

Senate Habilitation Directive

Application for a *venia docendi*

§ 1. (1) Applications for a *venia docendi* for a full academic subject are to be filed with the Rector's Council.

(2) The following documents have to be enclosed with the application:

- a) The academic papers submitted by the habilitation candidate
- b) The habilitation candidate's CV
- c) A list of the habilitation candidate's academic publications
- d) A list of academic conference presentations delivered by the habilitation candidate and his or her regular teaching activities at recognized postsecondary educational institutions
- e) A brief description of the topic of the habilitation thesis if necessary
- f) A copy of the habilitation candidate's doctoral diploma

(3) At least five copies of the candidate's academic papers shall be submitted. In the event that more than two habilitation reviewers are nominated, one additional copy shall be submitted for each additional reviewer. If the academic papers include a habilitation thesis monograph, the candidate must hand in two additional volumes to be shelved in the Austrian National Library and the WU University Library. The CV, the list of conference presentations and courses taught and, if required, the brief description of the topic of the habilitation thesis must also be submitted in digital form.

(4) The Rector's Council shall reject the application if the application was filed for a subject outside the scope of WU. In all other cases, the Rector's Council shall forward the application and all enclosed documents to the Senate. In the event that the Rector's Council rejects the application, the Rector's Council shall inform the Senate and the Equal Opportunities Committee.

(5) The following specific regulations apply to academic papers submitted for certain habilitation subjects:

a) Foreign Language Business Communication:
For applications for a *venia docendi* in one of the subjects represented at the Department of Foreign Language Business Communication, the "written academic papers" to be submitted mean either of the following:

- a) A monograph of appropriate length (habilitation thesis in a narrow sense) that has been published or at least accepted for publication, as confirmed by a publication contract with a publisher; in addition, a number of shorter publications are required as well, usually articles on the habilitation subject published in renowned academic journals
- ii) Or a larger number of shorter publications (= cumulative habilitation thesis), usually articles published in renowned academic journals, possibly in combination with one or more shorter monographs focusing on the same specific area of research or, in justified, exceptional cases, on different areas within the habilitation subject

b) Socioeconomics:

In addition to the other required academic papers, applicants for a *venia docendi* in one of the subjects represented at the Department of Socioeconomics also have to submit an independent habilitation monograph or several academic papers that are related to the habilitation subject and have been published in prestigious academic journals.

All the papers submitted by the habilitation candidate must have been published or at least accepted for publication.

c) Law:

As a rule, applicants for a *venia docendi* in a law-related subject also have to submit an independent habilitation monograph in addition to the other required academic papers. In individual cases, the requirement of an independent habilitation monograph may be waived if, in addition to the other required academic papers, the habilitation candidate also submits several academic articles that together form a coherent whole and demonstrate the candidate's academic skills in a manner that is equivalent to the investigation of a topic in the form of a monograph, both in terms of the scope of the articles and their dogmatic and academic depth. All academic papers submitted by the habilitation candidate must have been published or accepted for publication by renowned academic publishers or journals.

d) Economics:

In addition to the other required academic papers, applicants for a *venia docendi* in economics or one of the subjects represented at the Department of Economics have to submit an independent habilitation monograph or several academic papers that are related to the habilitation subject and have been published or accepted for publication (cumulative habilitation).

An independent habilitation monograph may be submitted in unpublished form if the habilitation candidate has already published other academic papers and if he or she can present a confirmation proving that a publisher has agreed to publish the monograph.

The academic papers submitted (habilitation monograph or cumulative thesis and other required academic papers) must include papers that have already been presented for scrutiny by the appropriate, recognized scientific community.

