

## Diversity through cooperation –

### Recommendations of the UniWiND board on procedures for doctoral qualification with partner institutions

*"The core of the doctorate is the independent and original research."*<sup>1</sup> Doctoral degrees are awarded in accordance with the applicable doctoral degree regulations and subject to the higher education legislature of the individual federal states in Germany. These regulations safeguard the independence of scientific work and their evaluation. The awarding of doctoral degrees always takes place under the auspices of a university (or one of the few other institutes of higher education with the authority to award doctoral degrees). In addition, supervisory or employment agreements with external partner organizations may exist with regard to the doctoral research. Such cases of "doctoral qualification in cooperation with partner institutions" or "cooperative doctorates" thus describes cases in which, in addition to a university or institution of higher education, external partners are involved. This may relate to cooperation with other universities, with non-university research institutions, with companies, with colleges or universities of applied sciences (in Germany Fachhochschulen, FHs, and Hochschulen für angewandte Wissenschaften, HAWs), with international partner institutions (for instance in form of Cotutelle or double degree programs) or other forms of external or extra-occupational doctorates with partners such as cultural institutions, foundations, archives, schools or churches. The aim of this position statement is to give general recommendations for procedures during cooperative doctoral research, independent of the nature of the partner institutions. We do not intend to enter into the debate regarding granting the right to award doctoral degrees to Universities of Applied Sciences or other institutions. Rather, the UniWiND Executive Board would like to highlight the various measures of safeguarding the quality for doctorates that are undertaken in cooperation with partner institutions. In addition to the general recommendations, at the end of this position statement four typical examples of cooperative doctoral procedures are provided that illustrate the quality control measures we propose.

The paths to the doctorate are diverse and the UniWiND board expressly welcomes this diversity. Cooperation of various kinds, in particular cooperation in the regional and international environment, offer opportunities for doctoral candidates to gain different perspectives and expertise. Parallel regulatory structures cannot always be avoided, but should be minimized and not compete with each other. The provisions of the institutions involved should therefore be coordinated. This can be ensured by institutionalized collaborations that extend beyond individualized agreements for doctoral candidates (for example framework agreements).

The academic promotion of doctoral candidates and their qualification for the diverse career options requires cooperation with partner institutions, which are a complementary enrichment of the university structures. This also includes the diversity of disciplines and perspectives in science. The UniWiND executive board is of the opinion that cooperation can create added value for both doctoral researchers and universities. Doctorates in cooperation with partner institutions offer doctoral researchers the opportunity to engage with non-university structures and processes in addition to furthering professional and academic qualifications, and to become acquainted with different working environments. This can result in a broader knowledge base of the structures and content of the research and scientific landscape, to the benefit of career development. Cooperative doctorates are a product of research collaborations that provide opportunities for broadening the thematic horizons of the doctoral studies and for the university supervisor or the institution at large.

However, cooperative doctoral research can also pose challenges for doctoral researchers, supervisors and institutions owing to disparate locations and regulations of the participating institutions. Since

---

<sup>1</sup> UniWiND recommendations 2011. „Junge Forscherinnen und Forscher. Empfehlungen zur Promotion an deutschen Universitäten“ and also the position statement of the UniWiND board (2014) „Zum Verständnis der Promotionsphase“.

English translation of the German position statement „Vielfalt durch Kooperation – Empfehlungen des UniWiND-Vorstands zu Promotionsverfahren mit Partnereinrichtungen“ (February 2019)

there are considerable differences in doctoral qualifications in Germany with regards to the respective cultural aspects of the various academic disciplines, the case studies at the end of this position statement will illustrate the existing tensions in this area, in addition to previous publications on this subject<sup>2</sup>.

