

## **Principles of the Tasks and Processes of Quality Assurance in the Max Weber Foundation – German Humanities Institutes Abroad of 18 November, 2016**

In accordance with Art. 6, Para 3, Item 5 of the DGIA law, the Board of Trustees monitors the “activities of the institutes and other bodies of the Foundation and arranges the evaluation of the institutes”. The principles for evaluation are listed in detail in the statutes of the Max Weber Foundation.

To guarantee a scientifically adequate and transparent quality assurance process, the Board of Trustees adopted principles<sup>1</sup> for tasks and processes during its meeting on 26 November 2009. In preparation of the 2nd evaluation cycle, the Board of Trustees has revised these principles and resolved the following during its meeting on 18 November 2016.

### **1. Principles of quality assurance**

The Board of Trustees of the Max Weber Foundation organizes the external evaluation of the institutes in foreign countries at an interval of normally seven years. Interim perspective reports conducted by each of the academic advisory councils of the institutes are intended to provide the Board of Trustees with information and discussion material on the one hand, while ensuring on the other that the institutes make use of other expert reports on quality assurance, thus enabling them to prepare for the external appraisals. At least one perspective report is prepared within the regular evaluation period.

The evaluation of the institutes of the Max Weber Foundation is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees. Its comments and opinions are based on the status report of the institute (Appendix A), the evaluation report of the external commission (Appendix B) and the comments of the institute on the evaluation report (Appendix C). The Board of Trustees deploys commissions to prepare its resolutions and comments. The Board of Trustees and commissions are supported by the joint central office, which organizes and coordinates the quality assurance process that includes the evaluations, as well as the preparation of the perspective reports by the respective advisory councils. The last seven years are usually evaluated.

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with a recommendation of the Wissenschaftsrat (9.11.2007), the quality assurance principles of the Max Weber Foundation are oriented towards the criteria of the Leibniz Association.

## 2. Evaluation dates

The ten institutes that currently belong to the Max Weber Foundation are evaluated every seven years. The 1st evaluation cycle extends through the years 2011-2017. The 2nd cycle will begin in 2018 and end in 2024.

2018	DIJ Tokyo, DHI Rome
2019	DHI London
2020	DHI Washington
2021	DFK Paris, OI Beirut
2022	DHI Warsaw, DHI Paris
2023	DHI Moscow
2024	OI Istanbul

After consulting the Directors' Assembly, which coordinates with the Committee of Advisory Council Chairs, the Board of Trustees determines which institutes are to be evaluated at the latest during the last meeting of the year for the year after next. The central office notifies the director of the institute in question about the pending evaluation and the schedule of the evaluation process. It also sets the on-site inspection date in coordination with the institute and chair of the commission.

## 3. Information discussion

At the request of the institute, a staff member of the central office visits the institute to explain the principles of the evaluation process and inspection procedure. The institutes can take advantage of consultancy and support by the central office in preparing the documents for the evaluation.

## 4. Members of the evaluation commission

The Board of Trustees appoints up to nine members of the evaluation commission with voting rights. The voting members should reflect the academic spectrum of each institute, but at least one member should belong to another discipline represented in the Foundation. Both members from different disciplines should possess experience in the area of evaluation and expert opinions. Academics from the host country, universities and non-university institutions should be represented.

With the exception of the final meeting, a representative of the academic advisory council appointed by the institute should be, and a non-voting representative of the Directors' Assembly can be invited to attend the commission discussions (guests).

At the beginning of the appointment process, the institute provides the central office with a list of the specialized areas which the institute believes should be covered. On the basis of this list, to which remarks can be added by the President of the Foundation, the central office requests that the science organizations represented on the Board of Trustees (DFG, MPG, AvH and WGL) and each professional association (Art. 12 HVO) submit recommendations for eight places before requesting recommendations from the institute for the ninth. The institute is given the opportunity here to raise objections in writing against each of the recommendations of the science organizations.