Acceptable proof of fulfillment of this requirement may for instance include the following:

- The habilitation thesis has been published or accepted for publication by a relevant and renowned academic publisher

- The other required academic papers include articles that have been published or accepted for publication in relevant and renowned journals or relevant and renowned edited volumes

- The cumulative habilitation thesis includes papers that have been published or accepted for publication in relevant and renowned journals or relevant and renowned edited volumes

When assessing whether a journal, an edited volume, or a publisher is regarded as "relevant and renowned," the varied spectrum of different opinions and methods shall be taken into account.

e) Business

Administration:

For applications for a *venia docendi* in the field of business administration or in one of the subjects represented at the business administration-related departments, the "written academic papers" to be submitted mean either a habilitation thesis in monograph format or a collection of academic papers related in topic to the habilitation subject (cumulative habilitation thesis), in addition to the other required academic papers. To be considered worthy of a *venia docendi*, a cumulative habilitation thesis must comprise a series of excellent academic contributions by the applicant that have been published or accepted for publication. The quality of the contributions shall be assessed based on the quality standards of the respective international scientific community. Excellent quality of an article can be assumed if the article has been accepted by a periodical regarded as very good by the scientific community. The evaluation should be based on department-specific journal ratings or other widely accepted rankings. The definite focus of a *venia docendi* in business administration should be on publications in periodicals dedicated in a broad sense to business administration. After consulting with the Convention of Business Administration-Related Departments and the Senate, the individual Department Committees, acting in the name of the Senate, can adopt interpretation guides to specify the exact procedures required. Such interpretation guides are to be published in the WU Bulletin.

(5a) In the event of any changes to the habilitation directives of individual departments, including changes to the external quality criteria specified therein (e.g. journal ratings) or the subject-specific regulations specified in item 5, the doctrine of legitimate expectation is to be observed. The habilitation candidate has the right to apply for a *venia docendi* pursuant to the terms of the department-specific directive in effect at the time of application or pursuant to the terms of a previous department-specific directive that was in effect no more than four years before the date of application for a *venia docendi*. This 4-year period shall be extended in the cases specified in § 20 (3) items 1 and 2 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Extensions pursuant to item 1 may not exceed three years in total, and extensions pursuant to item 2 are limited to a total of one year. These regulations also apply to changes to the subject-specific regulations specified in item 5.

(6) § 1 (5) item b applies to habilitation proceedings initiated after March 1, 2006.

(7) § 1 (5) item e applies to habilitation proceedings initiated after March 18, 2009.

Election and delegation of members of the Habilitation Committee

§ 2. (1) The chair of the Senate shall notify, without delay, the spokesperson of the Full Professors' Association and the persons named by each of the representatives of the academic staff pursuant to § 94 (2) item 2 of the Universities Act 2002 and the students in the Senate of the receipt of the application, forward to them the documents available electronically, and ask them to elect or delegate the members and, if required, also the substitute members of the Habilitation Committee in accordance with the procedure provided for in § 4 and § 40 of the By-Laws. In addition to the other requirements for passing a resolution, passing a resolution on the establishment of the Habilitation Committee in the Senate requires a majority of the present members of the group pursuant to § 25 (4) item 1 of the Universities Act, including the other members of the Senate with a *venia docendi*. Furthermore, the chair of the Senate shall notify, without delay, the Equal Opportunities Committee of the receipt of the application and of the composition of the Habilitation Committee and also forward to it the documents available electronically.

(2) If a habilitation thesis is listed among the academic papers, the groups of persons entitled to elect or delegate members to the Habilitation Committee can postpone the election or delegation until the habilitation candidate has submitted the habilitation thesis and the thesis is available for inspection in the office of the Senate.

(3) A representative nominated by the Equal Opportunities Committee has the right to attend the meetings of the Habilitation Committee in an advisory function.

Submission of proposals for external and internal reviewers

§ 3. (1) The spokesperson of the Full Professors' Association shall invite the chairs of the departments

or Department Conventions that are responsible for the *venia docendi* applied for to submit proposals for internal and external reviewers within a period to be set by the spokesperson, and shall notify the chairs of all other departments and Conventions thereof. All departments and Conventions who regard themselves as responsible can submit such proposals. The proposals of the departments or Conventions must be submitted by the full professors of the relevant department or Convention. In departments or Conventions where the chair is not a full professor, the longest-serving full professor shall replace the chair for the purposes of this subsection.

(2) If a habilitation thesis is listed among the academic papers, the departments or Conventions regarding themselves as responsible can postpone the submission of their proposals until the habilitation candidate has submitted the habilitation thesis and the thesis is available for inspection in the office of the Senate.

