

Translation of the New Version of the Doctoral Degree Regulations of Faculty 1 – Educational and Social Sciences at the University of Hildesheim (Dr. phil.)

*Please note that the following text was translated from the original document using generative AI. It may contain errors. **This translation does not constitute a legally binding document.***

On the basis of Section 44, Paragraph 1 of the Lower Saxony Higher Education Act (NHG) in the version dated 26 February 2007 (Nds. GVBl. p. 69), last amended by Article 14 of the Act of 13 December 2024 (Nds. GVBl. No. 118), Faculty 1 – Educational and Social Sciences of the University of Hildesheim adopted the following new version of the Doctoral Degree Regulations of Faculty 1 on 28 May 2025.

§ 1

Conferral of the Doctoral Degree

- (1) The University of Hildesheim confers, through Faculty 1 – Education and Social Sciences, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Dr. phil.).
- (2) The doctorate serves to demonstrate the ability to conduct advanced independent scientific research. This demonstration is provided by
 1. a scholarly treatise recognized as a dissertation,
 2. a successfully conducted disputation, and
 3. previous doctoral study achievements (§ 7).
- (3) The dissertation (paragraph 2) must relate to subject areas represented within the faculty.
- (4) Cotutelle procedure
Doctoral projects may be conducted in Faculty 1 jointly supervised with a foreign university. Cooperation on a doctoral project requires an agreement between the two universities and the responsible faculties or departments. The agreement is oriented towards the recommendations of the German Rectors' Conference concerning bi-national doctoral procedures. The agreement specifies the composition of the doctoral board and the examination procedure. These must not contradict the regulations set out in this doctoral degree regulation. When drawing up the agreement, the doctoral board of Faculty 1 must be involved.
- (5) Cooperative doctorates with other universities and with research institutions outside universities take place on the basis of cooperation agreements that must meet the requirements of these regulations.
- (6) In recognition of outstanding scientific achievements, cultural merit, or distinguished services to the advancement of science, the faculty may also confer the doctoral degree (Dr. phil. h. c.) honoris causa. The decision of the faculty council to confer the degree requires a two-thirds majority of the valid votes cast, as well as a

majority of all professors on the faculty council. The awarding takes place following a statement by the senate.

§ 2

Doctoral Board, Doctoral Commission, and Doctoral Committee

(1) The members of the doctoral board are elected by the faculty council for a term of two years by the respective membership groups. The doctoral board consists of four members from among the professors/habilitated members and two postdoctoral research associates. All board members belong to the faculty. The chair and the deputy chair of the doctoral board are elected by the board, from among the professors, by simple majority. The chair and the deputy should belong to different subject areas. In purely formal matters, the chair or their deputy may decide without convening the board; the other board members must be informed without delay. Any member may, for good reasons, request that a board meeting on the matter be convened within 14 days.

(2) The doctoral board decides on submitted applications for admission as a doctoral candidate or for admission to the doctoral procedure. For assessment of the dissertation, it appoints the reviewers according to § 8 para. 1; typically, the supervisor(s) according to § 5 are included. For each doctoral procedure, the doctoral board forms a doctoral commission, consisting of at least three members. The commission includes the reviewers and one member of the doctoral board who is habilitated or a professor. The chair of the commission is a member of the doctoral board who is not also a reviewer.

(3) The doctoral commission decides by majority vote. In purely formal matters, the chair or the deputy may decide without convening the commission; the other commission members must be informed without delay. Any member may, for good reasons, request that a meeting be convened on the matter within 14 days.

(4) Upon acceptance as a doctoral candidate, the doctoral board establishes a doctoral committee to support the candidate (§ 5 para. 2). In addition to the supervisor(s), the committee includes one academically qualified professor or habilitated member who is employed full-time within the faculty. The doctoral candidate may propose committee members when applying for admission as a candidate. The activity of the doctoral committee ends with admission to the doctoral programme.

