

Supplementary faculty regulations governing the doctorate in the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences

Situation

The Faculty Board of the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences approved these supplementary faculty regulations on 9 September 2015, 7 October 2015 and 17 August 2016. These regulations apply from the start of the academic year 2016-2017 and are to be seen as a supplement to the regulations recorded in the Education and Examination Code for Doctoral Matters as approved by the Board of Governors on 7 May 2021 of Ghent University (OER).

These supplementary faculty regulations were modified by the Faculty Board of the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences on 18 March 2020, and by delegation of power on 23 October 2020 (due to an incompatibility with the Resolution pertaining to awarding combined doctoral degrees for interdisciplinary doctorates).

Article 1. Guidance of doctoral students

- 1) In accordance with the Education and Examination Code for Doctoral Matters, each student enrolling as a doctoral student for the first time in 2015-2016 or later, has to be coached by two or more people. The faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences offers two possibilities:
- 2) Appointing a second coach. At the suggestion of the administrative PhD promoter, a second coach can be appointed. This coach can be affiliated to Ghent University, to another Belgian university, to one of the strategic research centres established on the initiative of the Flemish government (VIB, IMEC, ...) or to another research institute of the Flemish government (ILVO, VLIZ, ...) - and has acquired proven expertise in the field of doctoral research. For substantiated reasons it is possible to depart from this rule, thus allowing that a second coach be appointed belonging to another (possibly foreign) institution. The assignment of the second coach will be presented for approval to the Faculty Board at the moment the decision about the first enrolment is made. If – for whatever reason – the second coach cannot or will not further pursue this task, the administrative PhD promoter will suggest a substitute to the Faculty Board.
- 3) Appointing more than one promoter. At the suggestion of the administrative PhD promoter, a second and possibly a third promoter can be appointed. The second and possibly third promoter are required to have a doctoral degree. If a third promoter is appointed, the three promoters need to be affiliated to at least two different research groups. The second and possibly third promoter are registered in Oasis. Appointing a second and possibly third promoter at the time of the first enrolment is not necessarily related to being a promoter when the doctoral dissertation is submitted. When the doctoral dissertation is submitted, these promoters may or may not be confirmed by the Faculty Board, following the advice of the administrative PhD promoter. However, the criteria for promoters mentioned above remain valid when the definitive promoters are appointed.

Article 2. Refusal of re-enrolment

In the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, the Faculty Committee for Scientific Research is responsible for advising the dean about the possibility of re-enrolment after a negative feedback from the promoter. The Faculty Committee for Scientific Research is free to determine *ad hoc* the procedure to be followed. In any case, the Faculty Committee for Scientific Research will give

the promoter and the doctoral student the opportunity to be heard. The ombudsperson for doctoral students is entitled to attend the meeting in an observer capacity.

Article 3. Composition of the Examination Board for the doctoral exam

- 1) The Examination Board consists of six members who are qualified to vote.
- 2) At least two, and maximum four members who are qualified to vote are not affiliated with the faculty. At least one of these members not affiliated with the faculty is external to Ghent University.
- 3) For each doctoral dissertation, a maximum of three promoters can be proposed. If a third promoter is appointed, the three promoters have to be affiliated with at least two different research groups. The promoter(s) will be added to the Examination Board as members who are not qualified to vote.
- 4) At least five of the members who are qualified to vote are required to have a doctoral degree.
- 5) The Faculty Board appoints a chair and a secretary from amongst the members who are qualified to vote and who are affiliated with the faculty.
- 6) The promoter(s) will present the composition of the Examination Board to the Faculty Board, by means of the PLATO application. Thus, the promoter simultaneously solemnly declares that the proposed composition of the Examination Board is in accordance with the relevant stipulations of the Education and Examination Code for Doctoral Matters (OER Doctoreren).

Article 4. Minimum contents of the doctoral dissertation

Besides the individual chapters describing the scientific work conducted, each doctoral dissertation should at least contain a front page, a table of contents, an acknowledgement and/or preface, a list of abbreviations, an introduction, a description of the objectives, a general conclusion, a summary and a curriculum vitae. Furthermore, each doctoral dissertation should contain a separate, prominent chapter entitled "Broader international context, relevance and future perspectives". In this chapter, the doctoral student clarifies the broader international perspective of his/her research, paying particular attention to its economic and/or social relevance/valorization, to the future developments to be expected in the discipline, and to the potential contribution of the research conducted to these developments.

Article 5. The doctoral exam – first deliberation (internal defence) of the doctoral dissertation by the Examination Board

- 1) At least 7 calendar days prior to the first deliberation (internal defence), each member of the Examination Board submits a written appraisal of the dissertation by means of the PLATO application. The written appraisal consists of two parts: the first part is intended for the chair only and mandatorily includes a recommendation on whether or not the public defence should be allowed. The second part provides the general view on the thesis and scientific content possibly including details on changes required, and is delivered to the student and to the chair.
- 2) At least 3 working days prior to the first deliberation (internal defence), the PLATO application will make the written appraisals of the members of the Examination Board available to the doctoral student (i.e. the second part of the appraisal which is intended for the student).

Should one or more of these written appraisals fail to be available in due time to the doctoral student, the first deliberation (internal defence) is postponed, if requested by the doctoral student.

