



## Additional Doctoral Regulations

---

*Translation of the Dutch version, which was approved by the Social Sciences Faculty Board on 24 September 2025.*

**Readers should be aware that only the Dutch version of these Regulations has legal force. This English translation is strictly for reference and cannot be invoked as a legal tool.**

---

### Title I. Scope

#### Article 1

These regulations apply to doctoral study programmes [hereafter 'PhD activities'] and PhDs undertaken in the faculty of Social Sciences at the Universiteit Antwerpen [hereafter 'FSW']. They are supplementary to the Higher Education Code dated 11 October 2013, ratified by the Decree dated 20 December 2013 with regard to earning the academic degree of doctor and to the general doctoral regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen.

### Title II. Division of authority among the boards and committees

#### Article 2

The bodies responsible for PhD activities and their supervision in FSW are the Faculty Board, the dean, the faculty doctoral and research commission (FDOC) and its chair, the Departmental Boards, the bureau of Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development of the Universiteit Antwerpen, the individual PhD commissions (IPC's), the staff member PhD administration and policy and the Peer Review Committee.

#### Article 3

The Faculty Board is responsible for:

- §1. adopting and adapting, where necessary, these supplementary faculty doctoral regulations;
- §2. the final decision to incorporate the modifications in the faculty points table as suggested by the Peer Review Committee;
- §3. appointing the members of the faculty doctoral and research commission (FDOC).

#### Article 4

The dean acts as a mediator in case of a conflict between PhD students and their supervisor(s) with regard to appeal against the individual PhD commission's or doctoral jury's decision, as specified in the general doctoral regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen (section 7).

## **Article 5**

The Departmental Boards for Communication Sciences, Training and Education Sciences, Political Sciences and Sociology – or, in the case of a PhD in Environmental Science: the bureau of the Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development – are responsible for:

- §1. admission to the Universiteit Antwerpen doctoral study programme and commencement of the PhD;
- §2. approval, in exceptional cases, of a third and/or fourth supervisor following a well-founded request;
- §3. determination of the study area and the academic title (see appendix 2). Students undertaking PhDs in a combined study area must obtain authorisation from all faculties concerned (unless there is a framework agreement between the faculties concerned so a notification suffices);
- §4. composition of the individual PhD commissions and juries, including the evaluation of the neutrality of at least one member of the IPC and two members of the jury, provided these comply with the provisions in Article 3 and Article 10 of these regulations and the general doctoral regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen;
- §5. granting permission to write the thesis in a language other than Dutch or English;
- §6. determination of any preparatory programme as described under Articles 10 and 11 of the general doctoral regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen;
- §7. approval of the partnership agreement in the case of a joint-, double- or multiple PhD;
- §8. granting exemptions from the requirements that apply to the doctoral study programme on behalf of incoming joint-, double- or multiple PhD students.

## **Article 6**

The faculty doctoral and research commission (FDOC) has decision-making authority with regard to the following aspects of the doctoral study programme:

- §1. coordination and organisation of certain PhD activities;
- §2. granting exemptions from certain PhD activities to PhD students working in non-academic roles or outside the university (in case Article 5, §7 is not applicable);
- §3. monitoring the number of approved requests for a third and/or fourth supervisor.

## **Article 7**

The chair of the FDOC is responsible for:

- §1. monitoring the research progress report of all doctoral students
- §2. taking on the administrative role of chair in the case of incoming joint PhDs and approving their research progress reports
- §3. gives advice in case the IPC wants to refuse a doctoral candidate after a negative evaluation of the research progress report (art. 20)
- §4. mediates in disputes between members of the IPC and the jury
- §5. approval of the expenses charged to the faculty doctoral commission.

## **Article 8**

The individual PhD commissions have the following responsibilities:

- §1. with regard to the preparatory programme for PhD students as determined, where necessary, by the Departmental Board (see Article 5, §5) the individual PhD commissions provide advice to the Departmental Board regarding the follow-up of this programme;
- §2. with regard to the PhD itself, the individual PhD commission monitors the progress and quality of the PhD, as determined in Article 13 of the general doctoral regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen.

