

**Heidelberg University Statute
on the Evaluation of Junior Professors and Tenure-Track Professors**

Translated from German, which is the official version.

At its meeting on 5 February 2019 the Senate of Heidelberg University adopted the following Heidelberg University Statute on the Evaluation of Junior Professors and Tenure-Track Professors pursuant to §§19(1)10 and 51 b (1) and (2) LHG (Baden-Württemberg Higher Education Act). The Baden-Württemberg Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts granted its approval in a letter of 10 April 2019.

Table of Contents

Section 1: General provisions

- § 1 The purpose of the statute
- § 2 Definition of terms
- § 3 Procedural standards and the necessary transparency
- § 4 Responsibilities

Section 2: Conciliar evaluation

- § 5 The purpose of the conciliar evaluation
- § 6 Initiating and terminating the process
- § 7 Objects, means and method of the conciliar evaluation

Section 3: Aptitude evaluation and assessment

- § 8 The purpose and objects of the aptitude evaluation
- § 9 Initiating the procedure and obstacles to admissibility
- § 10 Means and method of the aptitude evaluation
- § 11 Recording and announcing the assessment decision

Section 4: Tenure evaluation

- § 12 Purpose and subjects of the tenure evaluation
- § 13 Initiating the procedure and obstacles to admissibility
- § 14 Means and method of the tenure evaluation

Section 5: Joint procedures for tenure-track professorships

- § 15 Principle of jointly implementing aptitude and tenure evaluations
- § 16 Procedure for jointly implementing aptitude and tenure evaluations
- § 17 Early aptitude evaluation

Section 6: Further procedure after conclusion of tenure evaluation

§ 18 Involvement of the Faculty Council, Rectorate and Senate

§ 19 Preconditions for non-advertised appointment with simplified procedure

Section 7: Sundry provisions

§ 20 Acceleration of procedure to preclude the acceptance of a professorship elsewhere

§ 21 Extension in the event of non-appointment

§ 22 Taking effect

Section 1: General provisions

§ 1 Purpose of the statute

This statute sets out the procedures and preconditions for assessing the aptitude and qualifications of junior professors for becoming full professors in accordance with §51(7) LHG (Baden-Württemberg Higher Education Act) and the further preconditions for conducting a simplified, non-advertised appointment procedure to take on tenure-track professors in accordance with §48(1) 4th sentence LHG.

§ 2 Definition of terms

(1) 'Tenure-track professorships', as used here, means junior professorships pursuant to §51b LGH. Tenure-track professors are regularly employed for the duration of six years as temporary civil servants or on a private-law contract; deviations from this fixed term are admissible as long as they appear appropriate at the time of the appointment in view of the level of qualification of the tenure-track professor. In the case of junior professorships without tenure track the relevant Faculty decides, by decision of the Faculty Council, whether the contract will be initially limited to a period of up to four years in accordance with §51(7) LHG.

(2) 'Aptitude evaluation', as used here, means the evaluation conducted in preparation for a decision on the aptitude and qualifications of the junior professor for a full professorship in accordance with §51(7) 2nd sentence LHG. If the service contract is initially limited to a period of up to four years under §51(7) LHG, the aptitude evaluation will take place as an 'interim evaluation' (§51(7) 3rd sentence LHG) notwithstanding a further evaluation on completion of the service contract, which may be required for the decision on the granting of the designation 'adjunct (*außerplanmäßig*) professor' in accordance with §51(9) LHG and §26(7) Heidelberg University Constitution (*Grundordnung*).

(3) 'Tenure evaluation', as used here, means the evaluation that prepares for the appointment of a tenure-track professor as a full professor in a higher grade with a

simplified appointment procedure and without advertising the post (§48(1) 4th sentence LHG).

(4) 'Conciliar evaluation', as used here, means a process of information and consultation intended to advise junior professors on possible obstacles to a successful result of the aptitude evaluation and possibly also of the tenure evaluation.

