

DOCTORAL DEGREE REGULATIONS

Preamble

The Academic Senate of the Hertie School of Governance adopted on 9 October 2014¹ the following doctoral degree regulations for all matriculated PhD students.

Contents

§ 1 Conferred degree	2
§ 2 Academic criteria.....	2
§ 3 PhD Board.....	2
§ 4 Admission requirements	3
§ 5 Admission procedure	3
§ 6 Matriculation as PhD student.....	4
§ 7 Doctoral programme	4
§ 8 Dissertation project supervision and standard completion time	4
§ 9 Information and supervision duties of the main advisor, prospectus defence and the decision on the continuation of the dissertation project	5
§ 10 Dissertation	6
§ 11 Dissertation evaluation	7
§ 12 Doctoral committee	8
§ 13 Decisions on the dissertation and scheduling the defence	8
§ 14 Defence.....	9
§ 15 Decision on the defence and passage of the doctoral examination.....	10
§ 16 Publication and submission obligation.....	10
§ 17 Doctoral degree certificate.....	11
§ 18 Motion for reconsideration	12
§ 19 Revocation of the doctoral degree.....	12
§ 20 Withdrawal from the doctoral examination process, new doctoral examination process	12
§ 21 Taking effect and publication	12

¹Confirmed by the Berlin Senate „Senatsverwaltung für Bildung, Jugend und Wissenschaft“ on 23 October 2014.

§ 1 Conferred degree

The Hertie School of Governance, Berlin (in the following Hertie School) confers the academic degree of Doctor rerum politicarum (Dr. rer. pol.) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) based on the following provisions of the doctoral degree regulations.

§ 2 Academic criteria

(1) The conferment of a doctoral degree provides proof of exceptional scholarly qualification through the completion of individual research which goes beyond the successful completion of a course of study. The written doctoral work includes a scientific treatise (dissertation) or several individual research papers (cumulative work). The oral examination takes the form of a colloquium (defence).

(2) The doctoral degree is conferred in the academic area of 'Governance', with a focus on one of the disciplines represented at the Hertie School.

(3) The regulations apply correspondingly for the conferral of a doctorate to those whose written doctoral work consists of several individual research papers.

(4) Requirements for conferral of a doctorate are to be fulfilled in the English language. Exceptions may be granted by the PhD Board.

§ 3 PhD Board

(1) The Academic Senate shall appoint a PhD Board to oversee doctoral examination processes. The Academic Senate shall appoint the members of the PhD Board at the beginning of each academic year. The chairperson of the PhD Board is a member of the Hertie School core faculty and the director of one of the doctoral programmes at the Hertie School. In addition to the chairperson, the PhD Board consists of at least two additional members of the Hertie School core faculty and one post-doctoral researcher.

(2) The PhD Board shall decide on the admission of candidates and their dissertation proposals into the doctoral programme. The Board shall meet at least once per semester. These meetings are not open to the public. The PhD Board may delegate admission decisions to a third party or to a committee within the Hertie School.

(3) The PhD Board may delegate decisions in individual cases or certain powers in general to the chairperson. The PhD Board may reverse this delegation at any time.

(4) The PhD Board shall inform the Academic Senate about its activities at least once per academic year. The Committee shall also report to the Academic Senate on request about individual doctoral examination processes.

§ 4 Admission requirements

(1) Candidates who have completed a degree programme at a German or foreign university with a substantive focus on one of the disciplines represented at the Hertie School in a particularly successful manner may be admitted to the doctoral programme.

(2) The following final degrees at a German university are considered

- Master's examination – requiring a total of 300 ECTS credit points, including the previously completed degree course,
- Magister Artium,
- diploma examination,
- first state examination (e.g. for secondary school teachers at general or vocational schools, law, medicine),
- church examination.

As a rule, a candidate must possess a first degree with a clear disciplinary foundation if the above-mentioned degrees are of an interdisciplinary nature.

(3) A final degree from a foreign university has to be equivalent to the final degrees listed in para. 2. In case of doubt, an equivalency confirmation from the central office for foreign education at the Secretariat of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education of the States in the Federal Republic of Germany shall be obtained. In the case that no scoring classification of the foreign university degree is provided by the central office for foreign education, a core faculty member of the PhD Board with a relevant disciplinary background verifies that the university degree grade is equivalent to the degrees mentioned in para. 2.

