



OFFICIAL NOTICES

Published by the Central Administration
Volume 42 – no. 5 – 17.03.2016
ISSN 1866-2862

Contents

PUBLIC NOTICES

Quality assurance plan according to § 48 para. (1) item (4) LHG for assistant professorships with tenure track and evaluation statute regarding assistant professors and junior lecturers	90
---	----

Quality assurance plan according to § 48 para. (1) item (4) LHG for assistant professorships with tenure track and evaluation statute regarding assistant professors and junior lecturers

According to sections §§ 8 para. (5) item (1), 19 para. (1) item (2) no. 10 of the law governing higher education in the state of Baden-Württemberg, "Landeshochschulgesetz (LHG)" (GBl. 2005, p. 1) of 1 April 2014 (GBl. p. 99), as amended on 10 November 2015 (GBl. p. 895), the University of Tübingen Senate at its meeting on 10 December 2015 passed the following statute.

Part 1: Assistant professorships

I. Assistant professorship

Assistant professors are usually appointed under § 51 para. (7) LHG for an initial limited time period of up to four years with the status of temporary civil servants: "Beamtinnen/ Beamten auf Zeit." This Beamte status may be extended to a total of six years if the assistant professor has proven his or her worth as a member of academic staff in his or her performance, particularly in research and teaching, according to the results of an interim evaluation. At the end of the period of service, a final evaluation is undertaken of the assistant professor's performance assessing his/her aptitude and ability for possible future academic positions. Assistant professors not employed as civil servants but according to private-law contracts are treated equally.

II. Assistant professorship with tenure track

Under § 48 para. (1) item (4) LHG, assistant professors at the University of Tübingen may be promoted to full professorship without a public call for applications for that position, if the prospect of subsequent employment as a full professor as well as the conditions for such a promotion were explicitly set out in the original call for applications for the assistant professorship, and if those conditions (aptitude, ability, and academic performance as an assistant professor according to requirements agreed upon between the University and the Ministry) have been met.

III. Procedure for assistant professorships with tenure track

1. Gender equality standards

To ensure gender equality in the selection process, the University of Tübingen Senate's resolution of 10 April 2014, "Advancement of gender equality and internationalization measures in appointments procedures" must be respected. Within the framework of gender equality monitoring, an annual report is made on appointments to assistant professorships with tenure track and on the evaluation procedure for assistant professorships with tenure track.

2. Call for applications to assistant professorships

Assistant professorships linked with a tenure track are usually advertised internationally. The advertisement contains a reference to the tenure track. The requirements establishing aptitude, ability, and academic performance and/or any special requirements to be met in order to be promoted to a full, W3 professorship must be set out in the call for applications to the W1 assistant professorship.

When submitting the application to the university senate and rectorate for approval of the professorship, the faculty presents this list of requirements based on the evaluation criteria and standards set out in section V and specifying which subject-specific evaluation criteria and standards form the basis of the interim evaluation and the final evaluation of the assistant professorship; in doing so, the faculty also establishes the necessary qualification criteria from its point of view. The Gender Equality Representative must be given the opportunity to make a statement on this list in advance.

Information on the course of the tenure process, evaluation criteria and standards, as well as subject-specific requirements and the weighting of the criteria is provided in writing to the assistant professor before he/she commences his/her employment, at the latest when the appointment is made.

3. Interim evaluation procedure

(1) The interim evaluation procedure is launched by the faculty 14 months before the end of the limited-term employment contract, at the latest two months before the end of the third year. The faculty will be reminded of the coming evaluation procedure by Human Resources.

The interim evaluation process may be launched earlier upon application by the assistant professor, for instance in the case he/she wishes to apply to a professorship elsewhere, to document the assistant professor's performance to date. The application must be made to the faculty responsible. An early evaluation presumes that the assistant professor will show credibly at the time of application that he/she has met the requirements for an extension of his/her employment contract to the full six years prior to the expiry of the initial four-year term of employment.

Furthermore, an early interim evaluation can be conducted to counter an offer of an external appointment (see no. 7).