§ 3 Procedural standards and transparency

(1) If it proves necessary to exclude a person participating in the evaluation on grounds of bias, this shall take place in accordance with §20 and §21 Baden-Württemberg Administrative Procedure Act (LVwVfG), and *mutatis mutandis* according to the rules on dealing with bias of the German Research Foundation (DFG).

(2) Advertising and filling posts as junior professors must be done in the light of the provisions and programmes set out in the gender equality policies of Heidelberg University, which seek to increase the share of women professors.

(3) Advertisements to fill a post as junior professor shall make appropriate reference to the provisions of this statute.

(4) When deciding on the proposed appointment, the appointments commission will determine individualised criteria for the later aptitude evaluation, taking account of the respective applicant's own suggestions. When appointed, the junior professor will be informed in writing about the procedural steps described here.

§ 4 Responsibilities

Unless this statute provides otherwise, the following responsibilities shall apply:

(1) For the conciliar evaluation the Dean's Office of the relevant Faculty shall form a conciliar commission consisting of at least three full professors. The Dean of Studies should be one of the commission members. At least one member must be from a discipline very close to that of the junior professor. To ensure this is the case, the Dean's Office may also appoint an external professor to the commission.

(2) The bodies responsible for carrying out the aptitude evaluation, and assessing the aptitude and qualifications of a junior professor for becoming a full professor in accordance with §51(7) LHG, are the commissions and committees formed in the Faculties for dealing with habilitations; they shall serve in this capacity unless the Faculty's rules for habilitation or evaluation provide otherwise.

- (3) For the tenure evaluation the Rectorate shall establish a Tenure Commission in cooperation with the relevant Faculty. This commission must include the Dean of Studies and should include the members of the conciliar commission. Moreover, §48(3) LHG shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the staffing of this commission. The Tenure Commission shall be chaired by a member of the Rectorate or the Dean's Office of the relevant Faculty.
- (4) In coordination with the Senate, the Rectorate shall establish a Tenure Board. It shall consist of eight internationally acclaimed professors, of whom at least four and at most six shall come from Heidelberg University. The Fields of Focus shall appoint two members each. The Board is expected to include at least three women. The members shall elect a chair and deputy chair from their number. The Rector shall appoint the members for a four-year term of office. Re-election is admissible. A member of the Rectorate whose area of responsibility covers support for young researchers shall attend the meetings of the Tenure Board as an advisor, as shall the Equal Opportunities Commissioner. The Tenure Board is established on a permanent basis and has the task of seeing to proper procedure in the context of tenure evaluation. Besides giving assessments in the tenure procedure, the Board is expected to make proposals on how to continually improve procedure on the basis of its experience. A member of the Tenure Board may serve on a Tenure Commission as an advisor.

Section 2: Conciliar evaluation

§ 5 Purpose of the conciliar evaluation

The purpose of conciliar evaluation is to advise junior professors at an early stage about possible obstacles to a successful aptitude evaluation. In the case of tenure-track professors, the conciliar evaluation shall also cover the question of a later successful tenure evaluation.

§ 6 Initiating and terminating the procedure

- (1) The conciliar evaluation shall only take place at the request of the junior professor to the relevant Faculty. If the service contract under §51(7) LHG is initially limited to four years at most, the application may only be made up to 18 months after taking up the post. If the service contract is not initially limited to a maximum of four years, the application may be made up to 30 months after taking up the junior professorship.
- (2) If, during the conciliar evaluation, the junior professor applies for an aptitude evaluation or applies to take the habilitation examination, including at another university, the evaluation shall be terminated by decision of the Conciliar Commission. In the case of tenure-track professors, the evaluation may be limited to the question of a later successful

tenure evaluation and suspended pending the successful completion of the aptitude evaluation or habilitation – provided there is enough time left after the conciliar evaluation until the tenure evaluation for the tenure-track professor to respond effectively to the results of the conciliar evaluation.