Objections must be justified, whereby the non-coverage of the specialized areas of the institute by the individual recommendations and the presumption of partiality are regarded as permissible reasons. The Board of Trustees decides on the admissibility of objections. For the appointment of the evaluation commission members, more recommendations must be submitted to the Board of Trustees than there are seats on the commission. Members of the Board of Trustees can present additional suggestions. The Stifterverband and BMBF (Federal Ministry for Education and Research) each appoint one advisory member (guest). A scientific member of the Board of Trustees without voting rights participates in each evaluation. The Board of Trustees appoints the member during the same meeting in which other commission members are chosen.

The central office presents the recommendations, including the information on possible reasons for partiality, to the Board of Trustees for a decision. The President of the Foundation invites the newly elected persons to participate in the evaluation commission and, with reference to the principles of partiality which apply to the evaluation process of the Max Weber Foundation (Appendix 1) and which are modeled on the DFG criteria, requests that they present any possible reasons for partiality.

With the letter of invitation, the commission members are also provided with information on the profile of the Max Weber Foundation and the peculiarities of its institutes.

## **5. Inaugural meeting of the commission**

The commission members get together approx. 4 months before the inspection of the institute in the central office of the MWS in Bonn for an inaugural meeting. With support from the executive director, the chair provides the commission with information on the evaluation process of the Max Weber Foundation, the criteria to be used (Appendix 3), any particularities which may apply to the respective institute and the tasks of the commission members in the process. If any reasons for partiality become known during the meeting,

which had not been disclosed beforehand by the member concerned or the institute, the commission chair decides whether the person concerned will continue to take part in the evaluation process. Guests of the commission take part in the inaugural meeting. Upon request, the commission is given the opportunity to consult even without the representative of the Academic Advisory Council. An employee of the central office prepares minutes of the meeting, which are used to prepare for the on-site inspection.

## **6. Cooperation partners**

The institute makes recommendations to the central office regarding the cooperation partners who should be invited to an interview during the on-site inspection of the institute. The chair of each commission decides on the number of cooperation partners to be invited under consideration of the ratio between the amount of time and money involved and the expected amount of information that will be acquired. A total of three cooperation partners should not be exceeded.

## **7. Documentation**

In preparation for the commission inspection, the institute presents a status report which also serves as a reply to the questionnaire enclosed as Appendix 2. The status report should be forwarded to the central office no later than two months prior to the inspection of the institute.

## **8. Agenda for the on-site inspection of the institute**

In coordination with the institute, the central office prepares a draft agenda for the inspection of the institute. The chair of the commission reaches a decision on the draft. The commission can decide to alter the agenda during the inspection.

## **9. On-site inspection of the institute**

The commission holds a preliminary meeting before starting the inspection, during which the minutes of the inaugural meeting are adopted. Reporting functions for specific areas are divided among the commission members, as needed. Group visits on the second day of the inspection are organized and the respective information is shared with the employees of the institute. If additional written information is requested from the institute by the commission during the inspection, it must be presented to the central office no later than one week after the inspection of the institute for immediate forwarding to the commission.

It is the responsibility of the executive director to monitor the proper roll-out of the process and express an opinion in this regard at the end of the inspection. It is the responsibility of the representative of the Advisory Council to provide information on the work of the Advisory Council since the last evaluation and report on the development of the institute from the viewpoint of an external researcher.

A final meeting of the commission is held at the end of the inspection, during which guests are given the opportunity to present their assessment of the evaluation. Afterwards, members of the commission with voting rights define the core items of the evaluation report and the key recommendations.

At the end of the inspection, the chair of the commission gives the director of the institute an initial appraisal of its development. He or she should be accompanied by the executive director here.

A member of the central office keeps internal minutes of all discussions conducted by the commission (as the basis for preparing the draft of the evaluation report). Excluded from this are discussions held in parallel by parts of the commission during visits to individual departments.