(4) If the applicant has a final degree other than those required in para. 2 and 3, she or he may be admitted to the doctoral programme if her or his qualifications for the disciplinary subject of the dissertation are proven. The PhD Board may conditionally admit the applicant to the doctoral programme with the requirement to provide missing certificates of course completion required in para. 1 or which are necessary for the dissertation pursued by the applicant.

§ 5 Admission procedure

(1) Applications for admission to the doctoral programme should be sent to the PhD Board with the following documents:

- a) Documents which are required pursuant to § 4, particularly diplomas or other proofs of qualification,
- b) a CV with special emphasis on the activities and experience relevant to the intended dissertation project,
- c) a statement as to whether or not the applicant has previously submitted a dissertation proposal or if her or his dissertation project is being conducted at another university or department; the application shall be accompanied by complete documentation, if applicable.

(2) The application for admission should include a presentation of the dissertation project's goals and methods. The dissertation project must be endorsed by at least one member of

the Hertie School core faculty. The doctoral candidate proposes a main advisor. The proposed advisor must confirm her or his acceptance of this function. She or he makes the decision at their own discretion.

(3) The PhD Board shall normally reach a decision on the admission applications within two months and in the framework of the meeting frequency set in § 3 para. 2. Rejected applicants shall be notified in writing. The explanation of rejection may be limited to notification that competing applicants better met the selection criteria set by the PhD Board.

§ 6 Matriculation as PhD student

(1) PhD candidates shall be matriculated as PhD students at the Hertie School of Governance.

(2) The PhD candidates shall be matriculated by the registrar of the Hertie School upon admission according to § 5 and upon examination and acceptance of all documents provided by the candidate in accordance with the notification of admission.

§ 7 Doctoral programme

Upon admission, the doctoral candidate shall be required to participate in one of the Hertie School's three-year doctoral programmes and to fulfill its requirements. Participation in a doctoral programme is an integral part of the dissertation supervision by the Hertie School. The respective doctoral programme serves to deepen the doctoral candidate's theoretical and methodological knowledge. The Academic Senate issues programme descriptions specifying the content, sequence and performance requirements of the Hertie School's doctoral programmes.

§ 8 Dissertation project supervision and standard completion time

(1) Upon the doctoral candidate's admission to the programme, the Hertie School accepts the duty to guarantee the supervision and the assessment of the dissertation project.

(2) The main dissertation advisor is normally a Hertie School core faculty member. The PhD Board appoints a second advisor in consultation with the doctoral candidate in time for the defence of the dissertation prospectus (§ 9 para. 2). A third advisor shall be appointed at the end of the second year. All dissertation advisors must be professors at their respective institution. The second advisor should not be a member of the Hertie School core faculty.

(3) The dissertation shall be supervised by the main advisor in co-operation with the other advisors. Supervision is a permanent obligation to be fulfilled by the advisors and may not be delegated. External advisors outside of Berlin shall provide sound supervision and shall especially take care that personal contact with the doctoral candidate is maintained.

(4) The advisors shall be obliged to supervise the dissertation project for a period of up to three years by written declaration to the doctoral candidate and the Hertie School. If this timeframe is to be exceeded, the PhD Board shall make a decision on an extension period in

consultation with the dissertation advisors. If the main advisor or the doctoral candidate sees reason to cease the advising relationship during the course of the work, they shall immediately inform the chairperson of the PhD Board and present their reasons. The PhD Board shall examine the reasons and ensure continued supervision of the dissertation, unless termination of the advising relationship is associated with the decision to terminate the doctoral degree process according to § 9 (para. 2-4).

(5) The dissertation shall, as a rule, be submitted after three years and the doctoral examination process shall be completed after four years (standard completion time).

(6) In the event of a conflict with an advisor relating to the code of conduct of the Hertie School, the doctoral candidate may appeal to the ombudsperson.

§ 9 Information and supervision duties of the main advisor, prospectus defence and the decision on the continuation of the dissertation project

(1) The doctoral candidate shall report in regular intervals to the main advisor on the progress of the dissertation proposal. The main advisor shall support the development of the proposal by meeting with the doctoral candidate on a regular basis.