§ 7 Objects, means and method of the conciliar evaluation

(1) The conciliar evaluation focuses on the junior professor's prospects of obtaining a successful evaluation of aptitude at the end of the service contract under §8 et seq. of this statute. In the case of a tenure-track professorship, the prospects of a successful tenure evaluation in accordance with §§12 ff. below must also be examined. The Faculty Councils shall adopt detailed rules of procedure about the means required and the method of the conciliar evaluation.

(2) On completion of the conciliar evaluation, the Conciliar Commission shall make a written report. Stating comprehensible reasons, this report should clearly indicate how the Commission rates the current prospects of the junior professor receiving a successful aptitude evaluation and possibly also tenure evaluation. In order to guarantee freedom of research and teaching, the Commission must make clear that its recommendations may not, and should not, be regarded as binding requirements or expectations.

(3) The Conciliar Commission's report must be sent to the junior professor and the Dean's Office in the relevant Faculty.

Section 3: Aptitude evaluation and assessment

§ 8 Purpose and objects of the aptitude evaluation

The purpose of the aptitude evaluation conducted in the cases under §51(7) 3rd sentence LHG with the designation 'interim evaluation' is to assess the aptitude and qualifications of junior professors for a position as full professor within the meaning of §51(7) 2nd sentence LHG. This means, in particular, reviewing their aptitude and qualifications for independent research of the kind expected of professors, reviewing their pedagogical aptitude for academic teaching and likewise their ability, in a lecture, to clearly, competently and critically present a research-related question and their findings, and then to discuss it at a scholarly level with a specialist audience.

§ 9 Initiating the procedure and obstacles to admissibility

(1) The aptitude evaluation shall be initiated by written application from the junior professor to the Faculty. The application may not be made until two years of employment have passed and must be filed at the latest 12 months before the end of the service contract. If the contract is initially limited to a maximum of four years under §51(7) LHG

this period of service defines the time, and the application shall then be for an interim evaluation.

(2) The junior professor must append the following to the application:

1. a note stating whether he or she has applied for admission to the habilitation examination or has submitted a habilitation thesis (Habilschrift) to Heidelberg University or another university entitled to grant habilitations,
2. a full list of publications and academic manuscripts ready for publication,
3. a list of lectures and seminars held,
4. where appropriate, proof of successful attendance at courses on university teaching,
5. proposed topics for an academic lecture in keeping with the Faculty rules for habilitation or evaluation,
6. a list of subjects, beyond those specified in the job description of junior professor, in which the junior professor wishes to be qualified for a full professorship.
7. in the case of an isolated aptitude evaluation (interim evaluation) a personal report as set out in §13(4)5.

(3) The application shall be deemed inadmissible if the junior professor has applied for admission to the habilitation examination at Heidelberg University, or another university entitled to grant habilitations, or has submitted a Habilschrift for the same subjects. If these preconditions arise only after submission of the application, the application shall be deemed inadmissible. As soon as it is foreseeable that these preconditions may arise during the aptitude evaluation, the junior professor must immediately inform the Faculty, in order to enable the Aptitude Assessment Commission to suspend the procedure, if necessary.

§ 10 Means and method of aptitude evaluation

(1) The aptitude and qualifications of the junior professor to perform independent research shall be assessed mainly on the basis of publications and completed research manuscripts submitted for publication, which he or she has produced in addition to academic papers written in connection with doctoral work. After the junior professor makes the application, the Aptitude Assessment Commission shall designate reviewers in keeping with the provisions of the habilitation or evaluation rules applicable in the Faculty. These experts must make their opinions available at the latest six months after their designation. Along with the publication list and completed research manuscripts submitted for publication, the expert opinions will be made available to each member of the Aptitude Assessment Commission for a period of at least four weeks. This may also take place electronically. After this period has elapsed the Commission, on the basis of a thorough discussion of the junior professor's academic papers and the expert opinions on them,

shall take a decision on the his or her aptitude and qualifications to perform the kind of independent research expected of full professors.