#### **10. Objection of the inspection by the institute**

If the institute has any doubts concerning the orderly conducting of the inspection, it can lodge an objection in writing with the central office within two weeks after the end of the inspection. The central office forwards the objection to the chair of the commission and President of the Foundation who then decide jointly on its admissibility.

#### **11. Minutes and evaluation report**

The central office prepares the draft evaluation report upon completion of the inspection. The evaluation report is coordinated first with the chair, then with the remaining voting members of the commission. Proposed amendments are documented by the central office and worked into the evaluation report, which is then coordinated in another round with the voting members of the commission. It is adopted once all members of the commission eligible to vote have given their consent.

If there is a lack of agreement among the voting members of the commission, the President of the Foundation must mediate. If necessary, he or she can convene another meeting of the commission. If no agreement is reached, the positions of the majority are recorded in the evaluation report. The Board of Trustees is informed of the positions of the minority and/or deviating votes, which it can consider in its opinion.

Once the evaluation report has been adopted by the commission, its contents can only be

amended in special circumstances (see Item 13). Any changes require the further consent of all voting members of the commission. The chair of the commission is responsible for the contents of the evaluation report and, jointly with the executive director, for the correct and orderly execution of the process as well.

Failure to respond within a set deadline of at least three weeks is also regarded as the consent of the voting members of the commission as defined by these regulations, whereby a written reminder, for which an e-mail is sufficient, must be issued a week before the deadline is due to expire. Special reference to this must again be made when forwarding the first draft of the evaluation report.

## **12. Statement on the evaluation report by the institute**

The central office sends the adopted evaluation report to the institute no later than six weeks prior to the meeting of the Board of Trustees during which the evaluation of the institute is to be addressed. Although the evaluation report is provided confidentially to the director of the institute, he or she is permitted to pass it on to the academic advisory council. The confidentiality obligation applies to everyone involved until the evaluation report is published by the Max Weber Foundation as part of the delivered opinion of the Board of Trustees.

The institute can lodge a statement on the evaluation report with the central office within three weeks of its receipt by the institute director. If no statement has been received by this point in time, the Board of Trustees processes the evaluation report without consideration of the statement made by the institute. The institute's statement on the evaluation report is attached to the statement of the Board of Trustees as an appendix.

## **13. Objection by the institute of the evaluation report**

Once it has been adopted, the commission's evaluation report can no longer be amended. In special, exceptional circumstances, however, the institute can apply for reprocessing by the commission by lodging an objection with the central office. Objections must be submitted in writing with justification by the director within two weeks of the receipt of the evaluation report. They are only admissible in the following instances:

- The evaluation report infringes the procedural principles contained in this document.
- The evaluation report contains incorrect or incomplete facts.

Complaints about the infringement of procedural principles concerning the partiality of experts or non-inclusion of an institute's specialized areas can only be raised using the

objection procedure outlined in Item 4 or, if the reasons for possible partiality are known, during the inspection of the institute using the objection procedure outlined in Item 9.

The central office forwards the objection to the chair of the commission and President of the Foundation who reach a joint decision on its admissibility and consideration. If an objection is admissible and justified, a new evaluation report must be drawn up and approved by the commission. This evaluation report must be reprocessed by the central office in accordance with Item 12, sentences 1 and 2. The institute has the opportunity to make a final comment in accordance with Item 12, Para. 2, within two weeks of the receipt of the evaluation report or notification that the objection was inadmissible or unjustified.

#### **14. Board of Trustees meeting**

The members and permanent guests of the Board of Trustees usually receive the self-portrayal of the institute, evaluation report and statement of the institute two weeks before the meeting.

The evaluation report is presented by the chair of the commission at the Board of Trustees' meeting. The Board of Trustees then issues a statement under consideration of all aspects and votes.

After the meeting, the President of the Foundation notifies the director of the institute of the content of the statement. The central office forwards the statement with appendices to the institute and BMBF. The statement and appendices are then published on the Max Weber Foundation's web pages.

