



Appointment Committee pursuant to § 98 Universities Act (UG)

Professorship *Philosophy of Mind*

Minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting

<b>Date:</b>	05.11.2025
<b>Start:</b>	10:02
<b>End:</b>	12:31
<b>Venue:</b>	Dean's Office meeting room {NIG, Universitätsstraße 7, 3rd floor- Dean's Office, 1010 Vienna) and Zoom

## 1. Opening by the chair

The chair, Univ.-Prof. Paulina Sliwa, PhD, opens the meeting at 10:00.

## 2. Attendance and quorum

The committee has a quorum if at least half of the members are present. With nine members, at least five must be present.

### Present (committee members):

Professors:

- Univ.-Prof. Paulina Sliwa, PhD
- Univ.-Prof. Max Kölbel, MA MPhil PhD

- Univ.-Prof. Dr. Hans-Bernhard Schmid; Schmid left: 11:57, transferred vote to Crane.
- Univ. -Prof. Mag. Mag. Dr. Georg Schiemer (Zoom)
- Univ.-Prof. Tim Crane

**Academic staff:**

- Ronald Sladky, Bakk. MSc PhD
- Mag. Dr. Claudia Naomi Osorio-Kupferblum, BA

**Students:**

- Katharina Kora Kreiner

**Absent members:**

Samuel Helgert: vote transferred to Kreiner.

**Equal Opportunities Working Party (AKG):**

Assoc. Prof. Mag. Mag. Dr. Dr. Esther Heinrich. Heinrich left meeting: 11.24.

**Proxy notifications:**

Quorum is established.

**3. Election of minute taker:**

Mag. Dr. Barbara Breunlich, BA volunteers to take the minutes. The committee expresses its thanks.

#### **4. Approval of the agenda**

The agenda for the second meeting is approved unanimously.

#### **5. Approval of minutes of constitutive meeting**

The minutes of constitutive meeting are approved unanimously.

#### **6. Report / Summary of chair on submitted comments regarding categorization of applications**

The chair reports that as a result of the application deadline extension, the the pool of applicants is now very good (62 applicants, 42 males, 20 females). The chair thanks all committee members for sending in their scoring in advance of the meeting. The chair clarifies the procedure for conflicts of interest. For each candidate, members of the committee will be asked for any conflicts of interests or the possibility of perceptions of conflict of interest. If there are such conflicts of interest (or possibility of perceived conflicts of interest), the committee member will leave the room for discussion and vote on the candidate. The chair has collated all scores into one spreadsheet, converted them into values (A=3, A-B=2.5, B=2, B-C=1.5, C=1) and ranked by average. The chair asks whether the committee would prefer to discuss candidates in alphabetical or by ranking. There is agreement that the candidates should be discussed by ranking.

#### **7. Discussion and A-B-C categorization of applications**

The committee agrees to proceed according to the list provided by the chair. The categorization of applicants starts with the highest numerical average, then goes down the list. It is decided that each individual candidate will be discussed and a preliminary A/B/C categorization (Stimmungsbild) will be agreed. Votes on final categorizations will be taken after all candidates have been discussed.

#### **Wong:**

Conflict of interest: Crane knows the candidate from professional interactions (but no close collaboration). To avoid appearance of conflict of interest, Crane leaves

the room.

**Discussion:** Outstanding candidate on all criteria: top publications, impressive funding record, supervision and teaching experience on all levels, considerable service.

Vote on provisional A:

unanimous in favour

**Jennings:**

Conflict of interest: none

**Discussion:** Excellent publications, two books (OUP and CUP), journal publications include Phil Studies, JAPA, Analysis. Extensive supervision and teaching experience in Mind. Some third-party funding (unclear amount). Outstanding service track record.

Vote on provisional A:

unanimous in favour

**Maibom:**

Conflict of interest: none (Crane was her PhD advisor but this was over 20 years ago, no conflict of interest)

**Discussion:** Strong publication record, many visiting appointments. Track record of third-party funding. Good coverage of teaching, experience of PhD supervision and MA supervision. Some leadership roles.