## **Article 9**

The Peer Review Committee (PRC) is responsible for:

§1. The evaluation and approval of the report on the activities of the Doctoral Study Programme;

§2. The proposal of modifications to the faculty points table (adding and/or deleting activities, adding details; allocating points).

## **Title III. Composition and obligations of the individual PhD commission and the doctoral jury**

### **Article 10**

- a. A PhD is supervised by one or two supervisors. When supervisors want to make use of the exception discussed in Article 15 of the general PhD regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen and want three or four supervisors to supervise the PhD, they need to submit a motivated reapplication quest to the qualified Departmental Board.
- b. A maximum of 2 supervisors are associated with the same department. Therefore, the other supervisor(s) must be associated with another department or another faculty within or outside the University of Antwerp.
- c. In the motivated application (as determined in point a. of this article), supervisors must clearly indicate in what way the role of the additional supervisors is complementary, and how this role differs from the input they would have as regular members of the individual doctoral committee (as determined in Article 11 of these regulations and Article 14, Article 17, Article 18 and Article 19 of the general PhD regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen) or as regular project supervisors (who are not a supervisor of the PhD).

### **Article 11**

In consultation with the PhD student, the supervisor(s) formulate(s) a proposal for the composition of a suitable individual PhD commission (IPC), and, when the PhD is almost complete, a doctoral jury. They submit this proposal for approval to the Departmental Board.

### **Article 12**

The individual PhD commission is composed of the supervisor(s), furthermore preferably one member from the same department and one member from another department, faculty or university. In the event that Article 19c of the general doctoral regulations of the Universiteit Antwerpen is applicable, the Departmental Board must justify the composition. The role of chair is taken on by the commission member from the same department or another member of the Universiteit Antwerpen's senior academic staff (ZAP).

At least one member of the IPC is not directly involved in the doctoral research. In any case, co-authorship of a publication within the doctoral research field will be considered a form of direct involvement.

### **Article 13**

In the event of a conflict between (a) supervisor(s) and a PhD student, and in the event of an appeal against a decision of the IPC or the jury, the procedures described in "7. Mediation and appeal procedure" of the general doctoral regulations of Universiteit Antwerpen should be followed.

### **Article 14**

Every year before 1 May, all individual PhD commissions submit a report on the progress of the PhD to the chair of the faculty doctoral commission (FDOC) and to the chair of the department. The standard

form provided in the online *Studenten Informatie Systeem Antwerpen* (SisA) must be used for this report.

#### **Article 15**

In accordance with Article 26g of the general doctoral regulations of Universiteit Antwerpen, two members of the doctoral jury should not be directly involved in the doctoral research. In any case, co-authorship of a publication within the doctoral research field will be considered a form of direct involvement.

The chair of the IPC will also adopt the role of chair of the doctoral jury.

### **Title IV. Assessment process for the PhD**

#### **Article 16**

The chair of the faculty doctoral and research commission (FDOC) ensures that all individual PhD commissions (IPC) submit their progress reports, takes note of the content assessment and submits it for review to the dean and the Executive Committee. In case of a negative evaluation by the IPC, the chair of the FDOC formulates an advice in consultation with the chair of the department and the dean. On the basis of this advice, the IPC may decide to refuse the PhD student permission to reenrol for the current PhD (cf. article 20 of the general doctoral regulation of the Universiteit Antwerpen).

#### **Article 17**

Each year all PhD researchers are obligated to submit a report regarding the activities of the Doctoral Study Programme via SisA. For the evaluation of these reports a Peer Review Committee (PRC) is composed.

Each year the Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS) will take the initiative to compose the PRC and organise the PRC meeting. Each PhD researcher (with staff number) of the corresponding faculty can be a member of the PRC by submitting an application for nomination upon the call by ADS. The commitment for participation is set for one year. The next year a new call is launched. Enrolled PhD researchers as well as members of the senior academic staff (ZAP) can be part of the PRC. The number of participants in the PRC will be determined by the number of accepted participants and the number of PhD researchers of the according research discipline. If the number of accepted participants is insufficient to review the submitted reports within a reasonable timespan the PRC meeting can be postponed and a new call can be launched. Anyone who wants to participate in the PRC has the right to do so as long as they meet the conditions for participation.

