Leibniz Association

The Senate

6 January 2012

The Leibniz Association Senate Evaluation Procedure
Basic Principles

as amended on 27 November 2018

Basic principles underlying the procedure

First stage: Evaluation of a Leibniz institution

1. Responsibility
2. Review board members
3. Evaluation package
4. Evaluation visit
5. Evaluation report
6. Statement by the Leibniz institution on the evaluation report
7. Language
8. Information sources for Leibniz institutions

Second stage: Senate's statement on a Leibniz institution

1. Responsibility
2. Preparation of a Senate's statement on an evaluated Leibniz institution by the Senate Evaluation Committee
3. Release of a Senate's statement on an evaluated Leibniz institution

Attachment 1: Criteria to determine a potential conflict of interest on the part of review board members

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

Attachment 3: Guidelines for preparing an evaluation package (with instructions)

Attachment 4: Deadlines for the evaluation procedure

Basic principles underlying the procedure

I.

At regular intervals, but at the latest every seven years, Federal and *Länder* governments verify whether the institutions united within the Leibniz Association are still in fulfilment of the requirements for joint funding. This assessment is normally based on an independent evaluation and a status report by the responsible departments of the Federal government and the *Land* which hosts the institute (see also the Implementation Agreement on the Administrative Agreement between the Federal and *Länder* Governments on the Establishment of a Joint Science Conference [GWK Agreement] with regard to the joint funding of member institutions of the Leibniz Association (*Wissenschaftsgemeinschaft Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz e. V. – Leibniz-Gemeinschaft*) dated 27 October 2008 – Implementation Agreement WGL – AV-WGL).

As a rule, the Leibniz Association Senate is in charge of this independent evaluation. It manages the evaluation procedure and issues recommendations to the Federation and the *Länder* regarding the continuation of joint funding for Leibniz institutions (see also the Leibniz Association statutes).

The Senate decreed the following basic principles for the evaluation procedure on 6 January 2012.

II.

The procedure for the regular evaluation of Leibniz institutions comprises two stages.

The first stage leads to an evaluation of the Leibniz institution by a review board.

The second stage leads to a science-policy status report by the Senate which includes a recommendation to the Federal and *Länder* governments concerning the continuation of joint funding. The Senate's status report is based on the results of the first stage.

The consultations between the review board and Leibniz Association committees are confidential. The Senate will publish its status reports as well as the information on which they are based (attachment A of the Senate's status report: presentation of the Leibniz institution; attachment B: evaluation report; attachment C: statement by the Leibniz institution on the evaluation report). Until they are released, these documents are also to be treated confidentially by anyone involved in the procedure.

First Stage: Evaluation of a Leibniz Institution

1. Responsibility

The Leibniz Association Senate's SAE (Senate Evaluation Committee) conducts the first stage of the procedure.

2. Review board members

Review board members are:

- chairs appointed by the SAE
- experts
- one representative of the Federal and one of *Länder* governments

The review board should normally be composed of no more than 16 members in total.

2.1 Chairs of the review board

As a rule, the SAE nominates two of its own members to assume the chairmanship and vice chairmanship of the review board. The SAE ensures that chairs regularly include one subject specialist and one non-subject specialist member of the committee. For institutions pursuing similar disciplines, the SAE strives for continuity in the chairmanship of the review boards.

The review board chairs appoint experts to the review board. In doing so they ensure that there is no apparent conflict of interest, which they determine on the basis of the criteria specifically cited in attachment 1. They are also in charge of presiding over the review board and report back to the SAE on the evaluation visit.

2.2 Experts

Experts are national and international academics as well as recognised experts from other professional sectors (such as business, associations, authorities).

Review board chairs draw on the pool of experts compiled by the previous review board, as well as on suggestions of their own or those made by other SAE members, the Evaluation Office or the institution itself. DFG headquarters are regularly asked to make suggestions and, if required, other science organisations and specialist scientific associations in Germany and abroad, as well as international institutions are also consulted. Those who have been requested to act as experts are notified of the criteria to determine a potential conflict of interest (attachment 1). DFG headquarters are regularly notified of and asked to comment on the selection of experts. Review boards for institutions pursuing similar disciplines should be composed of some of the same board members.

The Leibniz institution is given the following opportunities to participate in the selection of review board experts:

(a) Prior to the selection of experts by the review board chairs:

- it can suggest a list of focus areas on which expertise ought to be available on the review board
- it can suggest experts on these focus areas, observing the criteria to determine a potential conflict of interest (attachment 1)

(b) Following the selection of experts by the review board chairs:

- it can comment on whether the experts cover the focus areas named by the institution
- it can comment on whether it sees a potential conflict of interest in the experts selected as per attachment 1

If review board chairs and the Leibniz institution fail to reach an agreement against the backdrop of these comments, the SAE chairs make the final decision, involving the evaluation commissioner at the Leibniz Association presidency.

2.3 Federal and *Länder* government representatives

The Federal government is normally represented on the review board by an SAE member of the relevant Federal Research Ministry who does not have supervisory responsibility for the institution which is to be evaluated.