Vote on provisional A:

unanimous in favour

**Buehler:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Excellent publication record on attention and agency. Book currently under review with OUP. AJP, Mind, Ergo, Phil Studies. Good grant funding (ANRJCJC, Templeton). Teaching experience at all levels across Mind, Phil of Psychology, Phil of Cog Sci, and epistemology. Designed PhD program at ENS. Supervision experience at MA and PhD level.

Vote on provisional A:

unanimous in favour

**Montague:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Excellent publications, teaching of philosophy of mind across all parts of the curriculum, extensive PhD supervision experience, lots of service. Only minus is third-party funding but has held visiting fellowships, which require application with a project. Has not submitted teaching evaluations.

Committee decides that all candidates invited to interviews will be encouraged again to submit teaching evaluations if they have not already done so.

Vote on provisional A:

unanimous in favour

**Orlandi:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Excellent publication record (one OUP book that was widely reviewed), plenty of journal publications in top-tier journals. Impressive teaching portfolio and mentoring experience. Not much third-party funding but successfully applied for US fellowships, which should be seen as equivalent to European grants (also require

project proposal). Excellent leadership experience.

Vote on provisional A:

unanimous in favour

**Stokes:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Excellent publication record in perception, creativity (one monograph with Routledge, numerous papers in top-tier journals, including Phil Studies, AJP), third-party funding (postdoctoral fellowships in Canada), teaching and supervising experience in Phil of Mind, both department and professional service.

Vote on provisional A:

For: 8

Against: 1

Abstention: 0

**Nanay:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Very productive (5 monographs published, 2 under contract), outstanding grant income, large number of PhDs supervised. There are some reservations about his teaching: he has held a research-only position and has no recent experience of undergraduate teaching. Osorio-Kupferblum states that she has seen Nanay give a talk and it fell well short of professional standards.

Vote on provisional A:

For: 8

Against: 1

Abstention: 0

**Broessel:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Excellent publications but most of them are in epistemology. Emmy-Noether Group, DFG funding in Situated Cognition. Works at intersection epistemology/phil of science/mind. Solid publication record – many of them on the epistemology side. Supervision experience at all levels (with a lot of Mind supervision). Administrative experience, including director of MA in CogSci. Won dissertation prize. Sladky notes that Brössel is very respected in Cog Sci community.

Vote on provisional A:

For: 0

Against: 8

Abstention: 1 (Sladky)

Vote on provisional B:

For: unanimous

**Mroczko-Wasowicz:**

Conflict of interest: none

Comments: Good publication record but not outstanding (two edited volumes, plenty of journal pubs though no top-tier journals). Teaching experience in Phil of Mind at all levels. Unclear whether any PhD supervision experience.

Vote on provisional A:

For: 1

Against: 7

Abstention: 1

Vote on provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Quilty-Dunn:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Outstanding publication record, particularly given career stage. Teaching and supervising experience but no third-party funding and no service. Very little PhD advising.

Vote on provisional A:

For: 0

Against: unanimous

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Silins:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Excellent and influential publications, albeit fewer in quantity than some of the other candidates in the field. Competence in non-Western philosophy. Excellent track record teaching. Was editor of Phil Review (in house journal), so big service contribution. Fewer third-party funding opportunities in US for humanities, but candidate acquired significant grant funding for summer NEH seminar. There is discussion about whether the publication record is excellent.

Vote on provisional A:

Favour: 3

Against: 4

Abstention: 2

Vote on provisional B:

unanimous.

It is agreed that as there was disagreement here, this application would be discussed again after all applicants had been discussed.