(2) In consultation with the faculty, the President's Office appoints an evaluation committee; the relevant faculty has the right to propose the committee members. The composition of the evaluation committee follows the rules established for a faculty search committee under § 48 para. (3) LHG. Assistant professors may not be members of the evaluation committee. If the evaluation committee is headed by a member of the Dean's Office, the evaluation committee must additionally include a member of the President's Office.

(3) The assistant professor is called upon by the head of the evaluation committee to present a report in accordance with Attachment 1 on his/her academic profile and performance in research, teaching, and academic service, whereby the latter usually takes a low priority. The report must include statements on research and teaching performance. The academic profile of classes taught and the quantitative teaching load must expressly be taken into consideration. The report may not exceed ten pages. If applicable, the report should include documentation of successfully completed classes at the Center for Teaching and Learning.

(4) The evaluation committee appoints two external referees who make a written academic assessment on the basis of the assistant professor's report on his/her work to date. The referees must be outstanding academics (full professors or equivalent status) and be from two different institutions.

The referees receive an overview of the evaluation criteria and standards under section V as well as the list of subject-specific requirements and criteria weighting under (2) above; these form the basis for the interim evaluation.

If the referees' assessments diverge significantly in their recommendations and/or rationale, the evaluation committee may commission further external reviews.

(5) The evaluation committee consults on the assistant professor's degree of success on the basis of the evaluation criteria and standards set out in section V. and the subject-relevant requirements and criteria weighting under (2) above, the assistant professor's own report, the external referees' assessments, the results of at least two teaching evaluations as well as a statement by the Vice-Dean of Academic Affairs. After a review of the documents, the assistant professor is invited to an evaluation interview and is given the opportunity to present his/her own report orally to the evaluation committee.

The evaluation committee subsequently votes to present the Dean's Office with an evaluation report. In principle, the faculty and the President's Office are bound by the evaluation committee's vote.

(6) In the case of a positive vote by the committee, after approval by the Dean's Office (at the Faculty of Medicine, by the Dean's Office and the hospitals' Executive Board of Directors), and a subsequent positive vote by the Faculty council at the latest four months prior to expiry of the limited-term employment contract, the Dean submits an application for extension of the employment relationship to the President.

(7) The interim evaluation is intended to reveal strengths and weaknesses at an early stage, so that any failings which may prevent a later appointment may be rectified and a decision made on the assistant professor's further career at a point at which alternatives are still possible. To create transparency and if applicable to enable any necessary rectification, the assistant professor receives written notification on his/her performance to date along with any critical areas from the Dean; this feedback must also include recommendations on personal and academic development.

4. Status consultation

Before the final evaluation is begun, a status consultation must take place; it is conducted by the Dean of the responsible faculty or a Professor close to the relevant subject designated by the Dean. The status consultation helps the assistant professor assess his/her prospects, to sound out individual career options, and better plan his/her future career.

5. Final evaluation procedure

(1) The evaluation procedure is launched by the faculty 14 months before the end of the extended limited-term employment contract, two months before the end of the fifth year. The faculty will be reminded of the coming evaluation procedure by Human Resources.

Furthermore an early final evaluation is possible to counter an offer of an external appointment (see no. 7).

(2) In consultation with the faculty, the President's Office appoints an evaluation committee; the relevant faculty has the right to propose the committee members. The composition of the evaluation committee follows the rules established for a faculty search committee under § 48 para. (3) LHG. Assistant professors may not be members of the evaluation committee. If the evaluation committee is headed by a member of the Dean's Office, the evaluation committee must additionally include a member of the President's Office.

(3) The assistant professor is called upon by the head of the evaluation committee to present a report according to no. (3) para. (3) and to nominate three topics from his or her subject area for an academic lecture. After submission of these documents, the evaluation committee selects one of the proposed topics and invites the assistant professor to hold the lecture, which is open to the whole University, with subsequent discussion. The academic lecture makes it possible to judge the assistant professor's ability to conduct academic discourse and shows his/her ability to present academic issues and findings critically and spontaneously to an educated audience.

(4) The evaluation committee appoints at least two external referees who make a written academic assessment on the basis of the assistant professor's report on his/her work to date. The referees must be outstanding academics (full professors or equivalent status) and be from two different institutions.

The referees receive an overview of the evaluation criteria and standards under section V as well as the list of subject-specific requirements and criteria weighting under (2) above; these form the basis for the final evaluation.

