

SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS **CONCERNING THE DOCTORATE IN LAW** **AND CRIMINOLOGICAL SCIENCES**

Approved by:	Faculty Council Law and Criminology
On:	8/1/2021
Date of entry into effect:	8/1/2021

History

FR 09-09-2015

All provisions of the faculty supplementary regulations provided in this document are unofficial translations of the corresponding provisions of the official Dutch version.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS	3
CHAPTER II. FINALITY OF THE DOCTORAL EXAMINATION	3
CHAPTER III. CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION	3
CHAPTER IV. FORM, EXTENT AND LANGUAGE OF THE DISSERTATION	3
CHAPTER V. PLAGIARISM AND OTHER CASES OF FRAUD AND/OR IRREGULARITIES	4
CHAPTER VI. START AND ADMISSION OF THE DOCTORAL RESEARCH	5
CHAPTER VII. THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL	6
CHAPTER VIII. RIGHT TO GUIDANCE, RESEARCH TIME AND ACTIVITIES	7
CHAPTER IX. REPORTING DUTY	8
CHAPTER X. SUBMISSION OF THE DISSERTATION	8
CHAPTER XI. COMPOSITION OF THE EXAMINATION BOARD	9
CHAPTER XII. PRACTICAL PREPARATION AND PROGRESS OF THE DOCTORAL EXAMINATION	10
CHAPTER XIV. THE FACULTY DOCTORAL COMMITTEE (FDC)	12
ANNEX 1	13

Fout! Bladwijzer niet gedefinieerd.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTORY PROVISIONS

1. These supplementary regulations are the faculty's concrete implementation of the generally applicable examination regulations for the doctorate, the doctoral training programme and the pre-doctoral training programme, as set out per academic year in the University's Education and Examination Code (OER).

CHAPTER II. FINALITY OF THE DOCTORAL EXAMINATION

2. The doctoral examination is a test of the doctoral student's ability to conduct academic research. Doctoral students must prove that they are able to conduct original, critical, and in-depth academic research on an independent basis.
3. 'Independent' means that doctoral students must complete their dissertation themselves. This does not exclude supervision and fine-tuning by the members of the doctoral advisory committee. However, these members may not substitute the doctoral student. The independent nature of the doctoral dissertation also means that joint dissertations, in which several PhD students defend a single dissertation, are not possible at the faculty.
4. 'Original' means that the thesis, as a whole, adds something to the existing body of scientific knowledge. It is recommended that the doctoral students indicate the value of their original contribution within the body of their dissertation.
5. 'Critical' means that on the basis of their insights, doctoral students can distance themselves from existing rules, theories and opinions and can support, disapprove or nuance them in a substantiated manner.
6. 'In-depth' means that doctoral students carry out a thorough investigation of the source material relevant to their subject and reply to the research questions using the most appropriate methods and techniques.

CHAPTER III. CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

7. A dissertation contains an overview of the existing research, a problem statement indicating a knowledge gap, one or more research questions and an explanation of the methodology used. The dissertation must also contain a report of the research conducted and its results. It ends with a concluding chapter in which an answer to the research questions is formulated and in which recommendations for further research, policy or practice are proposed.

CHAPTER IV. FORM, EXTENT AND LANGUAGE OF THE DISSERTATION

8. A doctoral thesis may take the form of a monograph or may consist of the compilation of a number of academic articles in journals or book chapters, which are considered to be of a high level and impact within the relevant discipline.
9. §1. In the case of a doctoral thesis consisting of a compilation, the journal articles or book chapters must be related. This necessitates a common thread in terms of research theme, a common methodology or another form of coherence. This type of doctoral thesis must contain all the substantive components required for a doctorate. These components can be developed through articles or book chapters, through binding texts and through an introduction or a conclusion;
§2 A minimum of three bundled articles or book chapters is required.