The *Länder* are represented on the review board by an SAE member or delegate member who is not employed by the *Land* which hosts the institution which is to be evaluated.

3. Evaluation package and presentation of the Leibniz institution

The Leibniz institution prepares an evaluation package. Its purpose is to provide the review board with information on the institution's work and that of its Scientific Advisory Board and/or User Advisory Board since the last evaluation, as well as on the prospects for its future development. The Senate provides the institutions with a mandatory template to prepare the evaluation package.

Based on the evaluation package, the Evaluation Office prepares a presentation of the institution. Its purpose is to give the SAE and Senate as well as the Joint Science Conference (GWK) a concise, objective overview of the institution. This presentation will also be submitted to the review board.

The presentation is prepared in agreement with the Leibniz institution and in consultation with the responsible departments of the Federal government and the *Land* which hosts the institution as well as the review board chairs.

4. Evaluation visit

The review board will visit the institution. The purpose of the evaluation visit is to allow the review board to inform itself about the Leibniz institution over and above the evaluation package and to make an evaluation that is supported by all members.

The agenda will be determined by the review board chairs in agreement with the Leibniz institution. The following items are regular features of an evaluation visit:

(a) preliminary consultations by the review board clarifying, in particular, the purpose of the evaluation procedure.

(b) a presentation by the Leibniz institution outlining its overall concept and subdivisions (such as a poster session or a tour of the institution).

(c) meetings of review board members with the leadership of the institution as well as with employees in the absence of senior staff.

(d) a meeting with a member of the Scientific Advisory Board and, in case of existence at the institution, the User Advisory Board. As far as possible the Advisory Boards should be at least represented by its chairs. The boards may participate in the programme items of the evaluation visit that are open to the institution.

(e) a meeting with representatives of the institution's collaborative partners: the Leibniz institution is asked to make suggestions, and in doing so, to consider the rectors or presidents of universities with which it makes joint appointments. The decision as to which collaborative partners will be invited is agreed between the Leibniz institution and the review board chairs.

The review board will meet in camera to prepare an evaluation of the institution based on the criteria laid out in attachment 3.

Guests of the review board will be invited to attend the evaluation visits, in which they are free to participate with the exception of the meetings in camera. Guests comprise: one representative each of the responsible departments of the Federal government and *Land* which hosts the institution (who are, as a rule, members of the institution's Supervisory Board), of the GWK and Leibniz Association headquarters (normally the spokesperson for the relevant section).

Prior to the final review board meeting in camera, the representative of the Leibniz Association will make a statement as to whether, in his or her opinion, the evaluation visit has been conducted fairly and in accordance with the principles laid down in the present document.

If the Leibniz Association representative or the Leibniz institution has any doubts as to whether the evaluation visit has been conducted fairly and in accordance with the principles laid down in the present document, the SAE will make a decision as to whether the objections should be taken into consideration in consultation with the evaluation commissioner at the Leibniz Association presidency.

5. Evaluation report

The review board's assessment will be summarised in an evaluation report. The evaluation report does not contain a recommendation regarding the continuation of joint funding for the Leibniz institution.

The Evaluation Office will draft the evaluation report based on the results of the evaluation visit. After verification and approval by the chairs, the draft will be submitted to all other review board members for verification and approval. Once all review board members have approved the report, it can no longer be altered.

If the review board is unable to reach an agreement on the evaluation report, even after arbitration by the SAE chairs, any assessments that deviate from the majority opinion expressed by the review board will be listed separately in the report.

6. Statement on the evaluation report by the Leibniz institution

The final evaluation report, as agreed upon by the review board, will be sent to the leadership of the Leibniz institution, to the responsible departments at the Federal government and the *Land* which hosts the institution, as well as to the SAE and Senate chairs. The institution's leadership may submit the evaluation report to its own committees. By doing so the members of these committees become party to the procedure and thus bound by confidentiality until the Senate's statement is released.

The Leibniz institution may make a statement on the evaluation report. This statement will be submitted to the SAE and the Senate together with the status report and the evaluation report.

If a Leibniz institution feels that the evaluation report violates the procedural principles defined in the present document, or that any facts in the evaluation report have been significantly misrepresented, it can apply to the SAE chairs for a reappraisal of the evaluation report by the evaluation group.

Together with the review board chairs and the evaluation commissioner at the Leibniz Association presidency, the SAE chairs will then decide whether this request is admissible and justified. The evaluation commissioner will be given the necessary access to the SAE evaluation package. If the Senate committee chairs, the review board chairs and the evaluation commissioner cannot reach an agreement, the SAE will make a decision on the institution's request.

If a request is justified, the review board will reconsider the evaluation report. The institution will then have the right to make a new, final statement on this new and final version of the agreed evaluation report. Even if the request is inadmissible or unjustified, the institution has the right to make a new and final statement.

7. Language

As a rule, the first stage of the evaluation procedure will be held in German unless the institution and review board chairs agree that it should be conducted in English.