§ 3

Prerequisites for Acceptance as a Doctoral Candidate and for Admission to the Doctoral Procedure

(1) The applicant for acceptance as a doctoral candidate and for admission to the doctoral procedure should generally hold a degree with a high distinction (i.e., a grade of 2.5 or better) in a scientific programme, documented by a diploma, magister or master's certificate, a certificate of the first state examination for the higher

teaching profession, or an equivalent qualification. This degree must be based on (if applicable, consecutive) studies worth at least 300 ECTS credits. If ECTS credits have not been awarded, the Doctoral board shall decide on the equivalence of academic achievements and examinations performed, taking into account an equivalent course of study at the University of Hildesheim in which credits are awarded. The degree must relate to subject areas represented in the faculty. Exceptions to sentences 1, 2, and 4 are decided by the doctoral board. The requirements are also fulfilled if the applicant can demonstrate a qualification that meets the criteria for admission to an established doctoral programme within the faculty, provided that the admission requirements include a distinction or equivalent condition.

(2) Graduates of (if applicable, consecutive) programmes with fewer than 300 but at least 240 ECTS credits, who completed their studies with high distinction, may also be admitted to the doctoral procedure. These graduates must provide evidence of their ability to conduct advanced academic work. This is achieved either

- by a qualified presentation of the research project in the form of a research proposal (exposé) and through oral subject examinations in two fields represented at the University of Hildesheim, or
- through qualified academic achievements within a supplementary course of studies pursuant to paragraph 3.

The doctoral board decides on exceptions. Paragraph 1, sentence 3 applies accordingly.

(3) The supplementary studies for acceptance as a doctoral candidate must cover at least two semesters. They are to be planned under the guidance of at least one professor and/or habilitated member of the doctoral committee so as to enable attainment of doctoral qualification. Final acceptance as a doctoral candidate is granted by the doctoral board on the basis of a qualified written assessment by the supervising professor.

(4) The intended or completed dissertation must not have been submitted in whole or in part to any other scientific or art university, nor may it have been rejected by such an institution.

§ 4

Acceptance as a Doctoral Candidate

(1) Acceptance as a doctoral candidate should, as a rule, precede admission to the doctoral procedure. Exceptions, as well as any additional qualifications required to demonstrate aptitude for advanced academic work, are decided by the doctoral board. If the doctoral board decides to waive the admission procedure, a supervision agreement must be submitted with the application for admission to the doctoral procedure.

(2) The application for acceptance as a doctoral candidate is to be addressed to the chairperson of the doctoral board. The following documents must be enclosed:

- a. A certified copy of the graduation certificate in accordance with § 3 paragraph 1 or the proofs as per § 3 paragraph 2;
- b. Information about the research project:
 - Preliminary title of the dissertation,
 - Written description of the research project including a work plan.
- c. Declaration that no impediment pursuant to § 3 paragraph 4 exists;
- d. A supervision agreement,
 - stating the supervisor(s),
 - listing the individual elements of supervision (e.g., regular meetings with the supervisor, status reports, and updated schedules),
 - specifying agreements regarding mandatory doctoral coursework (§ 7),
 - containing a commitment by both parties to adhere to the rules of good scientific practice,
 - and including regulations for conflict resolution.The standards and requirements of the model supervision agreement (Appendix No. 2) are binding and may not be undercut.
- e. A statement by the supervisor as to the suitability of the research project.

(3) Upon acceptance, the doctoral board and the faculty are obliged to ensure the execution of the doctoral procedure, provided the requirements for admission to the doctorate are met.

(4) Status as a doctoral candidate is initially granted for six years and may be extended by the doctoral board by up to two years at a time upon submission of an interim report on the progress of the doctoral project, prepared in consultation with the supervisor.

(5) Acceptance as a doctoral candidate and admission to the doctorate are excluded in case of involvement with commercial doctoral placement agencies.

