

**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.**

## **GENERAL REGULATIONS ON OBTAINING THE ACADEMIC DEGREE OF DOCTOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ANTWERP**

**supplemented by the**

### **FACULTY REGULATIONS FOR THE DOCTORATE IN APPLIED ENGINEERING**

APPROVED BY THE FACULTY PHD COMMISSION of 12/09/2025 & 10/10/2025 AND THE FACULTY BOARD OF 26/09/2025 & 17/10/2025

#### **0. Definitions**

- These regulations use the term '**faculty**' to refer to the University of Antwerp's faculties, the Institute of Development Policy (IOB), the Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts (ARIA) and the associated Faculty of Nautical Sciences. All faculties may also delegate authority to sub-entities such as departmental boards.
- **Qualification of a degree:** suffix that refers to a study area (Higher Education Codex, Art. I.3, sub 39). The qualification therefore indicates the specific title of the academic degree of doctor being conferred<sup>1</sup>.
- **AUHA:** Antwerp University Association (Dutch: *Associatie Universiteit & Hogescholen Antwerpen*)

#### **1. Regulations**

##### **1. General provisions**

1. These regulations determine the requirements and procedures for obtaining the academic degree of doctor at the University of Antwerp (UAntwerp). The charter for PhD researchers<sup>2</sup> included in this document as Appendix 1 applies to all PhD researchers and their supervisors. The [code of conduct transgressive behaviour](#), which is included as a separate attachment to this document, applies to all PhD researchers, as well as all students and staff of UAntwerp.

2. The study areas and qualifications in which the degree of doctor can be obtained at UAntwerp are shown in Appendix 2. The qualification determines which faculty is responsible for overseeing and awarding the PhD. In case of an interdisciplinary PhD, two qualifications on this list are combined to form a new degree of doctor.

3. The academic degree of "doctor" (doctor of philosophy, abbreviated to PhD or Dr) is obtained after the public defence of a doctoral thesis. This thesis serves to demonstrate the PhD researcher's ability to generate new scientific knowledge on the basis of independent, sound scientific research as described in the Higher Education Codex (Art. II.58, § 7).

4. Besides preparing a thesis, PhD researchers are also expected to meet the requirements of the doctoral study programme coordinated by the Antwerp Doctoral School. These requirements are described in the additional faculty PhD regulations, which may include the option of imposing a mandatory study programme on PhD researchers.

5. The additional faculty PhD regulations describe the modalities and procedures to be used for progress reports, as well as the form and assessment of the thesis and the doctoral study programme. These additional regulations are approved by the faculty upon the recommendation of the Bureau of the Antwerp Doctoral School, which checks them against the general PhD regulations.

## **I. General provisions**

**Art. TI1.** These regulations apply to PhDs at the Faculty of Applied Engineering (TI) of the University of Antwerp. This includes the doctoral training program and the doctorate by dissertation. It is supplementary to the PhD Regulations of the University of Antwerp and the Regulations on Doctoral Training Programme, approved by the Board of Governors of the University of Antwerp dated 2015. 18.02.2025.

**Art. TI2.** Within the Faculty of TI, the following councils, committees and persons are responsible for PhDs:

- the Faculty Council (FR);
- the Faculty Doctoral Committee (FDOC);
- the individual doctoral committees (IPC);
- the Faculty Coordinator of PhDs (FCD);
- and the Peer Review Committee (PRC).

It is the research committee (OZC) of the TI faculty that will take on the task of FDOC. The chair of the OZC serves as chair of the FDOC and as faculty coordinator for doctorates (FCD). The administrative manager for the TI doctoral training programme attends the meetings of the FDOC as a minute-taker. The competence of these councils and committees in connection with PhDs is discussed in the following articles.

**Art. TI3.** The Faculty Council has decision-making power regarding PhDs on:

- a) the composition of the doctoral jury and the appointment of a chair and secretary when a candidate is admitted to the defence of the thesis;
- b) appointing a faculty coordinator for PhDs (FCD), who is also chair of the FDOC;
- c) Appointing the faculty ombudspersons for PhD students.