The core problems of all cooperative doctoral qualifications are aptly summarized in the position statement "Promotion in Umbruch"<sup>3</sup>: *"The faculties of the universities and universities of applied science with authority to award doctoral degrees are the institutional bodies that are responsible for safeguarding the implementation, supervision and quality control of the proper procedures during doctoral research. This does not mean that doctoral qualification projects cannot be carried out at other institutions. However, the institutional responsibility lies with those universities and institutions eligible to award doctoral qualifications. (...) In principle, diversity in access to doctoral research and their content is to be welcomed. However, this must not lead to different standards of quality and thereby generating second-class doctoral qualifications (...). For this reason, tasks, responsibilities, scope and their respective limits with regard to the doctoral qualification procedure have to be clearly defined, including at the institutional level, with regard to scientific performance."*<sup>4</sup>

### **Equal terms and conditions in all doctoral qualification procedures**

One of the central tasks of the universities is to qualify doctoral candidates for a scientific career and to prepare them for the post-graduate stage as an early career scientist. Nation-wide data on the current state of awarding doctoral degrees were first comprehensively collected in response to the amendment of the Higher Education Statistics Act of December 2017<sup>5</sup>. It will therefore be appropriate to formulate recommendations on the basis of these results once the empirical database is available. This position statement refers to the evaluations of the BuWiN 2017<sup>6</sup>.

The basis of the recommendations on procedures during doctoral qualification with partner institutions are the central points of the 2011 UniWiND Position Paper<sup>7</sup>, which apply to all doctoral research and are summarized here:

- Doctoral candidates are not students, but early career researchers.
- In the course of the doctoral phase, doctoral candidates must be introduced to the scientific community.
- A representation of the doctoral candidates - possibly with special consideration of doctoral candidates in cooperative procedures - in committees, at least with regard to matters relevant to the doctoral qualification, should be aimed for.
- Safeguarding good scientific practice can only be ensured in an environment of communicative care.
- When selecting and accepting doctoral candidates, a transparent selection procedure based on merit and quality should be adhered to.
- With regard to gender equality, women should be encouraged to pursue a doctorate or academic career.
- In all doctoral qualification procedures, including in cooperative doctorates, the admission of doctoral candidates must proceed according to the applicable regulations at the institution.

<sup>2</sup> See list of relevant publications at the end of the paper.

<sup>3</sup> "Promotion im Umbruch" (June 2017) Statement by the National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina, the German Academy of Science (acatech) and the Union of German Academies of Sciences.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 42.

<sup>5</sup> Law on Statistics for Higher Education and for the Vocational Academies (Hochschulstatistikgesetz – HStatG) [https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/hstatg\\_1990/](https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/hstatg_1990/)

<sup>6</sup> See the Federal Report on Early Career Researchers (BuWiN) 2017. Statistische Daten und Forschungsbefunde zu Promovierenden und Promovierten in Deutschland, chap. B1.

<sup>7</sup> UniWiND recommendations 2011 „Junge Forscherinnen und Forscher. Empfehlungen zur Promotion an deutschen Universitäten“.

This is to safeguard quality control, the regulation of potential Ombuds-procedures and legal commitments of supervision according to equal terms.

- A supervisory agreement and a personnel development plan are fundamental to appropriate scientific supervision and should always include a timetable with clearly set milestones. The supervisory agreement should also include co-supervision such as applicable and provide for the inclusion of scientific staff in the supervision of writing dissertations.
- Financial security for doctoral candidates, preferably through instatement on contracts subject to social insurance, should be provided.
- Part-time doctorates should be provided to accommodate candidates with family commitments.
- In the supervision of doctoral research projects, universities or other institutions of higher learning have the task of not only providing technical expertise but also a contemporary transferable skills training program that exceeds the skills of the respective scientific discipline, in order to prepare candidates for the diverse demands of the labor market. It may be necessary in individual cases to provide additional subject-specific training to candidates if, for example, certain prerequisite knowledge was not covered sufficiently during prior education (Bachelor/Master). Mandatory training should be strictly limited.
- To a reasonable extent, doctoral candidates should also gain experience in teaching and, if possible and appropriate, also acquire skills in the management of staff.
- Outstanding research today is often concomitant with international networking. The mobility of PhD candidates should be strongly promoted (outgoing mobility). For international doctoral candidates (incoming mobility), adequate framework conditions have to be created (for example: a welcome service, assistance when dealing with authorities, special training offers, space for cultural exchange).
- When assessing the dissertation, independent and, if necessary, external reviewers must be involved.
- For all doctoral programs, arrangements should be in place for early termination of a doctorate independently of the termination of the employment contract. Guidelines in the event of (unilateral) termination of the doctoral qualification should be established (for instance in the event of violations of the rules of good scientific practice).