Appointment of external and internal reviewers

§ 4. (1) The full professors in the Senate shall give due consideration to the proposals submitted by the departments and Conventions that are responsible for the *venia docendi* applied for, but are not obligated to accept them. In particular, they can select reviewers from among the proposals if more reviewers have been proposed than need to be appointed, or add reviewers to the proposals if fewer reviewers have been proposed than need to be appointed or should reasonably be appointed as a precaution, and even select reviewers other than those proposed in justified, exceptional cases.

(2) Representatives of the subject in which the habilitation is sought to be obtained who are not employed by WU can be appointed external reviewers. They must either have a *venia docendi* or qualification comparable to a *venia docendi*.

(3) Full professors of WU who represent the subject in which habilitation is sought to be obtained and who are not members of the Habilitation Committee can be appointed internal reviewers.

(4) The full professors in the Senate shall appoint a minimum of two reviewers. They can also appoint additional reviewers as a precaution in case the appointed reviewers are not willing to submit an assessment report. At least one external reviewer must be appointed.

Submission of assessment reports and opinions

§ 5. (1) The chair of the Senate shall notify the reviewers of their appointment and ask them to submit a written assessment report on the requirements referred to in § 103 (3) of the Universities Act 2002 as soon as possible, but no later than within two months, and send them the application by the habilitation candidate together with the documents enclosed by the candidate.

(2) The chair of the Senate shall notify, electronically and without delay after receipt of the assessment reports, all full professors of WU and all members of the Senate as well as the habilitation candidate that the assessment reports are available for inspection in the office of the Senate. In electronic form, the chair of the Senate shall invite all full professors of WU and the habilitation candidate to submit, within four weeks, opinions on the assessment reports, which must be addressed to the chair of the Senate. The chair of the Senate shall ensure that the habilitation candidate receives that information in any event.

Constitutive meeting of the Habilitation Committee

§ 6. (1) The chair of the Senate shall send all assessment reports and opinions received to the members of the Habilitation Committee and shall ask the longest-serving full professor who is a member of the committee to convene the constitutive meeting of the committee in which, in particular, the chair of the committee is to be elected, it is to be verified whether all documents pursuant to § 1 (2) and (5) of this Directive have been submitted, it is to be discussed whether assessment reports relating to didactics are to be obtained, the topic of the habilitation lecture is to be determined or suggestions for topics of the habilitation lecture are to be made, and the circle of persons to be invited to the habilitation lecture and the following presentation is to be specified.

(2) The Habilitation Committee can obtain assessment reports on the teaching qualifications of the habilitation candidate. Such an assessment report must be obtained in any event if the teaching qualifications of the habilitation candidate are disputed among the members of the committee or if the habilitation candidate does not have any previous teaching experience at WU. Moreover, every member of the Habilitation Committee is free to submit his or her own assessment report relating to didactics. The habilitation candidate is to be given the opportunity to give his or her opinion on the assessment reports relating to didactics if at least one assessment report comes to the conclusion that the habilitation candidate does not have the teaching skills required to be granted a *venia docendi*.

(3) The Habilitation Committee shall specify the topic of the habilitation lecture. It can also suggest habilitation lecture topics to the habilitation candidate, from which the habilitation candidate can choose the topic of his or her habilitation lecture. The habilitation candidate also has the right to suggest topics. The topic of the habilitation lecture must either relate to the academic papers by the habilitation candidate or to other areas of the subject in which habilitation is sought to be obtained.

Habilitation lecture and habilitation colloquium

§ 7. (1) The chair of the Habilitation Committee shall specify the date and duration of the habilitation lecture and make sure that the external and internal reviewers, the members of the Habilitation Committee and the full professors of the responsible department(s) or Convention(s) can attend the lecture, as far as possible, and that the habilitation candidate has an appropriate period for preparation. To facilitate attendance by the full professors of the relevant departments or Conventions, the habilitation lecture can, for example, be scheduled before or after other meetings of the full professors.

(2) The habilitation lecture is public.