(2) The aptitude of the junior professor to teach academic subjects shall be assessed according to their subject-related lectures and seminars. The Dean of Studies shall make a written report on the basis of the documents submitted and, where appropriate, trial classes or visitations. The report must be made available to the members of the Aptitude Assessment Commission along with the documents named in (1) above. This can also take place electronically. After discussing the report, the Commission will take a decision on the pedagogical aptitude of the junior professor for university teaching.

(3) The Aptitude Assessment Commission will determine the ability of the junior professor to comprehensibly, competently and critically present a research-related question and the replies found to it, and to discuss it with a specialist audience; the Commission will base its assessment on a presentation given in accordance with the rules provided in the habilitation or evaluation rules of the relevant Faculty.

(4) If the aptitude and qualifications of the junior professor are affirmed in accordance with (1) to (3) above, the commission will determine his or her aptitude and qualifications for a full professorship in accordance with §51(7) LHG. The decision must name the subjects to which the assessment relates. The Aptitude Assessment Commission is not bound by the job description of the junior professorship. If the contract is initially limited to a term of up to four years pursuant to §51(7) LHG the decision shall be made available at the latest three months before the expiry of the term of service and be communicated to the Rector via the university administration.

(5) If the Aptitude Assessment Commission comes to the conclusion that the aptitude and qualifications of the junior professor for a full professorship cannot be established because not all the decisions named under paragraphs (1) to (3) have led to an affirmative decision, it will inform the junior professor in writing, stating full reasons.

§ 11 Recording and announcing the assessment decision

The decision in accordance with §10(4) of this statute must be recorded in a document to be prepared and signed by the Rector and the Dean and handed to the junior professor. Furthermore, the decision shall be communicated in a manner corresponding to the announcement of successful habilitations.

Section 4: Tenure evaluation

§ 12 Purpose and subjects of the tenure evaluation

The tenure evaluation prepares for the decision on initiating a non-advertised, simplified appointment procedure for tenure-track professors in accordance with §48(1) 4th sentence LHG. In order to preserve the principle of selecting the best qualified candidate, it enables an assessment of whether the specialist achievements of tenure-track professors – going beyond their fundamental aptitude and qualifications for becoming full professors – also satisfy the university's special requirements with respect to filling a certain professorial post. Besides markedly above-average achievements in research and teaching, these requirements also involve the supervision of young researchers, participating in academic self-government and competence in staff management.

§ 13 Initiating the procedure and obstacles to admissibility

(1) Tenure evaluation is initiated by a written application by the tenure-track professor to the relevant Faculty. The application may be submitted at the earliest 14 months before the end of the service contract of the tenure-track professor and must be submitted at the latest 12 months before the end of this period.

(2) The application shall be deemed inadmissible if an aptitude evaluation held earlier (§17 below) has not led to a positive decision in accordance with §10(4) above.

(3) Further, the application shall be deemed inadmissible if the tenure-track professor has not undergone a 'status consultation' beforehand. This consultation aims to assist tenure-track professors to appraise their prospects at the Faculty, weigh up their individual career opportunities and thus be better able to plan their future academic pathway. The consultation shall be conducted by the Dean of the Faculty responsible and another professor, if possible from a similar academic field.