8. Information resources for Leibniz institutions

The Evaluation Office offers Leibniz institutions which are due for evaluation a preliminary consultation to clarify procedural questions in the run-up to the evaluation. The Leibniz institution may turn to Leibniz Association headquarters for advice on the contents of the evaluation.

Second Stage: Senate's Statement on a Leibniz Institution

1. Responsibility

The Senate conducts the second stage of the procedure. The SAE prepares its resolutions.

2. SAE preparation of a Senate's statement on an evaluated Leibniz institution

The SAE prepares a recommendation for a science-policy statement by the Senate on the Leibniz institution that has been evaluated. The review board chairs provide the SAE with a draft recommendation that has been coordinated with the Senate committee chairs.

The SAE recommendation for a Senate's statement is based on the presentation of the Leibniz institution, the evaluation report and, if submitted, the institution's statement on the evaluation report.

It is also based on an oral report by the review board chairs as well as a hearing of the responsible departments of the Federal government and the *Land* which hosts the institution on the SAE.

3. Release of Senate's statement on an evaluated Leibniz institution

The Senate will consult on and release a science-policy statement on the Leibniz institution that has been evaluated. For institutions that receive a positive overall evaluation, the Senate’s statement will, if applicable, address whether joint funding should be discontinued for individual subdivisions of the institution.

The Senate consultations are based on the SAE recommendations for a Senate's statement including attachments A: presentation; B: evaluation report and, if submitted, C: the institution's statement on the evaluation report.

The Senate will involve the SAE chair in its deliberations.

A Senate's statement includes, in particular, a recommendation on the continuation of joint funding by Federal and *Länder* governments. The Senate distinguishes between the following basic scenarios:

- the Senate of the Leibniz Association recommends that Federal and *Länder* governments continue their joint funding of the institution.
- the Senate of the Leibniz Association recommends that Federal and *Länder* governments continue their joint funding of the institution.

  The Senate requests the institution (or the Scientific Advisory Board and/or the User Advisory Board or the Supervisory Board) to submit a report on the implementation of recommendations by a certain deadline. If it then proves necessary, the Senate will recommend that the Federal and *Länder* governments should prepone the next evaluation of funding eligibility.
- the Senate of the Leibniz Association recommends that Federal and *Länder* governments continue their joint funding of the institution.

  The Senate furthermore recommends scheduling the next evaluation of funding eligibility for an earlier date than the regular seven-year interval: after an appropriate, individually agreed time period.
- the Senate of the Leibniz Association recommends that Federal and *Länder* governments discontinue their joint funding of the institution.

Attachment 1: Criteria to determine a potential conflict of interest on the part of review board members

The chairs of a review board, the Leibniz institution which is to be evaluated, and the expert board members, or persons who have been requested to act as experts for the review board are asked to observe the following criteria which might constitute a potential conflict of interest (for details, see also 'principles underlying the evaluation procedure of the Leibniz Association Senate', chapter 'First Stage', paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2).

A person will be excluded from participation in a review board if one of the following criteria applies:

- relative related up to the third degree, or married to or living with an employee of the institution in question
- employment by the institution or membership of its committees (within the last seven years prior to the evaluation visit)
- application for a position at the institution (within the last seven years prior to the evaluation visit)
- academic mentoring provided for senior employees or received from employees of the institution (within the last seven years prior to the evaluation visit)
- employment at another Leibniz institution, or at an institution which has applied to receive joint funding from Federal and *Länder* Governments as a Leibniz institution

At the discretion of the chairs of the review board, a person may be excluded from participation in a review board if one of the following criteria applies, in particular:

- close personal ties or conflicts
- close academic or commercial collaboration
- direct academic or commercial competition
- participation in the selection of senior staff at the institution
- evaluation of scientific project(s) by the person in question by employees of the institution

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 publications in organs outside of science and research, if applicable
       (c) on property rights/patents, if applicable
       (d) on spin-offs, if applicable
       (e) on policy advice papers, if applicable
       (f) on the use of research infrastructures (utilisation analysis), if applicable
       (g) on exhibitions (number of visitors, reception analysis), if applicable
       (h) on media outreach, 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

- Funding and facilities
  - institutional funding
  - third-party funding: goals and revenue
  - spatial provisions
  - IT
  - special infrastructures, if applicable
- 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)
- Quality management
  - measures to ensure good scientific practice
  - animal welfare measures, if applicable
  - publication strategy (including handling of open access)
  - technology transfer strategy (e.g. acquiring/holding industrial property rights and patents)
  - quality management measures for research infrastructures
  - research data management (including handling of open data)
  - internal performance incentives such as performance-based funding allocation (LOM)
  - budget management via the programme budget
  - management of fundamental administrative workflows
- 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
- Post-doctoral staff
  - promotion of post-doctoral staff
  - appointments at other institutions
  - proportion of fixed-term contracts
- Doctoral candidates
  - number of doctoral candidates and successful completions
  - average duration of doctoral studies
  - structured doctoral programmes
  - institution's appeal to junior staff
- Non-scientific staff
  - traineeships
  - vocational training measures
- Equal opportunities, work-life balance
  - gender percentage at the various levels of the hierarchy in research and scientific services
  - measures to promote gender equality (especially at the level of senior and leadership positions)
  - measures to reconcile work and family life

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
  - total volume of 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.

