

## Protokoll / Minutes

### Reguläre Sitzung des Doktorandenkonvents (DK)

### / Regular Meeting of the Doctoral Students Convention (DSC)

Datum / Date: 02.08.2017 / August 2, 2017

Ort / Place: INF 294, Raum 015/016 / INF 294, room 015/016  
Büro des DK / Office of the DSC

#### **TOP 0 – Begrüßung / Welcome** [Ende / end 19:05]

The DSC Executive Committee welcomes the attendees

#### **TOP 1 – Administratives / Administrative** [Ende / end 19:10]

Verification of the quorum:

6 people from the executive committee attend and are allowed to vote

Election of session chair and recorder of minutes:

Chair: Robert, Stefanie takes the minutes

Choice of language for the meeting:

English

Short introduction of the executive committee

Overview of Robin about who/what we are:

- Every doctoral student is part of it, we, as executive committee, represent the DS. We have an advisory seat in the senate. Jan is the representative there. Further the council for graduate studies. All the work related to doctoral research is set in place by the council for graduate studies. The Graduate Academy we have an advisory seat in the directory there. We bring forward issues there. We have further Faculty councils, we can sit in or nominate people there.
- To the structure of the DSC: we have working groups which work on issues which interest the doctoral students. They can be decided at the regulars session. The executive committee is the executive organ of the DSC and is elected once a year in the general assembly. It is concerned to take care to interact between the University and the DSC. They represent the four big fields of study (2 each and 2 each in the different ways you can do your PhD). There should be two regular session per semester and once a year a general assembly.  
Working groups: three members minimum and official acceptance at the regulars session.

#### **TOP 2 – Informationen / Information** [Ende / end 19:30]

- HeiDocs: The university made it mandatory to register every doctoral student in the HeiDocs platform. Not all faculties already provide it. The registration is the first part, the second part is the improvement of the PhD. Every faculty earns a certain amount of money per year and this will effect the research of each faculty. They should be distributed equally on the faculties, mainly. We from the executive committee and AG HeiDocs want to disperse people in the faculty to inform themselves about how the DS would like to improve their work with the money. There was a big infosession in February with Prof. Loureda on HeiDocs. At this session we discussed pros and cons about the whole HeiDocs project. Following we formed smaller working groups to proceed on this topic and how to improve the PhD in specific faculties. The Deans are mainly cooperative and try to implement the suggestions of the working group. The university wants to decide on the suggestions of the faculty as soon as possible. As the faculties want to take more time, they are discussing with the rectorate to not rush through this decisions. This is a process over six years. The senate committee (with involved doctoral researchers) is also deciding on the faculty-projects. There is no fixed plan on how the money will be distributed

between the faculties. They also don't have fixed rules about the whole process until now. This has to be supervised in general.

We as executive committee, we tried to keep in touch to the whole process. We try to implement measures that bring the most benefits. HeiDocs as registration platform does not effect the PhD right now, but without registration the DS are not able to finish their PhD in the end. As previously announced the money is not connected to the registration and will be distributed between the faculties in any way. Data security is checked by ZENDAS.

Officially the senate committee should meet in October, until then, the faculty level should have finished their project applications. Contact the DSC exe. Committee and they will forward the application.

- **Campus Card:** This card will identify you as doctoral researcher and will include all the benefits the student card has (maybe not for free). The university puts out advertisement for companies who want to contribute to this card. This is implemented on the card then. This card should also be able in the end to work in partner universities abroad. Santander group is acting as partner group for the bank account. The different channels can be activated or not. The manufacturing of the card is delayed. We are still waiting for them to sort out this problems. So, the test phase is also delayed. The card itself will be for free. Everybody can also join the working group-smartcard. Also the most important representatives of the university are present at the smartcard meetings. During the test phase your current position will be equal to the costs of the card. The involvement of the bank is strongly discussed and should be debated further. For external students the card would be an advantage. The use of the card is free and also the slot of the bank account.

### **TOP 3 – Vorschläge der Doktorand/innen / Suggestions from doctoral researchers [Ende / end 19:45]**

- **German-russion-philosophy** to connect DS from Germany and Russia, as a project. We, the executive committee already talked to the department of the Philosophy and agree on support of this project. An application for money is currently running. The group could also be an official working group of the DSC. And also in the philosophy seminar. Online: at the site of the philosophy seminar.
- **Matriculation:** foreign students don't have to be enrolled, but the pressure is high to enroll (no email address, aso). But this is not an international researcher problem. This is also faculty specific.