- §3. At least half of the articles or book chapters bundled in a dissertation should be accepted for publication by the deposit date of the dissertation.
10. It is recommended to limit the number of pages of a PhD (monograph) dissertation to a maximum of 350 pages (font : 12 for text - interline 1,15, 10 for footnotes - interline 1). This does not include the appendices or the bibliography.
11. Articles or book chapters written by more than one author can be included in a doctoral thesis that consists of a compilation of a number of articles. In addition, they can also be included in an adapted form within a monograph doctoral thesis. It is required, however, that the PhD student is the principal author of each article or book chapter that has been adapted or copied into the dissertation. The contribution of the doctoral student and the other author(s) must be detailed for each co-publication included or copied, and it must be clarified why the doctoral student is the principal author of those publications. This explanation should be included in the manuscript of the dissertation. The doctoral advisory committee sees to the compliance with this. The final assessment on principal authorship remains with the doctoral exam jury.
12. [=> Art. 83 §5 OER]
- §1. The doctoral dissertation can be written in Dutch or English. Another language may be accepted by the Faculty Council for all, or part, of the dissertation. This will be considered at the doctoral student's written request. Doctoral students must apply for the use of another language concurrently with the submission of their research topic proposal to the Faculty Council.
- §2. The doctoral student must have sufficient proficiency in the language that the dissertation will be written. This standard is verified by the supervisor and the faculty doctoral committee (hereinafter 'doctoral committee').

CHAPTER V. PLAGIARISM AND OTHER CASES OF FRAUD AND/OR IRREGULARITIES

13. [=> Art.97bis OER]
- §1. At Ghent University, plagiarism is considered a form of fraud and an irregularity. Plagiarism is defined as: presenting a source (or parts of a source) as an original product and under one's own name without crediting the source. Plagiarism can relate to different forms of products such as text (written, oral), image (photographs, footage, graphics, diagrams, figures, ...), music, data file, structure, rationale, concepts.
- Plagiarism, therefore, includes, among other things:
- the use of other people's texts without reference to the source immediately after the passage in question. A non-substantive change to a source, e.g. changing a few words or sentences in an uncredited text, is still considered plagiarism. A general reference to the source, e.g. at the beginning of a chapter, does not mitigate the plagiarism of individual passages;
 - the use in one's own work of the structure of another's work, without crediting the source;
 - the adoption of ideas of others without crediting the source;
 - the exclusive or abundant use of other people's texts, in translation or directly, without a correct reference to the source;
- The inclusion of a source in the bibliography, in the cases mentioned above, remains plagiarism.
- §2. Plagiarism is equated with:
- failing to clearly indicate in the text, e.g. by means of quotation marks or a certain graphic sign, that literal, or almost literal, quotations have been included in the work, even if this is done with a correct reference to the source.
 - Other cases of fraud, such as inventing and fabricating data, the introduction of changes to data and the deliberate presentation of false data.

§3. If plagiarism is suspected, the procedure provided for in the OER is followed [=> art. 97bis §§5-14 OER].

CHAPTER VI. START AND ADMISSION OF THE DOCTORAL RESEARCH

14. [=> Art. 83 OER]

§1 The prospective PhD student must apply for PHD admission via the online application procedure on the OASIS website (<http://oasis.ugent.be>). The application needs to be initiated by the administratively responsible supervisor. The following documents need to be uploaded to the online application:

- A research plan (3-5 pages): this can be the research plan approved by the funding institution of the doctoral research, or a document the prospective PhD student designs specifically in the frame of the application for PHD admission through the Oasis website. The minimum required content of a research plan is: a description of the research problem and the research questions; the research methodology; and a proposed timeline. An example of a research proposal template can be found in Annex 1 of these regulations;
- A Research Data Management Plan [=> Art. 84, §4 OER];
- A document (1 page) in which the candidate researcher explains her/his research capabilities;
- A motivated proposal for members of the doctoral advisory committee.

§2. Prospective PhD students who do not have a Master's degree (or equivalent) awarded at a Belgian, Dutch or Luxembourg university and who (i) intend to prepare a dissertation as part of a supervisor's project in which several PhD tracks are provided; or who (ii) prepare a scholarship application for which prior enrollment for the PhD is an admissibility requirement, do not need to add any of the documents mentioned in §1 to the Oasis online application platform.

