber

- President -

Appendix

The appendix to the personal self-evaluation report is structured as follows:

1. Personal details
2. Current scientific CV
3. Listing of activities in research, teaching and other areas in tabular form

Possible aspects include:

Research

- Current listing of publications as well as documentation thereof in electronic form. (Manuscripts accepted for publication may also be included.)
- Research collaborations (both internal and external)
- Third-party funding (acquired and applied for)
- Distinctions, awards
- Supervision of doctoral students

Teaching

- History of courses taught and brief description of conceptual development
- Explanation of teaching methods (didactics and methodology)
- Results of teaching evaluations by students
- Advising and supervision of students (e.g. involvement in examinations, supervision of final papers)
- Participation in training courses in the area of university didactics, where applicable

Other activities

- Listing of activities in self-governance/committee work
- Listing of cooperative projects with other teams (intra-university)
- Research collaborations and interdisciplinary collaborations (regional, national and international)
- Transfer activities (industry and business, administration, politics) or collaborations in fields with practical relevance