

Guidelines of the Presidential Chair for the implementation of tenure-track procedures

1. Preliminary remarks

These guidelines contain additional information on the Regulations for appointing tenured professorships within a tenure-track procedure at the Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg (hereinafter referred to as the Tenure-Track Regulations).

2. Notes on appointing tenure-track positions (see Section 2 of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

Calls for applications must clearly state the developmental character of the professorship in contrast to a tenured professorship.

Calls for applications must be published internationally in English and German. Exceptions to this rule must be requested from the Presidential Chair during the approval process for the professorship and the call for applications.

3. Evaluation criteria for tenure-track evaluation and interim evaluation for junior professorships with a tenure track (see Section 3 of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

Tenure-track evaluations are based on evaluation criteria in the six areas set out below. The evaluation criteria must already be included in the profile paper during the approval process for the professorship and can be supplemented or specified by position-specific criteria in justified cases (see Section 2 (7) of the Tenure-Track Regulations). They will be communicated to the tenure-track professor at the latest upon appointment. The criteria form the basis for the interim evaluation and for the evaluation within the framework of the tenure-track evaluation by the evaluation committee and the Tenure Board.

The criteria in the six areas listed below are therefore intentionally comprehensive. In general, the evaluation focuses on **significant achievements in research and teaching** performance. Assessing the nature of outstanding achievements is **subject-specific** and must be confirmed by **external review** (e.g. by peer review procedures, high-ranking publication media, external evaluation in third-party funding procedures, etc.).

The candidate must prove that he or she is suitable for the tenure-track professorship in terms of excellent performance based on the evaluation criteria. The tenure-track professor must therefore justify any criteria which have not been fulfilled. Due to the different entry requirements, the criteria for junior professorships or W2 professorships with a tenure track have to be considered differently. This has to be stated in the profile paper.

In order to advise the tenure-track professor in all matters relating to the evaluation and to support his or her career development as a whole, the School must appoint a suitable person to act as a mentor. The mentoring relationship is subject to strict confidentiality on both sides (mentor-mentee). It is not affected by rank. Therefore, the mentor cannot be a member of the evaluation committee or the Tenure Board at the same time.

Evaluation criteria (sorted by topic)

Research:

Sustainable research activities and their reflection, especially in:

- Publications: This includes, for example, monographs, journal articles, editorships, editions, etc.
- Lectures: proven participation in conferences with personal contributions (lecture, poster presentation, moderation), guest lectures or similar.
- Acquisition of third-party funding:
 - Application for individual funding (submitted) to the DFG or to a similar institution with a quality audit by an external scientific body
 - Application for a collaborative research project including an individual project with a similar scope
- Prizes/awards

Teaching:

- Successful teaching record, especially in tutoring/supervising students:
 - Supervision and assessment of Bachelor's and Master's theses (first and second reports)
 - Participation in training courses for lecturers
- Positive student feedback on teaching proven by regular participation in teaching evaluations (the faculty is responsible for carrying out regular teaching evaluations)
- Prizes/awards

Administration:

- Adequate involvement in administrative affairs, such as:
 - Consistent participation in academic administration (e.g. committees, development of degree programmes)
 - Membership in committees of the institute/department or the faculty (e.g. Institute Council, Faculty Council, Curriculum and Teaching Committee)

Support of early career researcher(s):

- Support of doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers demonstrated by, for example:
 - First supervision of a doctoral project approved by the doctorate committee
 - Involvement in doctoral procedures

Leadership, ability to work in a team and interpersonal skills:

- Demonstrated through participation in qualification programmes, mentoring programmes, coaching programmes etc.

Outstanding innovative contributions:

- University development (e.g. contribution to the establishment of a new degree programme or collaboration) and/or
- Transfer: Transfer of research (regional, national, schools)
- Internationalization: verifiable international contacts, e.g. through stays abroad, supervision of guest researchers and doctoral candidates or similar.

4. Performance of interim evaluation for junior professorships with a tenure track and interim report for W2 professorships with a tenure track (see Section 4a (1) and 4b (1) of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

The interim evaluation is conducted in accordance with the current 'Guidelines of the Presidential Chair for the interim evaluation of junior professors'.

The interim statement for W2 professorships referred to in the Tenure-Track Regulations must be prepared in accordance with the self-assessment template for the tenure-track evaluation (see item 5).