15. The full admission request of the prospective doctoral student is submitted via Oasis and forwarded to the doctoral committee, which will discuss it at its next session. The applicant receives a receipt confirmation and an invitation to appear before the doctoral committee together with the supervisor(s). Applications from candidate PhD candidates as defined in §2 of the previous article who do not have a master's degree (or equivalent) awarded by a Belgian, Dutch or Luxembourg university are also placed on the agenda of the doctoral committee during its next session. However, they and their supervisor(s) do not have to appear before the commission and only receive a receipt of confirmation.

16. At the doctoral committee meeting, the prospective doctoral candidate, together with the supervisor, present and explain the submitted documents and answer questions from the doctoral committee.

17. §1. On the basis of the research proposal and the oral presentation, the doctoral committee advises the Faculty Council on the admission of the prospective doctoral candidate to the doctoral research. This report contains a clear stance on the feasibility of the intended research in the broadest sense, taking into account the topic of the doctoral research (quality of the research proposal) as well as the competences of the prospective doctoral candidate (capacity of the prospective doctoral candidate to perform high-quality research, taking into account also the background of one's education, language skills, methodological competencies, etc.).

§2. If the doctoral committee is of the opinion that the proposed doctoral research is scientific and feasible, and that the candidate has the necessary skills to carry out the research as proposed, it then delivers a positive report to the Faculty Council. The doctoral committee may accompany a positive report with suggestions to the prospective PhD student and supervisor(s).

§3. If the doctoral committee is of the opinion that the proposed doctoral research is not scientific or feasible, or that the prospective doctoral candidate is not able to conduct high quality scientific doctoral research it can:

- invite the candidate-doctoral student to modify or complement the submitted documents. The doctoral committee in this case postpones its report. When the committee receives the amended or supplemented documents, it assigns them to the agenda of the next session. The doctoral committee may then decide to hear the candidate-doctoral student and supervisor(s) again. If it believes that the proposed doctoral research is scientific and feasible after the amendments or additions and that the prospective doctoral student has the necessary skills to carry out the research as proposed, it delivers a positive report; or
- deliver a negative report.

18. The doctoral committee only assesses the equivalency of the basic diploma of the applicants mentioned in art. 14, §2 who do not have a master's degree (or equivalent) awarded by a Belgian, Dutch or Luxembourg university. If the doctoral committee is of the opinion that the basic diploma is equivalent to a master's degree that gives admission to doctoral research, it will issue a positive equivalence advice to the Faculty Council. Holders of such a positive equivalence advice are obliged to submit to the doctoral committee, within six months after the start of their employment, the documents mentioned in art. 14, §1, first to fourth indents. They will then be invited by the doctoral committee, together with their supervisor(s), to present and explain the documents at a doctoral committee meeting.

19. [=> Art. 83, §5 OER]

The Faculty Council takes into account the advice of the doctoral committee and decides on the admission of the candidate doctoral student to the first enrolment. The Faculty Council appoints the supervisor(s) and the doctoral advisory committee, and determines the language of the dissertation. If necessary, the Faculty Council requires the candidate to partake in additional training. Once the Faculty Council has made a decision in reference to the admission, the doctoral student can enroll for the first time via Oasis. Doctoral students are automatically enrolled at the Doctoral School of Arts Humanities and Law after enrolment.

20. The latest that prospective doctoral candidates must submit their application is:

- For researchers (in particular fellows) no later than 6 months after commencement of employment.
- For assistants in a regular assistant track (2-2-2 years), the research plan is presented no later than 9 months after the start of the mandate.

21. [=> Art. 90, §1 OER]

Doctoral students are required to renew their enrolment as doctoral students every academic year, as long as the doctoral thesis has not been defended or the doctoral research has not been discontinued.

22. In the course of the doctoral research, doctoral students, the supervisors, or *ex officio* the Faculty Council if it sees a need to do so and having heard the doctoral student in question, can change the research topic, the language of the dissertation and/or the composition of the doctoral advisory committee by submitting a request to the Faculty Council.