§ 5

Supervision of the Doctoral Candidate

(1) During the preparation of the dissertation, the doctoral candidate should be supervised by a professor or habilitated member of Faculty 1 at the University of Hildesheim. A second supervisor (a professor or habilitated member) may be included. For cooperative dissertations, one professor/habilitated member from Faculty 1 supervises together with a professor from the cooperating institution. Junior research group leaders, selected through appropriate procedures and who independently manage research groups and have developed their own scientific research concepts, are considered equivalent to junior professors in terms of supervision and review. The faculty council determines the comparability of evaluation procedures for each junior research group leader.

(2) A doctoral committee should advise on the content-related and temporal progress of the dissertation, including the timing of the submission of the thesis.

§ 6

Admission to Doctoral Programme

- (1) The application for admission to the doctoral programme must be submitted in writing to the chairperson of the doctoral board.
- (2) The application must be accompanied by five printed and bound copies of the scientific dissertation written in either German or English. Exceptions regarding the language of the dissertation can be granted by the doctoral board upon the candidate's request. In addition, an electronically readable version, identical to the printed version, must be provided.
- (3) The scientific dissertation may be submitted as a cumulative dissertation. The cumulative work must meet the requirements of § 1 paragraph 2 sentence 1. Generally, it should also comply with the standards for cumulative dissertations as defined by the relevant academic professional association. The internal coherence of the cumulative texts must be specifically demonstrated. Submission of joint works is not permitted.
- (4) Admission to the doctoral examination furthermore requires evidence of doctoral study achievements. Further details are set out in § 7.
- (5) The following documents must also be submitted with the application:
 - a. A declaration that the applicant has written the dissertation independently and without unauthorized assistance and has fully disclosed all sources and aids used,
 - b. A curriculum vitae detailing the applicant's educational background,
 - c. A certified copy of the graduation certificate as per § 3 paragraph 1 or comparable evidence as per § 3 paragraph 2, if not already submitted per § 4 paragraph 2,
 - d. A declaration that no impediment pursuant to § 3 paragraph 4 exists, if not already submitted per § 4 paragraph 2,
 - e. A statement from the candidate that the submitted printed and electronic versions of the dissertation are identical and whether the candidate consents to submission of the dissertation for electronic plagiarism checking by external service providers.
- (6) The applicant may propose reviewers in accordance with § 8 paragraph 1.
- (7) The application for admission may be withdrawn by the applicant as long as no final assessments have yet been made by the reviewers.
- (8) The doctoral board decides on admission to the doctoral examination. If admission is granted, the board appoints the doctoral commission pursuant to § 2 paragraph 2 and appoints the reviewers according to § 8 paragraph 1.
- (9) Approval or rejection is communicated to the applicant by the chair of the doctoral board in written form.

§ 7

Doctoral Study Achievements

(1) Admission to the doctoral programme furthermore requires proof of special academic or subject-specific achievements that must have been obtained after completion of the qualifying degree as defined in § 3.

(2) In addition to broad expertise in their field, applicants should also have acquired competences in scientific work, particularly in presentation, discussion, and interdisciplinary transfer of scientific contents.

(3) These doctoral study achievements must be evidenced when applying for admission to the doctorate. They usually consist of either

- completion of the curriculum or programme of doctoral studies or doctoral colleges,
- or the conduct of teaching assignments (over at least two years),
- or participation in internal research colloquia, attendance of academic conferences, and the presentation of parts of one's research at colloquia or conferences,
- or publication of academic texts in specialist journals or edited volumes.

The supervisor or the head of the doctoral programme must confirm these achievements in writing.

(4) In justified exceptional cases, the doctoral board can waive the requirement to provide proof of achievements as described in paragraph 3 either wholly or in part, or recognize other achievements as equivalent. A relevant exception can in particular be based on a long and successful professional activity in the field of the dissertation project.

(5) When providing evidence of doctoral study achievements, compensation for disadvantages may be requested (see § 18).