5. Candidate's self-assessment (see Section 7a (1) of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

For the tenure-track evaluation, the candidate prepares a self-assessment (in German or English) which is submitted to the evaluation committee and the Tenure Board of the University. The self-assessment consists of three parts:

- CV
- Personal statement
- Supporting documentation

In the *personal statement* (max. 6 pages), the tenure-track professor describes past activities and plans for the future. Candidates are expected to relate their activities to the evaluation criteria mentioned above. In the personal statement, the candidate has the opportunity to describe and assess his or her main research areas, research collaborations and other research activities, to outline his or her role in teaching and to describe the teaching concept. If the faculty has defined further evaluation criteria in the professorship's profile paper, these must also be considered in the self-assessment. In addition, potential obstacles to the fulfilment of the evaluation criteria should be identified. The candidate shall also provide reasons for not meeting any specified performance criteria.

The personal statement is supplemented by *supporting documentation* (max. 8 pages) which sets out supporting evidence for the personal statement in a table or the like, and includes a compilation of further material/items the candidate deems relevant (see appendix 1).

6. Role of the evaluation committee and the Tenure Board (Sections 5-7 of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

- Evaluation committee

Pursuant to Section 5 (5) of the Tenure-Track Regulations, the procedural regulations for appointment and selection committees set out in the regulations for appointment of professors at the university also apply to the evaluation committee. Regulations dealing with conflicts of interest must also be observed (see current Recommendations of the Presidential Chair at the Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg for avoiding conflicts of interest in appointment procedures).

The evaluation committee submits a reasoned proposal on the outcome of the tenure-track procedure in the form of a written statement. The statement includes a description and assessment of the fulfilment of the evaluation criteria, an assessment of the further development of the professorship and the subject with regard to the evaluation criteria, and a recommendation as to whether the candidate should be appointed to a tenured professorship. The statement should be structured as follows:

1. Framework of the evaluation (procedure, description of the self-assessment)
2. Evaluation criteria and parameters
3. Description and assessment of research

4. Description and assessment of teaching (taking into account the report of the Dean of Studies)
5. Participation in administrative affairs
6. Fulfilment and assessment of further evaluation criteria
7. Assessment of overall performance

- **Tenure Board**

The Tenure Board shall establish rules of procedure for the conduct of its meetings. A statement assessing the candidate's research performance is to be issued. With regard to the evaluation criteria, the statement includes a description and assessment of the research achievement, an assessment of the further development of the professorship and the subject, and a recommendation as to whether the candidate should be appointed to a tenured professorship.

7. Dean of Studies' report (see Section 7a (2) of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

Based on the candidate's self-assessment (teaching) and the teaching evaluation results, the Dean of Studies submits a short report with a recommendation to the evaluation committee (see appendix 2). Recommendations for evaluation questions include:

- How do you rate the teaching activities of the candidate with regard to teaching, the range of subjects covered and the contents?
- How do you rate the candidate's ability to support early career researcher(s)?
- What recommendations do you have for future course designs?

8. External reports (see Section 7b (1) of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

The chairperson of the Tenure Board or his or her deputy shall obtain two or three external reports on the activities and results of the candidate's research. The evaluation committee may propose four to five reviewers via the Dean. Structured reports by internationally renowned external reviewers make a significant contribution to the evaluation decision on research performance. The following questions should be answered with reference to the evaluation criteria:

- What contribution does the candidate make to research in the subject area?
- To what extent do the research results contribute to the research profile of the subject/School?
- How do you rate the candidate's performance in national and international comparison?
- Statements on the scientific excellence of the candidate's research regarding a tenured W2/W3 professorship.

The reviewers must be provided with the evaluation questions, the candidate's self-assessment and the evaluation criteria.

The attached form can be used for feedback from the external reviewer to the candidate. Feedback to the candidate is provided by the Tenure Board.

9. Proposed structure for the School's statement (see Section 8 (1) of the Tenure-Track Regulations)

The recommendation of the School should be based on the proposal of the evaluation committee and the statement of the Tenure Board. In order to make the recommendations of the faculties as uniform and comparable as possible, they should be structured as follows:

1. Summary (main findings, recommendations) and conclusion

2. Proposal of the evaluation committee including minutes of the meetings
3. Statement of the Tenure Board
4. Resolution of the Faculty Council to grant or reject tenure track

If there is disagreement between the proposal of the evaluation committee and the statement of the Tenure Board, the Faculty Council must decide on the basis of detailed consultation and give comprehensive reasons for its decision.