CHAPTER VII. THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL

23. The Doctoral School of Arts Humanities and Law (hereinafter 'doctoral school') organises the doctoral training programme for doctoral research in the fields of Law and Criminology, among others.

24. The doctoral training consists of courses given by the doctoral school. Except for the onboarding track offered by the doctoral school, the doctoral training is not mandatory. Following the doctoral training with a view to obtaining a certificate from the doctoral School is highly recommended.

25. [=> Art.86 and art. 92 OER]

Any PhD student who wishes to complete the full doctoral study programme is responsible for ensuring that they are assessed at the end of the doctoral study programme. To this end, the doctoral student is to provide the chair of the assessment committee with proof that, with the exception of the defence of the doctoral dissertation, the required programme of the doctoral training programme was completed. One is to submit the relevant documents at least 20 working days ahead of the meeting of the Faculty Council on which the doctoral thesis is submitted. Upon the successful completion of the full doctoral training programme's curriculum and after the recommendation of the doctoral School, the faculty awards a certificate that is given by the rector.

CHAPTER VIII. RIGHT TO GUIDANCE, RESEARCH TIME AND ACTIVITIES

26. [=> Art. 88 OER]

§1. The doctoral student has a right to guidance by one's doctoral advisory committee. The doctoral advisory committee appointed by the Faculty Council consists of minimum 3 and maximum 5 persons, including the supervisor(s). At least one member of the doctoral advisory committee must not belong to the department of the doctoral student and the supervisor, and should ideally be an external expert. The composition of the doctoral advisory committee should unite a range of strengths and competences for adequate supervision in relation to the doctoral research. It is advisable to keep the number of members of the doctoral advisory committee to a minimum in order not to hinder the practical organisation of meetings, or to prejudice the composition of the examination board. Relatives by blood or by marriage up to and including the fourth degree cannot be part of the doctoral advisory committee. Any relations arising from a legal partnership are hereby considered equivalent to those arising from marriage. If this relation is created after the composition of the doctoral advisory committee, the Faculty Council will change the composition of the doctoral supervisor committee at the request of the members concerned. A supervisor or member of the doctoral advisory committee also requests a replacement if, due to personal involvement with another member of the doctoral advisory committee, proper supervision or an objective assessment of (the progress of) the dissertation may be compromised.

§2. The doctoral advisory committee is responsible for general support, follow-up and assessment of the doctoral student throughout the entire study and research period. Its task is to provide advice and recommendations on the general structure, methodology, substantive elaboration and depth of the research. As part of this, the doctoral advisory committee has the following specific tasks:

- to annually discuss the progress report submitted by the doctoral student and to issue advice on the continuation of the doctoral research;
- to assess the parts or chapters of the dissertation submitted by the doctoral student, which may have been submitted to the supervisor beforehand.

27. In the first instance, counselling is provided by the supervisor, who is the primary contact for the doctoral student. Regular consultation must be possible between the doctoral student and the supervisor. The doctoral student must be able to submit questions about the research to the supervisor at regular intervals. The doctoral student must receive feedback from the supervisor within a reasonable time and in any case within two months of submitting a text.

28. Doctoral students are entitled to sufficient research time to carry out their doctorate, without prejudice to the minima laid down in the Codex Higher Education and other regulatory provisions.

29. During their PhD trajectory, PhD students should be given the opportunity and motivated by the supervisor to at minimum:

- attend the faculty-provided introductory session for doctoral students in the first year after beginning doctoral research or recruitment;

- obtain the certificate of the doctoral school program by completing the required components;
- give a presentation at the annual PhD seminar for doctoral students. The supervisor(s) and the UGhent members of the doctoral advisory committee are expected to be present at the presentation of their PhD student;
- attend faculty research information sessions;
- undertake a short stay abroad: in the form of a research stay or in the form of a course (e.g. summer school), conferences or an internship.