### **Recommendations for cooperative doctoral qualification**

The following general recommendations supplement the recommendations on "Equal terms and conditions in all doctoral qualification procedures" regarding the special requirements of doctoral researchers in cooperation with partner institutions, regardless of the type of cooperating institutions:

#### **1. Mandatory agreements**

The agreements on cooperative doctoral qualification between the partner institutions must be implemented swiftly, comprehensibly and in accordance with defined standards. The rules under which cooperative doctoral qualifications are implemented by the partner institutions must be defined in cooperation agreements at the start of a doctorate. An institutionalization of such rules through contracts between institutions that exceed individual doctorates is considered useful.

#### **2. Admission for a doctorate**

With the admission to the doctorate, the university or institute of higher learning authorized to award a doctorate commits itself to safeguarding the quality control of the graduation procedure. These include clear guidelines on admission requirements, mutual recognition of procedures leading to the doctorate, the (cumulative or monographic) doctoral dissertation and the doctoral examination including its technical or subject-specific scope. Observance of these guidelines at the start and throughout the doctorate are necessary to comply with the reporting duties under legislation that

prescribes the compiling of the statistical data in the higher education sector (Hochschulstatistikgesetz).

### 3. Guaranteeing supervision

The scientific supervision by Professors is generally independent of the type of employment, the funding or the location of the doctoral research and must be guaranteed until the doctorate is completed. The basis for the supervision, also for the joint supervision by university and non-university supervisors, is a doctoral/supervision agreement at the beginning of the doctorate.

### 4. Access to advisory structures and further qualification

During the doctoral project, counseling services and options for further qualification must be available to the doctoral researcher. The cooperative doctorate should not be a disadvantage with regard to subsequent career options. Rather, all doctoral candidates should have the same opportunities, regardless of the chosen qualification path. For this reason, the cooperation agreements must also give access to further qualification opportunities and counseling services offered by the university or degree-awarding institution. In cooperative doctorates, access to the support structures of both partner institutions is deemed necessary.

### 5. Integration of all doctoral candidates in university structures

Equal treatment of all doctoral candidates must be guaranteed through centralized structures at the institutions with authority to award doctoral degrees. In the interests of optimal framework conditions, interdisciplinary endeavors and opportunities should be available to all doctoral candidates. For doctoral candidates in cooperative doctorates, these are likely to be particularly relevant. Accordingly, both the access to further qualification and the inclusion in the university infrastructure and culture (for example by participation in institute colloquia or the assumption of other institute-related tasks) should be set out in binding agreements.

### 6. Quality assurance and procedures in case of problems during the doctorate

Compliance with the rules of good scientific practice by doctoral candidates and supervisors must be ensured. Advisory and Ombuds structures must be available if conflicts arise during the doctorate. In cooperation agreements between institutions, it should therefore also be stipulated that all partners, in the exercise of their responsibility, provide the appropriate mediation structures to the doctoral candidates.

### 7. Mutual recognition of labor and performance

The different partners involved in the doctoral qualification must honor the work, services and achievements of the partner institutions for a successful implementation of the cooperative doctorate. It is recommended to draw up rules for the mention of the partner institutions on doctoral certificates. Similarly, there should be recognition of the contribution of all participating institutions in presentations and publications.

The UniWiND board,  
February 2019

### **Further recommendations for procedures during cooperative doctorates in different contexts**

Cooperative doctorates typically belong to one of four different cases: cooperation with non-university research institutes; colleges and universities of applied sciences (“Fachhochschulen” and “Hochschulen für Angewandte Wissenschaft”); business partners as well as public institutions and non-government organizations, and; international doctorates in cooperation with several institutions that are authorized to award the doctorate. These are now considered in depth and individually with regard to foreseeable challenges and opportunities they pose.