In principle, one meeting will be scheduled to review the reports. This meeting will take place in May or June, depending on the availability of the PRC members. The evaluation will be done in SisA. For more information on the method of the PRC meeting the Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS) can be contacted.

Activities undertaken after obtaining the degree that gives access to the doctoral programme, but before the actual registration as a PhD student, can lead to partial or full exemptions in the doctoral programme. These activities need to be added in SisA to the first progress report of the doctoral study programme (PhD activities report).

## **Article 18**

With regard to the assessment of the progress report of the doctoral study programme (PhD activities report) and the research progress report, the chair of the FDOC may request a meeting with the PhD student. PhD students may also request a personal interview.

## **Article 19**

In addition to writing a thesis, teaching assistants also take on teaching duties for the faculty. For this reason, they are required to conduct an annual performance appraisal with the chair of the department, who provides the dean with a report of this interview (as described in the appendix to the Academic Assistant Staff (AAP) statute, 'Van aanwerving tot doctoraat' - 'From appointment to PhD'). In this performance appraisal, the teaching assistant and chair of the department assess whether the assistant has been able to spend at least half of his or her time conducting their PhD research.

## **Article 20**

The IPC members assess the thesis.

- a. They indicate whether the thesis is ready to be forwarded to the full doctoral jury, possibly subject to minor revisions to be verified by the supervisor(s), or whether it is not ready to be forwarded to the jury.
- b. If at least one of the IPC members believes that major changes to the thesis are necessary, the IPC will convene to make a decision. If the IPC decides that major changes are necessary, they will inform the doctoral candidate. In that case, the dissertation must be resubmitted to the IPC.

## **Article 21**

The members of the doctoral jury assess the dissertation.

- a. They indicate whether the dissertation is admitted to the public defence, possibly subject to minor revisions to be verified by the supervisor(s), or whether it is not admitted to the public defence. Jury members are given five weeks for this evaluation so that a reasoned decision can be communicated in writing to the doctoral candidate within six weeks (cf. Article 33 of the General Doctoral Regulations).

- b. If at least one of the jury members believes that major revisions are necessary, the doctoral jury convenes to reach a decision (cf. Article 32 of the General Doctoral Regulations). If the jury so desires, the doctoral jury may also hear the doctoral candidate. The doctoral jury may decide to:

1. admit the dissertation to the defence;
2. admit the dissertation to the defence on the condition that major revisions are made;
3. not admit the dissertation to the defence.

- c. If the dissertation is admitted to the defence on the condition that major revisions are made (cf. Article 35 of the General Doctoral Regulations), the reasoned decision must specify which revisions are required and by what deadline. However, the set deadline may not exceed three months. (If the requested changes take more than three months, the doctoral thesis will be assessed as “not admitted to public defense”). The doctoral candidate submits the revised version of the dissertation within the set deadline to the chair of the doctoral jury, who ensures timely distribution of the dissertation among the jury members. The chair communicates the jury's decision in writing to the doctoral candidate within four weeks. If the doctoral jury approves the revised dissertation for public defence, the timelines set out in Article 34 of the General Doctoral Regulations of the University of Antwerp begin. If the doctoral jury finds the revisions insufficient, or if the doctoral candidate fails to

complete the revisions within the deadline, the procedure concerning the finalization of the dissertation is suspended.

d. If the doctoral thesis is not admitted to the public defense, the procedure for completing the thesis will be suspended.

f. In case of suspension of the procedure concerning the finalization of the dissertation, the doctoral jury communicates in writing which steps are necessary to restart the procedure.

g. A dissertation may be submitted to a doctoral jury a maximum of two times. If the jury does not approve the second version (possibly subject to minor changes to be checked by the supervisor(s)), the doctorate is terminated.

## **Title V. The form of the thesis**

### **Article 22**

The thesis may be presented either as a monograph or as a coherent collection of publications intended for academic journals, or as a combination of the two. The individual PhD commission and doctoral jury assess the clarity and relevance of the problem definition, the methodological robustness, critical reflection of, and contribution to the field, the originality and creativity and the clarity of written style and structure.

