



Supervision Agreement for Doctoral Studies

Note: The gray text sections are intended as suggestions/prompts and must be deleted or individually adapted. The black text blocks should remain unchanged.

The following supervision agreement serves to structure the doctoral phase, plan the project, and clarify expectations toward the doctoral candidate as well as the supervisors. The agreement should be completed at the beginning of the doctorate and revisited, used, evaluated, and, if necessary, modified during the annual TAC meetings (see below). The agreement applies to all doctoral candidates at the Department of Psychology at LMU, regardless of whether they are pursuing their doctorate as staff members of a chair, as project employees, as scholarship holders, or as external candidates.

1. Name of the doctoral candidate: _____

2. Working title of the dissertation: _____

3. Supervisory and Examination Committee (“Thesis Advisory Committee” TAC)

Note: Doctoral projects at the Department of Psychology should be supervised by a Thesis Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC usually consists of three persons, of whom at least the primary supervisor must have supervision and examination authorization in accordance with § 7 of the doctoral regulations.¹ The secondary supervisor may also serve as the second reviewer of the dissertation (in accordance with § 10 of the doctoral regulations). The third person in the TAC should neither prepare an expert opinion nor participate as an examiner in the defense, but should instead assume the role of an independent mentor.

Primary Supervisor: _____

Secondary Supervisor: _____

Third TAC member: _____

4. Timeline and Work Plan

The project is described in greater detail in an exposé or project plan dated _____ (date). The TAC ensures that the exposé or project plan is sufficiently realistic and scientifically suitable for a doctoral project.

The following completion date is targeted for the doctoral project (please indicate the intended month and year): _____²

This results in the following milestones (the dates entered here are intended as rough guidelines and may be changed at any time):

¹ <https://cms-cdn.lmu.de/media/contenthub/amtliche-veroeffentlichungen/1170-09dp-2016-d00.pdf>

² Note: In accordance with § 4 of the doctoral regulations, a duration of 3 years is generally envisaged. The date specified here corresponds to the date of the dissertation defense.

Submission of the written dissertation:	(approx. 4 months before the dissertation defense date)
<hr/>	
In the case of a publication-based dissertation: Beginning work on the integrative framework text (“Kummulus”):	(approx. 6 months before submission of the dissertation)
<hr/>	
Completion of data collection for the final study:	(approx. 8 months before submission of the dissertation)
<hr/>	
Finalization of the exposé and project plan with timeline for the planned studies:	(to be determined individually, e.g., 2–2.5 years before submission of the dissertation)
<hr/>	

Deviations will be discussed and documented during the annual TAC meetings (see documentation form in the appendix). When preparing the timeline, the selected dissertation format must be considered, as it may influence the chronological sequence of the work steps.

5. Type of Dissertation

The following is planned:

- publication-based or cumulative dissertation
- monograph.

(A switch between both models is possible; see § 9 of the doctoral regulations).

6. The following agreements are made regarding authorship:

Note: In general, agreements regarding authorship should be made at an early stage; see Section 7.3, Paragraph (13) of the Professional Ethical Guidelines of the BDP and the DGPs, as well as § 14 (“Authorship”) of the LMU Regulations for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice.³

If a monograph is intended, the following agreements are made with regard to later journal manuscripts based on parts of the dissertation (please check as applicable):

- In the case of journal manuscripts produced within the framework of a doctorate, the respective doctoral candidate shall generally be the first author. This also applies when the publication concerns data generated within the framework of a third-party funded project in which the supervisor also serves as project leader.
- Should the doctoral candidate decide not to revise parts of the monograph into manuscripts or not to contribute to the revision of a submitted manuscript, the primary supervisor or other members of the teaching/research unit may assume this role, and first authorship may, where applicable, transfer to that person. However, the doctoral candidate should still be offered co-authorship.
- In the case of journal manuscripts involving several doctoral candidates simultaneously (i.e., manuscripts intended to be used as parts of different dissertations), it must be clearly specified who assumed which task or role in the final product. For this purpose, the CRediT taxonomy (<https://credit.niso.org>) may be used.
- If parts of the monograph are already close to publication readiness at the time of submission and the doctoral candidate remains actively involved after submission in the manuscript submission and, where

³ <https://cms-cdn.lmu.de/media/lmu/downloads/die-lmu/beauftragte/richtlinien-der-lmu-muenchen-zur-selbstkontrolle-in-der-wissenschaft.pdf>

applicable, revision process, first authorship shall always remain with the doctoral candidate.