**Fink:**

Conflicts of interest: none

Discussion: Numerous but not outstanding publications: none are in top-tier journals (most of them are in a journal founded and edited by the applicant), good third-party funding, solid teaching experience in Phil of Mind on all levels.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Burnston:**

Conflicts of interest: none

Discussion: Good but not excellent publication record, primarily on cog-sci end of Phil of Mind (perceptual learning, predictive processing). Also some publications in Phil of science. Some grant funding as Co-PI. Teaching experience in core Mind-courses. Supervision at MA and PhD level. Leadership experience (CogSci-director, placement director, and PSA)

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Colombo:**

Conflicts of interest: none

Discussion: Strong publication record but the candidate mostly works in Phil of Science (two Phil of science monographs co-authored book with CUP, pubs include Ergo, BJPS, Erkenntnis, Episteme.) Excellent third-party funding: DFG Grant and Humboldt. Teaching in Phil of Mind. PhD supervision experience (3 completed), as well as MA level. Admin experience at department.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Langkau:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Outstanding track record with third-party funding, leading a research group, and teaching. But weak publication record in comparison to other candidates. Mostly invited volumes and handbooks. Few publications in peer-reviewed journals and only two (Analysis, CJP) in top ranked ones.

Schmid says that he considers the publications to be very good and that the candidate's focus on aesthetics is interesting.

Vote on provisional longlist:

For: 2

Against: 6

Abstention: 1

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Michael:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Weak publication record in philosophy (albeit very prolific in psychology). Since 2020 only 4 peer-reviewed publications in philosophy journals, none of

them in top-tier philosophy journals. One monograph (Routledge book on commitment), which is not in philosophy of mind. Supervision and teaching experience. Outstanding grant funding (including ERC Starting Grant and Leverhulme)

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Müller:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Publication record strong but not outstanding (one book with Palgrave, multiple journal publications). Part of publications are on normativity/ethics, rather than Phil of mind. Teaching experience in Phil Mind at all levels, MA supervision but no PhD supervision yet. Good track record of third-party funding.

Vote on Provisional B:

For: 8

Against: 1

**Schulz:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Would be outstanding candidate for Phil of Science chair but has only limited work in Phil of Mind. Excellent publication record, with four books and numerous articles in top journals (particularly top Phil of Science journals). Excellent funding record. Kölbl: impressive, but mostly phil of science, Schmid says that the field of philosophy of biology is interesting and relevant to cognitive science. This is a very strong candidate. Sladky notes that the candidate's work does not have broader relevance for the field, the candidate found a narrow niche.

Vote on Provisional B:

For: 8

Against: 1

11:08 Break for 5 Minutes

11:13 Continued

**Spener:**

Conflict of interest: Crane has known Spener for many years as a friend and colleague. Leaves the room to avoid appearance of conflict of interest.

Discussion: This applicant has a good but not outstanding publication record (one monograph with OUP) but only one journal publication since 2015. Excellent leadership experience, both at department level and service to the profession. Excellent teaching, including PhD supervision and mentorship of junior career researchers. A considerable weakness is complete lack of any third-party funding.

There is some discussion about the strength of the publication record compared to other provisionally long listed candidates. Kölbl notes that publications of this candidate are not on the same level; there is lack of recent journal publications. Schmid points out 2023 Journal of Consciousness Studies.

Vote provisional A:

For: 3

Against: 6

It is decided that this candidate will be revisited before voting on final A-list.

Heinrich leaves: 11.24.

**Martens:**

Conflict of interest: Martens was Schmid's postdoc at Uni Wien. Schmid leaves the

room

**Discussion:** This candidate has competence in Mind but in recent years her focus was on social ontology. Publications record is good but not outstanding. Only four peer-reviewed journal pubs (JSO, JSP, Phenomenology and Cognitive Sciences, Topoi), two grants, PhD and MA supervision. No teaching experience in Phil of Mind.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Neufeld:** Conflicts of interest: none.

**Discussion:** Excellent publication record for career stage (PhD 2020). PhD supervision and good teaching experience. No leadership, no third-party funding.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Pfeifer:**

Conflicts of interest: none.

**Discussion:** The candidate's AoS is in formal epistemology, no clear research focus in philosophy of mind. Teaching at all levels, no PhD supervision, a few MA theses. Limited administrative experience.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Varga:**

Conflicts of interest: none

Discussion: Some research is relevant to Phil of Mind, but the main focus of this candidate is Philosophy of Medicine. Would be more suitable for a Phil of science position.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Wiese:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Publication record is good but not excellent for career stage (one book with MIT press, several articles), some of it are more on philosophy of AI than Mind. No third-party project funding, third-party funding for journal. Sladky notes that this candidate is doing very promising work in Phil of AI.