If the referees' assessments diverge significantly in their recommendations and/or rationale, the evaluation committee may commission further external reviews.

(5) The evaluation committee consults on the assistant professor's degree of success on the basis of the evaluation criteria and standards set out in section V. and the subject-relevant requirements and criteria weighting under (2) above, the assistant professor's own report, the external referees' assessments, the results of the teaching evaluations considered during the interim evaluation and at least one further teaching evaluation, a statement by the Vice-Dean of Academic Affairs, and the academic lecture by the assistant professor from his/her subject area including subsequent discussion. After a review of the documents and after the academic lecture, the assistant professor is invited to an evaluation interview and is given the opportunity to present his/her own report orally to the evaluation committee.

The evaluation committee subsequently votes to present the Dean's Office with an evaluation report. The faculty and the President's Office are bound by the evaluation committee's vote.

(6) With its positive vote, the evaluation committee confirms that the requirements for establishing the aptitude, ability, and academic performance have been met and that the additional academic performance in research and teaching required for appointment as a full professor under § 47 para. (1) no. (4a), para. (2) item (1) LHG have been achieved. The promotion process must be launched at the latest four months prior to expiry of the extended time-limited employment contract.

6. Bias

(1) During the evaluation it must be ensured that no person or persons take part who should be recused. This is in accordance with §§ 20, 21 of the state administrative procedures law, Landesverwaltungsverfahrensgesetz.

(2) If any of the following – absolute – conditions arise, the relevant person must be strictly excluded from the procedure (that person may not participate in a decision-making nor in an advisory capacity):

- Relationship by blood, marriage or other family relationship, or close personal relationship;
- Employment dependency or supervisory relationship (e.g. student-teacher relationship) within the previous three years.

(3) If any of the following – relative – conditions arise, a decision on exclusion must be made on a case-by-case basis (see below):

- Involvement in the assistant professor's doctoral or habilitation thesis;
- close academic cooperation, e.g. joint projects and/or joint publications in the previous three years (multi- or co-authorship), joint patents or joint patent applications, network-forming;
- immediate academic competition with the assistant professor's projects or plans;
- personal economic interests in the outcome of the evaluation.

(4) Possible reasons for bias must be communicated to the head of the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee must check and assess whether bias as set out in (3) is actually present; the mere existence of the conditions listed is not sufficient for an immediate exclusion from the procedure. The evaluation committee decides whether a person

- is excluded from the procedure,
- refrains from any further involvement or
- must leave the room at relevant stages of the procedure and therefore does not take part in decision-making and votes about the assistant professor.

Prior to any decision, the affected person must be given the opportunity to speak on the matter; the decision must be noted in evaluation committee protocols. These regulations on bias must be given to all members of the evaluation committee and to the referees for their attention, upon appointment.

7. Competing appointment offers

An offer of appointment as professor at another university does not lead automatically to an extension of the employment relationship nor to promotion to a full, W3 professorship at Tübingen.

If, however, an assistant professor receives an offer of an appointment to a W2 or W3 professorship at a German university (or an equivalent professorship at a university outside Germany) before his/her interim evaluation in Tübingen, he or she may apply for recognition of this offer as a positive evaluation. The application must be made to the responsible faculty. The faculty may propose that the employment contract be extended to a total of six years; at the Faculty of Medicine, this requires the approval of the hospitals' Executive Board of Directors.

The offer of appointment as professor elsewhere after the interim evaluation cannot replace the final evaluation. The procedure for the final evaluation may, however, be launched early upon application by the assistant professor to the responsible faculty; an external offer must be taken into consideration within the framework of the evaluation criteria (section V.).

IV. Procedure for assistant professorships without tenure track

The assessment of the assistant professor's performance is the responsibility of the relevant faculty. The faculty must specify, based on the evaluation criteria and standards set out in section V, which subject-specific evaluation criteria and standards form the basis of the interim evaluation and the final evaluation of the assistant professorship; in doing so, the faculty also establishes the necessary qualification criteria from its point of view.

For the interim and final evaluations of assistant professorships without tenure track, the regulations set out in sections III. nos. (3), (5 - 7) apply, insofar as no other regulations are set out below.