#### **Doctorates in cooperation with non-university research institutes**

Many doctoral candidates work at non-university research institutions<sup>8</sup> that generally operate according to similar models as universities, particularly in the empirical disciplines. Supervisors at Max Planck Institutes, Leibniz Institutes, Helmholtz Centers or Fraunhofer Institutes are usually qualified scientists, and PhD candidates can often be additionally supported by postdocs. Such foundations and other publicly funded institutes, such as federal and state departmental research institutes, often carry out research tasks and thus represent an attractive environment for doctoral researchers. Cooperation agreements are commonly already in place between universities and non-university research institutes. In the case supervisors enjoy joint appointments at the university and the non-university institute, university supervision is at once ensured. Cooperation agreements for individual doctoral projects must set out the regulation of collegiate double or multiple supervision. The admission of doctoral candidates by the Faculty/department in early stages of the doctoral project is particularly important if the doctorate was not started cooperatively, but as employment at a research institute with the prospect of a doctoral qualification at a partner university.<sup>9</sup>

The International Max Planck Research Schools (IMPRS) serve as prime examples for the further development of the structured, jointly supervised doctorates. Similar conditions apply to the International Leibniz Research Schools (ILRS) and the graduate schools of the Helmholtz Association and the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft. The recently established Max Planck Schools, which are transnational and multi-institutional, present a greater challenge as multiple universities are typically involved and their respective regulations therefore have to be reconciled. These Max Planck Schools are currently in the pilot phase, meaning that there are no evaluation reports available yet. Instead, IMPRS structures that have been successful since the year 2000 will be discussed here.

In addition to research, the Max Planck Society at an early stage promoted structures that structurally anchor joint doctoral student support between the Max Planck Institutes (MPI) and the partner university. Since the application for the establishment of an IMPRS must be made jointly by a university and a Max Planck Institute, agreements are signed in advance. IMPRS-specific regulations are therefore known to the participating institutions from the onset.

In contrast to intra-university doctorates, during a doctorate within an IMPRS different obligations may arise, for instance with regard to teaching and administrative tasks. These should be minimized to prevent imbalanced workload and duties. The selection of doctoral candidates by the transparent procedures of the IMPRS should be coupled directly to the admission of the candidates as doctoral candidates in the applicable faculty or department. However, the criteria set out in the doctoral degree regulations of the Faculty/department must not be compromised (for instance with regard to required

---

<sup>8</sup> See BuWiN 2017 p. 104 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Admission as a doctoral candidate at the university is not the first priority in the quality guidelines for doctorates at the Max Planck Society (2014), the Helmholtz Association (2018) and the Leibniz Association (2013), but the supervisory agreement with the respective non-university research institution is. The Helmholtz Association points out that admission to a university should take place “immediately after completion of the doctoral agreement” (see Helmholtz Association, 2018, p. 9). The Max Planck Society guidelines only mention that the Max Planck Institutes cooperate with a university in terms of admission and supervision (see Max Planck Society, 2014, p. 2).

final passing grades for the Master's or Bachelor's certificates). Problems that have arisen in the past could be avoided if the admission of a doctoral candidate by a university Faculty or department were a prerequisite for the appointment at an MPI.

In addition, close cooperation between the IMPRS and its mentors with the Faculties and graduate academies of the universities is beneficial. By providing participants from partner institutes access to respective qualification programs, synergies can be exploited and the attractiveness of the location as an environment to conduct doctoral research can be enhanced. In all publications that include results of the dissertation or doctoral research project, the university is to be acknowledged as a contributing partner.