Attachment 3: Guidelines for preparing an evaluation package (with instructions)

Preparing the evaluation package – content guidelines

I.

The purpose of the evaluation package is to inform the Review Board about the institution's activities since the previous evaluation as well as about the prospects for its future development. The Review Board's work is made easier if the package is as clear and concise as possible.

The package (excluding appendices and tables) should not exceed 120 pages. Maximum numbers of pages are stipulated for each chapter, indicating how they could be structured. Please do not include any appendices with information not specifically requested.

II.

The institution's activities should be presented in their overall context, with the exception of Chapter 7 where you are asked to focus on appropriate subdivisions within the institution to explain their performance and work planning at this level. It is up to the institution to decide whether the subdivisions they present are composed, for example, of organisational units, work focus areas, research fields, programme areas or other units. The template consistently refers to "subdivision". This generic term will have to be adapted to the specifics of the respective institution. The subdivisions described in the evaluation package will be presented during the evaluation visit (as part of the "poster session").

III.

Some of the points require statistical details. They usually refer to calendar years and should cover the last three complete years prior to submitting the evaluation package. In a few cases, the details refer to a reporting date. Please round the figure up or down, as appropriate.

The blue explanations in italics are editorial notes for preparing the evaluation package and should be omitted later.

Preparing the evaluation package – organisational guidelines

Please take note of the following points:

(a) Format: DIN A4, font 11pt, line spacing 1.15.

(b) Hard copy: double-sided. Please start new chapters on a new, uneven numbered page.

(c) Type of paper: lightweight paper (not high gloss paper).

(d) Loose leaf folder, as slim as possible.

Once the evaluation package has been prepared:

(a) Please send a preliminary hard copy as well as an electronic version of the evaluation package to the Evaluation Office which will feed back to you whether the package is complete.

(b) Depending on the number of reviewers and guests of the Review Board, once the package has been finalised, approx. 25 copies (hard copies as well as pdf electronic versions) will be required.

(c) Please send the package to the members of the Review Board and guests participating in the evaluation visit directly. You will receive the relevant address list from the Evaluation Office. Please also send two copies of the package to the Evaluation Office itself.

(d) Please provide the Evaluation Office with Word docs of both the preliminary copy and the final copy of the package (tables in Excel, please).

The Evaluation Office will be pleased to answer any questions that arise.

Contents

1. Key data: statutory mission, organisation, budget, human resources *(max. 2 pages)*

Appendices to Chapter 1:

- Items of organisational law *(Statutes, Articles of Association or similar)*
- Professional CVs of senior scientific staff *(two pages max.)*

Key data:

Year established:

Admission to joint funding by Federal and *Länder* Governments:

Admission to the Leibniz Association:

Year of last statement by the Leibniz Senate or the German Council of Science and Humanities:

Legal form:

Responsible department at *Länder* level:

Responsible department at Federal level:

Total budget (see overview in Chapter 4.1):

€ __m institutional funding

€ __m revenue from project grants

€ __m revenue from services

Number of staff (see overview in Chapter 5):

__ individuals in research and scientific services

__ individuals in service sector

__ individuals in administration

Statutory mission *(quoted from the Statutes, Articles of Association or similar)*:

Organisation:

With reference to the organisational chart, please explain briefly how work is divided up in the subdivisions in Chapter 7.

Please include the following overview in the appropriate place:

i) Organisational chart *(clearly legible and on one page only please)*

ii) List of senior scientific staff

(If there are professors at your institution who do not hold a leadership position, please include them at the end of this list.)

Name	**Leadership position**	**At the institute since**	**Year and salary grade of appointment as well as partner university, if applicable**
Family name, first name	Head of institute	July 2002	2002, W3, HU Berlin
	Department xyz		
	Research group xyz		
	Junior research group xyz		

2. Overall concept and core results *(max. 10 pages)*

Appendix to Chapter 2:

- List of third-party funded projects (20xx–20zz)

Explain briefly (ca. 2 pages) the overall concept of your institution. What role do the three types of activity research, development and operation of research infrastructures, and transfer play at your institution (see "Items and criteria for the evaluation of institutions in the Leibniz Association")?

Describe the institution's core results (highlights) in the three types of activity (it is possible that you mainly or even exclusively explain the 10 most important results [see list i] in detail). Please describe other quantitative indicators if they are not covered by the overviews i)-iv) below but are of relevance to your institution (e.g. user statistics for infrastructures, number of visitors to exhibitions etc.).

