**Supervision Agreement**

between

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **­­­­­­­­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | **(Doctoral Candidate)** |
| **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | **(Primary Supervisor)** |

The supervisor and the PhD student agree to work towards a doctoral thesis, which has to be prepared and defended under the authority of the Faculty according the following conditions:

1. **Thesis**
	1. The student who prepares the PhD thesis:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Date/Place of birth | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

[Doctoral Candidate] has been a(n) [Member/Associated Member] in [PhD Program] since [Date].

* 1. The research topic of the PhD thesis:

The thesis will be written in [English/German]. The thesis concept and a possible work plan is described in the exposé (thesis concept paper) attached to this document.

* 1. It is agreed that the thesis is to be written within the following time period:

From \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_[Semester] to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_[Semester]
(usually about three years). This time frame may be extended in exceptional cases, e.g. child care, family obligations.

The thesis is to be supervised by a Thesis Committee (in compliance with the “Promotionsordnung” (Doctoral Regulations) of the Faculty)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Primary Supervisor |
| 2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Secondary Supervisor |
| **3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | **Further member of the Thesis Committee** |

1. **Supervision**
	1. **Thesis Committee:** The primary supervisor is responsible for providing the PhD student with a suitably equipped laboratory workspace and for advising and supporting the independent scientific working of the PhD student. The supervisor has to support the career of the PhD student and to control the quality of the thesis. Students will report in the weekly group seminars about the progress of their project and the supervisors are expected to attend the corresponding seminars
	The work of the doctoral student should not only be supervised by the primary supervisor. A thesis committee, which includes the primary supervisor and [one / two] additional senior scientist[s], should meet at least once a year to facilitate the progress of the thesis by discussing the experiments, results and time-line. The secondary supervisor shall be member of the RTG.

The PhD student is responsible for compiling a written summary outlining his/her work and for writing a report of each meeting.

* 1. **Timelines and reports**: In the beginning of his/her scientific work, the PhD student should compile an exposé (thesis concept paper) with a timeline that allows a successful completion of the PhD thesis within the period agreed (usually about three years). The PhD student should wherever applicable document his/her progress in written reports. An updated time line should be part of each report.
1. **PhD Training Program**

[Name of the Doctorade Candidate] will participate in the RTG program and the PhD Program [“Neurosensory Science and Systems”]. [Name of the Doctorade Candidate] will take part in the PhD program courses and events to an adequate extent.

1. **Good scientific practice**

At German universities and research institutions, freedom of science in research, teaching and studies is guaranteed. This freedom is associated with responsibility for fostering the fundamental values and norms of good scientific practice, for realizing them in the researcher’s daily activity and for defending them.

The successful application of the principles of good scientific practice is a prerequisite for the high standard of achievement in the scientific system. The recommendations on fundamentals for good scientific work are as follows:

* 1. **Awareness of principles of good scientific practice**: Honesty and truth maintain absolute priority in scientific work. The PhD student should be aware of all principles of good scientific practice. The information can be obtained through the participation in an adequate course offered by the Graduate School of the Faculty V and/or the daily activities of the research group.

The principles of good scientific practice are to be looked up by the PhD student (e.g. at http://www.forschung.uni-oldenburg.de/download/gute\_wiss.\_praxis\_web.pdf).

PhD Students have to learn about good scientific practice in a corresponding Workshop.

* 1. **Cooperation and leadership responsibility in working groups**: Each PhD student is personally responsible for his/her own work. A working group or unit usually has one group leader. The group leader carries the responsibility for the work and the conditions for facilitating an effective cooperation and coordination of the members.

All members of a working group must be able to rely on each other since mutual trust is the basis for all conversations, discussions and even confrontations. Cooperation in scientific working groups must allow the findings to be communicated, critically discussed and integrated into a common level of knowledge and experience.

* 1. **Scientific misconduct:** Misconduct, including the production and use of incorrect data, neglecting intellectual property rights and affecting others research activities, must be completely avoided. The Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg has appointed two confidants as contacts who look into allegations of misconduct and the “Commission for Impact Assessment and Ethics” who inquire into the case of misconduct. The rules of procedures and the time limits for inquiries and investigations to ascertain the facts and rights of the involved parties to be heard are also defined. The sanctions depend on the seriousness of the proven misconduct and include consequences for employment, civil implications or penal consequences of the misconducting scientist(s).

The Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg has defined proceedings in the case of suspicion of scientific misconduct:

<http://www.uni-oldenburg.de/uni/amtliche_mitteilungen/dateien/AM2000-01_Ordwissf.pdf>

* 1. **Documenting results:** Experiments and numerical calculations can only be repeated if all important steps are reproducible. For this purpose, they must be recorded in a clear and comprehensive manner. Therefore, the PhD students should securely store methods and primary data as the basis for publications for at least ten years in a durable form in the institution of origin.
1. **Mentorship for young scientists and scholars**

Working groups usually consist of older and younger, experienced and less experienced scientists. Younger members or less experienced members of the group should receive adequate mentorship of the senior scientist(s). In conflict situations the confident committee as well as the coordinator should mediate between both parties.

1. **Gender Equality and Family Friendliness**

Gender equality is an important aim of this university and is pursued by a special support program of the [graduate academy](http://www.uni-oldenburg.de/praesidium/55852.html). The University of Oldenburg is certified with the ([audit familiengerechte hochschule](http://www.uni-oldenburg.de/verwaltung/dezernat1/familiengerechtehochschule/konzept/audit/)) Certified Family-Friendly University. The University of Oldenburg runs child care facilities for children aged of 1-6 years and holiday child care facilities for children aged 3-12 years.

1. **Conflict resolving arrangements**

In case of conflicts, the PhD student or the supervisor may contact the coordinator or the confident committee of the RTG for mediation. A procedure concerning the handling of possible conflicts between the PhD student and the supervisor, e.g. change of supervisor, abnormal termination of the doctorate/PhD work/thesis, is defined in the RTG application.

1. **Publication of results from collaborative projects**

In many projects, several members of a lab and/or members of several labs might contribute to projects, which benefit from the input from several parties. In such cases, potential conflicts about authorship (e.g. author order) can arise. In such cases, the senior scientist on the project (the group/project leader) will invite all involved parties to a round table discussion of the disputed authorship issues. Here, all involved parties get a chance to voice their opinions. The goal of the round table discussion is to come to a mutual agreement between all authors about any disputed authorship issues. If the round table does not lead to a mutual agreement between all involved parties, it is the right and duty of the group leader(s) to make a final decision on all disputed authorship issues.

This agreement is valid after, the primary supervisor and the PhD student have provided their signatures. The primary supervisor and the PhD student commit to abide by this thesis agreement, in the knowledge that it is not an enforceable legal document.

Date, Place

Date, Place