

General Information

The Philipps-Universität highly values professional and fair assessment as part of its appointment procedures. To enable professional and fair assessment, the departments are asked to assign individuals to the appointment committees and select reviewers who are distinguished by their scholarly expertise and can therefore assess the scholarly profile of the candidates. Equally essential for a fair appointment process is the avoidance of bias or apparent bias among the members of the appointment committee and the reviewers.

The appearance of bias may be present with a member of the appointment committee or a reviewer on the grounds of too close of relations with the candidate or if there is otherwise reason to doubt the impartiality of the expert assessments. Reason for such a doubt exists when one or more of the partiality criteria described below are fulfilled.

Securing and maintaining the impartiality of the appointment committee and the reviewers is so important that impartiality is already assumed if from a responsible, neutral point of view the circumstances constitute the semblance of partiality. It is therefore not necessary to prove an actual deficit in the objectivity of an appointment committee member or reviewer.

I. GENERAL PARTIALITY CRITERIA (CRITERIA FOR EXCLUSION)

Regardless of any subjective assessment, the appearance of partiality - both among members of the appointment committee and reviewers – is present in the following instances and thus excludes their participation in an appointment process.

1. First-degree kinship, marriage, civil partnership or cohabitation with the applicant.
2. Dependent working relationship or supervisory relationship (e.g., teacher-student relationship up to and including the post-doctoral phase). If a former supervisor or advisor has been performing independent scholarly work for more than five years since the working relationship, the partiality criterion falls under the statute of limitations.

When filling professorships that include patient care in the Department of Medicine, the participation of the institute or clinic director in the selection process as a voting member of the appointment committee is permissible. When there are internal applicants among the pool of applicants, these applications are to be considered in accordance with the UMR guidelines for internal professorship appointments. In this special case the supervisor must leave the room for the discussion of the qualifications of the applicant in **all** phases of the appointment committee's work.

3. Ownership of the advertised post, whether immediately preceding or current.
4. Participation in the same application process as a candidate.
5. Representation of a candidate by virtue of law or power of attorney in general or in this administrative process (e.g., as an attorney) or another profession that stipulates a confidential relationship with an oath of secrecy.
6. Paid employment relationship with an applicant or employment with applicant as a member of the board of directors, the supervisory board or a similar agency or institution.

II. PARTIALITY WITH CASE-BY-CASE DECISIONS

Moreover, there can be facts present that may give rise to a semblance of partiality and should be examined on a case-by-case basis. Whether these facts are so grave that a committee member or a reviewer should be regarded as biased must be diligently examined and weighed out. This decision process must be transparent and documented. Apparent partiality can be particularly present in the following instances:

7. Close scholarly collaboration, e.g., working on common projects or common publications of appointment committee members or reviewers with candidates within the past three years. The same applies for appointment committee members and reviewers who have been involved with the applicant within the past year prior to the application in a university council or other committee in the research field.
8. Relationships that do not fall under the criteria for exclusion; other personal ties or documented or documentable conflicts.
9. Participation in mutual reviews or assessments within the past 12 months.

III. PROCEDURES WHEN PARTIALITY APPEARS TO BE PRESENT

a) For members of the appointment committee

When one of the first seven partiality criteria listed above (1-6) applies to a member of the appointment committee, membership in the appointment committee is no longer possible. The Office of the Dean receives a report forthwith from the chairperson of the appointment committee, withdraws the assignment of the person in question to the appointment committee, and in consultation with the President identifies another member.

When one of the last three criteria above (7-9) could apply to a member of the appointment committee, the Office of the Dean is to receive a report immediately from the chairperson of the appointment committee. When the Office of the Dean recognizes the semblance of partiality, it immediately withdraws the assignment of the person in question to the appointment committee, and in consultation with the President identifies another member. If the Office of the Dean reaches the decision that a semblance of partiality is not present, this should likewise be documented in the appointment process dossier.