Please insert the following overviews at the appropriate place:

i) List of the most important results (ten max.) since the previous evaluation

Until a few years ago, a list of the 10 most important scientific publications was requested. This list has now been opened up, so that other, clearly defined work results of the types of activity "research infrastructures" (e.g. the online provision of a database) and "knowledge transfer" (e.g. a policy advice report) can also be listed.

ii) The institution's publication figures (20xx–20zz)

Type of publication	**20xx**	**20yy**	**20zz**
Monographs			
Individual contributions to edited volumes			
Articles in peer-reviewed journals (contributions that have been accepted for publication but not yet appeared may be added in parentheses for the respective year)			
Articles in other journals			
Working and discussion papers			
Editorship of edited volumes			

iii) The number of industrial property rights held by the institution (20xx–20zz)

	20xx	**20yy**	**20zz**
Patents (granted / applied)			
Other industrial property rights (granted / applied)			
Exploitation rights / licences (number)			

iv) The number of expert reviews produced by the institution (20xx–20zz)

Expert reviews refer to expert reports and opinions for science policy-makers, business, associations etc., not reviews of academic theses or peer reviews for publications or grant applications.

	20xx	**20yy**	**20zz**
Number of expert reviews			

3. Changes and planning *(max. 10 pages)*

3.1 Development since the previous evaluation
3.2 Strategic work planning for the coming years

Appendices to Chapter 3.2:

- most recent programme budget

In the two sub-chapters, please explain the development of the institution since the previous evaluation (Chapter 3.1) and the strategic work planning for the coming years (Chapter 3.2), taking account of major changes (particularly the winding up and/or development of new research fields as well as new appointments to scientifically important positions) and the recommendations issued at the previous evaluation. If appropriate, one sub-chapter can be used for both purposes.

3.3 Planning for additional funds deriving from institutional funding

General remarks concerning 'extraordinary items of expenditure' („Sondertatbestände")

A "temporary extraordinary item of expenditure" ("temporärer Sondertatbestand") can be evaluated in the context of the regular evaluation procedure. A positive vote in the evaluation report and Senate's statement will be submitted to the committees of the Joint Science Conference for a decision.

A "minor extraordinary item of expenditure of a scientific-strategic nature" („kleiner Sondertatbestand inhaltlich-strategischer Natur") can undergo an initial evaluation in the context of the regular procedure. Please note that a positive vote in the evaluation report and Senate's statement is followed by another procedure that serves to prioritise 'extraordinary items of expenditure' submitted by Leibniz institutions in the Senate Strategic Committee (SAS). Subsequently, the committee of the Joint Science Conference will make a decision on the prioritised 'extraordinary items of expenditure'.

For procedures see the "WGL resolutions" by the Joint Science Conference and the "Manual on Leibniz institution budgets". Both documents are publicly available on the website of the Joint Science Conference.

Remarks to the required information in the evaluation package

In case the institute's planning requires an "extraordinary item of expenditure" to be assessed in the context of the evaluation, the following information is required:

- *Reference to the Supervisory Board's agreement to propose the planning for an "extraordinary item of expenditure" in the evaluation package.*
- *Content planning for the "extraordinary item of expenditure".*
- *Financial planning of the "extraordinary item of expenditure": a) explanation and amount of funding for human resources (with information on designated positions), non-staff costs, investments, b) summary of the funds planning showing own and additional funds for the 'extraordinary item of expenditure' (please use the following table)*

„Extraordinary item of expenditure": summary of funds planning

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	Permanently
Own funds + additional funds = „extraordinary item of expenditure"	*850 k€*	*917 k€*	*924 k€*	*951 k€*	*951 k€*
Own funds from existing funding by institution (at least 3 % of core budget)	*450 k€*	*457 k€*	*464 k€*	*471 k€*	*471 k€*
Additional funds of institutional funding	*400 k€*	*460 k€*	*460 k€*	*480 k€*	*480 k€*

Explanation of the table:

Please fill in the actual year (e.g. 2020 instead of „1st year").

A "minor extraordinary item of expenditure of a scientific-strategic nature" will be transferred to the core budget after four years maximum. In case it should be transferred earlier to the core budget, please delete the corresponding columns (4th, 3rd and 2nd year if applicable).

A "temporary extraordinary item of expenditure" can be provided for four years maximum. In this case, please delete irrelevant columns (always column "permanently" and 4th, 3rd, 2nd year if applicable).

4. Controlling and quality management *(max. 10 pages)*

4.1 Facilities, equipment and funding

Please briefly explain the institution's total budget in accordance with the overview at the end of the chapter (revenue from institutional funding, revenue from project grants, revenue from services).

What targets are there for revenue from third-party funding (revenue from project grants, revenue from services)? In particular, are there targets relating to revenue from specific third-party funders or to the composition of the third-party funding portfolio?

Describe the facilities and equipment. If relevant, discuss the specifics of the institution, e.g. in relation to large-scale equipment, laboratory facilities and equipment, collections etc.