### **Article 23**

When publications or papers with co-authors<sup>1</sup> are included in the doctoral thesis, the contribution of the PhD student and of all other co-authors should be made clear at the end. Quantitative indications of the contribution of each author are not imperative.

### **Article 24**

In addition to the integrity statement (see Appendix 4 of the General Doctoral Regulations), the doctoral candidate must also include a statement on the use of generative AI.

## **Title VI. Validity**

### **Article 25**

These regulations take effect as of 1 August 2025

---

<sup>1</sup> The faculty guidelines with regard to (co-)authorship can be found in appendix 3.

## Appendix 1. Structure and content of the FSW PhD activities

### 1. Activity table

As part of the doctoral study programme, PhD students are expected to hone their competences as young researchers. Using the [competence profile](#) for PhD students at the Universiteit Antwerpen, and in consultation with their supervisors, PhD students determine the activities that they will undertake.

Every year all PhD students need to submit a progress report of their doctoral activities in SisA.

In order to complete the doctoral study programme successfully, PhD students are required to submit an activity file according to the following general rules:

- the activities undertaken must amount to a total of at least 30 credits;
- at least 1 credit must have been earned in at least 4 categories of the competence profile;
- no more than half of the total number of credits may be earned in a single competence category;
- for all activities a supporting document is required;
- the mandatory training course "Mind the GAP" was successfully completed and the certificate of participation was delivered as proof (only applicable for doctoral students who started from academic year 2022-2023);
- the doctoral study programme needs to be completed before the official composition of the doctoral jury and following the procedures mentioned on the website of the Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS).

Competence categories
A. Research skills and techniques
B. Adaptation to the research environment
C. Research management
D. Personal efficiency
E. Communication skills
F. Networking and teamwork
G. Career management

The allocation of credits to each activity must correspond to the following table. Within the first two years, the PhD student must have given at least one doctoral seminar (see cat E). It is strongly recommended that the PhD student takes part in at least one international summer school (see cat A).

As determined in Article 6. §2, the faculty doctoral and research commission (FDOC) may grant exemptions from the PhD activity requirements to PhD students working in non-academic roles or outside the university.

The following list of activities is not exhaustive. The PhD student can formulate a well-founded proposition for other activities and their number of credits in their annual progress report in SisA.

Competence categories	Activity	Credits per activity	Maximum points	Enter in Sisa
A. Research skills and techniques	Postgraduate and other doctoral study programmes <sup>2</sup>	0.1 per contact hour (0,5 p/ECTS) <sup>3</sup>		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course
	Summer school	0.6 per day		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Summerschool
	Research residency at another institution (in the student's own country or abroad) lasting at least one month	3 per month (credits should be divided: 1.5 in comp. A + 1.5 in comp. F)		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Research Stay
	Attending a lecture	0.1 per hour		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Lecture/workshop
	Reviewer of manuscript	0.1 per manuscript		<b>Type:</b> 3. Publications and productions/creations <b>Activiteit:</b> Reviewer of manuscript
	Attending a faculty (PhD) research day	0.5		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Attending research day
	Correcting papers / exams in the context of a course	1	1 per academic year	<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Evaluation/Jury membership

<sup>2</sup> Language courses only when they are crucial for the PhD research, such as a course on academic English, Dutch course for international PhD students (who don't speak Dutch and work in Flanders) or another language that is necessary for conducting the PhD (e.g. for an international comparison for which certain language skills are required), they can be accepted in competence category A.

<sup>3</sup> Calculation based on ECTS may only be applied if no contact hours are specified on the certificate.