§ 8

Examination of the Submitted Scientific Dissertation

(1) For assessment of the submitted scientific work as a dissertation, at least two academically qualified professors or habilitated members will be appointed as reviewers. At least one reviewer must be a member of Faculty 1 at the University of Hildesheim. In individual cases, junior professors from the faculty (not appointed to a professorship) may be appointed as reviewers after successful mid-term evaluation. If necessary for the assessment of the academic achievement, an additional review may be requested from another professor or habilitated member. Suggestions from the applicant regarding the appointment of reviewers may be considered.

(2) In the case of a cumulative dissertation, at most one reviewer who is a member of the doctoral commission may be a co-author of any of the texts included in the

cumulative work.

(3) The reviewers submit their assessments in writing within three months and recommend acceptance or rejection of the dissertation. If certain conditions must be met for acceptance (without rejecting the dissertation), the commission may set an appropriate deadline for fulfilment, which cannot be extended without valid reason. Thereafter, the reviewers submit their final assessments and propose a grade for the dissertation in the case of acceptance.

The following grades apply:

- outstanding (summa cum laude) 0
- very good (magna cum laude) 1
- good (cum laude) 2
- satisfactory (rite) 3

Non-acceptance of the dissertation is graded as 5 (failed).

(4) The chairperson of the doctoral commission provides the assessments in copy to all commission members and announces the receipt to the faculty. Every professor and doctoral member of the faculty has the right to inspect the dissertation and the assessments; every professor and habilitated member has the right to submit a written statement regarding the proposed evaluation within two weeks. The right to inspection and comment also applies to professors and habilitated members of other faculties at the University of Hildesheim, provided their field relates to the dissertation topic. The doctoral commission decides whether such statements are to be considered in the assessment.

(5) If all reviewers have recommended acceptance and no member of the faculty has submitted an objection, the dissertation is considered accepted. In this case, the chair determines the grade of the dissertation on the basis of the grades proposed by the reviewers. The grade is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the individual grades. The mean is rounded down to one decimal place. A grade up to 1.5 is "very good", up to 2.5 "good", up to 3.0 "satisfactory". The work can only be graded as "outstanding" if all reviewers award this mark.

(6) If acceptance according to paragraph 4 is not achieved, the doctoral commission decides on acceptance or rejection of the dissertation as well as on the grade, if accepted. If the assessments from the reviewers and any statements under paragraph 3, sentence 2 are not sufficient for a decision, the commission may consult further reviewers. If there is a tie in the commission's vote, the dissertation is considered rejected. The calculation of the grade corresponds to paragraph 4; any rejected reviews are counted as grade five in the mean.

(7) If all reviewers recommend rejection, the dissertation is considered rejected without the need for a meeting of the doctoral commission.

(8) If the dissertation is accepted, the candidate will be notified of the grade by the doctoral commission, and the assessments will be provided in copy.

(9) If the dissertation is rejected, the doctoral procedure is terminated. The applicant will be informed of this outcome by the chair of the doctoral board. A copy of the

rejected dissertation, with all reports and assessments, is filed by the faculty. The applicant has the right to review the doctoral file.