Vote on Provisional B:

For: 7

Against 2

**Taleb:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: This would be an outstanding candidate for a history of philosophy job, but there is no clear research focus in philosophy of mind. The candidate works on history of phenomenology.

Vote on Provisional B:

For: 8

Against: 1

**Barwich:**

**Conflict of interest:** none

**Discussion:** Research focus is not in Mind but in Phil of Science. Would be outstanding for Phil of Science position. One book with HUP 2020, one Cambridge Elements, other publications mostly in science journals. Teaching in Philosophy of Cog-Sci teaching. 5 PhD students. No big admin roles.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Finlay:**

**Conflict of interest:** none. Finlay was briefly employed (one month) on the Knowledge in Crisis project as a postdoc.

**Discussion:** This is an excellent candidate, but he has no research focus in Philosophy of Mind. Would be outstanding appointment in moral philosophy/metaethics.

Vote on Provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Kompa:**

**Conflict of interest:** none

**Discussion:** Excellent publication record (several monographs, journal articles, volume chapters), excellent teaching experience, including PhD and MA supervision, and mentoring early career researchers. Good third-party funding.

There is some discussion how much of the applicant's work is in Mind as opposed to Phil of language. Kölbel clarifies that Kompa's work is very much in Mind. Crane and Kölbel both say that her latest book is excellent. Schmid notes that Kompa was asked to be a referee for this position.

Vote on provisional B:

For: 5

Against: 4

It is decided that this candidate will be discussed again before voting on final A-list.

**Barz:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Publication record is not excellent. Two books in German (Suhrkamp, Mentis), publications in mid-tier journals. Lots of MA-thesis supervised, no PhD students. Was institute director for a year. Some third-party funding.

Vote on provisional B:

For: 8

Abstention: 1

**Gregory:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Good but not outstanding publication record in philosophy of Mind for career stage. Third-party funding and teaching experience, no PhD supervision. No leadership/admin role experience. Would be competitive for tenure track but not for full professorship.

Vote on provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Hlobil:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No research focus in Phil of Mind, excellent record in philosophical logic.

Vote on provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Kyselö:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Weak publication record in philosophy of mind (no top-tier journals), stronger in cognitive science. Applicant has PhD in Cognitive Science, not Philosophy. Philosophy of mind teaching at undergrad level. No recent MA supervision (all in Berlin), one ongoing PhD student, 2 more co-supervised. Good funding track record. Kölbl says he believes this is a C-candidate, not a B-candidate.

Vote on provisional B:

For: 8

Against: 1

**Madary:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Publication record not excellent for career stage (most recent publication is 2022). No PhD student supervision.

Vote on provisional C:

For: 7

Against: 0

Abstention: 2

**O'Brian:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Research focus in philosophy of action, rather than in philosophy of mind. Publication record good but not excellent for career stage. One book on philosophy of action, one more forthcoming. Numerous grants as Co-PI. Extensive teaching and supervising, as well as admin experience.

Vote on provisional B:

For: 8

Abstention: 1

**Reiland:**

conflict of interest: Kölbl was Reiland's mentor for his Esprit project, Osorio-Kupferblum is colleague and prefers to leave the room.

Discussion: Strong publication record for career stage though more recent work seems to be in Philosophy of Language rather than Phil of Mind. Strong track record with grants, Teaching experience in Phil of Mind. Some MA supervision, some PhD co-supervision. Very little service. Would be strong candidate for a TT position but not quite for a full Prof yet.

Vote on provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Salice:**

Conflict of interest: Schmid leaves the room because of cooperation with applicant.

Discussion: No AoS in Mind, no future research plans in Mind. Does social ontology and history of phenomenology. Many publications but not in top journals.

Vote on provisional B:

unanimous in favour

**Queloz:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Very prolific and impressive scholar but no research focus in the philosophy of mind. Works in ethics/language. Unclear how many PhD students are supervised. No leadership/service experience mentioned.