Competence categories	Activity	Credits per activity	Maximum points	Enter in Sisa
B. Adaptation to the research environment	Taking a course <sup>4</sup>	0.1 per contact hour (0,5 p/ECTS)		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course
	Membership of a board, (Peer Review)committee or editorial board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>board that meets frequently (at least 5 times a year): 0.5 per year</li> <li>board that doesn't meet frequently (fewer than 5 times a year): 0.1 per year</li> </ul>		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Membership board of committee
	Chair or secretary in a board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>board that meets frequently (at least 5 times a year): 1 per year</li> <li>board that doesn't meet frequently (fewer than 5 times a year): 0.5 per year</li> </ul>		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Chairmanship of board or committee
	Create or thorough revision of course material, like a chapter of a coursebook <sup>5</sup>	1 per part or chapter		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Teaching in higher education

<sup>4</sup> E.g. course on innovation management & entrepreneurship

<sup>5</sup> Writing a chapter of a course book falls under category D Personal efficiency.

	Student coaching	0,5 per year		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Formal mentoring system, mentorship of ombudsperson
	Course 'Mind the GAP' <sup>6</sup>	1		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course

---

<sup>6</sup> Mandatory for starting doctoral students beginning in academic year 2022-2023

Competence categories	Activity	Credits per activity	Maximum points	Enter in Sisa
C. Research management	Taking a course <sup>7</sup>	0.1 per contact hour (0,5 p/ECTS)		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course
	Supervising a Master or Bachelor dissertation <sup>8</sup>	1 per Master or Bachelor dissertation		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Supervision of Bachelor's or Master's thesis
	Assessment of a Master or Bachelor dissertation	0.3 per Master or Bachelor dissertation		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Supervision of Bachelor's or Master's thesis
	Supervision of students in the honours programme	1 per student		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Formal mentoring system, mentorship of ombudsperson
	Organising or helping to organise an academic conference lasting at least one day	0.5 per day	1 per conference	<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication Organisatie <b>Activiteit:</b> Organization of scientific of science popularizing activity
	Organising or helping to organise a science popularizing activity of conference for a broad audience lasting at least one day	0,2 per day	0,5 per activity/ conference	<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Organization of scientific of science popularizing activity
	Organising seminar series <sup>9</sup>	0,5 (series = min. 4 sessions of 1,5 hour)		<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Organization of scientific of science popularizing activity
	Participating in or completing project proposals (research project, individual PhD grant,...) <sup>10</sup>	Number of credits should be motivated for the peer review committee	1 per academic year	<b>Type:</b> 5. Project proposals and recognitions <b>Activiteit:</b> Writing a project proposal for FWO/VLAIO/BOF or similar <i>Of</i> Writing a project proposal for an individual PhD scholarship

Competence categories	Activity	Credits per activity	Maximum points	Enter in Sisa
D. Personal efficiency	Taking a course <sup>11</sup>	0.1 per contact hour (0,5 p/ECTS)		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course
	Author or co-author of an article in a refereed <sup>12</sup> academic journal, reader or series <sup>13</sup>	3 per published article		<b>Type:</b> 3. Publications and productions/creations <b>Activiteit:</b> Author
	Author or co-author of a refereed book or a chapter in a book	3 per book or chapter in a book		<b>Type:</b> 3. Publications and productions/creations <b>Activiteit:</b> Author
	Receiving a prize	0.2 per prize		<b>Type:</b> 5. Project proposals and recognitions <b>Activiteit:</b> Individual scientific prize
	Article in a non-refereed journal, reader or series <sup>14</sup>	0.5 per published article		<b>Type:</b> 3. Publications and productions/creations <b>Activiteit:</b> Author
	Editor of a book or thematic issue of a journal (with or without peer review) <sup>15</sup>	2 per book or issue		<b>Type:</b> 3. Publications and productions/creations <b>Activiteit:</b> Editor or editorial board member

<sup>7</sup> E.g. course on project management, Word, mindmapping

<sup>8</sup> A valid supporting document is either the cover of the Master dissertation, on which the PhD student is mentioned as a supervisor, or a written confirmation by the (main) supervisor.

<sup>9</sup> Also for own research group

<sup>10</sup> This includes grant applications. The PhD student must prove that he/she has substantially contributed to the proposal.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. course on time management, achieving your goals

<sup>12</sup> [Here](#) you can find a definition of the different publication types

<sup>13</sup> If an article was published in several languages, the article concerned can only be awarded credits once.