This translation is for your convenience only. The sole legally binding document is the original German "Qualitätssicherungskonzept gemäß § 48 Abs. 1 Satz 4 LHG für Juniorprofessuren mit Tenure Track und Evaluationsatzung betreffend Juniorprofessuren und Juniordozenten"

(1) There will be no early evaluation. An offer of appointment at another university after the interim evaluation may be assessed at the end of the employment relationship as a positive final evaluation upon application by the assistant professor. The application must be made to the responsible faculty. Otherwise the external offer must be taken into consideration within the framework of the evaluation criteria (section V.).

(2) The faculty council appoints an evaluation committee for interim and final evaluations in consultation with the President's Office. The evaluation committee comprises at least three professors. At least one female member of academic staff must be included. Assistant professors may not be members of the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee is headed by a member of the Dean's Office, the evaluation committee need not include a member of the President's Office. In the case of a final evaluation, the evaluation committee must be made up of the persons who comprised the evaluation committee for the assistant professor's interim evaluation.

(3) An academic lecture is not required within the framework of the final evaluation.

(4) For the interim evaluation, the evaluation committee appoints two external referees who make a short written academic assessment on the basis of the assistant professor's report on his/her work to date. For the final evaluation, the evaluation committee may, if it considers it necessary, also commission at least two external reviews. The assistant professor may propose an external referee. The referees will be provided with an overview of the Faculty's subject-specific requirements and criteria weighting which are to form the basis for the final evaluation. Further assessments will not be made.

(5) For their consultations, the evaluation committee must apply the faculty's subject-specific requirements and criteria weighting instead of the subject-specific requirements and criteria weighting under section III, no. 2.

V. Evaluation criteria and standards

All the assistant professorship's areas of responsibility are the focus of the evaluation: research, teaching, and service. The area of academic service is generally accorded a lower priority.

The interim and final evaluations of the assistant professorship are based on the following evaluation criteria:

A. Research

1. Quality and quantity of publications as sole author or as co-author (Significance of research work in international comparison, contribution to further development of the research field, reception and evaluation of the publication (citations, impact factors etc.), distinctions and prizes)
2. Academic lectures and participation in symposia and events beyond the university's own
3. Research projects (type, scope, innovative/ interdisciplinary in nature)
4. Third-party funding (amount, institution)
5. Academic collaboration and participation in joint research
6. (Co)organization of specialist conferences
7. Work for specialist organizations, education, government, or other institutions
8. Transfer (impact) activities (society, economy, politics)
9. Activities as a referee, reviewer

10. Participation in doctoral qualification processes and doctorates supervised
11. Other distinctions, e.g. research prizes, patents, potential appointments to other institutions, editorial work

B. Teaching

1. Classes/courses taught (type, workload, scope)
2. Teaching performance, documented by at least two teaching evaluations in the case of the interim evaluation;
 - the results of the teaching evaluations considered during the interim evaluation and at least one further teaching evaluation
 - a statement by the Vice-Dean of Academic Affairs and
 - in the case of a final evaluation of an assistant professorship with tenure track, an academic lecture open to the whole University in the research area of the assistant professorship including subsequent discussion.
3. Participation in university examinations and theses supervised
4. Teaching materials
5. Internationality
6. Other, e.g. teaching prizes, advanced professional training on university teaching, advanced professional training on gender and diversity questions, participation in academic advisory services

C. Academic service

1. Membership on committees
2. Taking on extra responsibilities in the department
3. Other, e.g., pan-university projects

Promotion to a W3 professorship as part of the tenure procedure is only possible if the evaluation establishes that the assistant professor's performance in his/her tasks was above average. The yardstick for an above-average performance is equivalency with academic staff who have a habilitation. In this comparison, the assistant professor's time in academia and current qualification phase must be taken into consideration.