CHAPTER IX. REPORTING DUTY

30. Doctoral students should regularly report the progress of their research to the doctoral advisory committee and the supervisor, either on their own initiative or on request.
31. [=> Art. 89 and 90 §2 OER]
- §1. In relation to the progress report that each PhD student must submit annually to the Doctoral School, the doctoral advisory committee meets to assess the progress of the research, on the basis of the document drawn up by the PhD student.
- §2. At this meeting, the PhD student will explain the advancement of one's research. The supervisor ensures that all of the members of the doctoral advisory committee, barring any case of force majeure, participate in the meeting. The members of the doctoral advisory committee who are unable to attend the meeting should, in this case, submit their comments in writing to the PhD student and the doctoral advisory committee, so that they can be discussed at the meeting.
32. The doctoral advisory committee then issues an advice on the progress of the doctoral student in the research, the quality of the data management plan (DMP), and, if necessary, on the doctoral study programme. The doctoral supervision committee submits this advice to the doctoral student.
33. The discussion of the progress report is the subject of minutes which, in addition to the formal recommendation of the doctoral advisory committee on the progress of the research, summarize the comments and suggestions made by the (members of the) doctoral advisory committee.

CHAPTER X. SUBMISSION OF THE DISSERTATION

34. [=> Art. 93 OER]

§1. The doctoral student who wishes to submit one's doctoral thesis delivers:

- the doctoral thesis, accompanied by a summary in Dutch and English and the final version of the DMP, in print form to the dean's office and an electronic version in pdf format to faculteitsraad-rechten@ugent.be . The number of copies to be submitted in print form corresponds to the number of members of the proposed examination board.
- an advice from the doctoral advisory committee on the submission of the dissertation. A positive recommendation implies that all or a majority of the members of the doctoral advisory committee are of the opinion that, taking into account the committee's general counselling task, the doctoral student has adequately complied with their suggestions and recommendations, and that the dissertation, therefore, meets the usual standards of academic quality to be submitted to an examination board for assessment. For the individual members of the doctoral advisory committee the agreement with the submission of the thesis does not imply that they agree with the content of the dissertation in all its details.
- when appropriate, the assessment results of the doctoral training by the assessment committee

- The document "my dissertation", accompanied by an electronic passport photo: the contents of this document allow the dean's office, subject to a decision to that effect by the examination board, to make the public defence known.

§4. When submitting the dissertation, the supervisor shall formulate a considered proposal for the composition of the examination board.

§5. Subsequently, the dean will put the submission of the thesis on the agenda of the next Faculty Council. The Faculty Council examines whether the formalities for submitting the dissertation have been complied with and, if so, declares it admissible. The Faculty Council will further set up the examination board and determine the language of the doctoral examination.

CHAPTER XI. COMPOSITION OF THE EXAMINATION BOARD

35. [=>Art. 94 OER]

1§. The examination board is composed by the Faculty Council and consists of at least 5 and at most 8 members with voting rights, including the chair and the secretary. Supervisor(s) are considered additional members of the examination board; as such, they do not have the right to vote.

2§. The examination board consists of the following voting members:

- the dean, or his professorial staff representative, who chairs the examination board (the chairmanship of the examination board and the supervision of the dissertation are incompatible);
- 1 or more members of the professorial staff of the faculty, who are familiar with the subject matter or aspects thereof;
- at least 2 external members who are not affiliated with the Faculty of Law and Criminology. At least one of these members is not affiliated with Ghent University. The external members are sufficiently familiar with the subject of the dissertation.

§3. Moreover, the following provisions shall be taken into account when appointing voting members:

- at least half the members who are qualified to vote are authorized to act as a supervisor for a doctorate at their own organization;
- at least half the members who are qualified to vote have a full-time or part-time (temporary) appointment at Ghent University or are postdoctoral researchers of the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO), with Ghent University as its host institution;
- Not more than half of the members who are qualified to vote are part of the doctoral advisory committee or are co-authors of a publication or patent that is included in the dissertation in full. For the calculation of this, abstraction shall be made of the chair of the examination board.
- A gender balance shall be sought when composing the examination board.

36. The chair of the examination board will take care of the secretarial duties himself, or will appoint one of the members with voting rights as secretary.

37. Each dissertation is checked for plagiarism by the services of the dean's office using plagiarism software. The chair is informed of the result.