**Special measures for quality assurance:**

1. *Admission according to applicable doctoral regulations as a prerequisite for employment at non-university institutions: sensibilisation and possibly providing guidelines/checklists for representatives at departments and International Offices of the non-university research institutions.*
2. *Arrangements for joint supervision: alignment of supervisory agreements to avoid clashes between different applicable regulations.*
3. *Different contractual and financing principles of the partner institutions: explore possibilities of alignment.*
4. *Standardizing the awarding of credits from the qualification programs of the partner institutions: providing access to additional doctoral candidates of the partner institutions to the qualification programs.*

**Cooperative doctorates with colleges and universities of applied sciences (FH/HAW)**

*"Doctoral procedures involving partnership between Universities and "Fachhochschulen" are possible and common.*"<sup>10</sup> The legislation of the federal states has in some cases granted the right to FHs or HAWs (Fachhochschulen or Hochschulen für Angewandte Wissenschaft) to award doctoral degrees, either as a recognized institution in its entirety or for certain specialty subjects. However, the majority of FH/HAWs are not authorized to award doctoral degrees. In the latter case, a cooperative doctorate with a partner university on the basis of providing access to the respective supervisory and training structures should be the norm.<sup>11</sup>

The comparatively low number of doctoral candidates at FHs/HAWs (with or without degree-awarding authority) means that these early career researchers often do not have access to additional training offered by interdisciplinary graduate institutions of the universities. This is being addressed through the founding of associations of universities and FHs/HAWs in various cooperation platforms or by the establishing graduate institutes in individual federal states<sup>12</sup>. In some of these cross-university institutions, separate statutes<sup>13</sup> set out the course of the doctoral program, supervision agreements and provisions of counseling, advice and conflict resolution. The task of these platforms is to support all those interested in pursuing a doctorate, the doctoral candidates themselves as well as the supervising professors in cooperating with the existing departments of the participating institutions.

<sup>10</sup> German Council of Science and Humanities/Wissenschaftsrat (2016): Recommendations for recruitment and development at universities of applied sciences.

<sup>11</sup> For an overview of the regulations in the individual federal states see Synopse in Lehre & Forschung 11/18 "Kooperative Promotionsverfahren. Ein Ländervergleich" p. 968-969.

<sup>12</sup> For example: Bavarian Science Forum (BayWISS), Graduierteninstitut NRW.

<sup>13</sup> For instance as part of the Research Campus of Central Hessen (FCMH).

Aside from the aforementioned cooperation platforms, the cooperative doctorate based on cooperation agreements between individual universities and FHs/HAWs is an established procedure. The Cooperation agreements regulate, among other things, the admission requirements for doctoral qualification. The possibility or necessity of duplicate enrollment under the applicable regulations should be agreed upon. This includes the access to training at both institutions and the recognition of the qualifications obtained at the partner institution. These can also be agreed on in the absence of a double enrollment. The participation of the supervisors with an established research track record<sup>14</sup> and habilitation equivalence at the FH/HAW together with supervisors at the university, their membership in the doctoral committee as well as the access of the doctoral candidates to training opportunities are all in accordance with good practice during doctoral qualification<sup>15</sup>. These measures ensure through binding contracts that doctoral candidates have the best possible framework conditions for their doctoral research in the spirit of UniWiND (including access to all offers of graduate support).

Good supervisory support is the basic principle that serves the scientific interest of all participants involved in the doctoral qualification. This includes joint prioritizing of objectives in annual progress update meetings through the scientific exchange between the candidates and supervisors. This also includes the regular participation of the doctoral candidate in seminars, colloquia or working group meetings. In all publications emerging from the doctoral research, the partner university and FH/HAW are to be duly acknowledged.

**Special measures for quality assurance:**

1. *Regulation of joint supervision in the doctoral agreement.*
2. *Integration of doctoral researchers in the academic environment or the structures of the university awarding the doctorate by opening their offers and participation (including the supervisor) at regular meetings.*
3. *Coordination of the qualification and support program of the partner institutions.*
4. *Legal framework conditions for free access to the offers that are meaningful for the doctorate of both partner institutions should be created by contract.*

**Doctorates in cooperation with partners from business as well as public institutions and non-governmental organizations**

Doctorates<sup>16</sup> that arise from joint research projects between universities and commercial enterprises or lawful public or private sector employers<sup>17</sup>, require clear rules. The cooperation between doctoral candidates and supervisors at the university and at their cooperation partner should be defined by key general points. In practice, contractually agreed cooperation projects between a university and the external partner institutions are the basis for such doctorates. These should ensure that the doctoral candidate can use the relevant infrastructures of the participating institutions.