#### **15. Confidentiality**

The members and guests of the commission and Board of Trustees, as well as the employees of the Max Weber Foundation are committed to confidentiality in regard to the contents of the evaluation process. It is in particular not permitted to pass on minutes, evaluation reports, and statements in full or in part to any persons not authorized to view them in accordance with the regulations laid down in this document, or to give any unauthorized persons information concerning the contents of the evaluation.

Inquiries from the press for the contents or results of evaluations are either rejected before adopting the statement of the Board of Trustees by all persons involved in the evaluation process, with reference to the confidentiality of the process, or passed on to the central office which can give information on procedural questions.

## **16. Deadlines**

If not determined in this document, the standard time periods for the individual steps of the evaluation process can be taken from the flow chart attached to this document as Appendix 4.

## Appendix 1

### Criteria to determine a potential conflict of interest on the part of the evaluation commission members

The autonomy and integrity of experts is essential for evaluations in the academic system. The following criteria help to determine to what extent a presumption of partiality may appear. They are based on criteria cited by the German Research Association (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft - DFG) and by the Leibniz Association e. V. (WGL).<sup>1</sup> The criteria can be divided into those which inevitably lead to exclusion and those which could lead to exclusion. The chairs of the commission decide whether the fulfillment of criteria in accordance with (2) will lead to the exclusion of an expert.

(1) The following will lead to exclusion:

- Membership in the Board of Trustees or in one of the academic advisory councils of the institute during the period to be evaluated;
- Direct relationship or corresponding personal connections to employees of the institute;
- A business or contractual dependent relationship in the period to be evaluated;
- A teacher-student relationship to management employees of the institute, unless there has been independent academic activity for more than ten years;
- Application for a position at the institute in the period to be evaluated.

(2) Reasons which could lead to exclusion include the following:

- Close research cooperation in the form of joint projects or publications in the period to be evaluated;
- Direct competition, e.g. preparation of a proposal or implementation of the project with a closely related research topic;
- Participation in reciprocal consultations within the last 12 months;
- Affiliation with the institute before the period to be evaluated.

---

<sup>1</sup> German Research Association: Guidelines for Avoiding Conflicts of Interest (DFG form 10.201 - 4/10); <https://www.leibniz-gemeinschaft.de/ueber-uns/evaluierung/das-evaluierungsverfahren-des-senats/grundsaeetze-des-evaluierungsverfahrens/>

## Appendix 2

### Status Report of the Institute (max. 20 pages of continuous text plus additional appendices)

#### Introduction

Free text, no stipulations in terms of content (1-2 pages)

#### 1. Structure

1.1 Mission (in accordance with statutes), organization (org. chart) and committees (academic advisory council)

#### 2. Positioning of the institute

2.1 National and international academic environment, national and international significance of the institute, reasons for doing research in the respective host country

Comparable organizations in Germany and internationally; is it reasonable or necessary to coordinate work with other institutes? University chairs with a similar setup; localization within the foundation; How do you assess the significance of your institute, especially in reference to its anchoring in the host country?

Which criteria underlie this assessment? Has the significance of the institute changed in Germany, the host country and internationally over the past few years? What are the legal and political ramifications in the host country?

#### 3. Overall concept and profile of the institute

3.1 Development of the institute/work program in the past years

Overview of the central tasks and research focal points; implementation of the recommendations of the last evaluations

3.2 Work results

3.2.1 Research and publication achievements, special results, publication concept

Description of research and publication achievements, special noteworthy achievements in this area; academic awards; academic conferences; academic lectures by employees; exhibits; third-party projects, short description of the publication concept; positioning of in-house journals and book series in the book market

3.2.2 Additional research-based work results

(a) Infrastructure projects and services for science

Editions, databases, libraries and collection; expert opinions

(b) Knowledge transfer, consultation, mediation and networking

Expert activity; political consultation; exhibits; media consulting; cooperation with schools; important positions and functions of individual institute employees; prizes; awards; honors; cooperation with German institutions in the host country