(4) The following must be appended to the application to undergo tenure evaluation:

1. In the case of isolated tenure evaluation (§15(2) below) a copy of the assessment document in accordance with §11 above or a certified copy of the habilitation certificate of a university entitled to grant habilitations,
2. a confirmation that the status consultation has been held under (3) above,
3. the documents required under §9(2) 2 to 6 above (without 5 and 6 in the case of isolated tenure evaluation under §15(2) below),
4. in the case of isolated tenure evaluation under §15(2), a proposed topic for an academic presentation with a discussion,
5. a personal report containing, in particular,

- a. an up to 5-page description of completed, current and planned research projects,
- b. a list of the lectures, presentations and talks given to date and current invitations to lectures (including the event spoken at),
- c. a list of completed, current and planned third-party funded projects,
- d. a list of current and planned academic collaborations (internal, external, national, international),
- e. a list of conferences that were personally organised, or co-organised,
- f. a list of memberships and functions in professional associations and of activities in extra-university educational organisations, governmental organisations or similar institutions,
- g. a list of academic prizes and awards (including teaching prizes) and, where appropriate, also patents or similar,
- h. a list of activities for the purpose of knowledge transfer,
- i. a list of expert opinions provided outside of regular examination grading,
- j. a list of participation in completed and current doctoral processes, naming the respective function (first or second referee), the respective topic and, if known, the result,
- k. a list of personally supervised theses (Bachelor's, Master's and comparable projects in other study courses) stating the topic, the state of progress (current or completed) and, if known, the result,
- l. a list of involvement in examinations (type and number of examinations, respective function in the examination process),
- m. a list of special activities and offerings in the field of teaching (e.g. holding classes in other languages, accepting guest professorships, developing new teaching formats, advisory and supervisory programmes etc.),
- n. a list of offices held in academic self-government (membership of committees, functions, taking on special assignments for the university and its institutions),

6. proof of having completed training courses on staff management, where appropriate.

The tenure-track professor may add further documents to the application, such as the results of teaching evaluations, teaching materials or the report of the Conciliar Commission.

§ 14 Means and method of tenure evaluation

(1) At the latest 14 months before the expiry of the contract of a tenure-track professor, the Rectorate shall establish a Tenure Commission in accordance with §4(3) of this statute, unless the tenure-track professor has already stated in writing that he or she will not apply for a tenure evaluation to be conducted.

(2) Immediately after receiving the application for tenure evaluation, the chair of the Tenure Commission shall provide all commission members with the documents submitted by the tenure-track professor under §13(4) of this statute. This can also take place electronically.

(3) Immediately after receiving the application for tenure evaluation, the Tenure Commission shall appoint three external reviewers, in order to assess the research performance and potential of the tenure-track professor. In principle, two of them shall come from abroad. The reviewers shall be given a full list of publications as well as copies of ready-for-publication academic manuscripts and the personal report of the tenure-track professor. In an extensively substantiated written assessment, which clearly shows the grounds for their decision, they shall set out whether the research performance and potential of the tenure-track professor should be assessed as below average, average, above average or outstanding, in comparison with academics of the same age and level of development in the discipline. They shall take particular account of the following criteria:

1. Quality and quantity of the publications,
2. Independence, originality, innovativeness and well-founded methodology of prior and planned research,
3. the national and international visibility and significance of prior and planned research,
4. the development of the tenure-track professor's research fields and approaches since obtaining his or her doctorate,
5. the acquisition of third-party funding.

The expert opinion shall be completed at the latest three months after it is requested and made available without delay to the members of the Tenure Commission. That can also take place electronically.

If the tenure-track professor has completed a habilitation before the tenure evaluation takes place, and therefore no aptitude evaluation takes place in accordance with §§8 ff. of this statute, the opinions obtained from the habilitation procedure must also be taken into account.

(4) In order to assess the tenure-track professor's teaching performance, the Dean of Studies shall make a written report on the basis of the documents submitted, as well as other officially obtained information about his or her teaching activity. The report shall, in particular, comment on

1. the independence, academic foundations and quality of the teaching skills demonstrated in the classes conducted,
2. the disciplinary breadth and formats of the classes conducted,

3. any innovations demonstrated in the field of teaching,
4. the advisory and supervisory activity of the tenure-track professor (also related to theses and dissertations),
5. the classes held by the tenure-track professor in other languages and invitations to him or her to give lectures outside the University, particularly internationally.

