

## Protocol of the 1. meeting in the winter semester 2016

---

**24.11.2016, 17:30 – 19:00, Seminar room 6/1**

**Participants:** 38: Alexander Wlotzka, Álvaro Hernández, Andre Schneider, Andreas Pargner, Aswathi Balagopal, Carolin Klusmann, Carsten Röttele, Cornelia Hintze, Daniela Mockler, Francesca Bisconti, Garlich Fischbeck, Hendrik Seitz-Moskaliuk, Ingo Medebach, Iris Schwenk, Jakob Schwichtenberg, Jan-Michael Reiner, Jasmin Seeger, Jinjie Chen, Joachim Debatin, Johannes Eckstein Julian Gethmann, Kumar Ghosh, Lin Karf, Marc Korzeczek, Marcel Krause, Mareike Hoyer, Markus Klug, Markus Neuwirth, Marta Moscati, Matthias Hecker, Moritz Fischer, Pascal Nagel, Patrik Schönfeld, Philipp Basler, Robin Roth, Sarah Müller, William Painter, Xnewen Liu,

**Guests:** Stefan Backers,

**Chair:** Garlich Fischbeck

**Protocol:** Julian Gethmann

---

### Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Acceptance of the agenda</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Report from the crossfaculty board meeting</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The new PhD ordinance</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1	Switch to new PhD Ordinance . . . . .	2
3.2	Presentation and exam . . . . .	3
3.3	Five instead of six examiners . . . . .	3
3.4	Grading . . . . .	3
3.5	General procedure . . . . .	3
3.6	Contentious issues . . . . .	3
3.6.1	Ratio presentation vs. exam . . . . .	3
3.6.2	Weighting of the mark for the thesis compared to the oral examination	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Miscellaneous</b>	<b>5</b>

### Presence of a quorum

We have a quorum.

## **1 Acceptance of the agenda**

The agenda sent as part of the invitation is accepted.

## **2 Report from the crossfaculty board meeting**

There will be a PhD symposium from 14<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> March 2017 with a panel discussion. The topic will be something like “Kumulative Dissertation/publication-based dissertation vs. Monographie/monograph”. If you wish to participate in the organisation, get in contact with Jana Schmitt <[jana.schmitt@kit.edu](mailto:jana.schmitt@kit.edu)>. Also if you know someone who would be an interesting person on the panel, do not hesitate to get in contact with her or with Julian Gethmann.

Among the PhD students in Baden-Württemberg there is a discussion ongoing if we should try to convince the government to create a new status group for PhD students. That would for example imply the possibility to vote in committees instead of just having an advisory seat in them.

It is planned to have one wiki for all PhD students. The SCC is working on an authentication for such a wiki.

There are four KIT wide working groups on

- writing documents for PhD students,
- KIT bodies,
- legal situation of PhD convents, and
- legal situation of PhD students.

Aso Rahimzadegan, also a PhD student from our faculty, has been elected as the second KIT representative for the Helmholtz Juniors, the PhD representation inside all Helmholtz centers.

## **3 The new PhD ordinance**

In the last faculty council, the process to change our PhD Ordinance (Promotionsordnung) has made a huge progress and probably is going to be voted on a final draft.

### **3.1 Switch to new PhD Ordinance**

It will be possible to switch to the new PhD ordinance (§26 (3)).

### 3.2 Presentation and exam

The Questions in the oral exam should be related to the dissertation (§17 (4)).

The presentation of the candidate will be public for the faculty, but not the oral exam (§17 (8)). So this point probably might not change from the current PhD Ordinance.

### 3.3 Five instead of six examiners

The exam committee will consist of 5 instead of 6 examiners by default (§15 (1)). In case of the supervisor being a KIT-Associate Fellow there will be six examiners.

### 3.4 Grading

There will be two preliminary certificates, one with the marks only and one preliminary certificate of the PhD degree (§20 (5)).

### 3.5 General procedure

The date of the exam will be announced at least two weeks in advance (§17 (1)).

### 3.6 Contentious issues

#### 3.6.1 Ratio presentation vs. exam

The wish of the majority of the PhD students (16 in favor/ 2 abstentions/ 1 against) to extend the presentation time and leave the time for questions as it is was not implemented. In this draft the presentation is still just 20 minutes long (§17 (4)), as it is in the current PhD Ordinance.