### **TOP 4 – Arbeitsgruppen / Working groups [Ende / end 20:00]**

- **AG HeiDocs:** Elias is the official speaker
- **AG SmartCard:** Robin is the official speaker
- **AG Evaluation of the medical faculty:** Raban is the official speaker. They want to cover the sight of the supervisors and the doctoral students and want to implement changes and work on problems during the medical PhD phase. By the end of the year they want to achieve their first aims. The proceedings can be implemented in other working groups.
- **AG international researchers:** Jubin is the official speaker. International doctoral students can join or ask questions about their ongoing PhD. All the members will finish soon their PhD, so new members are needed. Contact Jubin. Two persons are interested in joining in.
- **AG Scholarships:** Jubin is the official speaker. This group will be officially dissolved within this session.
- **AG scientific employees:** Robert is the official speaker. This group will be officially dissolved within this session.
- **AG survey:** Swetlana is the official speaker. A general survey was planned to cover the topics relevant for doctoral researchers and get an insight into their needs. The response of the University was quite critical and wanted to have an external data security check. In the end this was not possible and there were further problems with the University concerning their own survey, as the faculties want to have their own survey done. The DSC will maybe only have access to the results of the survey in an aggregate way. So the survey is on ice right now, but Elias wants to stay in this survey working group

and wants to work on the survey. Svetlana and Robert are also still in and the working group will not be dissolved.

- AG communication: Robert is the official speaker. It aims to mobilize doctoral researchers to contribute to the DSC. Making people aware of the DSC, work on the website, add some information on projects aso. They are able now to use the HeiDocs mailing list to contact the doctoral students. And some of the attendees of the regular session did show up due to this mailing list.  
Further, they want to have the DSC on the homepage of each faculty.  
As a suggestion: Include it in the newspapers/flyer/leaflets/publications of the university.
- AG doctoral regulations: No official speaker. This group did not start to work. This group is officially dissolved in this session.

## **TOP 5 – Statusgruppe für Doktorand/innen / Status group for doctoral researchers [Ende / end 20:20]**

overview of the status group

Still unknown how doctoral students which are not employed nor enrolled or accepted at the faculty are involved in the law. This should improve and there should be more means on that.

Meeting with the Ministry: Three representatives of the Ministry joined the meeting and three executive committee researchers from three universities (Tübingen, Konstanz and Heidelberg). Issues were brought up. Not having enough voice. The Ministry agreed on different solutions. One idea would be building up a new status group, the other possibility would be more voice at different political levels, without establishing a status group.

If the status group is established, it will not be possible any more to enroll as student and be part of the doctoral researchers. As status group every doctoral researcher will be part of the university. To summarize them as group this would be a political step. This leads to a separation from the students. The purpose would be to reach a better financial and political standing of the doctoral researchers. This is a big aim, but it is a long term process. As negative aspect not being a student could lead to a loss of several benefits. The representative of the Ministry argued that a benefit for DR could be established. Similar issue with public transport, Uni-sport or Mensa. This topic was discussed on university level here in Heidelberg, with positive promises on benefits.

Without status group we want more voting rights in the senate and faculties. Also a small budget for the DSC would be possible without status group.

The ministry is working on another change on the law and has to be implemented until February. If we want to include changes we have to do that as soon as possible, to apply and take care of this negotiations.

Another opportunity would be to block this whole negotiations.

A big meeting with the universities and the ministry will take place in October and we as DSC will be part of it.

Questions and discussion:

- Being part of one group means officially (voting rights aso)
- For this big decision it would be a good idea to make an info session or a survey-mail.
- The draft law was established by the government of BW. How this is implemented is not sure by now.
- Online vote could also be tricky, the election in November is too late. A info session including a election on this topic would be appropriate.
- More information is needed on the level of the status group. Further, more contact with other conventions is important. And of course this should be done fast as this whole process is going on.
- More people are needed on this status group topic.
- 6th and 7th of October will be the meeting of the other executive committees. This could be open during the discussion session.
- A general vote on this would be great, but the information we receive is really wake. Informing people sufficiently is difficult as we don't have all the information. Still a big info session would help. The most urgent point is to receive more information and more time from the ministry.
- The awareness about this topic is nearly none, throughout the doctoral researchers.

- Different conventions already worked on a positioning paper. This is not finished yet, but could be public available.
- To the three persons joining the Ministry: they are part of the AG status group, which was established at the last meeting of the DSCs of BW.
- A Heibox folder could be opened for more information on that topic. Robert will be in charge of that.
- The StuRa should also be interested in this topic, in focus on a loss of power with loss of students. Keep in touch and talk to them.
- A definition of a status could be a problem and lead DR to stick to a certain position.
- Money raised as status group would be also stay within the group of the status group of DR.
- Information should be put on list, what is legally possible and what not. Should be checked by a lawyer. The two options from the ministry should be checked by a lawyer. The executive committee should write to the ministry and have something solid.

**TOP 6 – Diskussion / Discussion [Ende / end 20:50]**

Last comment:

Robert closes the session with the announcement of the general assembly in autumn.