Proceedings: The Dean opens the meeting and reminds the appointment committee members of the UMR's rules on impartiality. The form provided below is to be used to confirm whether or not the aforementioned criteria do or do not hold true. The chairperson is elected. The applicant's documents are reviewed. Any member of the appointment committee who qualifies as partial on the discussion of the applicant's qualifications is asked to leave the room. If after the first selection decision no partiality is present, the appointment committee member may remain in the commission. Otherwise a new appointment committee member must be named in consultation with the President prior to the next appointment committee meeting.

b) For reviewers

The form provided below is to be used to confirm whether or not the aforementioned criteria do or do not hold true.

When one of the first seven (1-6) partiality criteria listed above applies to a reviewer, the commission identifies a replacement reviewer.

When one of the last three criteria above (7-9) could apply to a reviewer, the appointment committee decides whether or not a replacement reviewer shall be identified. The reasons for the decision are to be documented in the meeting minutes.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR NEGOTIATIONS TO REMAIN IN OFFICE, EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES AND PROCEDURES FOR REMOVING TIME LIMITATIONS

In proceedings where there is no announcement for upgrading the W salary grade or for evaluation and removal of time limitations (for example, with tenure proceedings of junior professorships), only partiality criteria 1-6 apply.

V. IMPARTIALITY RULES FOR MEMBERS OF OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE PHILIPPS-UNIVERSITÄT MARBURG

Partiality criteria 1-9 are applied analogously to members of other committees.

This also applies to the process steps outlined in Par. 3 so long as the committee was established solely for meeting and deciding on the matter where the partiality exists.

If the matter where partiality applies is only one of several issues discussed in the commission in question, the biased member is only to be excluded from those meetings and decisions that pertain to the particular matter where partiality is present. The appointment committee member must leave the meeting room. His or her committee membership remains otherwise intact. In cases of doubt the chair of the appointment committee shall decide in absentia of the committee member in question whether or not said committee member is to be excluded from participation.

Thank you for your cooperation!

The President
Philipps-Universität Marburg

Marburg, 1 June 2014

Partiality Declaration

For all Members of the Appointment Committee
For External Reviewers in all Appointment Proceedings
For Members of other Committees

I. GENERAL PARTIALITY CRITERIA (CRITERIA FOR EXCLUSION)

1. First-degree kinship, marriage, civil partnership or cohabitation with the applicant.
2. Dependent working relationship or supervisory relationship (e.g., teacher-student relationship up to and including the post-doctoral phase). If a former supervisor or advisor has been performing independent scholarly work for more than five years since the working relationship, the partiality criterion falls under the statute of limitations. Current or immediately preceding ownership of the advertised post. *When filling professorships that include patient care in the Department of Medicine, the participation of the institute or clinic director in the selection process as a voting member of the appointment committee is permissible. When there are internal applicants among the pool of applicants, these applications are to be considered in accordance with the UMR guidelines for internal professorship appointments. In this special case the supervisor must leave the room for the discussion of the qualifications of the applicant in **all** phases of the appointment committee's work.*
3. Ownership of the advertised post, whether immediately preceding or current.
4. Participation in the same application process as a candidate.
5. Representation of a candidate by virtue of law or power of attorney in general or representing in this administrative process (e.g., as an attorney), or another profession that stipulates a confidential relationship with an oath of secrecy.
6. Paid employment relationship with an applicant or employment with applicant as a member of the board of directors, the supervisory board or a similar agency or institution.

II. SPECIAL PARTIALITY CRITERIA WITH CASE-BY-CASE DECISIONS

7. Close scholarly collaboration, e.g., working on common projects or common publications of appointment committee members or reviewers with candidates within the past three years. The same applies for appointment committee members and reviewers who were involved with the applicant within the past year prior to the application in a university council or other committee in the research field.
8. Relationships that do not fall under the criteria for exclusion; other personal ties or documented or documentable conflicts.
9. Participation in mutual reviews or assessments within the past 12 months.

I have read and understood the partiality criteria of the Philipps-Universität of Marburg.

Please mark:

[...] None of criteria 1-9 hold true for me.

[...] One or more of criteria 1-6 hold true for me. For this reason I decline participation in the appointment process.

[...] One or more of criteria 7-9 may hold true for me. Since a case-by-case decision must be made here, I will include my comments on the surrounding circumstances on a separate sheet of paper.

City, Date

Signature of the Appointment Committee Member or Reviewer