10. Overview of the procedure

Stage	Responsible	Time left before contract end
Application for the initiation of the evaluation procedure and submission of self-assessment	Candidate / Candidate and Dean's Office	13 months
Election of the TT evaluation committee to initiate the tenure-track procedure	Faculty Council	13 months
School submits application to the Presidential Chair to initiate the tenure-track evaluation and to obtain the Presidential Chair's consent for the evaluation committee	Dean	12 months ¹
Evaluation committee stage (at least 2 meetings): Evaluation of the self-assessment, assessment of the Dean of Studies' report, invitation to and assessment of the lecture given to members of the university community; hearing and discussion with the evaluation committee, preparation of a proposal for the outcome of the TT procedure.	Evaluation committee	11 months
The Tenure Board evaluates the research performance of the TT candidate: Agreement on reviewers and consideration of the Dean's proposals (circulation procedure permissible), obtaining 2-3 external reports (deadline permissible), review of external reports, drafting a statement on the outcome of the TT procedure.	Tenure Board	
School statement based on the statement of the Tenure Board and the evaluation committee's proposal.	Faculty Council	7 months

¹ Pursuant to Section 4a (2), the procedure shall be initiated one year before the end of the fixed-term professorship. This is the latest possible deadline. The procedure can be initiated at an earlier time. Even then, a swift implementation of the procedure should be ensured in accordance with the specified schedule.

Stage	Responsible	Time left before contract end
Forwarding of the complete proposal to the Presidential Chair	Dean	7 months
Statement of the Senate and Central Equal Opportunities Officer	Senate and Equal Opportunities Officer	6 months
Decision of the Presidential Chair	Presidential Chair	6 months
If the outcome is positive: Presidential Chair reports to MWK	Presidential Chair	6 months
Decision of the MWK to fill the professorship without a call for applications	MWK	5 months
Appointment of the candidate to a tenured professorship	Presidential Chair	As soon as possible

Appendix 1: Template for documentation supporting the self-assessment

A. Research:

- List of publications (indicating 5 key words) in the reporting period (distinguishing between peer-reviewed publications and others)
- List of scientific presentations during the reporting period
- Editorships for scientific journals, series, etc.
- Review activities
- Applications for third-party funding and third-party funding raised in the reporting period (list)
- Awards and prizes within the reporting period
- Memberships in scientific committees
- Other relevant activities

B. Teaching:

- List of courses held
- List of theses supervised
- Involvement in examinations
- International activities (supervision of exchange students, international doctoral candidates, courses in English or other foreign languages, etc.)
- Involvement in university-wide teaching projects
- Proof of participation in regular internal teaching evaluations and, if applicable, external evaluation of the academic programme and teaching.

C. Academic administration

- Short description of role in academic administration and list of individual contributions

D. Promotion of early career researcher(s):

- Supervision of doctoral projects
- Further activities supporting early career researchers

E. Personal development

- Evidence of participation in qualification programmes, mentoring programmes etc.
- Participation in university teaching courses

F. Outstanding innovative contributions, for example

- University development (for example, contribution to the establishment of a new degree programme or international collaboration) and/or
- Transfer activities (knowledge and technology transfer, patents, licenses) or applied collaboration and/or
- Internationalization: verifiable international contacts, for example through stays abroad, supervision of guest researchers and doctoral candidates

Appendix 2: Rückmeldung der externen Gutachterin/des externen Gutachters an die Kandidatin/den Kandidaten / *Reviewer feedback for the candidate*

Name der Kandidatin/des Kandidaten/*Candidate's name*:

Gesamtfazit – Empfehlung / *Result – Recommendation*

- uneingeschränkte Empfehlung/*Unconditional recommendation*
- eingeschränkte Empfehlung/*Conditional recommendation*
- Ablehnung/*Rejection*

**Weitergabe des anonymisierten Gesamtgutachtens an die Kandidatin/ den Kandidaten
*Forwarding the full report in anonymous form to the candidate***

- einverstanden/*I agree*
- nicht einverstanden/*I do not agree*

oder/or

Feedback für die Kandidatin/den Kandidaten / *Feedback for the candidate*