Please elucidate the institution's IT strategy (including data backup)

At the end of Chapter 4.1, please insert the following overview (preferably on one page):

The institution's revenue and expenses

	Revenue	20xx k€	20xx % 2)	20xx % 3)	20yy k€	20yy % 2)	20yy % 3)	20zz1) k€	20zz1) % 2)	20zz1) % 3)
Total revenue (sum of I., II. and III.; excluding DFG fees)										
I.	**Revenue (sum of I.1., I.2. and I.3)**	**10.000**	**100 %**			**100 %**			**100 %**	
1.	INSTITUTIONAL FUNDING (EXCLUDING CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY)	7.000	70 %							
1.1	Institutional funding (excluding construction projects and acquisition of property) by Federal and *Länder* governments according to AV-WGL	7.000								
1.2	Institutional funding (excluding construction projects and acquisition of property) not received in accordance with AV-WGL									
2.	REVENUE FROM PROJECT GRANTS	2.000	20 %	100 %			100 %			100 %
2.1	DFG	1.000		50 %						
2.2	Leibniz Association (competitive procedure)	1.000		50 %						
2.3	Federal, *Länder* governments									
2.4	EU									
2.5	Industry									
2.6	Foundations									
2.7	*If applicable: other sponsors*									
3.	REVENUE FROM SERVICES	1.000	10 %							
3.1	Revenue from commissioned work	1.000								
3.2	Revenue from publications									
3.3	Revenue from exploitation of intellectual property for which the institution holds industrial property rights (patents, utility models etc.)									
3.4	Revenue from exploitation of intellectual property without industrial property rights									
3.5	*If applicable: other services*									
II.	**Miscellaneous revenue** (e.g. membership fees, donations, rental income, funds drawn from reserves)									
III.	**Revenue for construction projects** (institutional funding by Federal and *Länder* governments, EU structural funds, etc.)									

	Expenditures	20xx k€	20yy k€	20zz k€
Expenditures (excluding DFG fees)				
1.	Personnel			
2.	Material expenses			
2.1	*Proportion of these expenditures used for registering industrial property rights (patents, utility models etc.)*			
3.	Equipment investments			
4.	Construction projects, acquisition of property			
5.	Other operating expenses			
DFG fees (if paid for the institution – 2.5% of revenue from institutional funding)				

[1] Preliminary data: yes / no

[2] Figures I.1, I.2 and I.3 add up to 100 %. The information requested here is thus the percentage of "Institutional funding (excluding construction projects and acquisition of property)" in relation to "Revenue from project grants" and "Revenue from services".

[3] Figures I.2.1 to I.2.7 add up to 100 %. The information requested here is thus the percentage of the various sources of "Revenue from project grants".

4.2 Organisational and operational structure

How is the institution organised (structure and personnel composition of management and management bodies, organisation of subdivisions and other organisational units, if applicable)?

How is the institution operated (decision-making processes, particularly control of institute activities)?

4.3 Quality management

Please explain your quality assurance measures, if appropriate with reference to the Leibniz Association's relevant guidelines. Please focus on the following themes, in so far as they play a role at your institution:

- *measures to ensure good scientific practice*
- *animal welfare measures, if applicable*
- *publication strategy (including handling of open access)*
- *technology transfer strategy (e.g. acquiring/holding industrial property rights and patents)*
- *quality management measures for research infrastructures*
- *research data management (including handling of open data)*
- *internal performance incentives such as performance-based funding allocation (LOM)*
- *budget management via the programme budget*
- *management of fundamental administrative workflows*

4.4 Quality management by advisory boards and supervisory board

Appendices to Chapter 4.4:

- audit report
- minutes of meetings of Scientific Advisory Board and, if appropriate, User Advisory Board (20xx–20zz)

i) Please state the Scientific Advisory Board's mission (quoting from the Statutes or comparable document).

List of the members of the institution's Scientific Advisory Board (current members and members during the last seven years)

Member	Institution	Discipline	Period in office
n.n. (Chair)			
n.n. (Vice-Chair)			
n.n.			

Add specific information, if necessary.

ii) Use the same format for the User Advisory Board, if appropriate.

iii) Use the same format for the Supervisory Board, whereby the column "Discipline" in the list of members should be deleted.

<u>5. Human resources</u> *(max. 10 pages)*

5.1 Leading scientific and administrative positions

Please elucidate the procedures used for appointing leading scientific and administrative management positions as well as joint professors.

5.2 Staff with a doctoral degree

How does your institution promote staff with a doctoral degree, especially in the "post-doc phase"? Have staff at your institution been appointed to professorships or transferred to other leading positions during the reporting period? How does your institution deal with fixed-term contracts and tenure?

5.3 Doctoral candidates

Please describe your institution's supervision strategy for doctoral candidates, including structured programmes, if applicable. What is the average length of doctorates?

How do you assure the quality/success of your doctoral training? Do you keep track of your graduates' career paths? Do you stay in contact with former doctoral candidates (e.g. via an alumni network)?