3.2.3 International forum functionality, events and public image

(a) Conferences and central events at the institute

Series of events of the institute; participation in the organization/management of external events; events of external partners at the institute

(b) Public image

Mission statement; strategy of the institute for public distribution of work results, including: media selection and deployment; involvement of the Institute in public debates and topics; reception in the media

3.3 Strategic work planning of the institute for the years to come - development potential of the research field or work area

Short description of medium-term work objectives (for the next 3 to 5 years or until the end of the term of office of the director); overall strategy beyond the term of office of the director; development potential of the

## Appendix 2

research field or work area; how is the work program defined? How do management, employees and committees work together to plan and structure work?

### 3.4 Suitability of the spatial, material and staffing resources, especially with regard to the implementation of strategic work planning

#### Spatial resources, library, IT

Short description and explanation, especially of the library and IT concept

#### Assessment of the resources with staff and equipment

Short explanation, including the third-party funding strategy

## 4. Staff

### 4.1 Recruiting scientific staff

How are posts filled for scientific staff (type of announcement, who is involved in the recruitment process)? Are PhD students employed? Which functions are assumed by staff from the host country, from temporary services or third-party funding? Which areas does the institute recruit its new employees from? Are there any issues with recruiting or retaining qualified staff?

### 4.2 Staff structure and planned medium-term staff development

Ratio of temporary/permanent employees; ratio of posted/local employees; handling changes of management; professional qualifications of non-scientific employees

### 4.3 Promoting gender equality and the reconciliation of work and family life

## 5. Promotion of young talent

### 5.1 Offers for young talent

Qualification, support and guidance for scientific staff; doctorates and habilitations; programs for the training of young scientists (scholarships, summer schools, subject-specific training courses, internships); structured doctoral programs

### 5.2 Careers after leaving the institute

Did any of the employees find an academic position or any other prominent position after leaving the institute? Please specify

## 6. Cooperation and networking

### 6.1 Cooperation with universities and other institutions in Germany

Contractually supported cooperation with universities and non-university research institutions; teaching assignments; personal cooperation

### 6.2 Cooperation with universities and other institutions in the host country

Contractually supported cooperation with universities and non-university research institutions; teaching assignments; personal cooperation

### 6.3 Other important cooperation efforts and networking

Cooperation with partners in third countries; leadership or participation in national, as well as bi- and multinational networks; collaborative projects; EU projects; appeal, especially for foreign scientists or scientists from the host country; scholarship holders, if possible with details regarding the source of financing; guest residences at the institute; visiting scholars program

## 7. Quality assurance

### 7.1 Internal quality management of the institute

How does the institute ensure the quality of its work results (e.g. "quality circles", regular employee appraisals, internal performance-related resource allocation)?

### 7.2 Quality management by the academic advisory council

Role and commitment of the advisory council members; consulting services in the field of work program and research planning; job planning and (individual) promotion of young talent

## Appendix 3

### Criteria for the preparation of the evaluation report by the commission

#### Structure and positioning, overall concept and profile

##### Development in the past years and strategic work planning for the years to come

- Is the overall concept of the institute conclusive (in retrospect and with a view to future development)?
- Is the work program original and up to date (e.g. unique selling points, interdisciplinary or transnational/transregional comparative questions)?
- Does the organizational structure make it possible to convincingly implement the work program?
- Are the various tasks of the institute (research, infrastructure offers, services, consulting and promotion of young talent) in a reasonable proportion to each other as measured by the objectives of the institute? Are they convincingly related to each other?
- Is the work of the institute relevant for the economy, politics, culture or other social areas outside of the scientific realm?
- Is the institute convincingly positioned in its national and international environment?
- Were the recommendations of the last evaluation adequately embraced? Possibly: can the institute convincingly explain why certain recommendations have not been implemented?
- If in its status report, the institution has presented basic perspectives for reorientation or restructuring: are the plans convincing? Do they reasonably expand on a self-analysis of its own strengths and weaknesses?