Der Konvent beauftragt seine Stellvertreter die Verlängerung der Präsentationszeit im Verhältnis zur Fragerunde erneut zu fordern.

---

#### Vote

Der Konvent beauftragt seine Stellvertreter die Verlängerung der Präsentationszeit im Verhältnis zur Fragerunde erneut zu fordern.

*The Konvent wants their representatives to address their will to extend the duration of the presentation, again.*

Yes	No	Abstain
19	6	11

---

### 3.6.2 Weighting of the mark for the thesis compared to the oral examination

The current draft plans to average the marks of the oral exam including the presentation and the mark of the dissertation. So there is a ratio of 1:1 (§20 (2)). The last time the Konvent voted for a ratio of 2:1 dissertation vs. exam.

The effort of three years of work compared to an exam of 70 minutes length is not well represented by a ratio of 1:1. Hence we think that the grade of the PhD should be based on a ratio with a focus on the dissertation, namely 2:1.

---

#### Vote

Soll unser Statement beinhalten, dass wir ein 2:1 Verhältnis fordern?

*Shall the written statement explicitly include that we want 2:1:*

Yes	No	Abstain
36	0	1

---

#### Stellungnahme:

Der Doktorandenkonvent hat sich in den Sitzungen am 30.6.2015, 14.7.2015, 23.06.2016 und 24.11.2016 ausführlich mit der Neufassung der Promotionsordnung auseinandergesetzt. Die Protokolle der Sitzungen sind unter [1] zu finden. Zusammenfassend gibt der Doktorandenkonvent hierzu mittels Beschluss folgende Stellungnahme ab: Der Doktorandenkonvent begrüßt die Neufassung der Promotionsordnung, insbesondere die ausführliche Formulierung, die Verringerung der Anzahl der Prüfer und die stärkere Fokussierung auf den Inhalt der Dissertation in der Aussprache. Der Doktorandenkonvent befürwortet die vorliegende Fassung vom 23.11.2016 mit folgenden Ausnahmen:

Der Doktorandenkonvent spricht sich für eine Verlängerung des Vortrags im Verhältnis zur Aussprache sowie für eine höhere Gewichtung der Dissertation im Vergleich zur Aussprache (2:1) bei der Findung der Gesamtnote aus, da die Dissertation mindestens drei Jahre Arbeit widerspiegelt und nicht nur eine Prüfung.

Der Doktorandenkonvent weist in diesem Zusammenhang auf den Heidelberger Kommentar zum LHG hin, laut dem "aus Sachgründen dem schriftlichen Teil das erheblich größere Gewicht zukommen muss" [2]. Diese Einschätzung wird auf mündliche Nachfrage hin von Herrn Wassermann (DE Hochschulrecht und Akademische Angelegenheiten) geteilt.

[1] <https://www.khys.kit.edu/doktorandenkonvent-physik/68.php>

[2] Kommentar zum Gesetz über Hochschulen in Baden-Württemberg (Landeshochschulgesetz — LHG), zum Universitätsklinik-Gesetz (UKG) und zum Gesetz über das Karlsruher Institut für Technologie (KIT-Gesetz) von Professor Dr. jur. Dr. jur. h. c. Georg Sandberger, 2. Aufl. 2015

---

**Vote**

Die obige Stellungnahme wird dem Fakultätsrat zu dieser Version der Prüfungsordnung vorgelegt.

*The Stellungnahme will be given the faculty council as a official comment of the PhD Konvent.*

Yes	No	Abstain
32	0	1

---

**Vote**

Falls das Verhältnis von Dissertation und mündlicher Prüfung für die Bestimmung der Gesamtnote nicht auf 2:1 angepasst wird, bitten wir die Mittelbauvertreter gegen die Promotionsordnung zu stimmen.

*We would like to see the Mittelbauvertreter in the faculty council to vote against the current version of the PhD ordinance, if the ratio is not changed to 2:1.*

Yes	No	Abstain
23	5	2

---

In the case this version will not pass to the senate, we should suggest to form a discussion group which includes PhD students as well as Professors.

Will the time between handing your dissertation in and the oral exam change? The draft does not show too big differences to the current PhD ordinance, so we do not think so, but we will state the point, since it has not been discussed in the faculty council, yet.

**4 Miscellaneous**

Nothing.