(2) The doctoral candidate shall submit a dissertation prospectus of 6,000 to 8,000 words no later than twelve months after the start of the doctoral programme to which the candidate had been admitted. The proposal shall be defended in a one hour (approx.) discussion with the main advisor and the second advisor. Based on the prospectus and the defence, the main advisor and the second advisor shall decide in internal consultation whether the dissertation project should be continued or terminated. Continuation may also be made conditional upon requirements, to be met within an appropriate timeframe. The decision shall take into account the circumstances of the individual case, in addition to the academic standards. The doctoral candidate shall be promptly informed of the decision. The doctoral candidate shall be informed in writing within two weeks of the reasons leading to a decision of termination of the proposal or continuation of the proposal contingent upon requirements. Should the doctoral candidate consider termination unjustified, he or she may request a review by the PhD Board within one month after notification. The request shall be in written form and state the reasons for the request.

(3) At the end of the second year, the doctoral candidate shall submit the completed sections of the dissertation and discuss these with the main advisor and the second and third advisor for approximately one hour. The regulations in para. 2 sentences 2 to 8 shall be applicable.

(4) The main advisor shall report in regular intervals of one year to the PhD Board on the dissertation's further progress. If such a report should raise doubts concerning the feasibility of the completion of the dissertation, the PhD Board shall request a statement from the doctoral candidate to be submitted within one month. Subsequently, the PhD Board may terminate the doctoral supervision if it appears the dissertation will not be completed within an appropriate time period. The decision shall be made taking into account the specific circumstances of the individual case, in addition to the usual duration of a comparable dissertation project. The decision to terminate the process shall be justified and the doctoral candidate

shall be informed of the decision in writing by the chairperson of the PhD Board. Termination does not bar the doctoral candidate from reapplying for admission to the doctoral programme.

(5) Upon request, the PhD Board can consider and accept the respective procedure of another doctoral programme if it meets the standards of the procedure stipulated in para. 1-4.

§ 10 Dissertation

(1) The written doctoral work shall demonstrate the ability to produce original advanced scholarly work and shall strive to contribute to the advancement of science.

(2) The written doctoral work may be submitted as:

- a) a dissertation which is unpublished or published in part that must include a complete presentation of the research and its results. Prepublications are only acceptable upon a mutual agreement between the doctoral candidate and the main advisor; or
- b) a cumulative work made up of at least three published and/or unpublished individual works which must in its entirety present an equal amount of work as a dissertation, as detailed under a). Unpublished research papers must meet quality standards for publications. The Doctoral Committee's (see § 12) right to decide on the acceptance or rejection of the cumulative work shall remain unaffected by the fulfillment of these requirements. Upon acceptance, discipline-specific quality criteria shall be applied in each individual case. A cumulative work shall have a general title and consist, in addition to the particulars provided in the following para. 5, of a list with the titles of the individual works, an introduction and a text which connects these works and establishes their overall coherence.

(3) If doctoral work according to para. 2 is performed in collaboration with other researchers, the doctoral candidate's contribution must be clearly identifiable and reviewable. The doctoral candidate shall be required to present in detail her or his contribution in terms of the conception, research and writing of the dissertation. The statement shall be signed by the co-authors of the respective research paper.

(4) The doctoral candidate shall present all forms of resources and aid and give assurance that the work was completed independently on that basis. The dissertation may not have been accepted or rejected during the course of an earlier doctoral examination process. In case of doubt, dissertations from earlier doctoral examination processes shall be presented for a comparative assessment.

(5) The dissertation shall contain a title page listing the name of the author, the Hertie School as the institution to which the dissertation has been submitted and the year of submission as well as a page listing thesis advisors. An appendix shall be included with a summary of its results as well as a list of publications which have been published during preparation of the dissertation. A brief CV should also be included upon agreement by the doctoral candidate.

(6) Six printed copies and one electronic version of the dissertation shall be submitted. Each advisor shall receive one copy and one copy shall remain at the Hertie School to be archived. Individual sections of the dissertation which have already been published shall be reprinted and submitted in sextuplicate.