The selection of candidates and research topics of the doctorates must proceed with involvement of both the university supervisors and the partner institution. The topic must meet the scientific requirements of a doctorate. Furthermore, the doctoral candidate should be given the opportunity to present and achieve the results of the doctoral thesis in the applicable professional community for discussion before completing the doctoral thesis. For this purpose, provisions for scheduled

<sup>14</sup> In accordance with the Hessen State Legislation for Higher Education.

<sup>15</sup> Examples include the association of FH professors in Baden-Württemberg and the possibility of co-appointments, as is practiced in Thuringia.

<sup>16</sup> Reliable data are missing, as cooperative doctorates have not yet been recorded in a structured manner. According to BuWiN 2017, 6% of all doctoral candidates are employed in the business sector (Fig. B6 on page 91) and about 126,663 early career scientists work in businesses (see BuWiN 2017, p. 106-108).

<sup>17</sup> See the definition of "Industriepromotionen" by the Stifterverband 2018.

attendance of meetings at the university, but also free time for attending congresses, conferences and summer or winter schools must be allocated. The doctoral project is of course supervised by university professors without remuneration; any arising professional connections and cash flows should be fully disclosed. Involvement of the supervisors from the partner institution in the thesis committees should be possible.

Prior to starting the doctoral project, it should also be formally agreed that the rules of good scientific practice must be adhered to. In particular, the publication of results emerging from the doctorate is part of the qualification procedure and the doctoral candidate is entitled to the copyright and rights of use in accordance with the statutory provisions. If secrecy is required in exceptional cases, such as in the context of a patent application, this should be limited to a short period of time (usually not longer than one year) by request of the responsible faculty or department, provided that the information will be made available in due course to the experts assessing the dissertation. All publications containing results of the dissertation or doctoral research should duly acknowledge the participating university and the cooperation partner.

With these basic requirements in place, cooperative doctoral procedures with partner institutions are expedient and desirable. Contractual arrangements should be in place prior to starting work on the doctoral research should.

Other forms of part-time doctorates, which are common in some subjects (for example, law, theology) pose special challenges to supervisors and doctoral candidates<sup>18</sup>, should follow similar rules to other doctoral procedures. The close connection to university structures ensures the quality assurance and optimal support of the doctoral candidates.

**Special measures for quality assurance:**

1. *The participation of both partner institutions must be reflected in the research topic. The selection of doctoral candidates should be transparent and involve the supervisors at the university.*
2. *The publication of the results, rights of use, copyrights (intellectual property), and joint ownership of results as well as patent applications and provisions for data protection must be guaranteed in the cooperation agreement.*
3. *Recruitment and employment by the partner institution with a view to entering into a doctoral qualification should take place in coordination with the university or institution with authority to award the doctorate. In the case the decision to enter into a doctoral qualification is made at a later stage, a partial exemption for participation in seminars, colloquia, conferences and further qualifications is essential.*
4. *Transparency of the network of relationships and cash flows of all participants.*
5. *Managing expectations: Clarification and settlement of mutual expectations; information about industrial doctorates for doctoral candidates and business employees should be posted on university websites.*

**International cooperation of several institutions entitled to award the doctorate**

Mobility and internationalization play an increasingly important role in scientific careers. Hence, cooperative doctorates with international partners are increasingly of importance. For this reason, the DFG established a program for International Research Training Groups in 1997, which provides for research visits of at least six months at the international partner institution. In addition, DFG graduate schools of excellence<sup>19</sup> often provide for international visits. A cooperative doctorate resulting in a bi-

<sup>18</sup>See German Council of Science and Humanities/Wissenschaftsrat (2011): “Anforderungen an die Qualitätssicherung der Promotion”, p. 21.