§ 9

Oral Doctoral Examination

- (1) The oral doctoral examination consists of the disputation of theses.
- (2) The candidate must register for the disputation with the chairperson of the doctoral commission within six months after acceptance of the dissertation (§ 8 paragraph 4 or 5). If a candidate does not register within this period, the doctoral commission will set a date for the disputation.
- (3) The disputation consists of two parts:
 - a. Defense of the dissertation: The candidate presents the central thesis or questions and the results of the dissertation in a 15–20 minute talk, addressing the dissertation reviews. The Doctoral Commission will then discuss the presentation with the candidate. This part of the disputation shall not exceed 60 minutes.
 - b. Afterwards, the candidate presents a thesis on a topic outside the field of the dissertation (10 minutes), followed by a 20-minute discussion of this thesis. The total duration of the disputation shall not exceed 90 minutes.
 - c. Supporting materials may be used in both parts of the disputation.
- (4) The oral doctoral examination must be publicly announced within the university at least seven days prior to the date.
- (5) The disputation may take place no earlier than seven days after the chairperson of the doctoral commission has determined the grade for the dissertation. In general, it should take place within 12 weeks of the grade being determined. For valid reasons (e.g., illness), the candidate may submit a request for an extension to the chairperson of the doctoral commission (see also § 18).
- (6) The thesis for the second part of the disputation must be submitted by the candidate to the chairperson of the doctoral commission during the public display period for the dissertation and reviews (§ 8 para. 3). The chairperson checks whether the thesis is on a topic outside the area of the dissertation.
- (7) The disputation is conducted in front of the doctoral commission and is chaired by the chairperson, who ensures that the disputation focuses on the accepted dissertation, the reviews, the presentation, and the justification of the thesis, and that time limits are adhered to.
- (8) Only the candidate and members of the doctoral commission and doctoral board are entitled to speak. The chairperson may grant the right to speak to other university members with a doctorate.
- (9) The disputation is open to members and affiliates of the university. Others may

attend with the consent of the candidate and unanimous approval of the doctoral commission. If proper conduct of the disputation cannot otherwise be assured, the chairperson may exclude the public. Members of the doctoral board always have the right to attend.

(10) A member of the faculty appointed by the chairperson shall record the proceedings and results of the disputation in minutes.

(11) After the disputation, the doctoral commission decides whether the candidate has passed. If passed, each commission member awards a grade according to § 8 paragraph 2 for the entire disputation. The result is determined in accordance with § 8 paragraph 4, sentence 3. A grade up to and including 0.3 is considered “outstanding”, up to 1.5 “very good”, up to 2.5 “good”, and up to 3.0 “satisfactory”. The result is communicated to the candidate by the chairperson of the Doctoral Commission immediately after the decision, excluding the public.

(12) If the disputation is not passed, it may be repeated once within a period set by the chairperson of the doctoral commission.

§ 10

Regulations for Disputation in Electronic Format

(1) The disputation should take place in person. For good cause and with the consent of the candidate and all members of the doctoral commission, the disputation may be conducted in electronic or hybrid form.

(2) Only video conferencing systems and web browser-based examination platforms of the University of Hildesheim are used. The following categories of personal data of participants may be collected, temporarily stored, and transmitted:

1. University email address,
2. (Account) name,
3. Authentication data,
4. Communication content, especially audio and video data,
5. the data technically necessary for the provision of the web browser-based examination platform and the video conferencing system
6. a current telephone number or similar contact details for the purposes specified in sentence 3

recorded, temporarily stored, and transmitted to the participants. In the event of technical malfunctions, the chair and deputy chair may be provided with telephone numbers or comparable contact details of the doctoral candidate, the examiners, and the advisors for the purpose of contacting them at short notice and concluding the defense.

(3) At the start of the disputation, the candidate must present identification. The camera must remain on, and the candidate must be visible throughout, unless the chair grants a break.

(4) If image or sound transmission is briefly disrupted without significantly impairing the disputation, it is to be continued once the disruption is remedied. If the technical disruption continues or recurs so as to significantly impair the examination, the disputation will be rescheduled. The examiners determine whether a significant disruption has occurred or whether a substantial part of the examination has been completed.

(5) Otherwise, § 9 applies.

§ 11

Determination of the Overall Grade

(1) If the disputation is passed, the doctoral commission determines the overall grade. The grade of the disputation counts once, and the grade of the dissertation counts twice. The calculation of the overall grade is otherwise as per § 8 paragraph 4, sentence 3. A grade up to and including 0.3 is “outstanding”, up to 1.5 “very good”, up to 2.5 “good”, and up to 3.0 “satisfactory”.