§ 11 Dissertation evaluation

(1) Immediately upon the submission of the dissertation, the PhD Board shall appoint two dissertation reviewers and request their reviews.

(2) As a matter of principle, the main dissertation advisor as well as another professor shall be appointed as dissertation reviewers. The latter should be employed at another university with the right to confer doctoral degrees. In most cases, this should be the second advisor. Upon appointment, the reviewers are to be informed that their reviews shall be made available to the doctoral candidates for the preparation of the dissertation defence. Upon request, the review may also be inspected by the members of the PhD Board.

(3) The reviews must be written independently from each other and have to be submitted to the PhD Board within 10 weeks after they have been requested. Any failure to observe the deadline must be justified in writing to the PhD Board. The persons mentioned in para. 2 shall keep the reviews confidential. The reviews must state whether the dissertation fulfills the standards laid down in § 2 para. 1 and § 10 para. 1.

(4) If the reviews differ in their assessments by more than one grade, the PhD Board may appoint an additional reviewer. If a reviewer considers there to be faults with the doctoral work whose correction appears to be possible and necessary for accepting the dissertation, she or he must identify these clearly in the review. In such a case, she or he can recommend a revision of the dissertation. In the overall assessment, each reviewer shall provide a recommendation for the acceptance of the dissertation together with a grade according to § 13, the rejection of it, or the return of the dissertation for revision and resubmission. If a review does not clearly provide the required assessment, the PhD Board shall return the review to be revised.

(5) After the review process has been completed, the dissertation shall be displayed along with the reviewers' proposed grades to the members of the Hertie School with a PhD degree for two weeks, or for four weeks outside of term-time. All core faculty members and post-doctoral researchers at the Hertie School may see the dissertation and the proposed grades and may submit a written comment which will be included among the documents related to the doctoral work. The PhD Board shall adequately inform this group about the public display of the dissertation. In addition, the members of the PhD Board and of the respective Doctoral Committee (see § 12) also have the right to inspect the reviews during this display period. If there are comments made during the display period, the PhD Board may appoint an additional reviewer.

§ 12 Doctoral committee

(1) The PhD Board appoints a Doctoral Committee for each defence. It is composed of the main advisor as chairperson and two professors. In most cases these are the second and third adviser. In addition to this, a post-doctoral researcher should be admitted to the Doctoral Committee in an advisory capacity. One member of the Doctoral Committee should not be a member of the Hertie School faculty. One additional core faculty member or a professor from a university with the right to confer doctoral degrees may be appointed member of the committee if this seems to be appropriate for reasons of the subject-specific focus of the dissertation or in view of the comments according to § 11 para. 4 and 5.

(2) The Doctoral Committee's responsibilities are:

- a) the evaluation of the dissertation based on existing reviews and possible comments in accordance with § 11,
- b) scheduling and execution of the defence,
- c) evaluation of the defence,
- d) determining the overall grade, taking into account the individual assessments of the dissertation and the defence in accordance with § 13.

(3) For those members of the Doctoral Committee who resign or who are prevented from performing their duties for a longer period due to compelling reasons, the PhD Board appoints a replacement according to the guidelines stipulated in para. 1.

(4) If the Doctoral Committee makes decisions by vote, the majority of the members present shall decide. In the event of a tied vote, the vote cast by the chairperson of the Committee shall be conclusive. Votes on grades shall be public within the Committee, abstention shall not be permitted.

(5) The meetings of the Doctoral Committee are not open to the public. The regulation of § 14 para. 1 sentence 2 shall remain unaffected.

§ 13 Decisions on the dissertation and scheduling the defence

(1) The Doctoral Committee shall decide on the basis of the reviews whether the dissertation is accepted, rejected or should be re-submitted within a period stipulated by the Committee for the removal of specific faults. If the dissertation, according to the judgment of the Doctoral Committee, fulfills the requirements stipulated in § 10 para. 1, the candidate shall be admitted to the defence. The following grades are possible for dissertations that have been accepted:

- with distinction (summa cum laude)
- very good (magna cum laude)
- good (cum laude)
- satisfactory (rite)

(2) If the Doctoral Committee rejects the dissertation, the chairperson of the PhD Board shall inform the doctoral candidate of this decision stating in writing the reasons for the decision.