<sup>19</sup>[www.dfg.de/foerderung/programme/koordinierte\\_programme/graduierntenkollegs/internationale\\_grakos/index.html](http://www.dfg.de/foerderung/programme/koordinierte_programme/graduierntenkollegs/internationale_grakos/index.html).



national degree often allows for easier entry into international career paths, in addition to the visits abroad during the doctoral research.

International doctoral cooperation commonly takes the form of a cooperation between two universities. The partner institutions may award a doctorate jointly, but more commonly two separate doctoral certificates are issued that are only valid together. Cotutelle procedures are widely in place that provide for the negotiation and agreement of the contractual basis for each individual case. Provision of model contracts can simplify these procedures. Since both institutions with authority to award doctorates may have their own doctoral regulations, which may in some cases be incompatible, a case-by-case agreement of applicable regulations will be required before signing the cooperation contract.

Requirements for admission (for example, Bachelor's or Master's degrees), equivalence calculations of grades, but also integration of genuine study achievements within the meaning of the third cycle of the Bologna Process that might be in place in the other country, as well as the documents to be submitted during the application process are to be set out in the cooperation agreement. It should be noted that the independent study may not take the place of documented academic achievements.

The aforementioned framework conditions, such as free access to additional training and qualifications at both locations, intercultural competencies and support structures for incoming and outgoing doctoral candidates are also to be provided for in cooperative international procedures.

The duty to fulfill legal requirements should be examined early. For instance, the requirement to provide regular supervisory meetings and the representation of supervisors at doctoral defense may necessitate provisions such as Videoconferencing. This can also provide opportunities for limiting costs.

Frequently, the doctoral committees at the partner institutions may differ in their composition. Thus, it is quite possible that supervisors at one location are obliged to write a report, whilst they may not be part of the commission at the other location. As a rule, an agreement can be reached that provides for dual supervision to formally meet the requirements of both partner institutions. However, it should be noted that this should proceed within the confines of the applicable procedures within the Faculties/departments of the partnership. The increased time commitment of the doctoral candidate and supervisors with regard to travel should be taken into consideration.

In addition to any required language certificates, the language and, if necessary, the translation of the doctoral thesis as well as the report in the Cotutelle contract should be determined at an early stage.

In order to secure subsistence, it should be noted that fixed amounts may lose value due to inflation. This should be taken into account in the calculation of funds for the entire duration of the PhD phase. Doctoral students should be guaranteed that they can finish their doctorate with sufficient income.

***Special measures for quality assurance:***

1. *Outgoing: provisions for intercultural preparation of the visit abroad have proven very beneficial.*
2. *Incoming: The integration of doctoral candidates from other teaching and learning cultures must, in addition to the preparatory phase of the doctoral program, also ensure that the research can be initiated promptly on arrival. Publication of the results, (joint) use of the results and intellectual property rights must be regulated and guaranteed in compliance with patent law and data protection.*
3. *An international doctoral committee at the German university may be helpful for examining the standard of the respective foreign partner university (as is already the case for short term student exchanges).*
4. *Uniform contractual regulations of the requirements of the foreign university for awarding grades or the provision of an additional German certificate or academic transcript, as well as*

*the possibility to withdraw a title (for instance if the title was revoked at one of the partner universities). The distribution of tasks (assessment and supervision) is also to be recorded in the contract.*

5. *Other helpful tools: Guidelines and procedural principles, coordinator of Cotutelle procedures, welcome service/offices (tutors, offices, structures), joint admissions board, joint supervision agreement, joint doctoral committee, best practice networks.*

English translation of the German position statement „Vielfalt durch Kooperation – Empfehlungen des UniWiND-Vorstands zu Promotionsverfahren mit Partnereinrichtungen“ (February 2019)

**Relevant publications**

Bundesbericht Wissenschaftlicher Nachwuchs (BuWiN) (2017). Statistische Daten und Forschungsbefunde zu Promovierenden und Promovierten in Deutschland.