- All persons who have made substantial contributions to the creation of the manuscript should be included as co-authors, provided this is consistent with the provisions of § 14 (“Authorship”) of the LMU Regulations for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice.
- Further agreements regarding authorship:

7. Academic Further Qualification within the Framework of the Doctorate

Doctoral candidates at the Department of Psychology are expected to attend courses and/or workshops for academic further qualification during the course of their doctorate, including, among others, the cross-sectional topics of (a) “Good Scientific Practice,” (b) research data management, and (c) research ethics.

These courses may, among others, be requested and/or attended at the LMU Graduate Center (<https://www.portal.graduatecenter.lmu.de/gc/de/workshops>), the LMU Open Science Center (<https://www.osc.uni-muenchen.de/index.html>), or the LMU Center for Leadership and People Management (<https://www.lmu.de/psy/de/center-for-leadership-and-people-management>). They may also be completed online or at other institutions. Participation in these courses must be documented and confirmed by the TAC.

Further qualification measures agreed upon with the TAC:

8. Methodological Quality, Transparency, and Reproducibility

Engagement with current methodological standards and scientific discourses constitutes a central quality aspect of every dissertation. This includes, in particular, questions concerning appropriate methodological procedures, transparency, reproducibility, robustness of findings, as well as openness to the verification and further development of scientific results. Specifically, for each study to be conducted, agreements should be made regarding:

- whether the **preregistration** of hypotheses, analysis scripts, etc. is meaningful and appropriate, and how this should be conducted,
- how data, analysis code, materials, etc. can be made openly available for the purposes of reproducibility and reuse (“**open science**”),
- what measures can be taken to ensure the **analytical reproducibility** of the findings, and
- journal manuscripts arising from the dissertation can be made openly accessible (“**open access**”).

Specifically, the following is agreed upon:

Note: These aspects are the subject of ongoing scientific discussions. One task of the doctoral process is to engage with and follow these discourses and, on this basis, to make well-founded decisions within the respective research context. The agreements made here may be revised in light of such decisions; this should be documented accordingly during the TAC meetings (see documentation form in the appendix).

It is expected that doctoral candidates, within the framework of their dissertation—particularly in the integrative framework section and/or the overarching discussion—explain, with reference to the current methodological discourse, which methodological decisions were made, how these decisions are justified, and in which cases certain approaches were not implemented or did not appear appropriate in the respective context. The quality of this reflection constitutes an essential criterion for the evaluation of the dissertation. The attached form “Reflection and Documentation Regarding Openness and Transparency” may be used to document and justify the relevant decisions.

9. The doctoral candidate and the supervisors jointly commit to, ...

- designing and structuring the doctoral project in such a way that the doctorate can be completed by the date specified under section (4). Extensions of the doctoral period are possible in the interest of family-friendliness and due to particular burdens (e.g., professional and training-related obligations, health-related burdens).
- ensuring an appropriate lead time for feedback and the implementation thereof in the case of submissions with critical deadlines (e.g., manuscript submissions, conference contributions, interim/final project reports). The following are agreed upon as typical lead times:
 - for one-page documents (abstracts, etc.): _____ (e.g., 3 working days)
 - for documents up to 5 pages (exposé, etc.): _____ (e.g., 1 week)
 - for manuscripts (or documents exceeding 5 pages): _____ (e.g., 1 month)
- conducting supervisory meetings with the TAC members at regular intervals (but at least once per year) (see documentation form in the appendix). During these meetings, the status of the work shall be jointly reviewed on the basis of the milestones, the planning revised and adjusted if necessary, and the next work steps defined. Opportunities for participation in conferences and workshops should also be discussed. Reflection on the collaboration, communication, and the status of the overall project is likewise encouraged.
- complying with the provisions and regulations contained in ...
 - the doctoral regulations applicable to the Department of Psychology (<https://cms-cdn.lmu.de/media/contenthub/amtliche-veroeffentlichungen/1170-09dp-2016-d00.pdf>)
 - the Professional Ethical Guidelines of the BDP and the DGPs (https://www.dgps.de/fileadmin/user_upload/PDF/Berufsetische_Richtlinien/BER-Foederation-20230426-Web-1.pdf)
 - the DFG Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice (<https://zenodo.org/records/14281892>)
 - the LMU regulations based thereon for safeguarding good scientific practice (<https://cms-cdn.lmu.de/media/lmu/downloads/die-lmu/beauftragte/richtlinien-der-lmu-muenchen-zur-selbstkontrolle-in-der-wissenschaft.pdf>)
- jointly reviewing and completing the form concerning individual contributions that must be filled out upon submission of the dissertation manuscript.