(3) The full professors of WU and the members of the academic staff pursuant to § 94 (2) item 2 of the Universities Act 2002 working at WU must in any event be invited, electronically and in due time before the habilitation lecture, to attend the habilitation lecture, and be informed of the topic of the habilitation lecture. In addition, the Habilitation Committee shall decide on the manner in which representatives of the subject in which habilitation is sought to be obtained working at other universities and other academic institutions, WU graduates interested in the subject in which habilitation is sought to be obtained, and other academically interested practitioners and interested students can be invited to attend the habilitation lecture. The Habilitation Committee and the chair of the Habilitation Committee shall ensure, by means of appropriate measures, that a broad expert audience gets to know about the habilitation lecture and actually attends the lecture, as far as possible.

(4) After the lecture, a public discussion (habilitation colloquium) must take place, which is hosted by the chair of the Habilitation Committee. During the colloquium, the audience is supposed to ask the habilitation candidate questions, primarily regarding the habilitation lecture, or regarding academic papers written by the candidate. Topics whose discussion enables the habilitation candidate to prove that he or she has knowledge of the methods and an in-depth academic understanding of the subject in which habilitation is sought to be obtained can also be addressed.

Final meeting of the Habilitation Committee

§ 8. (1) If possible, the final meeting of the Habilitation Committee should take place immediately after the habilitation colloquium.

(2) The external and internal reviewers are to be invited to attend the deliberations of the Habilitation Committee in the final meeting in an advisory function.

(3) In its final meeting, the Habilitation Committee decides whether the habilitation candidate has both excellent academic qualifications and teaching skills (§ 103 [2] of the Universities Act 2002) and thus the requirements for being granted the *venia docendi* applied for. The Habilitation Committee shall make its decision on the basis of the assessment reports and opinions received (§ 103 [8] of the Universities Act 2002) and shall also take into account the academic papers submitted by the habilitation candidate and the insight on his or her academic and teaching skills gained during the habilitation colloquium. The Habilitation Committee shall use the standards of the relevant scientific community to judge whether the habilitation candidate has excellent academic qualifications. This is to ensure that the habilitation candidate can be appointed full professor.

(4) Decisions on the excellent academic qualifications of the habilitation candidate require the majority of the members of the Habilitation Committee with a *venia docendi*.

(5) If the Habilitation Committee chooses to ignore individual assessment reports and opinions submitted in the habilitation proceedings, the Habilitation Committee shall give reasons.

(6) Members of the Habilitation Committee who were among the minority in votes on the excellent academic qualifications and/or teaching skills of the habilitation candidate can present their dissenting opinion (*votum separatum*) in writing and enclose it with the minutes.

(7) If the Habilitation Committee comes to the conclusion that the habilitation candidate does not have excellent academic qualifications in the subject in which habilitation is sought to be obtained, the Habilitation Committee can suggest to the habilitation candidate to amend the application for a *venia docendi*, provided that the subject suggested by the Habilitation Committee is an academic subject falling within the scope of WU and that the habilitation candidate has excellent academic qualifications in the suggested subject according to the assessment reports and opinions submitted. If the habilitation candidate amends his or her application to that effect, the Habilitation Committee can continue the proceedings on the basis of the amended application even without scheduling another habilitation lecture and habilitation colloquium.

Issuance of an official notification on the *venia docendi*

§ 9. (1) On the basis of the documents submitted by the chair of the Habilitation Committee, the Rector's Council shall examine whether any fundamental principles of the proceedings have been violated and, if that is not the case, issue an official notification on the application for a *venia docendi* on the basis of the resolution by the Habilitation Committee.

(2) If the Rector's Council rejects the resolution by the Habilitation Committee, the chair of the

Senate must be notified thereof and of the reasons without delay. Taking into account the legal opinion of the Rector's Council, the Senate shall decide whether a new Habilitation Committee should be instituted, whether the full professors in the Senate should appoint other reviewers, and/or whether the Habilitation Committee should repeat the entire proceedings or certain parts thereof.

Information of the full professors and the habilitated persons

§ 10. During the proceedings and within one year after the end of the proceedings, the full professors of WU and the habilitated academic staff members permanently employed by WU have the right to inspect the academic papers presented by the habilitation candidate and all assessment reports and opinions submitted during the proceedings. During the proceedings, this right can be exercised in the office of the Senate, and after the end of the proceedings in the office of the Rector's Council. Persons who exercise this right are subject to official secrecy.