Deutscher Hochschulverband (DHV) (2014): Eckpunkte für die Gestaltung von kooperativen Promotionsverfahren.

Expertenkommission Forschung und Innovation (EFI) (2018): Zugang von FH-/HAW-Absolventinnen und -Absolventen zur Promotion, kooperative Promotionen und Promotionsrecht. Studien zum deutschen Innovationssystem 16-2018.

Forschung & Lehre (11/2018): Kooperative Promotionsverfahren. Ein Ländervergleich. S. 968-969.

Gemeinsame Position von BDA, BDI, HRK und Stifterverband (2018): Promotionen in Kooperation zwischen promotionsberechtigten Hochschulen und Unternehmen (Promotionen mit externem Arbeitsvertrag).

Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft deutscher Forschungszentren e.V. (2018): Leitlinien zur Durchführung von Promotionsvorhaben in der Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft.

Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (HRK) (2012): Zur Qualitätssicherung in Promotionsverfahren. Empfehlung des Präsidiums der HRK vom 23.4.2012 an die promotionsberechtigten Hochschulen.

Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (HRK) (2015): Handhabung der Kooperativen Promotion. Empfehlung der 18. Mitgliederversammlung der HRK am 12. Mai 2015.

Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (HRK) (2017): Eckpunkte zur Qualitätssicherung der Promotion mit externem Arbeitsvertrag. 23. Mitgliederversammlung der HRK am 14. November 2017.

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft (2013): Leitlinien für die Arbeitsbedingungen und die Karriereförderung promovierender und promovierter Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler in den Instituten der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft.

Max-Planck-Gesellschaft (2014): Leitlinien für die Ausbildung von Doktorandinnen und Doktoranden in der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft.

Positionspapier der TU9 zusammen mit der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Technischen Universitäten in Deutschland (ARGE-TU) (2017): Promotionen in Kooperation mit der Industrie („Kuckucksei“-Promotionen).

Stellungnahme der Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina, der Deutsche Akademie der Technikwissenschaften (acatech) und der Union der deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften (2017): Promotion im Umbruch.

Stellungnahme des UniWiND-Vorstands (2014): Zum Verständnis der Promotionsphase.

Stifterverband (2017): Durch Kooperation zum Standortprofil. Partnerschaften von Universitäten und Fachhochschulen – Strategien und Fallbeispiele.

Stifterverband (2018): Promotionen in Kooperation mit Unternehmen.

TU9-Eckpunktepapier (2017) zur Qualitätssicherung und Einhaltung wissenschaftlicher Standards bei Promotionen in Kooperation mit der Wirtschaft.

TUM (2016): Empfehlungen für Promotionen in Zusammenarbeit mit Hochschulen für angewandte Wissenschaften, außeruniversitären Forschungseinrichtungen und Unternehmen.

UniWiND (2011): Junge Forscherinnen und Forscher. Empfehlungen zur Promotion an deutschen Universitäten.

UniWiND-Publikationen Band 4 (2. Aufl. 2017): Betreuung Promovierender. Empfehlungen und Good Practice für Universitäten und Betreuende.

UniWiND-Publikationen Band 7 (2016): Promovierendenerfassung. Leitfaden für einen einheitlichen Datensatz.

Wissenschaftsrat (2010): Empfehlungen zur Rolle der Fachhochschulen im Hochschulsystem. Drs. 10031-10.

Wissenschaftsrat (2011): Anforderungen an die Qualitätssicherung der Promotion. Positionspapier.

Wissenschaftsrat (2016): Empfehlungen zur Personalgewinnung und -entwicklung an Fachhochschulen. Drs. 5637-16 vom 21. Oktober 2016.

Wissenschaftsrat (2018): Empfehlungen zu regionalen Kooperationen wissenschaftlicher Einrichtungen. Drs. 6834-18 vom 26. Januar 2018.