(2) The grades are communicated in writing to the candidate by the chairperson of the doctoral commission.

§ 12

Failure of the Examination

The examination is considered failed if the submitted dissertation is rejected or if the disputation has been definitively failed.

§ 13

Publication of the Dissertation

(1) Upon successful completion of the doctoral procedure, the dissertation must be made accessible to the academic public:

- in a scholarly journal, or
- in a book series, or
- as an independent publication in the book trade, or
- as an electronic publication.

For cumulative dissertations, any unpublished components must be published in one of the above formats.

(2) The final print version is to be submitted to the chairperson of the doctoral commission. After all changes and required modifications have been made, printing approval is granted.

(3) Four copies must be submitted to the faculty for any of the above publication methods.

(4) The required copies, together with the original, must be submitted to the faculty within one year after passing the examination. For significant reasons (e.g. illness), a request for an extension may be submitted to the chairperson of the doctoral board (see § 18).

§ 14 Doctoral Certificate

(1) The doctoral certificate shall be prepared according to the template (Appendix 2). It contains the title of the dissertation, the dissertation grade, and the overall grade for the doctoral procedure and is dated on the day of the disputation and signed by the dean.

(2) The certificate is only handed over after submission of the required copies in accordance with § 12, or upon proof that the publication is secured. The doctoral degree may only be used after the certificate has been presented.

(3) Upon request, the dean may issue a provisional certificate after the disputation, indicating both the dissertation grade and the overall grade.

§ 15 Invalidity of Doctoral Achievements

If, before presentation of the doctoral certificate, it emerges that the doctoral candidate committed fraud in the doctoral achievements or that fundamental admission requirements were erroneously assumed to have been met, the doctoral board may declare the doctorate invalid.

§ 16 Revocation of the Doctoral Degree

(1) A conferred doctoral degree may be revoked by withdrawal or rescission. Revocation of the doctoral degree is subject to the applicable legal provisions. Sections 48 (4), 49 (2) sentence 2, and 49 (3) sentence 2 of the VwVfG are not applicable. Beyond the cases of sections 48, 49 VwVfG, revocation is possible if the holder committed a severe violation of the principles of good scientific practice when preparing the dissertation. A criminal offense can only be considered according to the regulations of the Federal Central Register Act. The decision on revocation of the doctoral degree and the certificate is made by the faculty council. The university administration (Presidium) is to be informed in due time before such measures are carried out. The dean implements the measures through a substantiated decision accompanied by information on legal remedies.

(2) If the admission requirements were not fulfilled without the applicant having committed or attempted any deception, and this only becomes known after the certificate has been handed over, this defect is remedied by the submitted and recognized dissertation and successful oral examination. Revocation is not applicable in this case.

§ 17 Information on Legal Remedies

All negative decisions in the doctoral procedure must be justified in writing and include information on available legal remedies.

§ 18 Compensation for Disadvantages and Protective Provisions

(1) For persons with disabilities or chronic health conditions that make it difficult to fulfil doctoral study requirements, meet deadlines and dates set out by the doctoral regulations or the supervision agreement, or participate in the disputation, the doctoral board may, upon written application, take appropriate measures to compensate for disadvantages. This is done in consultation with the doctoral candidate and the doctoral committee or the doctoral commission. Waiving the assessment of abilities required for the disputation is not permitted.

(2) The application is informal and must be directed to the doctoral board, including details about the disability or chronic illness. It must be accompanied by a specialist medical report or comparable certification describing the symptoms that affect the doctoral process and final examination phase.

(3) Expectant mothers are subject to the protective provisions of the Maternity Protection Act (MuSchG) in its current version; proof of eligibility must be provided by a medical certificate or a certificate from a midwife.

(4) Upon request, expectant mothers may be exempted from fulfilling doctoral study requirements and from observing deadlines and dates specified by the doctoral regulations or supervision agreement, when, according to medical certification, the life or health of the mother and/or child is at risk. The doctoral study requirements must be made up for later. No disadvantage to the doctoral candidate must result from compliance with paragraphs 3 and 4.