The relevant academic commission (*Studienkommission*) must discuss the report before passing it on to the Tenure Commission and append the result of its deliberation to the report. The report shall be available to the members of the Tenure Commission at the latest three months after the application by the tenure-track professor. It is sufficient to send it electronically.

(5) In order to assess the performance of the tenure-track professor in supporting young researchers, the Dean shall write a report on the basis of the documents submitted and the information officially available to the Dean's Office. The report should be made available to members of the Tenure Commission at the latest three months after the tenure-track professor filed the application. It is sufficient to send it electronically.

(6) In order to assess the performance of the tenure-track professor in academic self-government, as well as to judge his or her competence in staff management, the Dean shall write a report on the basis of the documents submitted and the information officially available to the Dean's Office. The report should be made available to the members of the Tenure Commission at the latest three months after the tenure-track professor first applied for assessment. It is sufficient to send it electronically.

(7) The Faculties may supplement, specify and weight the assessment objects and criteria named in (3) to (6) by their own rules of procedure. Such rules of procedure must be adopted by the Faculty Council and require the approval of the Rectorate. They must be published and communicated in the same way as this statute.

(8) Once all the expert opinions, reports and assessments are available, they must be discussed in detail and assessed by the whole of the Tenure Commission within a period of at most two months. In the context of these discussions, the Tenure Commission shall set a date as early as possible for a 'strategy conversation' with the tenure-track professor. This shall focus on his or her plans and ideas for future research projects, teaching approach and strategy for fostering young researchers. It shall also refer to an academic lecture to be given by the tenure-track professor to a university audience, followed by a discussion. If the aptitude and tenure evaluations are carried out jointly by the Tenure Commission (see §15 1st sentence below) §10(3) shall apply when it comes to deciding the topic of the lecture.

(9) Following the strategy conversation, the Tenure Commission shall discuss whether the academic performance of the tenure-track professor, going beyond his or her basic

aptitude and qualifications for a full professorship, are up to the university's specific requirements for the professorship to be filled. In doing so, it shall also consider the documents accompanying the candidate's application and, in particular, the expert opinions, reports and assessments submitted. If the Tenure Commission comes to a positive assessment it shall decide to recommend the tenure-track professor for a non-advertised appointment with simplified appointment procedure. Otherwise it shall decide not to propose the tenure-track professor for appointment by such a procedure. The assessment of the Tenure Commission is to be submitted at the latest six months before the expiry of the tenure-track professor's term of service.

Section 5: Joint procedures for tenure-track professorships

§ 15 Principle of jointly implementing the aptitude and tenure evaluations

In the case of tenure-track professorships, the aptitude and tenure evaluations shall, in principle, be conducted jointly by the Tenure Commission;
In this case, §9(3) of this statute shall not apply. If the aptitude evaluation has been held earlier (§17 below) or if it is not necessary because of the tenure-track professor's successful habilitation, the tenure evaluation will be carried out separately.

§ 16 Procedure for jointly implementing the aptitude and tenure evaluations

If the aptitude and tenure evaluations are conducted jointly, a further reviewer must be appointed in accordance with §10(1) of this statute, in addition to the reviewers to be appointed in accordance with §14(3).

In this case, all opinions, reports and assessments must comment both on the fundamental aptitude of the tenure-track professor for a full professorship and on the particular requirements in accordance with §12 of this statute. For the procedure, §14 shall apply *mutatis mutandis*. After the final deliberation of the Tenure Commission, it must take a decision initially in keeping with §10(4) and (5) above on the fundamental aptitude of the tenure-track professor for a full professorship. If this decision is positive, the commission must then, in accordance with §14(9), take a decision on the proposal for a non-advertised appointment in simplified procedure.

§ 17 Early aptitude evaluation

At the request of a tenure-track professor, the Rectorate may arrange for the aptitude evaluation to be held earlier if the tenure-track professor has a justified interest in this.