**Art. TI4.** The FDOC has decision-making power regarding PhDs:

- a) the organisation, quality control and follow-up of the doctoral training programme; The FDOC is responsible for drawing up and adjusting the transcripts for the doctoral training programme, determining which activities are eligible and how many points are awarded to them. The FDOC discusses the changes proposed by the peer review committee and decides whether to implement them;
- b) the decision on admission to a PhD on the basis of an aptitude assessment of the candidate and of the proposed research project;
- c) designating the supervisor(s) of the dissertation;
- d) the composition of the IPC and the appointment of a chair of the IPC when a candidate is admitted to the PhD. The promoter formulates a proposal to the FDOC for this;
- e) defining the content and follow-up of any preparatory programme, and deciding whether this programme has been successfully completed
- f) take note of the evaluation reports of research submitted by candidates and doctoral committees;
- g) take note of the annual reports of the doctoral training programme submitted by the candidates and the faculty peer review committee;
- h) granting permission to write the PhD in a language other than Dutch or English;
- i) drawing up a proposal for the doctoral jury, including chair and secretary, for the Faculty Council;
- j) the approval of the cooperation agreement for the joint doctorates, doubled doctorates or multiple doctorates.

**Art. TI5.** The IPC has decision-making power regarding doctorates:

- a) the evaluation of the progress of the doctoral work of the doctoral student on the basis of a report and possibly personal contact.

**Art. TI6.** The FCD has advisory authority to the FDOC on doctorates on:

- a) coordination of the evaluation of the annual progress report of the doctoral training programme together with the Antwerp Doctoral School, for which the FDOC relies on a faculty peer review committee to be set up annually.

**Art. TI7.** Every year, the Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS) takes the initiative to set up a peer review committee (PRC) and to organise a PRC meeting for the evaluation and assessment of the activities for the doctoral training programme. The number of members of the PRC is determined on the basis of the number of selected candidates and the number of PhD students within the relevant discipline. Any PhD student with a personnel number can apply. Participation is valid for one year. The PRC has decision-making power with regard to the doctoral training programme on:

- a) the evaluation and approval of the reported activities of the doctoral training programme;  
With regard to the doctoral training programme, the PRC has advisory authority on:
- a) proposing adjustments to the faculty table of points (adding and deleting activities, adding details, awarding points).

---

<sup>1</sup>In these regulations, the research discipline is equated to the diploma qualification.

<sup>2</sup> For readability reasons, we consistently use the following terms: 'PhD researcher'/'PhD student', 'supervisor', 'chair', 'representative'. However, the text applies to all persons regardless of their gender identity (M/F/X).

## 2. Admission and enrolment

6. PhD researchers wishing to obtain the academic degree of doctor must enrol as a PhD student every academic year during the enrolment period. For more information about the admission and enrolment procedures, please see Appendix 3 of these regulations.

7. Enrolment for the preparation of a doctoral thesis is open to holders of the degree of Master (or equivalent), provided Articles 9), 10) and 11) are taken into account.

8. In order to obtain permission to enrol for the preparation of a thesis, candidate PhD students must send a written application to the faculty via the Registrar's Office (Dutch: *Centrale Onderwijsadministratie*) containing information about themselves and the PhD project. The faculty will decide on the suitability of the candidate and the research topic within a reasonable period of time following receipt of the application (appendix 3).

9. The faculty may waive the admission requirements mentioned in Article 7 for candidates who are not in possession of a Master's degree or equivalent. This waiver depends on the results of an enquiry whose goal is to establish that the candidate has the research-related competences normally acquired during a Master's programme on the basis of the Master competences or the Dublin descriptors. The faculty informs both the candidate and the Registrar's Office of its decision. In the event of doubt, the application will be submitted to the Bureau of the Antwerp Doctoral School.

10. For the categories of candidate PhD students listed below, it is possible for the faculty to grant admission conditional upon the successful finalisation of a preparatory programme:

- candidates wishing to obtain the degree of doctor in a different discipline from the one in which they obtained their Master's degree;
- candidates with a Master's degree from an institution outside of the Flemish Community;
- candidates who do not hold a Master's degree.

11. The faculty is responsible for the composition and follow-up of the preparatory programme. The candidate should enrol in the preparatory programme on the basis of a diploma contract. Before enrolling as a PhD student, the candidate must be able to demonstrate successful completion of all components of the preparatory programme. The faculty may allow candidates to complete their preparatory programmes during the first years of their PhDs. In that case, students must be able to demonstrate that they have passed the preparatory programme before being allowed to enrol in the second year. The preparatory programme is not eligible for recognition as part of the doctoral study programme.

12. UAntwerp PhD students are automatically enrolled in the doctoral study programme. The faculty may exempt PhD students from the doctoral study programme if it can be shown that they fulfil the requirements of the doctoral study programme – as outlined in the faculty PhD regulations – before embarking on their PhDs.

## II. Admission

**Art. TI18.** The PhD at the Faculty of TI is open to any candidate who meets the conditions as provided for in the General PhD regulations, and who has also obtained explicit permission after a suitability test by the FDOC.