- 3) The promoter attends the Examination Board meeting but is not entitled to vote and does not take part in the deliberation (i.e. the promoter leaves the room for the deliberation). If more than one promoter was appointed, the promoters have to designate one of them, who will attend the first deliberation (internal defence). If there is no consensus between the promoters, the Faculty Board decides which promoter will attend the Examination Board meeting.
- 4) During the first deliberation (internal defence) the doctoral student will give a short (max. 15 minutes) explanation about his/her work. After that, the Examination Board will evaluate the doctoral student's skills and competences.
- 5) The members of the Examination Board who are qualified to vote assess the doctoral student's skills and competences and deliberate on the basis of the written reports by each of the members who are qualified to vote and the hearing of the doctoral student, in the absence of the promoter.
- 6) The deliberation will result in one of the appraisals below:
 - a) No or only minor adjustments necessary, the doctoral student is admitted to the second part of the examination, i.e. the public defence of the doctoral dissertation (score A), a possibly (slightly) adapted version of the thesis needs not to (but can) be presented to the jury before the public defence;
 - b) The doctoral student is admitted to the second part of the examination, but only after substantial corrections have been made by the doctoral student to his/her doctoral dissertation. A (electronic) version (clean) of the revised doctoral dissertation, a (electronic) version of the revised dissertation with the revisions in track changes, and a rebuttal text are to be submitted to all members of the Examination Board at least 7 calendar days prior to the date on which the public defence is planned (score B); simultaneously, the doctoral student needs to provide evidence to the dean's office that he/she has indeed submitted his/her revised doctoral dissertation to the Examination Board within the prescribed period of time of 7 calendar days;
 - c) This work is of insufficient quality, the doctoral student is not admitted to the second part of the examination (score C).
- 7) After the deliberation, feedback is given to the candidate and the promoter. During this feedback the Examination Board will clarify what changes (if any) are required before the doctoral student can be admitted to the second part of the examination. In case the Examination Board decides to give the score "C", a detailed written report of the feedback will be drafted and will be sent to the doctoral student and the promoter.
- 8) The total duration of the first deliberation (internal defence) may not exceed 3 hours (deliberation included).

Article 6. The doctoral exam – public defence of the doctoral dissertation

- 1) The public defence should take place at the earliest 14 calendar days after the first deliberation (internal defence), except when permission for a suitable earlier date was granted based on a motivated request to the dean. In the end, it is up to the chair of the Examination Board, in joint consultation with the doctoral student, the promoter and the dean, to assess and decide about the necessary time lapse between the first deliberation (internal defence) and the public defence.
- 2) When a member of the Examination Board does not agree with the adjustments to the doctoral dissertation, he/she shall immediately report this to the chair of the Examination Board. The chair consults (possibly by electronic means) with the other members of the Examination Board, and can decide – at the latest 5 days before the planned date – to suspend the public defence. Such suspension is to be motivated in writing and delivered to the doctoral student, the promoter(s) and the dean. On the initiative of the doctoral student and/or the promoter(s), and via the chair, discussion with the Examination Board is initiated in order to adequately adapt the doctoral dissertation and to set new terms and dates.
- 3) In the second part of the doctoral exam, the doctoral student puts forward an oral and public presentation of his/her doctoral dissertation, accessible to a broad public and taking between 40 and 50 minutes.
- 4) Immediately afterwards, the student explains the broader international perspective of the conducted research, paying explicit attention to the economic and/or social relevance of the research, to anticipated future developments in the concerned discipline and to the potential contribution of his/her research to these developments. This explanation takes 10 to 15 minutes; it is an elaboration of the mandatory chapter in the doctoral dissertation called “Broader international context, relevance and future perspectives”. The slides used in this presentation have to be delivered electronically to all members of the Examination Board at least 2 working days prior to the public defence.
- 5) Next, the members of the Examination Board may interact with the doctoral student regarding the statements put forward in the second part of the public defence. This interactive discussion is limited to maximum 20 minutes.
- 6) After proclaiming the candidate a PhD in Pharmaceutical Sciences, the chair invites the candidate to pronounce the vow of integrity according to the following words:

Chair:

The doctoral degree is the highest academic diploma that can be awarded by a Belgian university. I now invite the candidate to pronounce the vow of integrity.

Doctor:

I receive this diploma as a scientist who independently can carry out scientific research for the benefit of mankind and society. I have always conducted my research in accordance with the European Code of Conduct for scientific integrity.

I do promise that scientific research carried out by me or under my supervision will always be in accordance with these principles. I also promise to propagate these principles in my scientific communications and when mentoring young scientists.

(Dutch version)

Voorzitter:

Het doctoraatsdiploma is het hoogste academische diploma dat kan worden uitgereikt door een Belgische universiteit. Ik nodig nu de kandidaat uit om de integriteitsgeloofte uit te spreken.

Doctor:

Ik ontvang dit diploma als wetenschapper die op een zelfstandige wijze wetenschappelijk onderzoek kan uitvoeren ten dienste van mens en maatschappij. Ik heb mijn onderzoek steeds gedaan conform aan de Europese gedragscode voor wetenschappelijke integriteit.

Ik beloof dat het wetenschappelijk onderzoek uitgevoerd door mij of onder mijn leiding steeds zal gebeuren conform deze beginselen. Tevens beloof ik deze principes uit te dragen in mijn wetenschapscommunicatie en bij het begeleiden van jonge wetenschappers.

Article 7. Timeline of the doctorate life cycle in the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences

In joint consultation with the dean and the chair of the Faculty Committee for Scientific Research, the dean's office draws up a compulsory timeline of the doctorate life cycle, as well as the different mandatory administrative steps which must be taken throughout the process. The timeline is available on the faculty website and through the PLATO application.