10. The supervisor ...

- supports the doctoral candidate in the preparation of the exposé, work plans, study design, manuscripts, and other written reports,

- provides support in the preparation of documents (e.g., ethics applications, data management plans),
- endeavors to secure continuous funding for the duration of the doctorate and/or supports the doctoral candidate in applying for scholarships,
- commits to conducting the annual TAC meetings,
- discusses funding possibilities for the further qualification measures agreed upon herein and, where applicable, for additional costs incurred (in particular Open Access publications).

11. The doctoral candidate ...

- commits to complying with all legal or otherwise relevant norms and obligations relevant to the implementation of the project,
- endeavors to adhere to the agreed work and timeline plan,
- informs the primary supervisor immediately if circumstances arise that alter or hinder the progress of the work,
- prepares, in advance of the annual TAC meeting, a brief status report (approx. 1–2 pages) presenting the current progress with regard to the agreed milestones (Which goals have been achieved? Which have not, and why?) and prospectively outlining the next steps for the coming months.

12. Procedure in Cases of Conflict

Open, trusting, dependable, and binding communication can prevent conflicts in advance and/or contribute to their resolution. Wherever possible, such communication should initially take place at the level at which the respective conflict arose. In this regard, the TAC bears particular responsibility. If the conflict cannot be resolved or de-escalated at this level, or if the parties involved do not consider themselves able to seek dialogue at this level, they may refer the matter to higher-level bodies. The relevant bodies are listed in the “Code of Conduct” of the Faculty of Psychology and Pedagogy (see <https://www.lmu.de/psyedu/de/die-fakultaet/gleichstellung-diversitaet/code-of-conduct>).

If there is uncertainty regarding whom to contact, doctoral candidates may at any time approach their academic staff representatives. Where appropriate, Ombudspersons may be involved if discussions are to take place outside the faculty.

13. Further Agreements

14. Date: _____

(Signature of the doctoral candidate)

(Signature of the primary supervisor)

(Signature of the secondary supervisor)

(Signature of the 3rd member of the TAC)

Reflection and Documentation Regarding Openness and Transparency

Doctoral Candidate: _____

Title of the Dissertation: _____

Doctoral candidates are expected, within the framework of their dissertation and with reference to the current methodological discourse, to explain which methodological decisions were made, how these decisions are justified, and in which cases certain approaches were not implemented or did not appear appropriate within the respective context. The quality of this reflection constitutes an essential criterion for the evaluation of the dissertation. This form may be used to explain and justify the relevant decisions.

Openness/Transparency Aspect	Explanation / Justification
Preregistration of hypotheses, analyses, etc.	
Open Science (i.e., open data, materials, code, etc.)	
Analytical reproducibility	
Open Access	



Documentation Form for TAC Meetings

Name of the doctoral candidate: _____

Working title of the dissertation: _____

Supervisory and Examination Committee (“Thesis Advisory Committee” TAC)

- Primary supervisor: _____
- Secondary supervisor: _____
- Third participating member of the TAC: _____

Start of doctorate: _____

Planned completion of the doctorate: _____

Date of the supervision agreement: _____

Date of today’s TAC meeting: _____

1. Milestones

Have the milestones specified in the supervision agreement (see Section 4: “Timeline and Work Plan”) been achieved, or is it expected that they can be achieved within the specified time frame?

Yes Partially No

If no: Does the work plan need to be adjusted/revised accordingly?

Yes No

What new milestones result from this?

Submission of the written dissertation:	(approx. 4 months before the date of the dissertation defense)
---	--

In the case of a publication-oriented monograph: _____

Beginning work on the integrative framework text (“Kummulus”):	(approx. 6 months before submission of the dissertation)
--	--

Completion of data collection for the final study to be conducted:	(approx. 8 months before submission of the dissertation)
--	--

Finalization of the exposé and the project plan, including the timeline for the studies to be conducted:	(to be determined individually, e.g., 2–2.5 years before submission of the dissertation)
--	--

2. Form of the Doctorate

Does the originally intended form of the doctorate need to be changed?

Yes No

If yes: which form of doctorate is now intended?

publication-oriented or cumulative dissertation monograph

3. Further Qualification

Have the agreed measures for further academic qualification been fulfilled?

Yes Partially No

If not: Does the agreement regarding these measures need to be adjusted?

Yes No

If yes, how?

4. Methodological Quality, Transparency, and Reproducibility

Is there any need for discussion regarding the topics of preregistration, Open Science, analytical reproducibility, and/or Open Access, or do any existing agreements need to be revised?

Yes No

If yes, which ones?

5. Miscellaneous

Is there any need for changes or adjustments regarding other agreements?

Yes No

If yes, which ones?

6. Date: _____

(Signature of the doctoral candidate)

(Signature of the primary supervisor)

(Signature of the secondary supervisor)

(Signature of the 3rd member of the TAC)