(5) For doctoral candidates who exclusively care for a dependent close relative in their household, the regulations of the current Care Leave Act (PflegeZG) apply accordingly. No disadvantage to the doctoral candidate may result from caring for close relatives.

(6) Close relatives include: grandparents, parents, parents-in-law, spouses, life partners, partners in a relationship similar to marriage, siblings, children, adopted or foster children, the children, adopted or foster children of the spouse or life partner,

children-in-law, and grandchildren.

(7) The doctoral candidate must prove the need for care of the close relative by submitting a certificate from the care insurance fund or the medical service of the health insurance. In cases of private long-term care insurance, comparable proof must be provided.

§ 19

Transitional Arrangements / Entry into Force / Expiry

(1) Applicants who, at the time these doctoral regulations enter into force, have already been accepted as doctoral candidates or have submitted a complete application for admission to the doctorate before 01.10.2025, or for acceptance as a doctoral candidate before 01.10.2025 (date of receipt), may choose whether their doctoral procedure is conducted under the doctoral regulations valid as of 30 September 2025, or these doctoral regulations.

(2) This revised version enters into force on the day after its publication in the official gazette of the University of Hildesheim. Simultaneously, the doctoral regulations published in University of Hildesheim Verkündungsblatt No. 116 - Issue 02 / 2016 (08.02.2016) expire.

Wording of the Doctoral Certificate

Faculty 1 of the University of Hildesheim

– Educational and Social Sciences –

hereby confers

First Name Last Name

born on ... in ...

the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

(Dr. phil.)

after the candidate has demonstrated the ability to conduct advanced independent scientific work through the dissertation entitled

"Title of the Dissertation"

which was assessed with the grade "Grade",

as well as through the subject-specific disputation, which was evaluated with the grade "Grade".

The overall grade is

"Overall Grade"

(Honours Classification)

Hildesheim, [date]

The Dean of Faculty 1

(seal/signature of Dean)

Classification:

0 = outstanding (summa cum laude);

1 = very good (magna cum laude);

2 = good (cum laude);

3 = satisfactory (rite).

Supervision Agreement

Purpose and Objective of the Agreement

"A supervision agreement is intended to make the relationship between doctoral candidates and supervisors transparent in terms of both content and time. The planning and execution of the doctoral project are to be organized through the structured cooperation between supervisors and doctoral candidates, in such a way that the project can be completed with high quality within a reasonable timeframe through their own responsibility." (DFG Form 1.90 – 10/14).

This agreement concerning the doctoral project on the topic
(working title) is concluded, subject to acceptance as a doctoral candidate, between

Ms./Mr. (doctoral candidate)

and

Ms./Mr. (supervisor).

1. There will be regular meetings, typically quarterly, regarding preparation, development, and execution of the project.
2. The doctoral candidate will, according to the current status of the project, prepare scientific exposés, interim reports, or individual chapters, as well as an up-to-date timeline.
3. The supervisor will supervise and comment on the preparation of these interim results, the scheduled progress of the work, and the contributions provided at the agreed meetings, regularly either orally and/or in writing, and will review the current timeline.
4. Arrangements will be made concerning the doctoral study achievements to be completed according to § 7 of the doctoral regulations (PromO), which are to be documented in an appendix to this supervision agreement.
5. Both parties commit to complying with the principles of good scientific practice in accordance with the recommendations of the DFG (Vorschläge zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis. Denkschrift, ergänzte Auflage Weinheim 2013).
6. In the event of an unresolvable conflict between the parties that would severely strain further cooperation, this situation may be reported to the doctoral board, which will then act in an advisory and mediating capacity.
7. The supervision agreement can be supplemented by mutual consent, which will be documented in an appendix to the agreement. The above provisions may not be overridden or altered by these supplements.