Attachment 1

Contents of assistant professor's report on his/her work

Evaluation criteria and further information

A. Research

Publications: (Sole author and/or co-author)	- Published (e.g. journal, book) - Submitted
Academic lectures	- Invited - Conferences etc.
Research projects	- Completed - Current - Applied for
Third-party funding	- Approved (third-party funding)

This translation is for your convenience only. The sole legally binding document is the original German "Qualitätssicherungskonzept gemäß § 48 Abs. 1 Satz 4 LHG für Juniorprofessuren mit Tenure Track und Evaluationsatzung betreffend Juniorprofessuren und Juniordozenturen"

	- Applied for
Academic collaborations	- Internal - External (national and international)
(Co)Organization of specialist conferences	- List specialist conferences
Specialist societies; Work for education, government, or other institutions	- Membership - Function
Transfer activities (society, economy, politics)	- Type of activities
Activities as a referee, reviewer	- (not as a supervisor of a doctorate)
Doctorates supervised	- First supervisor/ second supervisor - First supervisor/ second supervisor - Completed (if applicable) - Candidate - Current - Title
Other	- e.g. awards, research prizes, patents

B. Teaching

List of classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Degree course- Semester- Average number of students
Examinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Type of examinations- Number of examinations- First, second examiner or First, second examiner- Major, minor subject
Supervised (Bachelor's, Master's, Staatsexamen etc.) theses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Number- Candidate- Completed- Current
Student teaching evaluation (interim evaluation: at least two courses; final evaluation: in addition, one further course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Class type (as many different types as possible)- Time taught (for interim evaluation: preferably in the second semester following start of the assistant professorship and in the third year; for final evaluation: from fifth year on)
Teaching materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- e.g. provide links to slides, scripts
Internationality	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Classes given in English or other language other than German- Advising and support of international students
Advanced professional training	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Courses at the Center for Teaching and Learning- Courses on gender and diversity matters
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- e.g. teaching prizes, academic advisory service

C. Academic self-management

Academic self-management committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Membership/ committee
Taking on extra responsibilities in the department	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Research organization- Teaching organization
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- e.g., pan-university project

Part 2: Junior lecturers

Under § 51a para. (3) item (1) LHG the first appointment of a lecturer is strictly as a junior lecturer. This employment contract is usually limited to an initial four years. This employment status may be extended to a total of six years if the junior lecturer has proven his or her worth as a member of academic staff in his or her performance, particularly in research and teaching, according to the results of an interim evaluation. At the end of the period of service, a final evaluation is undertaken of the junior lecturer's performance to establish his/her aptitude and ability as a member of academic staff, particularly in teaching. If the junior lecturer has proven his/her worth, he/she may then be employed with a permanent contract (Hochschuldozentin or Hochschuldozent).

I. Interim and final evaluation procedures

(1) The assessment of the junior lecturer's performance is the responsibility of the relevant faculty. The faculty must specify, based on the evaluation criteria and standards set out in section II, which subject-specific evaluation criteria and standards form the basis of the interim evaluation and the final evaluation of the junior lecturer; in doing so, the faculty also establishes the necessary qualification criteria from its point of view.

(2) The evaluation procedure is launched when Human Resources reminds the faculty of the upcoming evaluation procedure, one year prior to the end of the limited-term employment contract; in the case of the interim evaluation by the end of the third year at the latest; in the case of the final evaluation at the end of the fifth year.

(3) The faculty council appoints an evaluation committee in consultation with the President's Office. The evaluation committee is composed of three professors, one further member of academic staff, and a student representative. At least one female member of academic staff must be included. Junior lecturers may not be members of the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee is headed by a professor.

(4) The junior lecturer is called upon by the head of the evaluation committee to present a report in accordance with Attachment 2 on his/her academic profile and performance in research, teaching, and academic service, whereby the latter usually takes a low priority. This report must include statements on the subject's teaching context and the didactic concepts. The report may not exceed ten pages. Documentation is expected of two successfully completed classes/ courses at the Center for Teaching and Learning before the interim evaluation and a further class/ course before the final evaluation.

(5) External assessments will not be made.

(6) The evaluation committee consults on the junior lecturer's degree of success on the basis of the faculty's subject-specific requirements and criteria weighting, the junior lecturer's own report, the results of at least four teaching evaluations for an interim evaluation or the results of the teaching evaluations considered in the interim evaluation plus two further teaching evaluations for a final evaluation, as well as a statement by the Vice-Dean of Academic Affairs. After a review of the documents, the junior lecturer is invited to an evaluation interview and is given the opportunity to present his/her own report orally to the evaluation committee.