38. [=> Art. 94, §3 OER]

With the exception of the chair, each member of the examination board who is entitled to vote draws up a written assessment of the dissertation prior to the doctoral examination. The written assessment consists of two parts:

(1) a section that is handed to the doctoral student by the examination board prior to the first assessment of the dissertation and

(2) a section that is intended for the examination board which contains at least the personal advice on the admission of the doctoral student to the public defence (if necessary after adjustments have been made to the text of the dissertation).

CHAPTER XII. PRACTICAL PREPARATION AND PROGRESS OF THE DOCTORAL EXAMINATION

First examination part of the doctoral examination

39. The supervisor decides, in consultation with the examination board, when the deliberation meeting on the first part and on the second part (subject to passing the first part) will take place, after the chair's options for inclusion on the agenda have been assessed. The dates of the first part of the examination and of the public defence are chosen in such a way that the entire examination jury can attend, either in person or via video-conferencing.
40. With the intention of preparing the first examination part of the doctoral examination, each member of the examination board submits his reading report in word format at the latest 7 calendar days before the first examination part and exclusively via phd-lawfaculty@ugent.be. The reading reports are not communicated in advance to the other members of the reading or examination board. After all reading reports have been submitted, they will be given, by the chair, to the other members of the examination board. The first part of the reading report is sent simultaneously to the doctoral student via the UGent e-mail address, or in the absence thereof, the e-mail address the doctoral student provided. If the reading reports have not been submitted on time, the doctoral student may request to postpone the meeting of the examination board for the first part of the doctoral examination.

41. [=> Art. 96 OER]

The meeting involving the first part of the doctoral examination is held in three stages:

- (1) The internal meeting of the members of the examination board, in which the written reports are discussed and potential questions to the doctoral student are agreed upon.
- (2) The discussion in the presence (physically or via video-conferencing) of the doctoral student in relation to the academic qualities of the dissertation. The purpose of the discussion is to establish an in-depth academic dialogue between the doctoral student and the members of the examination board around all aspects of the dissertation (general research plan, methodology, structure, substantive questions, specific positions, ...). The doctoral student is first given the opportunity to respond to the findings and points of criticism as expressed in the reports made available to him/her; then each member of the examination board is given the opportunity to ask additional questions, in order to test the doctoral student's knowledge and competences.

The discussion with the doctoral student is limited to a maximum of two hours.

The language of the meeting is the same as for the public defence, as determined by the Faculty Council at the time of the submission of the dissertation.

(3) The deliberation by the examination board about the first part of the doctoral examination

The examination board deliberates on the basis of the written assessments drawn up by each voting member and the discussion with the doctoral student. After deliberation, the examination board reaches one of the following decisions:

- Admission to the second part of the doctoral examination (public defence). The fact that some of the members of the examination board may have comments that indicate that the dissertation contains in their opinion limited imperfections or shortcomings, does not preclude admission to the second part of the doctoral examination. The doctoral student may process the comments later when publishing the thesis.

Purely editorial corrections may be made to the thesis with a view to its submission to the UGent Academic Bibliography.

- Admission to the second part of the doctoral examination, under the condition that the doctoral student has made the necessary corrections to the dissertation within the time limit set by the examination board. In setting a time limit, the aim is to cause minimum, if any, delay in the timetable for the public defence. This decision should only be considered if the dissertation contains errors or inadequacies that are not indicated to appear in a publicly visible version of the dissertation, taking into account Ghent University's open access policy (dissertation at least visible within the Ghent University network). The decision does not prejudice the assessment of the overall quality of the dissertation. The examination board shall ensure that these corrections can be made within a reasonable period of time. The chair and the supervisor shall, in consultation with each other, ensure that the requested corrections are complied with. If the corrections are not made or do not meet the set requirements, the examination board may still decide not to grant admission to the second part of the doctoral examination.
- No admission to the second part of the doctoral examination. When this decision is taken, it is assumed that the dissertation does not meet the requirements of academic quality in order to be admitted to the public defence. The decision is cogently reasoned and, if necessary, gives indications about the adjustments that need to be made to the dissertation before it can be re-submitted.