Please insert the following overview at an appropriate place:

Degrees completed at the institution (20xx–20zz)

	20xx	**20yy**	**20zz**
Degrees qualifying candidates to study for a doctorate			
Doctorates			
Habilitations			

5.4 Science supporting staff

Please describe vocational training measures. How many traineeships and which qualifications does your institution offer? Please state the number of vocational qualifications completed between 20xx and 20zz.

5.5 Equal opportunities and work-life balance

The Leibniz Association has committed itself to implementing the DFG's "Research-Oriented Standards on Gender Equality" (which include the cascade model) and developed them further into the „Leibniz-Gleichstellungsstandards". Please explain the measures adopted and the status reached at your institution with regard to the five principles contained in the „Leibniz-Gleichstellungsstandards": women in leadership positions, gender equality as a guiding principle, gender equality officer, reconciliation of work and family life, external certification. What problems are you still facing? How can they be solved?

At the end of Chapter 5, please insert the following overview (one page only, if possible, and adapted as appropriate):

Institution staff (as of: dd.mm.yyyy)

	Full time equivalents		Persons		Women		foreigners
	Total	**on third-party funding**	**Total**	**on temporary contracts**	**Total**	**on temporary contracts**	**Total**
	Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**
Research and scientific services	**8**	**50 %**					
1st level (scientific directors)	1	-					
2nd level (department leaders or equi.)	1	-					
3rd level (group leaders or equi.)	1	100 %					
Junior research group leaders (if applicable)	1	100 %					
Further academic staff in executive positions	1	-					
Scientists in non-executive positions (A13, A14, E13, E14 or equivalent)	1	-					
Doctoral candidates (A13, E13, E13/2 or equi.)	2	100 %					
Science supporting staff (laboratories, technical support etc.)	**8**	**50 %**					
Laboratory (E9 to E12,upper-mid-level service)	2	-					
Laboratory (E5 to E8, mid-level service)	2	-					
Animal care (E5 to E8, mid-level service)	2	100 %					
Workshops (E5 to E8, mid-level service)	2	100 %					
Library (from E13, senior service)							
Library (E9 to E12, upper-mid-level service)							
Library (E5 to E8, mid-level service)							
Information technology - IT (E9 to E12, upper-mid-level service)							
Technical (large equipment, service) (E5 to E8, mid-level service)							
Science supporting staff (administration)	**4**						
Head of the administration	1						
Staff positions (from E13, senior service)	-						
Staff positions (E9 to E12, upper-mid-level service)	-						
Internal administration (financial administration, personell etc.) (from E13, senior service)	1						
Internal administration (financial administration, personnel etc.) (E9 to E12, upper-mid-level service)	1						
Building service (E1 to E4)	1						
Student assistants							
Trainees							
Scholarship recipients at the institution	**2**						
Doctoral candidates	1						
Post-doctoral researchers	1						

<u>6. Cooperation and environment</u> *(max. 7 pages)*

6.1 Cooperation

<u>Appendix to Chapter 6.1:</u>

- collaborative agreements with universities with which appointments are made jointly

Please describe your institution's major collaborations, taking account of the following aspects and broken down in a form appropriate to your institution:

- *collaborations with universities, especially if they involve joint appointments*
- *total scope of 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*

6.2 Institution's status in the specialist environment

Please name between three and five of the most important institutions in your institution's environment. How do you rate your position in comparison with these institutions? Where do you identify overlaps?

<u>7. Subdivisions</u> *(max. 6 pages per subdivision)*

In this chapter, please present the subdivisions at your institution. Use a sub-chapter for each individual subdivision, taking account of the following scheme:

- *Summary (half a page max. - the text should be so concise that it can be copied without any changes into the "status report")*
- *Activities and core results (it is possible that you mainly or even exclusively explain the 10 most important results [see list i] in detail)*
- *Development of the subdivision since the previous evaluation as well as central planning for its future.*

7.1 Subdivision I

Taking note of the above points, please describe Subdivision I. At the end of Chapter 7.1, please insert the following overviews at an appropriate place in the text:

i) Overview of researchers (as of: dd.mm.yyyy)

Name	**Position**	**At the institute since**	**Sub-unit, if applicable**
Family name, first name	Head of Subdivision I	January 2011	Research group xyz
Family name, first name	Doctoral candidate	July 2017	Junior res. group xyz

ii) List of the most important results (ten max.) since the previous evaluation

Until a few years ago, a list of the 10 most important scientific publications was requested. This list has now been opened up, so that other, clearly defined work results of the types of activity "research infrastructures" (e.g. the online provision of a database) and "knowledge transfer" (e.g. a policy advice report) can also be listed.

iii) List of the ten journals in which Subdivision staff published most frequently (20xx–20zz)

Please cite the ten journals in which staff in the Subdivision published most frequently between 20xx and 20zz. Reference should be made to the categories in overview iv) "Papers in peer-reviewed journals" and "Papers in other journals". Please arrange them in descending order of the number of papers published.

Title of journal	**Peer review (yes/no)**	**Number**
1. Zeitschrift für…	yes	8
2. Journal for …	no	6
3. Proceedings of…	yes	4
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

In addition to the list, please complete the following:

Between 20xx and 20zz, papers were published in a total of __ different peer-reviewed journals and a total of __ other journals.