The evaluation committee subsequently votes to present the Dean's Office with an evaluation report.

(7) In the case of a positive vote in an interim evaluation, after approval by the Dean's Office (at the Faculty of Medicine, by the Dean's Office and the hospitals' Executive Board of

This translation is for your convenience only. The sole legally binding document is the original German "Qualitätssicherungskonzept gemäß § 48 Abs. 1 Satz 4 LHG für Juniorprofessuren mit Tenure Track und Evaluationsatzung betreffend Juniorprofessuren und Juniordozenten"

Directors), and a subsequent positive vote by the Faculty council at the latest four months prior to expiry of the limited-term employment contract, the Dean submits an application for extension of the employment relationship to the President.

(8) The regulations regarding bias set out in part 1 section III no. 6 apply.

II. Evaluation criteria

All the junior lecturer's areas of responsibility are the focus of the evaluation: research, teaching, and service. The area of academic service is generally accorded a lower priority.

The interim and final evaluations of the junior lecturer are based on the following evaluation criteria:

A. Teaching

1. Classes/ courses taught (type, workload, scope)
2. Teaching performance, documented by
 - at least two teaching evaluations in the case of the interim evaluation; the results of the teaching evaluations considered during the interim evaluation and at least two further teaching evaluations for a final evaluation
 - a statement by the Vice-Dean of Academic Affairs
3. Participation in university examinations and theses supervised
4. Supervision of students, participation in student advisory services
5. Teaching concepts, didactic method, teaching materials
6. Internationality
7. Other, e.g. teaching prizes, advanced professional training in university teaching, advanced professional training in gender and diversity questions

B. Research

1. Quality and quantity of publications as sole author or as co-author
2. Academic lectures and participation in symposia and events beyond the university's own
3. Research projects (type, scope, innovative/ interdisciplinary in nature)
4. Third-party funding (amount, institution)
5. Academic collaboration and participation in joint research
6. (Co)organization of specialist conferences
7. Work for specialist organizations, education, government, or other institutions

8. Transfer (impact) activities (society, economy, politics)
9. Activities as a referee, reviewer
10. Other

C. Academic self-management

1. Membership on committees
2. Taking on extra responsibilities in the department
3. Other, e.g., pan-university projects

Attachment 2

Contents of junior lecturer's report on his/her work

Evaluation criteria and further information

A. Teaching

List of classes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Degree course - Semester - Average number of students
Examinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Type of examinations - Number of examinations - First, second examiner or First, second examiner - Major, minor subject
Supervised (Bachelor's, Master's, Staatsexamen etc.) theses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number - Candidate - Completed - Current
Student teaching evaluation (interim evaluation: at least four courses; final evaluation: in addition, two further courses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class type (as many different types as possible) - Time taught (for interim evaluation: from the second semester following start of the junior lecturership, in the second and in the third year; for final evaluation: from fifth year on)
Supervision, advice for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in advisory services
Teaching concept and didactic methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brief description
Teaching materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - e.g. provide links to scripts used
Internationality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Classes given in English or other language other than German - Advising and support of international students
Advanced professional training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Courses at the Center for Teaching and Learning - Courses on gender and diversity matters
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - e.g. teaching prizes

B. Research

Publications: (Sole author and/or co-author)	- Published (e.g. journal, book) - Submitted
Academic lectures	- Invited - Conferences etc.
Research projects	- Completed - Current - Applied for
Third-party funding	- Approved (third-party funding) - Applied for
Academic collaborations	- Internal - External (national and international)
(Co)Organisation of specialist conferences	- List specialist conferences
Specialist societies	- Membership - Function
Transfer activities (society, economy, politics)	- Type of activities
Activities as a referee, reviewer	-
Other	-

C. Academic self-management

Academic self-management committees	- Membership/ committee
Taking on extra responsibilities in the department	- Teaching organization - Research organization
Other	- e.g., pan-university project (e.g., AG Prüfungsorganisation)

Part 3: Effective date

This statute becomes effective on the day following its publication in the official notices - Amtliche Bekanntmachungen - of the University of Tübingen. It applies to assistant professors who are appointed after the statute has come into effect.

Tübingen, 9 March 2016

Professor Dr. Bernd Engler
President