Second part of the doctoral examination

42. [=> Art. 97 OER]

The second part of the doctoral examination (public defence) takes place on the day and at the time that has been specified by the examination board after the deliberation on the first examination part, and, except in case of *force majeure*, in the presence of the entire examination board. The duration of the second examination part is a minimum of 1 hour and no more than 2 hours.

43. The public defence of the dissertation before the examination board shall include:

- (1) The public presentation (approx. 30 minutes) of the dissertation and the research findings in a form that is comprehensible to the public.
- (2) The answering of questions from the members of the examination board. The members of the examination board strive to revisit the questions that were asked during the first part of the examination; in doing so, they can highlight the broader context of the research, the policy or social implications of the research findings, or new research perspectives.
- (3) The answering of any questions from the public.

44. The dean's office is responsible for the following aspects of the administrative handling of the doctoral examination:

- It invites the members of the examination board to the meeting of the first part of the examination;
- In preparation for the deliberation of the first part of the doctoral examination, it collects the reports of the examination board and distributes the reading reports to all the examination board members and to the doctoral student;
- It books a venue for the deliberation meeting of the first part and, if necessary, provides the necessary video-conferencing facilities;
- It invites the doctoral student to be heard during the deliberation meeting on the first part;
- After the deliberation meeting of the first part of the doctoral examination, the dean's office informs the doctoral student of the deliberation report (including the deliberation decision);

- In case of admission to the public defence, it is announced via the faculty website and via e-mail to all members of the faculty. The doctoral student is also reminded of the need to register for the doctoral examination and to pay the registration fee. As soon as the doctoral student is admitted to the public defence, the Registrar's Office sends an invitation to the doctoral student to register for the doctoral examination. It is the responsibility of the doctoral student to ensure that the registration and payment are done correctly. If it transpires that the registration is not in order, the doctoral student will not be admitted to the public defence;
 - The dean's office coordinates the reimbursement arrangements for the possible travel and accommodation expenses of the *extra mural* members;
 - It ensures that, at the end of the examination, the candidates receive their doctoral degree.
45. Doctoral students and/or the departments to which they belong are responsible for the following:
- the booking and any associated costs of a suitable venue for the second part of the doctoral examination, i.e. the public defence;
 - the organisation and the costs associated with a possible reception;
 - possible hotel reservations for external members.

CHAPTER XIV. THE FACULTY DOCTORAL COMMITTEE (FDC)

46. A faculty doctoral committee (doctoral committee) is set up, consisting of 3 professorial staff members with extensive research experience, one of whom will be the chair, and 2 assistant academic staff members from the post-doctoral team. The doctoral committee's composition reflects the diversity in terms of research and research culture within the faculty.
47. The mandate of the chair of the doctoral committee runs simultaneously to the mandate of the dean. For the rest, the composition is laid down when the Faculty Council decides on the composition of the faculty committees.
48. Tasks of the doctoral committee:
- The doctoral committee advises the Faculty Council on the research plans when a doctoral researcher applies to the Faculty Council;
 - The doctoral committee provides the dean with the recommendation referred to in Article 89, § 5, of the OER.
 - The doctoral committee shall carry out the nomination referred to in Article 89, §5(4) of the OER.

ANNEX 1

(PROVISIONAL)TITLE

SUPERVISOR(S)

STATE OF THE ART

Write a concise, targeted state of the art of the relevant literature.

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVES

Define your research problem(s) and the research objective(s) that you derive from the(se) problem(s).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Define your research question(s). Link each question to (one of) the objectives that you have identified.

METHODOLOGY

Describe and explain your methodology to address the identified research problem(s) and questions.

SCIENTIFIC AND SOCIAL RELEVANCE

Explain why your research is relevant in a scientific sense. Substantiate also the wider, societal relevance or potential impact of your research.

WORKPLAN/TIMETABLE

Provide a timetable in order to demonstrate the feasibility of your research and indicate any potential risks in this regard. Link your timetable to the objectives and research questions you have identified and indicate any potential risks regarding feasibility.