The following additional information may be included:

Visit www.institut.de for a complete list of the subdivision's publications

iv) Key data

	Number of FTEs (as of: day/month/20xx)	
	Total	on third-party funding (in %)
Personnel [1]	**100**	
Research and scientific services (excluding doctoral candidates)	70	
Doctoral candidates	20	
Science supporting staff (laboratories, technical support etc.)	10	

	20xx	20yy	20zz
Institutional funding (excluding construction projects and acquisition of property) by Federal and *Länder* governments according to AV-WGL (in k€)	**3.000**		
Revenue from project grants (in k€)	**1.000**		
DFG	500		
Leibniz Association (competitive procedure)	300		
Federal, *Länder* governments	100		
EU	100		
Industry			
Foundations			
If applicable: Other sponsors			
Revenue from services (in k€)	**1.000**		
Revenue from commissioned work	500		
Revenue from publications	100		
Revenue from the exploitation of intellectual property for which the institution holds industrial property rights (patents, utility models etc.)	400		
Revenue from exploitation of intellectual property without industrial property rights			
If applicable: revenue for other services; please specify			

Monographs			
Individual contributions to edited volumes			
Articles in peer-reviewed journals (contributions which have been accepted for publication in the past year may be added in parentheses)			
Articles in other journals			
Work and discussion papers			
Editorship of edited volumes			
Number publications co-authored with scientists from other subdivisions			

Patents (granted/applied)			
Other industrial property rights (granted/applied)			
Exploitation rights / licences (number)			

Number of expert reviews			

Academic degrees leading to doctoral work			
Doctoral degrees			
Habilitations			

[1] As per the annex to section 5.

<u>**Handling of recommendations from the previous evaluation**</u> (max. 2 pages)

Please quote the recommendations issued at the previous evaluation and briefly describe how they have been implemented. For details, refer to the relevant passages in the text of the document. The two-page guideline refers to the text excluding the recommendations quoted.

Appendices

Appendices to Chapter 1:

- Items of organisational law *(Statutes, Articles of Association or similar)*
- Professional CVs of senior scientific staff *(two pages max.)*

Appendix to Chapter 2:

- List of third-party funded projects (20xx–20zz)

Third-party funder	**Project leader**	**Grant (in €k)**	**Duration**	**Project title (short title, if appropriate)**	**Responsible subdivision**

Please arrange the columns as follows: Put together all the projects financed by the same third-party funder (e.g. BMBF, DFG) and arrange this group in alphabetical order according to the name of the project leader. If one and the same leader has several projects financed by the same third-party funder, please cite the project with the highest funding in first place, followed by the second highest etc. Please indicate in the last column which subdivision is responsible for the project or, in the case of projects with several subdivisions involved, which one is in charge.

Appendix to Chapter 3.2:

- Most recent programme budget

Appendices to Chapter 4.4:

- audit report
- minutes of meetings of Scientific Advisory Board and, if appropriate, User Advisory Board (20xx–20zz)

Appendix to Chapter 6.1:

- collaborative agreements with universities with which appointments are made jointly

Attachment 4: Deadlines for the evaluation procedure

The SAE and Senate manage the procedure so that the Joint Science Conference (GWK) receives the status report on an institution, which is the basis for assessing the funding eligibility, no later than two months prior to the date of the GWK committee meeting at which the assessment is to be made.

As a rule, no more than twelve months should elapse between the evaluation visit and the assessment at the Joint Science Conference. Therefore, the following basic time periods should not be exceeded:

<u>Deadlines prior to the evaluation visit</u>

12 months	SAE	decides on chair and vice chair
11 months	Leibniz institution	discusses the procedure with the Evaluation Office and, if required, with Leibniz Association headquarters
10 months	Leibniz institution	suggests a list of focus areas for which expertise should be available on the review board; suggests experts
6 months	Evaluation Office	informs Leibniz institution of proposed review board members
5.5 months	Leibniz institution	comments on any potential conflicts of interest or failure to cover the focus areas named
4 months	Leibniz institution	sends a preliminary copy of the evaluation package to the Evaluation Office
3 months	Evaluation Office	provides feedback on the evaluation package
2 months	Leibniz institution	sends evaluation package to the review board and the guests involved in the evaluation visit
0.5 months	Evaluation Office	sends the status report to the review board

Deadlines after the evaluation visit

0.5 months	Leibniz institution	raises any objections to the evaluation visit
3 months	Evaluation Office	drafts an evaluation report for review board chair
4 months	Review board chair	critically reviews and approves evaluation report
5 months	Other review board members	critically review and approve evaluation report (silence procedure, three-week deadline)
7 months	Leibniz institution	makes statement on the evaluation report
9 months	Senate Evaluation Committee	proposes a Senate's statement
10 months	Senate	releases a Senate's statement
12 months	Joint Science Conference GWK	assesses funding eligibility