

Protocol of the 2. meeting in the summer semester 2015

01.06.2015, 17:30 – 18:30, Seminar room 6/1

Participants: 7: Alexander Wlotzka, Iris Schwenk, Julian Gethmann, Konrad Deetz, Mareike Hoyer, Pablo Schad, Robin Roth

Guests: Tim Ludwig

Chair: K. Deetz

Protocol: R. Roth

Contents

1 Acceptance of the agenda	1
2 Reports	1
3 Discussion of the Promotionsordnung (PO)	2
4 Further wishes/suggestions	3

Presence of a quorum

We don't have a quorum.

1 Acceptance of the agenda

There are no changes to the agenda.

2 Reports

- Faculty council (29.04.2015): We asked to get the meeting minutes online and to have an official document about the formalities of finishing a PhD and how the exam is structured.
- Meeting of the chairpersons of the KIT Doktorandenkonvente (11.05.2015): Organized by KHYS, only organizational discussion so far. We will get the list of candidates for Ombudsperson at KIT, so we can comment on them.

- Document on “Timetable of formalities to get a PhD”: Julian collected information in a html document. It will be put on the Fachschaft Homepage and also send to the mailing list.
- New representatives in the “Mittelbaukonvent”: Andreas Barth (GPI), Bernd Pilawa (PI), Christina Widmann (LAS); There was no election because there were less candidates than open seats. The IMK has 7 candidates for 4 seats.
- Candidates for the faculty council, meeting 28.05.15; there are 3 seats for the “Mittelbau”, i.e. people with a contract. At the convent we found interested candidates. The list of candidates will be handed in on 03.06.2015.

3 Discussion of the Promotionsordnung (PO)

Konrad presents an example exam to point out the problems of the current system.

It would be helpful to have a list of arguments pro/contra and a list of yes/no questions of things we could change.

We don’t have a solid opinion on what kind of exam is optimal. There should be a survey of the opinion of all PhD students. We will do an online survey, including options “I want to keep the current system” and “I don’t care” as well as a comment field for further ideas. This might help to motivate people to come to the convent.

Arguments:

- public/nonpublic
 - public
 - * helpful for other students
 - * professors have to be nice/fair
 - * can be a festive event, parents in the audience, ...
 - * also tests whether one can present to the general public
 - non-public
 - * less embarrassing
 - * more like an exam
- Rigorosum/Disputation
 - Rigorosum (questions on all of physics)
 - * it’s easier, as people expect you to not know fields beyond yourself
 - Disputation (long presentation and questions only on your topic)

- * it's what you worked on for 3+ years
- * you can be expected to really know details there
- graded/ungraded
 - graded
 - * allows to differentiate between students
 - ungraded
 - * there's no meaning to the grade anyway

Question: What should the future PhD exam be like?

- I don't care
- non-public - thesis and about physics in general (current state)
- public - only about thesis
- non-public - only about thesis
- public - thesis and about physics in general
- none of the above

Comment field for more details and invite people to the convent to continue the discussion. Also people who want to stick to the current system should come as otherwise they can't make their point.

For Meteo/Geo: Maybe change the number of Physics (i.e. non Meteo/Geo) professors in the committee to focus more on the actual subject.

4 Further wishes/suggestions

We should have one responsible person at each institute. This makes sure they are all represented and might help to ensure to get a quorum at meetings. We will try to do this at the next meeting.

Next date: Doodle, before 08.07.2015