<sup>14</sup> This includes proceedingspapers (as co-author), articles and opinion pieces in newspapers and invited articles, blogposts, podcasts, etc. on scientific websites.

<sup>15</sup> Er wordt geen onderscheid gemaakt tussen met/zonder peer review.

	Review published in an academic journal	0.1 per article review 0.2 per book review		<b>Type:</b> 3. Publications and productions/creations <b>Activiteit:</b> Author
	Research report <sup>16</sup>	0.5 per report		<b>Type:</b> 3. Publications and productions/creations <b>Activiteit:</b> Author

Competence categories	Activity	Credits per activity	Maximum points	Enter in Sisa
E. Communication skills	Taking a course <sup>17</sup>	0.1 per contact hour (0,5 p/ECTS)	3 per semester	<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course
	Giving a (guest) lecture	0.5 per hour of lecturing		<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Teaching in higher education
	supervising a seminar, student research or practical course	0.1 per contact hour	3 per semester	<b>Type:</b> 2. Education and (academic) services <b>Activiteit:</b> Supervision of a practical
	Giving an academic presentation at a conference after acceptance of an abstract or paper	1.5 per (poster or paper) presentation		<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Giving a presentation
	Giving a doctoral seminar <sup>18</sup>	1 per seminar		<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Giving a presentation
	Presentation for a wider audience <sup>19</sup>	0.5 per presentation		<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Giving a presentation
	Construction or maintenance of an academic website <sup>20</sup>	0.5		<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Construction or maintenance of an academic website

<sup>16</sup> This includes research reports without ISBN. ISBN is not a criterion for the classification as a research report.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. course on giving presentations, (academic) writing, communication, Powerpoint, speed reading, webdesign, writing proposals, writing coaching

<sup>18</sup> This does not include: an internal defence or a presentation for the own research group.

<sup>19</sup> Including a presentation during the doctoral day

<sup>20</sup> Also a scientific blog, podcast, etc. fall under this. This differs from single articles, blogposts, podcasts. These fall under category D.

Competence categories	Activity	Credits per activity	Maximum points	Enter in Sisa
E. Communication skills	Interview or panel discussion for a wider audience <sup>21</sup>	0.1 per interview or panel discussion		<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Press conference or interview of Participant in panel discussion
	Serving as an opponent or discussant at an academic meeting <sup>22 23</sup>	0.5 per conference		<b>Type:</b> 4. (Academic) Communication <b>Activiteit:</b> Giving a presentation
F. Networking and teamwork	Taking a course <sup>24</sup>	0.1 per contact hour (0,5 p/ECTS)		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course
	Attending a conference <sup>22</sup>	0.5 per conference		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Networking
	Research residency at another institution (in the student's own country or abroad) lasting at least one month	3 per month (credits should be divided: 1.5 in comp. A + 1.5 in comp. F)		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Research stay

---

<sup>21</sup> This includes a press conference.

<sup>22</sup> Credits for attending a conference are awarded per conference, not per day.

<sup>23</sup> This includes serving as an opponent or discussant at a conference or a doctoral seminar.

<sup>24</sup> E.g. course on leadership and teamwork

Competence categories	Activity	Credits per activity	Maximum points	Enter in Sisa
G. Career management	Taking a course <sup>25</sup> (workrelated)	0.1 per contact hour (0,5 p/ECTS)		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Course
		Semester programme for starting assistant = 6		
	Internship or professional experience in a non-academic environment	3 per month	3 per Doctoral study programme	<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Internship of work experience in a non-academic environment
	Attending a career-oriented event	0.1 per hour		<b>Type:</b> 1. Courses and career development <b>Activiteit:</b> Attending career-oriented event
No credits for:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADS Doctoral day except for the substantive lecture (0.1 per hour);</li> <li>• Meetings with the Individual PhD commission (IPC);</li> <li>• Presentation for the own research group</li> <li>• Completing a survey</li> </ul>			

<sup>25</sup> E.g. course on solicitation techniques

## **2. Explanation of the activity table**

### *A. Research skills and techniques*

The first competence category contains different types of activity which are related to learning research skills and techniques. First, there are summer schools. These are courses of one or more weeks which introduce certain methods or techniques. Secondly, PhD students can follow postgraduate courses and training sessions or lectures in Belgium or abroad as part of their PhD activities. Moreover, PhD students can do research residencies in Belgium or abroad, during which they spend at least one month at a university or research institute where research is performed in the same field as the own PhD topic. The location is determined in consultation with the supervisor. For each research residency, half of the credits are awarded to competence category A (research skills and techniques) and half to the competence category F (networking and teamwork). Lastly, PhD students can review manuscripts or papers, correct exams or attend a faculty research day.