(3) If the Doctoral Committee accepts the dissertation, it shall inform the doctoral candidate thereof and shall determine a date for the defence in consultation with the candidate. The defence should take place within four months of receiving the last review. Upon request, the chairperson of the PhD Board shall decide on well-founded exceptions to this rule. The chairperson of the Doctoral Committee extends invitations to the defence. She or he shall forward the reviews as well as any comments according to § 11 para. 4 to the doctoral candidate.

(4) In the event that the dissertation is returned to the candidate for review and resubmission, the defence shall be scheduled after the submission and review of the revised dissertation according to § 11.

§ 14 Defence

(1) The purpose of the defence is to demonstrate the doctoral candidate's ability in the oral presentation and debating of academic issues. The defence is open to the university public. All members of the Doctoral Committee must participate in the defence.

(2) The defence begins with a presentation of about thirty minutes, in which the doctoral candidate presents the results of the dissertation and explains their importance in a larger academic context. Subsequently, the doctoral candidate defends the dissertation against criticism and answers questions from the members of the Doctoral Committee. The chairperson of the Doctoral Committee may allow questions from the public regarding the topic of the defence. The discussion shall last at least thirty minutes and should not last longer than sixty minutes.

(3) The chairperson of the Doctoral Committee shall guide the academic discussion and decide on the priority and, if necessary, admissibility of questions. She or he may exclude the public, if this is necessary for an orderly defence.

(4) The members of the Doctoral Committee appoint one of their members as minute taker. He or she shall summarize the defence. The minutes shall be included into the files of the defence. The minutes must contain the following information:

- date/time/place of the defence
- attendance list of the Doctoral Committee members
- short summary of the discussion
- special incidents.

The minutes shall be signed by the minute taker and the chairperson of the Doctoral Committee.

(5) If the doctoral candidate fails to appear without excuse, the defence will be deemed failed. This shall be communicated in writing to the doctoral candidate by the chairperson of the Doctoral Committee within two weeks.

§ 15 Decision on the defence and passage of the doctoral examination

(1) Following the defence, the Doctoral Committee shall grade the defence in closed session according to § 13 para. 1. In grading the defence, the discussion shall receive more weight than the presentation. The Doctoral Committee then determines the overall grade according to the grading system given in § 13 para. 1. In the overall grade, the dissertation shall receive more weight than the defence – in a ratio of 2:1. The Committee shall inform the doctoral candidate of the individual grades for the dissertation and the defence as well as the overall grade.

(2) After the overall grade has been determined by the Doctoral Committee, the candidate shall receive a temporary certificate including the title of the dissertation, the individual grades for the dissertation and the defence as well as the overall grade. This temporary certificate does not allow the candidate to hold the title of a PhD or a Dr. rer. pol.

(3) If the defence is not passed, the chairperson of the PhD Board shall communicate the decision and the reasons for it in writing to the doctoral candidate within a period of two weeks. The defence may be repeated once; after a period of not less than three months.

(4) If the second defence is also not passed, the Doctoral Committee shall declare the doctoral examination to not have been passed and shall give reasons for their decision. The decision shall be communicated in writing to the doctoral candidate by the chairperson of PhD Board within two weeks.

(5) After completion of the doctoral examination process, the entire doctoral examination process must still be handled confidentially; the student or the former doctoral candidate shall have the right to access the doctoral examination file within one year.

§ 16 Publication and submission obligation

(1) The dissertation shall be made available to the academic community in an appropriate way through reproduction and dissemination. This requirement is deemed fulfilled if, within two years following the date of the defence,

- a) a binding publication commitment by a publishing company is obtained for a book publication with a minimum circulation of 150 copies by the commercial publisher, or
- b) a binding publication commitment by a publishing company is obtained for the publication of individual research papers of a cumulative work in a journal.

(2) In well-founded exceptional cases and with the consent of the PhD Board, the publication obligation can also be fulfilled by the publication of an electronic version or by submission of fifteen bound and durable copies in letterpress within the period stipulated in para. 1 sentence 2.