**Art. TI19.** The suitability assessment of a candidate by the FDOC is based on a dossier as stipulated in the general doctoral regulations. A language test can be part of the suitability test.

**Art. TI10.** The result of the suitability test must be communicated to the candidate within a reasonable period of time. A reasonable period of time is 6 to 8 weeks. This period cannot be guaranteed between 20 July and 31 August.

**Art. TI11.** If the FDOC imposes a preparatory program with preliminary examinations on the candidate, it will inform the candidate of this within a reasonable period of time. This extra preparatory programme consists of a maximum of 30 credits. In justified cases, EVCs and/or EFCs can be contributed for part or all of the preparatory programme. This program cannot be part of the candidate's doctoral training program. The candidate will register with the central education administration with a diploma contract for the components in this preparatory programme.

### 3. Supervision – individual PhD commission (IPC) – faculty PhD commissions

13. The supervisor(s) is (are) responsible for the supervision of the doctoral work. If the nature of the research requires confidentiality, the supervisor(s), in consultation with the Valorisation Office and prior to the discussions by the IPC, contact the chair of the IPC to take the necessary measures to maintain confidentiality. The IPC is responsible for monitoring the progress of the PhD research and for mediation as necessary. The IPC may be convened at any time at the request of the PhD researcher or one of the IPC members.

14. Following approval of the candidate and the research topic, the faculty appoints the supervisor(s) and the chair and members of the IPC. The chair should be a member of the senior academic staff (Dutch: *zelfstandig academisch personeel*, ZAP) at UAntwerp or an emeritus with assignment (contract research staff (Dutch: *bijzonder academisch personeel*, BAP) statute in accordance with the retirement regulations of UAntwerp), but cannot be the PhD researcher's supervisor. The chair is not necessarily required to be a member of the IPC. If the nature of the research requires confidentiality (reported by the supervisor(s)), the chair will take the necessary measures to maintain confidentiality, prior to the discussions by the IPC.

15. The doctoral thesis is generally prepared under the guidance and supervision of one or two supervisors. If additional expertise is required to ensure the high-quality supervision of the PhD research, the faculty may appoint one or two additional supervisors – up to a maximum of four in total, at most three of whom may be affiliated with AUHA.

16.a. All supervisors should be in possession of the academic degree of doctor or '*geaggregeerde voor het hoger onderwijs*' also taking into account the provisions of Article 19.

16.b. At least one of the supervisors should be a member of the UAntwerp senior academic staff (ZAP) with an appointment of at least 10% or an emeritus with assignment (contract research staff (Dutch: *bijzonder academisch personeel*, BAP) statute in accordance with the retirement regulations of UAntwerp).

17.a. The IPC is composed of all of the supervisors and supplemented by two additional members who have sufficient expertise and affinity with the research field to be able to assess the progress of the doctoral work.

17.b. All IPC members should be in possession of the academic degree of doctor or '*geaggregeerde voor het hoger onderwijs*' also taking the provisions of Article 19 into account.

17.c. At least two members of the IPC should be members of the UAntwerp senior academic staff (ZAP) or an emeritus with assignment (contract research staff (Dutch: *bijzonder academisch personeel*, BAP) statute in accordance with the retirement regulations of UAntwerp). If the PhD is being undertaken in the study area "Nautical Sciences", one of these two ZAP members may be replaced by a member of the teaching staff appointed in Group 3 (OP3) at an AUHA university college.

18.a. In order to guarantee the referee function of the IPC, at least one of the commission members must not be directly involved in the PhD project. The faculty assesses the IPC members' neutrality.

18.b. The following persons can never be appointed as members of the IPC: the PhD researcher's husband, wife or legally cohabiting partner, partner or blood or other relatives up to and including the fourth degree.

18.c. The chair of the IPC may invite additional experts to advise during IPC meetings if it is believed that this would benefit the supervision of the PhD.

19.a. For PhDs in the study areas "Architecture", "Movement and Rehabilitation Sciences", "Conservation and Restoration", "Applied Engineering and Technology", "Product Development", "Applied Language Studies" and "Nautical Sciences", a deviation from the PhD requirement mentioned in Articles 16a and 17b may be possible for teaching staff appointed in Group 3 (OP3).

19.b. For PhDs in the study areas "Audiovisual and Visual Arts" and "Music and Performing Arts", a deviation from the PhD requirement mentioned in Articles 16a and 17b may be possible for members of staff from the AUHA Schools of Arts provided that these members of staff are in possession of expertise that is essential to the supervision of the PhD research.

