

**The Leibniz Association Senate Evaluation Procedure – Basic Principles  
(passed on 6 January 2012, as amended on 26 November 2024)**

---

**Attachment 2: Items and criteria for the evaluation of institutions in the Leibniz Association**

**Stage one: evaluation of a Leibniz institution**

I.

Leibniz institutions conduct three different types of work:

- Research
- Development and operation of research infrastructures  
examples: large-scale facilities, animal facilities, information infrastructures, cohort studies, panel data, collections (physical or data-related), social research infrastructures, e.g. Fellows Programmes etc.
- Transfer
  - application of new knowledge (examples: technology transfer, clinical translation etc.)
  - consultancy based on new knowledge (examples: reviews for governments and parliaments, involvement in advisory bodies etc.)
  - communication of new knowledge (examples: exhibitions, citizen science, web-site, media outreach etc.)

These three types of work interrelate but they are differently weighted at the various individual Leibniz institutions. The Review Board takes this weighting into account and assesses it.

II.

Irrespective of how the three types of work are weighted, all Leibniz institutions are evaluated on five major **items**:

- overall concept (tasks and key results, changes and planning)
- controlling and quality management
- human resources
- cooperation and environment
- subdivisions (performance in work units to be defined by the institution).

The evaluation of these five items and the individual sub-items assigned to them is based on **criteria** which include quality (taking account of discipline-related international standards and the relevant discipline-specific indicators), originality, relevance for other areas of society, efficiency, demand etc.

## III.

At every evaluation, the framework described under I. and II. is utilised with specific reference to the institution under consideration.

- (a) As part of the **evaluation package (summarised in the Status Report)**, the Leibniz institution submits a self-presentation. It constitutes the point of reference for the evaluation and explains the institute's weighting of the three types of work it conducts, the amount of resources devoted to the five items and the respective results.
- (b) During the evaluation visit, the Review Board jointly collates its assessments in closed sessions.

In this process, the items are seen in its references to other items. In order to evaluate an institution's functionality and arrive at an appropriate assessment of the institution as a whole, it is essential to examine the interlinkages between research and the promotion of junior researchers, for example, or between leadership structures and the use of resources.

The assessments are summarised in an **Evaluation Report**. The relevant draft is agreed upon in writing with the members of the Review Board after the evaluation visit.

## IV.

Based on the structure used for the evaluation report, the following elucidates which sub-items should be evaluated according to which criteria:

### **Structure of the evaluation report stating the *sub-items* to be evaluated and the *criteria* for evaluating them**

---

#### **1. [Summary]**

#### **2. Overall concept: activities and key results**

- Overall concept and institution's activities (in research, development and operation of research infrastructures, transfer)
  - Key results, taking account of
    - qualitative indicators (highlights from the institution's spectrum of activities)
    - quantitative indicators
      - (a) on scientific publications
      - (b) on property rights, if applicable
      - (c) on policy advice papers (e.g. for ministries), if applicable
      - (d) on the use of central research infrastructures (databases, collections, large-scale equipment, fellow programs, etc.), if applicable
      - (e) on the use of central formats for knowledge transfer (media service, exhibitions, etc.), if applicable
- as well as any other institution-specific indicators, if applicable

*Evaluation criteria:* quality, response, perception, impact, competitiveness, visibility, quantity, originality, current relevance, risk appetite, coherence, plausibility, relevance for other areas of society etc.

### 3. Changes and planning

- Development since the previous evaluation
- Strategic work planning for the coming years

each taking account of

- key changes (particularly the winding-up and/or development of new research fields and new appointments to scientifically important positions) and its strategic controlling
- the recommendations issued after the previous evaluation

Evaluation criteria: plausibility, coherence, quality, response, perception, impact, competitiveness, originality, current relevance, risk appetite, relevance for other areas of society etc.

- Planning for a temporary or permanent increase in institutional funding by the Federation and the *Länder* (“extraordinary item of expenditure”), if applicable
  - content planning
  - financial planning

Evaluation criteria: quality, fit with overall strategic work planning, necessity for planned provisions (HR, equipment, investment resources) etc.