### *B. Adaptation to the research environment*

The second category covers all activities which allow PhD students to demonstrate their integration into the broad research and work environment. These activities include supporting research and teaching in the student's own institution (e.g. supervising a course component or Master dissertation, reworking a coursebook, being a member on a board). With regard to involvement in boards, a distinction is drawn between membership of boards which do not meet frequently (fewer than five times a year) and membership of a board which meets frequently (at least five times a year). Also, other credits apply when the PhD students serves as the chair or secretary of a board.

### *C. Research management*

With regard to the research management competence, the emphasis is on supervising or organising activities and projects. Activities may consist of supporting a group (seminar, student research or practical course), a master dissertation, or the organisation of an academic event. In the latter case, the number of credits awarded depends on the duration of the organized event.

### *D. Personal efficiency*

Acquiring and processing of scientific knowledge is classified under personal efficiency. Three groups can be distinguished. Firstly, successfully completed academic work and initiatives fall under this. This category mainly covers the completion of academic contributions in the form of scientific publications. Contributions to refereed and non-refereed journals, readers or series and authorship or co-authorship of books may also be awarded credits in this category. Reports are generally research reports written for clients outside the Universiteit Antwerpen, with a limited readership. No fundamental distinction is made based on the language in which the work is published. Only genuine authorship will be recognised, and not 'in cooperation with'. Publications can only be submitted when they have actually been accepted. Articles which have already been published must be included in the Universiteit Antwerpen's academic bibliography. Secondly, composing academic works as an editor is awarded credits in this competence. Thirdly, prizes are also recognised (e.g. for presentations or academic papers).

### *E. Communication skills*

This category covers a broad range of activities related mainly to academic and non-academic communication in the form of an oral presentation (guest lecture, conference presentation, doctoral seminar or presentation for a wider audience).

A doctoral seminar (or lunch seminar) has the goal (1) to promote communication about research among PhD students, (2) to receive feedback from peers (and senior researchers) and (3) provide an accessible platform to discuss (their own) research. In practice a doctoral seminar involves PhD students presenting one or more aspects of their own research to colleagues and other interested parties (also outside of their own research group), who provide them with comments and feedback. In general the purpose is to discuss practical difficulties, obstacles and unresolved issues. Amongst others, presentation could be on the approach and design of the PhD research, research results, research proposals, etc. All PhD students give



at least one doctoral seminar within the department during the first two years of their PhD. It is however recommended to give at least two presentations.

Per department, PhD students are supposed to take the initiative to organise these seminars. This means: selecting dates, sending calls for presentations, distribute announcements and invitations within the department. Organizing doctoral seminars can receive credits as “Organizing a seminar series” in category C. Participating as discussant can be submitted for credits under category E as ‘Serving as an opponent or discussant at an academic meeting’ (see also footnote 19). Further information and good practices can be obtained from the faculty doctoral administration.

#### *F. Networking and teamwork*

The competences in this category relate to the development of national and international networks. Activities which contribute to this include participation in scientific conferences or research residencies at other institutions. Participating in an scientific conference and giving a presentation at the same conference can be reported as separate activities (in the relevant competence categories).

#### *G. Career management*

Depending on the PhD students' individual study pathways, career objectives can be identified, CVs geared towards these objectives and application/interview techniques acquired. ADS provides training and workshops aimed at honing these skills. In this framework the semester programmes for starting assistants will be recognised as well.