##### Work results

##### Research and publication achievements, special results, publication concept

- Are the research results of the institute theoretically and methodologically sound?
- Is the publication concept convincing?
- How should the indicators of work performance be assessed (e.g. number of publications depending on the publication culture of the disciplines, especially in peer-reviewed journals, at peer-reviewed congresses, in monographs)?
- Does the institute organize national and international expert conferences? Was the institute particularly visible internationally with certain events and expert conferences?
- Is the participation of the scientific community in the events of the institute convincing?
- Are the research results of the institute received in varying degrees of success in Germany, in the host country and in third countries? In which areas is there a need for improvement?
- Did employees of the institute receive academic awards during the reporting period?

## Appendix 3

- What is the evaluation of the amount of third-party funds acquired for research, infrastructure offers, services, consulting and promotion of young talent? Have third-party funds been competitively acquired in qualitative assessment processes?
- What particularly noteworthy work results in research or in other tasks relevant to the institution has the institution achieved in recent years?

### Additional research-based work results

- Are infrastructure, services and consulting offers (e.g. databases, library, information, expert opinions, communication of scientific contacts), as well as knowledge transfer of good quality?
- Are currently required methods and techniques applied and further developed (e.g. digital access to primary and secondary literature, networking of the library)?
- Are infrastructure, services and consultation offers, as well as the transfer of knowledge for users and/or other addressees relevant and are these recipients satisfied with the services (e.g. visits to the library and use of the internet services from Germany, from the host country and third parties)?
- Are the offered forms of consultation appropriate (e.g. expert opinions, participation in expert hearings, membership of institute staff on advisory boards, participation in broad public discussions)? Should certain forms be promoted more or less rigorously?
- Are the respective target groups appropriately reached? Has the potential of possible users or other addressees been exhausted?

### International forum functionality, events and public image

- Does the institute address the scientific community and interested public with profiled series of events?
- Are the public relations efforts of the institute adequate? Is the institute involved in public discussions to which it can contribute? How are the work results of the institute received in German and international media?
- Is the scientific staff of the institute represented in relevant committees or pertinent research groups? Do they participate in expert hearings?
- Are there any joint events with the realms of culture/politics/economy in the host country or Germany?
- Is the institute used as an event forum by external partners?

### Adequacy of the facilities

- Are the spatial and information technology facilities of the institute adequate? Is there a convincing and sustainable IT concept? Are other material facilities and financial resources overall adequate? Can the medium-term goals pursued by the institute for the coming years be achieved with the existing facilities?

## Appendix 3

- Insofar as the Institute has submitted plans for an extraordinary increase in institutional funding: are the plans scientifically outstanding?
- Is the institution's strategy for attracting third-party funding and generating other means of funding convincing?

## Staff

- Does the institute pursue suitable strategies for the recruitment of staff, especially at management level, and for the recruitment of female scientists for management responsibilities? Have you been able to avoid change at the senior management level?
- Is the staffing structure of the institution in terms of temporary and permanent posts designed to strike the right balance between required change and necessary stability?
- Are good opportunities for continued education available for scientific and non-scientific employees?
- Is the institute convincingly working on gender equality?
- Has the institute implemented suitable measures to reconcile work and family life?

## Promotion of young talent

- How can the quality of the promotion of young talent be evaluated?
- Is the development of postdoctoral researchers adequately supported (teaching experience, relationship between additional tasks and time for own research, further qualification in the field of science management)?
- Is the institution good at attracting young scientists? From the point of view of young talent, is work at the institution attractive (demand for scholarships, internships, amount and flexibility of scholarships)?
- Are the programs of the institute for young talent education convincing?
- Are the number and duration of completed qualification procedures appropriate?
- Did announcements for scientific positions (or comparable non-scientific job offers) for young scientists at the institution fare well?