### 4. Controlling and quality management

- Organisational and operational structure
  - organisational structure (structure and personnel composition of management and management bodies, structure of subdivisions and other organisational units, if applicable)
  - operational structure (decision-making processes to manage the institute’s work)
- Financial equipment and use of financial revenue for the institution's tasks
  - institutional funding
  - third-party funding: goals and revenue
  - budget management (via the programme budget, internal performance incentives, etc.)
- Infrastructural equipment and its usage
  - room situation, spatial provisions
  - research infrastructure equipment, framework conditions for its use
  - IT/information technologies, key processes for use and IT security
  - sustainable and resource-conserving handling of infrastructures and their use
- Quality assurance of the scientific work
  - ensuring scientific integrity (measures to ensure good scientific practice; if applicable: research involving animals; research ethics; dealing with risks in international collaborations)
  - publication strategy (including handling of open access)
  - research data management (including handling of open data), if applicable
  - collection management, if applicable
  - technology transfer (e.g. acquiring/holding property rights), if applicable
- Quality management by the Scientific Advisory Board, the User Advisory Board (if applicable) as well as the Supervisory Board
  - structure and personnel composition of bodies
  - execution of responsibilities

Evaluation criteria: appropriateness, quantity, quality, competitiveness, efficiency, functionality, fit with overall concept etc.

## 5. Human resources

- Management
  - execution of responsibilities
  - recruitment and/or changes in scientific and administrative leadership
  - joint appointments
- Academic staff after the qualification phase
  - requirements for permanent employment contracts, proportion of fixed-term contracts
  - recruitment and promotion of academic staff from Germany and abroad
  - opportunities to participate in university teaching
- Academic staff during a qualification phase (doctoral candidates and staff with a doctoral degree)
  - recruitment and promotion of doctoral candidates from Germany and abroad, number of doctoral candidates and successful degrees, average duration of doctoral studies, structured doctoral programmes, regulations for structuring the doctoral phases via supervision agreements
  - recruitment and promotion of staff with a doctoral degree from Germany and abroad, appointments at other institutions, opportunities to participate in university teaching
- Science supporting staff
  - traineeships
  - recruitment and promotion of science supporting staff from Germany and abroad
- Equal opportunities
  - promotion of equal opportunities (equal treatment, equality and diversity)
  - gender equality: gender percentages at the various levels of the hierarchy in research and scientific services, target quotas according to the DFG cascade model (defined in the programme budget)
  - measures to promote gender equality (especially at the level of senior and executive positions)
  - measures to reconcile family care work and career

Evaluation criteria: appropriateness, fit with overall concept, efficiency, quality, effectiveness of measures etc.

## 6. Cooperation and environment

- Cooperation
  - collaborations with universities, especially if they involve joint appointments
  - teaching activities by institute staff at universities
  - involvement in and coordination of alliances such as Collaborative Research Centres, excellence clusters, Leibniz ScienceCampi etc.
  - cooperation with Leibniz institutes, involvement in Leibniz research alliances
  - other collaborations
- Institution's status in its scientific environment

Evaluation criteria: visibility, competitiveness, relevance, fit with overall concept, impact etc.

## 7. Subdivisions

- Responsibilities and results (research, development and operation of research infrastructures, transfer)
- Development since the previous evaluation and strategic work planning for the coming years

Evaluation criteria: quality, response, perception, impact, competitiveness, visibility, quantity, originality, current relevance, risk appetite, coherence, plausibility, relevance for other areas of society etc.

The assessment of each subdivision is pooled in a final graded vote: “excellent”, “very good”, “good”, or “inadequate” (half-grades are possible; units graded as “inadequate” are not eligible to continue receiving joint funding from the Federation and the *Länder*).

## **Stage two: Senate statement on a Leibniz institution**

Based on the evaluation report, the Leibniz Association Senate issues a science policy statement concluding with a recommendation to the Federation and the *Länder* on whether to continue joint funding. In this context, the following points are addressed:

- Institution’s performance
  - conclusions drawn from the evaluation on scientific quality, both overall and with reference to the subdivisions
  - the institution’s unique features
  - appropriateness of the statutory mission and its implementation by the institution and its bodies
  - appropriateness of use of resources
- Institutional added value
  - supra-regional importance
  - national interest
  - need for funding outside of university context
  - relevance for continuing to develop a specific area and its environment
- Importance within the Leibniz Association
  - involvement in joint Leibniz Association projects
  - contribution to Leibniz Association’s profile building
  - compliance with the Leibniz Association’s standards and guidelines
- Position in the European/international scientific context
  - visibility
  - national and international connectivity
- Importance for other areas of society
  - importance for policy-makers, administrations, the health service, industry/business, education, the public etc.