#### ***Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS) courses***

PhD students can participate in the courses offered by ADS for credits in all categories (see table above). Each of these training courses aims to strengthen a specific competence, as specified on the ADS webpage describing the [courses on offer](#). These training courses are recognised as indicated in the overview shown on the ADS website or, if the number of credits is not shown, according to the number of contact hours (0.1 credit per contact hour). **ADS courses taken from the academic year 2015-2016 onwards, will be automatically added to the progress summary in SisA, so PhD students shouldn't add these courses manually to their annual progress report of the doctoral study programme.**

## BIJLAGE 2. OVERZICHT VAN DOCTORTITELS FSW

### Doctor in de ...

filmstudies en visuele cultuur  
informatie- en bibliotheekwetenschap  
onderwijswetenschappen  
sociale wetenschappen  
sociale wetenschappen: communicatiewetenschappen  
sociale wetenschappen: politieke communicatie  
sociale wetenschappen: politieke wetenschappen  
sociale wetenschappen: sociaal werk  
sociale wetenschappen: sociologie

### *Gecombineerde studiegebieden*

### Doctor in de ...

sociaal-economische wetenschappen	i.s.m. Faculteit Bedrijfswetenschappen en Economie (BE)
milieuwetenschap	i.s.m. Faculteit Wetenschappen
veiligheidswetenschappen	i.s.m. Faculteit Bedrijfswetenschappen en Economie (BE) en Faculteit Rechten

### Doctor of ...

Film Studies and Visual Culture  
Information and Library Science  
Education Sciences  
Social Sciences  
Social Sciences: Communication Studies  
Social Sciences: Political Communication  
Social Sciences: Political Science  
Social Sciences: Social Work  
Social Sciences: Sociology

### *Combined study areas*

### Doctor of ...

Social and Economic Sciences	with Faculty of Business and Economics
Environmental Science	with Faculty of Science
Safety Sciences	with Faculty of Business and Economics and Faculty of Law

## **Appendix 3. Code of practice**

### **1 Introduction**

Authorship is an explicit way of giving credit for intellectual work and assigning responsibility. Discussions on authorship ideally start at the inception of a research project. Decisions about authorship and about acknowledgement (i.e. the way to recognize people who have contributed otherwise but who do not fulfill the authorship criteria) normally result from a process of ongoing communication, reflection and/or revision as the project evolves throughout its duration.

### **2 Authorship criteria**

2.1. Generally, an author is considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. Authorship should be restricted to individuals who:

- made a substantial intellectual contribution to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition/collection, analysis or interpretation of data for the work;
- and substantially contributed to the drafting of the manuscript (e.g. article, paper, book) or substantively critically revised its content;
- and approved the final version of the publication to be published;
- and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work could be appropriately investigated and resolved.

In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work they have done, authors should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, authors should have justified confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors.

2.2. All individuals who are affected by authorship should be involved in the communication, discussion and decision-making on authorship in order to ensure that they reach agreement together, have clear expectations about and can robustly defend their own individual authorship positions and the authorship position of others (individuals who join the project at a later stage, who are affected by authorship, should be involved).

All authors should confirm the list of co-authors in a written understanding (written records, e-mails of decisions on authorship can help avoid potential misunderstandings).

2.3. No person who fulfils the authorship criteria may be excluded as an author. This applies to all publication types.

2.4. Individuals who are affected by authorship decisions should be notified of changes in a timely manner and in writing; each alteration in the author list should be approved by all authors.

2.5. The work of all contributors and collaborators who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be properly acknowledged in publications. This may include advisers, communities, funders, individuals, sponsors, or others.

2.6. Where a research project would not have been possible without, and builds upon, the efforts of other researchers' previously published research, that previous research should be properly cited.

2.7. Together, the authors should attempt to reach a consensus on the sequence of authorship. Every author should be prepared to explain the rationale for the agreed author sequence.

### **3. Publications in a PhD and the autonomy of the PhD student**

The author guidelines will be applied within the framework of the faculty doctoral regulations. For papers included in the PhD, it is expected that the student had a substantial contribution to drafting the manuscript. Students will also give a full description of their contribution to each publication, describing at least how much they contributed to the conception of the project, the design of methodology or experimental protocol, data collection, analysis, drafting the manuscript, revising it critically for important intellectual content.