(3) Upon publication, three original copies of book publications or three original copies of journal publications shall be submitted to the library of the Hertie School free of charge. For an electronic publication, the doctoral work must be submitted to the Hertie School library

in a data format and on data carriers agreed upon with the library, in addition to five print copies. In this case, the graduate shall give the library permission in written form to make the file available to their users free of charge.

(4) Upon well-founded written request of the doctoral candidate, the Doctoral Committee shall decide on an extension of the period stipulated in para. 1.

(5) Before publication of the dissertation according to para. 1 and 2, the doctoral candidate shall obtain the approval of the text version to be published. This approval shall be granted by the chair of the PhD Board in agreement with the reviewers.

(6) For already published individual works of a cumulative work, there is no additional publication requirement within the doctoral examination process. The individual research papers of a cumulative work, the introduction and the text which connects these works and establishes their overall coherence should be made available to the academic community in an appropriate way through reproduction and dissemination. Upon well-founded written request of the doctoral candidate, the PhD Board shall decide whether a dissertation which has been published in parts can be exempt from the publication requirement.

§ 17 Doctoral degree certificate

(1) A certificate for the doctoral degree shall be issued in English or upon request in German.

(2) The doctoral degree certificate must contain the following information:

- a) name of the Hertie School,
- b) name, birthdate and birthplace of the graduate
- c) conferred degree: Dr. rer. pol or Dr. Phil. (PhD),
- d) dissertation title
- e) date of defence which shall be the date of graduation,
- f) grades of dissertation and defence as well as overall grade of the doctoral examination,
- g) names of the reviewers,
- h) name and signature of the Dean of the Hertie School and of the chairperson of the Doctoral Committee,
- i) official seal of the Hertie School,
- j) name of the successfully completed doctoral programme.

(3) If it becomes apparent before delivering the doctoral degree certificate that

- a) the applicant was dishonest about the basic requirements for receiving the doctoral degree or
- b) the basic requirements for the conferment of the doctoral degree were wrongly assumed to be fulfilled, and if the case delineated under 3a) does not apply, the doctoral degree certificate shall not be handed over to the candidate and the doctorate shall be declared to have been failed, unless the PhD Board makes another decision.

(4) The doctoral degree certificate shall be delivered within six weeks after notification of the fulfilment of the submission obligations according to § 16. The doctoral diploma entitles the candidate to hold the title of Dr. rer. pol. or PhD.

§ 18 Motion for reconsideration

Graduates respectively former doctoral candidates may submit motions for reconsideration with regard to the results of the doctoral examination process. Such motions for reconsideration must be explained in writing and addressed to the chairperson of the PhD Board within three months after the announcement of the results. The chairperson of the PhD Board shall be responsible for the proper conduct of such motions for reconsideration. She or he shall submit the motion for reconsideration to the members of the Doctoral Committee. The chairperson of the PhD Board shall communicate the Doctoral Committee's decision about the motion for reconsideration to the affected person. As a rule, the Doctoral Committee shall make a decision on the motion for reconsideration within one month. In this reconsideration procedure, the grades and the relevant reasons for these grades shall be reviewed. The results of this review, including the grading, must be explained in writing.

§ 19 Revocation of the doctoral degree

The doctoral degree conferred by the Hertie School may be revoked if, after conferment, it becomes apparent that it has been obtained by deceit or that essential conditions for the conferment were not fulfilled. The regulations of § 48 of the German Administrative Procedures Act [*Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz*] shall apply accordingly.

§ 20 Withdrawal from the doctoral examination process, new doctoral examination process

(1) The doctoral candidate shall have the right to withdraw from the doctoral examination process up to the receipt of the first review. After a withdrawal, the previous steps in the examination process shall not count as examination process. A new application for submission to the doctoral examination process shall not be excluded.

(2) If the doctoral examination is not successfully completed, the doctoral candidate may apply to the PhD Board for admission to a new doctoral examination process. The new dissertation may be submitted one year thereafter at the earliest.

§ 21 Taking effect and publication

These Doctoral Degree Regulations shall take effect on the day after receipt of the confirmation from the senate administration of the federal state of Berlin responsible for universities by the Hertie School. They shall be published within the Hertie School.