## Cooperation and networking

- Is the institute cooperating convincingly with universities in Germany/in the host country?
- Is participation in university teaching appropriate?
- Are opportunities for cooperation with other research institutions and scientific infrastructure institutions in Germany/in the host country adequately pursued?
- Are opportunities for cooperation with associations or other institutions outside of the scientific community or the immediate field of responsibility of the institute in Germany/in the host country adequately pursued?
- Is the institute cooperating convincingly with partners in third countries?

## Appendix 3

- Are programs at national, European and non-European international levels used to promote cooperation and strengthen strategic positioning?
- Are residencies for domestic and foreign guests organized in a reasonable manner at the institute? Do scientific employees of the institute take advantage of the possibilities of guest residencies/lectures at other institutions in Germany and abroad?
- Does the scientific staff of the institute participate in national and international expert conferences?
- Are scientific employees represented in German committees, in committees of the host country and in third countries?

## Quality assurance

- Does the leadership or management of the institute fulfill its tasks appropriately and successfully?
- Are decision-making and responsibility structures transparent at the institute?
- Is the organization clearly arranged?
- Are the measures for internal quality assurance appropriate?
- Are there performance incentives in place (something like a performance-based resource allocation - PBRA) and are these measures effective? How are employee appraisals conducted?
- What forms of institutional communication are there?
- Does the advisory council adequately represent the work areas of the institute?
- Does the advisory council work convincingly (support research planning, support the ongoing work progress of individual employees)?

## Appendix 4

### Flow chart - deadlines before the inspection of the institute by the commission

18 months	Institute	Briefing with the central office (Gst) on the principles of the process, the course of the inspection, areas to be covered
16 months	Institute	The institute will provide the central office with a list of specialized areas to be covered four months before the meeting of the Board of Trustees, which will decide on the composition of the commission.
	Central office	The central office asks the scientific organizations represented in the Board of Trustees (SR) and the respective professional associations to make suggestions for eight seats of the commission and informs the institute
	Institute	Comments from the institute on presumption of partiality or non-coverage of the specialized areas of the institute of the nominated experts
	Institute	On the basis of the proposals of the scientific organizations and professional associations, the Institute proposes names for the 9th place
	Central office	Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and Stifterverband appoint one advisory member each
12 months	Board of Trustees	<b>Board of Trustees meeting</b> Appointment of commission members by the Board of Trustees and appointment of the Chair by the President - definition of a reserve list
	Central office	The central office coordinates the process with the chair of the evaluation group
	President	Official invitation of the commission by the President with suggestion of on-site inspection date
	Central office	The central office asks the Institute to submit a status report in accordance with Appendix 2 and proposals for cooperation partners, which should be invited to an interview
10 months	Central office	Determination of the evaluation commission, if necessary by making use of the reserve list, as well as determination of the on-site inspection date
7 months	Institute	The institute sends its status report to the central office of the foundation for forwarding to the commission
	Central office/institute	The central office works in coordination with the institute on a draft agenda for the inspection
4 months	Commission	<b>Inaugural meeting of the commission</b>
0 months	Commission	<b>Inspection of the institute</b> Adoption of the key elements of the evaluation and the essential recommendations by the Commission as a basis for the evaluation report

## Deadlines after the inspection of the institute by the commission

0.5 months	Institute	Objections regarding the course of the on-site inspection
1-4 months	Central office/commission	Draft of the evaluation report to the chair of the commission, vote with the evaluation commission in several rounds until a final version is reached which has been approved by all
4.5 months	Central office/institute	Central office sends evaluation report in confidentiality to the director of the institute with the opportunity to comment
5 months	Institute	Objections to evaluation report
5 months	Institute	The institute sends statement on the evaluation report to the central office
	Central office	The central office sends status report, evaluation report and statement of the institute to participants of the Board of Trustees
6 months	Board of Trustees	<b>Board of Trustees meeting</b> Statement
	President	President informs the director of the institute about the statement of the Board of Trustees
	Central office	The central office sends the statement of the Board of Trustees with appendices to the institute and BMBF, statement and appendices are published exclusively on the website of the foundation