Vote on provisional B:

Against: 3

For: 6

Schmid requests vote on provisional A:

Vote on provisional A

For: 3

Against: 6

**Casper:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Fairly recent PhD (2018) and publications not outstanding for this career stage. (Monograph with De Gruyter and Springer, many invited volumes, one publication with Phenomenology and Cog Sci). Just started running DFG project as PI. No PhD supervision experience. Teaching in Mind and Phil of Psychology. No leadership roles.

Vote on provisional C

For: 7

Against: 2

**Werner:**

**Conflict of interest:** none

**Discussion:** Publication record is not excellent for career stage (only two articles in internationally leading philosophy journals (Erkenntnis, Analysis). Teaching experience at undergrad/MA level but no PhD supervision. No leadership experience.

**Funding good.** (DFG)

Vote on provisional C:

**For:** 7

**Against:** 1

**Abstention:** 1

**Dembic:**

**Conflict of interest:** none

**Discussion:** This is a recent PhD (PhD 2020), with an excellent publication record for that career stage (one book with Routledge, one paper with Phil Imprint and smattering of other publications). Has only supervised two MA's, no PhDs. No third-party funding. Would be suitable for TT but not full professorship at this point.

Kölbel points out that this is a reason to categorise the applicant as a C, rather than B.

Vote on provisional B:

**For:** 6

**Against:** 3

**Goffin:**

**Conflict of interest:** none

**Discussion:** No AoS in Mind, publications in Philosophy of AI, philosophy of Emotions, and Moral psychology. Teaching experience in moral psychology, some MA supervision, no PhD. Marie Curie Fellowship.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Poljansek:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Publication record is not excellent. Many publications but none in top-tier journals or high quality volumes. No clear focus in Phil of Mind, many of the pubs are on AI ethics, anthropology. No teaching experience in Phil of Mind. No MA or PhD supervision.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Schmitz:** Schmid leaves: 11:57 Uhr, transferred: vote to Crane.

conflict of interest: Osorio-Kupferblum leaves the room as she knows Schmitz as a colleague.

Discussion: No research focus in Mind, works in philosophy of language and social ontology

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Bromand:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No AoS in Mind – works in Language and Epistemology.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Fingerhut:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No focus in Mind – works more in aesthetics, philosophy of art, neurourbanism.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Kolak:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Above retirement age

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Porot:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Strong but not excellent publication record for career stage. Good teaching experience but no PhD or MA supervision. No third-party funding. Would be good for TT but not for full Professorship.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Satne:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No AoS in Mind – works in social ontology/social normativity. Publication record good but not outstanding.



Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Weber:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: AoS is not Mind, works in epistemology.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Günther:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No AoS in Mind – works in Decision Theory/Formal Epistemology.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Melichar:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No research focus in Philosophy of Mind. The key publication (monograph) is a piece on Hegel on arguments for god's existence. Publications are not outstanding, no top-tier journals.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Gabriel:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No research focus in Philosophy of Mind. Two monographs, no publications with top-tier philosophy journals. No PhD supervision experience, no third-party funding.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Hashi:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: above retirement age.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Muss:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No research focus in Philosophy of Mind, this is a psychologist.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Eveangelidis:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No research focus in Philosophy of Mind, this is a psychologist.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Gaikis:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No research focus in Philosophy of Mind, background in cultural studies.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Gratvol:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: applicant has not completed her PhD in philosophy.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Koshzhanova:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No PhD in philosophy.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Rodriguez:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No AoS in Mind, no excellent publications. Works on Schelling and Hegel.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Schumann:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: No AoS in Mind – works in epistemology. Publication record is not excellent.

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

**Streubel:**

Conflict of interest: none

Discussion: Publication record not excellent (no publications in international journals).

Vote on provisional C:

unanimous in favour

The committee agrees that now that all candidates have been discussed, the borderline A/B cases should be discussed. It is agreed that the following candidates will be discussed, as they had a significant votes for inclusion in longlist and/or there were some questions about their record:

**Langkau**

**Mroczo-Wasowicz**

**Kompa**

**Sillins**

**Spener**

Sliwa suggests that the candidates are discussed individually and that the committee vote on each individually, whether they should be included on provisional A-list.

