

This is a translation of the regulatory text as promulgated in Official Bulletin I No. 46, page 1358, dated September 30, 2015.

Only those regulations published by the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen in its Official Bulletins are legally binding. Any claims to rights or titles resulting from the English translation of these regulations are expressly excluded.

Presidential Board:

The Presidential Board of Georg-August-Universität Göttingen adopted the Guidelines for the Ideas Competition for Students at the University of Göttingen on July, 28 2015 (Section 37 paragraph 1 sentence 3 of the Lower Saxony Higher Education Act (NHG) in the version promulgated in the Official Bulletin of February 26, 2007 (Lower Saxony Law and Ordinance Gazette (Nds. GVBl. p. 69), last amended by Article 11 of the law dated December 16, 2014 (Nds. GVBl. page 436).

Guidelines for the Ideas Competition for Students at the University of Göttingen

Section 1 Purpose

- (1) The aim of the Ideas Competition for Students is to encourage every student to contribute their abilities, knowledge and experiences to the improvement of academic quality at the University of Göttingen.
- (2) All students of the University of Göttingen are entitled to make proposals.

Section 2 Bodies

The bodies responsible for the Ideas Competition are:

- a) the Jury, and
- b) the Representative for Academic Quality.

Section 3 Jury

- (1) ¹The Jury consists of five members. ²At least two members of the Jury belong to the body of students. ³A personal deputy shall be named for each member. ⁴The Representative for Academic Quality and individuals in accordance with Section 4 (3) take part in meetings of the Jury as advisory members.
- (2) Each member of the Presidential Board may take an advisory role in the meetings of the Jury.
- (3) ¹The members of the Jury are proposed by the Study Quality Committee and appointed by the member of the Presidential Board responsible for the Department of Teaching and Learning for a term of two years. ²Reappointment is permitted.
- (4) The Jury selects a chair and his/her deputy from its midst.

(5) 1The Jury is quorate when the majority of members entitled to vote is present. 2Decisions are taken by simple majority.

(6) 1The Jury meets at least once a year to consult and decide on the proposals for improvement. 2The Representative for Academic Quality convenes the meetings.

(7) The results of the consultation and decisions of the Jury are recorded in minutes of the meeting.

Section 4 The Representative for Academic Quality

(1) The Representative for Academic Quality is responsible for all the tasks set by this guideline, unless they are allocated to another body or agency.

(2) The tasks of the Representative for Academic Quality include in particular:

- a) Advising and supporting students who are entitled to make proposals,
- b) Checking that the proposals are complete and carrying out the appropriate notifications for the procedure,
- c) Researching the data,
- d) Preparing the proposals for the Jury,
- e) Convening the Jury,
- f) Taking the minutes of the meeting of the Jury,
- g) Requesting opinions from the relevant sections or departments and passing them to the Jury,
- h) Informing the proposers about the decision of the Jury,
- i) Managing day-to-day business.

(3) The Representative for Academic Quality may be represented or supported by other members of staff assigned to him/her in order to complete the tasks in (2).

Section 5 Proposals for improvement

(1) 1Any proposal which might result in an improvement in study conditions for students or other basic teaching conditions counts as a proposal for improvement. 2These include in particular proposals designed to:

- a) improve the quality, service orientation, performance and efficiency of institutions for students,
- b) improve the offerings of teaching-related infrastructure, or
- c) enhance the curriculum for a degree programme.

(2) 1The following do not count as proposals for improvement for the purposes of the Ideas Competition:

- a) information about existing difficulties and the need for repairs,
- b) proposals that violate legislation or regulations,
- c) criticism or depiction of problems without concrete proposals for solutions,
- d) proposals for improvements that are already being planned or are in preparation in a field of activity, and
- e) obviously vague or implausible notions.

²Documents as defined in Clause 1 will be rejected by the Representative for Academic Quality. ³The proposer will receive an explanatory letter of rejection. ⁴Obvious complaints will be recorded and processed by the Representative for Academic Quality of the University as part of his or her routine work.