Section 6: Further procedure after conclusion of the tenure evaluation

§ 18 Involvement of the Faculty Council, Rectorate and Senate

(1) After the decision of the Tenure Commission pursuant to §14(9) the report shall be forwarded to the Tenure Board together with all the documents on which it is based. Within one month, the Tenure Board shall send its written assessment to the Rectorate; this may take place by circular procedure. Within this period, the Tenure Board may refer the matter back to the Tenure Commission with a reasoned request for renewed consideration; in this case the assessment of the Tenure Board shall be made within one month after receiving the report based on renewed consideration. If the assessment of the Tenure Board deviates from the decision of the Tenure Commission, it must give detailed reasons. If no assessment is made within one month the Rectorate shall take a decision.

(2) The decision of the Tenure Commission in accordance with §14(9) of this statute, along with the assessment of the Tenure Board, must be communicated to the Faculty Council of the relevant Faculty, the Rectorate and the Senate for consideration. If one of these bodies has serious doubts about the substantive correctness of the decision of the Tenure Commission, it shall refer the decision back to it for renewed discussion and decision. Otherwise it shall approve the decision of the Tenure Commission.

(3) If, in accordance with (1) above, the Tenure Commission is requested to reconsider its decision, this renewed decision must, in turn, be communicated to the Faculty Council of the relevant Faculty, to the Rectorate and the Senate. If the Tenure Commission again proposes to appoint the tenure-track professor without advertisement in simplified procedure, the Faculty Council, Rectorate and Senate shall decide on whether they approve the proposal of the Tenure Commission. If the Tenure Commission this time decides not to appoint the tenure-track professor without an advertisement, no further decision needs to be made.

§ 19 Preconditions for non-advertised appointment with simplified procedure

(1) The Rector shall appoint the tenure-track professor to the professorship without advertisement in accordance with §48(2) LHG, if this corresponds to the proposal of the Tenure Commission and if this proposal has found the approval of the Faculty Council of the relevant Faculty, the Rectorate and the Senate.

(2) The Rector shall make the appointment in keeping with the proposal of the Tenure Commission even if this proposal – after renewed decision-making in accordance with §18 of this statute – has not met with the approval of the Faculty Council, Rectorate or Senate. That shall not apply, however, if the Faculty Council, Rectorate and Senate have refused the approval due to serious doubt about the substantive correctness of the decision of the Tenure Commission and the relevant decisions of the Rectorate were

unanimous, and those of the Faculty Council and Senate were adopted by a three-quarter (qualified) majority and a unanimous vote by those professors who were not members of the Tenure Commission.

(3) If – with the approval of the Faculty Council, Rectorate and Senate or after a renewed decision in accordance with §18 of this statute – the Tenure Commission decides not to appoint the tenure-track professor without advertisement in a simplified procedure, the Rectorate shall take a decision to this effect. This decision must be communicated in writing to the tenure-track professor without delay. The same shall apply in the case of (2) 2nd sentence above.

Section 7: Sundry provisions

§ 20 Acceleration of procedure to preclude the acceptance of a professorship elsewhere

If a tenure-track professor receives an offer of a permanent professorship from another university, the Rectorate may order an immediate conducting of the aptitude and tenure evaluations on request of the relevant Faculty and with the approval of the tenure-track professor.

§ 21 Extension in the event of non-appointment

If a tenure-track professor is not appointed to the professorship because his or her aptitude and qualifications as a full professor could not be established (§10(5) of this statute), the legal basis of the tenure-track professorship may be extended by one year in accordance with §51(7) 4th sentence LHG. The same applies if the Rectorate decides not to appoint a tenure-track professor to the professorship without an advertisement and with the simplified appointment procedure in accordance with §19(3) of this statute.

§ 22 Taking effect

This statute shall take effect on the day after its publication.

Heidelberg, 29 April 2019

(signed) Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Bernhard Eitel

Rector