**1. Langkau:**

Kölbl repeats concerns about the quality of the publication record. Sliwa agrees.

Vote on upgrading to prov. A-list: everyone against.

Unanimous support for staying with provisional B.

**2. Mroczo-Wasowicz:**

Crane notes that the candidate does not have any outstanding research achievements.

Vote on upgrading to prov. A-list: everyone against.

Unanimous support for staying with provisional B.

**3. Kompa:**

Crane notes that Kompa has been producing excellent work and that he believes her research achievements are excellent.

Vote on upgrading to prov. A-list:

Favour 8

Abstention: 1

#### **4. Silins:**

Sliwa notes that his work on philosophy of perception has been significant. Crane agrees that it can be considered an outstanding research achievement.

Vote on moving Silins to provisional A-list:

For: 6

Abstentions: 3

#### **5. Spener:**

Conflict of interest: Crane leaves room

Osorio-Kupferblum says that Spener is an outstanding teacher and would make an excellent colleague. Kölbl agrees but says that she does not meet criterium of third-party funding. Sliwa agrees it is difficult to see her application being assessed favourably in light of lack of third-party funding. Kölbl reiterates concerns about publication record.

Vote on moving Spener to provisional A-list:

For: 1

Abstention: 1

Against: 6

Sliwa says that now that we have provisionally categorised all applicants A/B/C, the committee will take a vote on the *final A/B/C categorization*.

**Vote:** It is proposed that all candidates on the provisional A-list, be categorised as A. These are the following 10 candidates:

Wong

Jennings

Montague

Maibom

Bühler

Orlandi

Stokes

Nanay

Silins

Kompa

For: 8

Against:0

Abstention: 1

Kölbel and Crane request that the committee consider whether some candidates that have provisionally been categorised as B should not be categorised as C. This includes candidates who do not have a research focus in philosophy of mind, although they are outstanding in their respective AoS.

**Vote:** It is proposed that the following candidates who had been provisionally classified as B should be reclassified as provisionally C because their research focus is not in philosophy of mind:

Queloz

**Finlay**

**Barz**

**Hlobil**

**Taieb**

**Pfeifer**

**For: unanimous.**

**Vote: It is proposed that the following candidates who have been provisionally classified as B should be classified as B:**

**Brössel**

**Mroczko-Wasowicz**

**Quilty-Dunn**

**Fink**

**Burnston**

**Colombo**

**Langkau**

**Michael**

**Müller**

**Schulz**

**Spener**

**Martens**

**Neufeld**

**Varga**

**Wiese**

**Barwich**

**Gregory**

**Kyseló**

**O'Brian**

**Reiland**

**Dembic**

**Vote: It is proposed that the following candidates who have been provisionally classified as C should be classified as C:**

**Queloz**

**Finlay**

**Barz**

**Hlobil**

**Taieb**

**Pfeifer**

**Madari**

**Salice**

**Casper**

**Werner**

**Goffin**

**Poljanšek**

**Schmitz**

**Bromand**

**Fingerhut**

**Kolak**

**Porot**

**Satne**

**Weber**

**Günther**

**Melichar**

**Gabriel**

**Hashi**

**Muss**

**Eveangelidis**

**Gaikis**

**Gratvol**

**Koshzhanova**

**Rodriguez**

**Schumann**

**Streubel**

**For: Unanimous**

### **8. Scheduling: Deadlines for reviews, next meetings and hearings**

The next meeting will be to decide on the shortlist for interviews. This will be scheduled once the longlist has been confirmed and we have a clear idea of the timeline.


### **9. Any other business**

None

12:31 end of meeting.


The minutes will be prepared within two weeks in accordance with the guidelines and submitted to all members for review.

---

 Chair

Univ.-Prof. Paulina Sliwa, PhD

---

 Minute taker:

Dr. Barbara Breunlich