Section 6 Submitting proposals for improvement

(1) ¹Proposals for improvement should be submitted in text form to the Representative for Academic Quality. ²By submitting his or her proposal for improvement, the proposer declares his or her consent to the proposal for improvement being treated in accordance with the provisions of this guideline. ³By submitting a proposal for improvement the proposer accepts the judgement of the Jury and its decision as final.

(2) A proposal for improvement should be written briefly and precisely and structured as follows:

- a) description of current situation with explanation of areas requiring improvement or change,
- b) outlining of possibilities for a solution or improvement, and
- c) description of possible effects of implementing the proposal for improvement.

Section 7 Processing the proposal for improvement

(1) The Representative for Academic Quality documents the receipt of a proposal for improvement.

(2) ¹Any incomplete proposals or proposals as defined in Section 5 (2) will be returned by the Representative for Academic Quality. ²The Jury will be informed about returned proposals. ³On request from a member of the Jury, these proposals will be discussed by the Jury.

(3) ¹The Representative for Academic Quality shall make all the preparations necessary for assessment by the Jury. ²In particular, (s)he shall indicate any identical or similar proposals.

(4) ¹In general, the assessment takes place on an objective basis and regardless of the proposer. ²On principle, all relevant data and information are gathered, and positive aspects are identified, even if the proposal can only be realised in part or in a modified form.

(5) If expert opinions are sought, they must make authoritative statements/give reasons for the following:

- a) the feasibility or otherwise of the proposal for improvement,
- b) the nature and scope of the potential advantages,
- c) details on how to determine any benefit.

Section 8 Decisions of the Jury

(1) The Jury may consult experts or guests, in particular from the relevant institutions, in order to clarify specialist, economic, teaching-related or other questions.

(2) ¹The Jury decides once a year on the proposals for improvement it has received. ²The member of the Presidential Board with responsibility for the Department of Teaching and Learning shall set the closing date for submissions (deadline). ³Any proposals for improvement received after the deadline in accordance with Clause 2 are excluded from further proceedings.

(3) The Jury decides whether it accepts or rejects proposals, and on the prizes it awards.

(4) Jury members are not permitted to take part in the decision if it involves assessment of a proposal for improvement that affects their own area or department.

(5) If two or more proposals for improvement are similar in concept, on principle only the first one received can be accepted.

Section 9 Implementing proposals for improvements

(1) The Representative for Academic Quality will endeavour to ensure that accepted proposals for improvement are realised, insofar financially possible.

(2) ¹There is no entitlement to have accepted proposals for improvement realised. ²However there are no consequences for awards that have already been made.

Section 10 The rights and protection of the proposer

¹Up until the final decision, a proposal for improvement is considered by the Jury without disclosing names. ²There must not be any detriment to the proposer as the result of making a proposal for improvement.

Section 11 Prizes

(1) ¹Prizes may be awarded for proposals as defined in Section 5 (1). ²These honour and promote especially innovative proposals. ³The award of a prize is only a one-off distinction. ⁴Funds are provided for this from central academic quality resources in accordance with the applicable funding decision.

(2) In response to the proposal of the Jury, the Presidential Board decides on an awards system including a catalogue of prizes, which is published separately.

Section 12 Effective Date

(1) ¹These Guidelines shall become effective after their promulgation in the Official Bulletin of Georg-August-Universität Göttingen on October 1, 2015. ²At the same time the Guidelines for the Ideas Competition for Students at the University of Göttingen in the version promulgated in the Official Bulletin of March 11, 2008 (Official Bulletin I No. 7/2008 p. 370), last amended by decision of the Presidential Board on May 13, 2009 (Official Bulletin I No. 15/2009 p. 1458) become ineffective.

(2) The members of the Jury who were appointed in accordance with the procedure laid down in section 3 paragraph 1 sentence 2 remain in office until the end of the current term of office.