19.c. For PhDs that have been prepared in close cooperation with the professional field, deviation from the PhD requirement described in Articles 16a and 17b may be possible provided that the professional advisors concerned are in possession of expertise that is essential to the supervision of the PhD research.

20. On a regular basis – ideally every year and at least every two years – the IPC evaluates the progress of the PhD researcher's doctoral research on the basis of a report and preferably a personal meeting. The IPC decides whether the progress is sufficient and provides a report of this decision to the faculty. If the PhD researcher fails to submit a report without a valid reason, this automatically leads to a negative evaluation ("insufficient progress"). Following a negative evaluation and recommendation from the faculty PhD commission or other body designated by the faculty, the IPC may refuse the PhD researcher permission to reenrol for the current PhD.

21. Every year, the faculty PhD commission follows up on each PhD researcher's progress in the doctoral study programme on the basis of a report. The faculty PhD commission reports on this to the faculty and to the Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS).

### III. Supervision

**Art. TI12.** The supervisor(s) is (are) responsible for supervising the doctoral work. A change of supervisor, at the request of the supervisor, IPC or PhD student, is submitted to the FDOC by the IPC chairman. The IPC Chair will provide written confirmation from the current supervisor, a reasoned explanation, and an amended proposal for the new IPC composition. In exceptional circumstances where consultation with the promoter is not possible, the IPC Chair may request FDOC intervention. If the FDOC accepts the change of supervisor, the individual doctoral committee (IPC) will be adjusted and the FDOC will notify the supervisor.

**Art. TI13.** The IPC consists of all supervisors and is supplemented by two additional members, a chairman and a member. The IPC is composed in accordance with the PhD regulations of the University of Antwerp, with due observance of the following provisions. The IPC chair is a member of the independent academic staff (ZAP) at the University of Antwerp or emeritus with assignment and is not a member of the same research group as the supervisors. The additional IPC member has sufficient expertise in and affinity with the research domain to be able to monitor the progress of the doctoral work. For incoming joint PhDs, double PhDs or multiple PhDs, a limited IPC, consisting of the University of Antwerp supervisor(s) and the chair, is sufficient to monitor the progress of the PhD research.

### IV. Doctoral training programme

**Art. TI14.** Within the doctoral training programme, PhD students need to sharpen their competencies as young researchers. They must report on this annually via the online Student Information System Antwerp (SisA). With the help of the competency profile for PhD students at the University of Antwerp, PhD students determine in consultation with their supervisor(s) which activities they undertake for this purpose. In order to successfully complete the doctoral training programme, the PhD students submit an activity file to which the following general rules apply:

- a) activities must have been undertaken for a total of at least 30 points;
- b) at least 1 point must be obtained in at least 4 categories of the competency profile;
- c) a maximum of half of the total number of points may have been obtained in one competency category;
- d) Proof of participation must be provided for all activities, clearly showing which activity is involved, when it took place and who participated in it. More information about the valid supporting documents can be found on the ADS website. Exceptionally, if there is no evidence for a particular activity, a signed confirmation from the promoter may suffice. It is not permitted to use the signature of the promoter as sole proof of all activities.
- e) The mandatory training '[Mind the GAP](#)' was successfully completed and the certificate of participation was provided as proof (*only applicable for PhD students starting from academic year 2022-2023*). More information is available on the ADS website.

**Art. TI15.** For the allocation of points per activity, the table of points in Appendix 1 with the specifications and limitations as included in Articles 13 to 17 of these Supplementary Regulations applies. The maximum amounts mentioned apply to the entire doctoral training programme. The table also mentions the category in SisA where the activity belongs. The categories in SisA are:

1. Training and career development
2. Education and (academic) services

3. Publications and productions/realisations
4. (Academic) communication
5. Project proposals and recognitions

**Art. TI16.** In general, the following specifications apply:

- a) The points in the table, determined by the faculty of TI, apply to all PhD students who are doing a PhD within the study areas TI;
- b) The maximum points to be obtained are limited per category and activity as shown in the table and articles 13-15;
- c) The following specification applies to training and courses:
  - Training and courses = max. 9 points in total for the entire doctoral training programme;
  - Teaching, practical and educational guidance = max. 9 points in total for the entire doctoral training programme;
- d) In the reporting, the competency category (e.g. A.1., C.4., etc.) should be mentioned.
- e) Only personal grant applications, e.g. FWO, can count once. Project applications are not eligible.
- f) Maximums are not yet taken into account when activities are approved annually. This only happens at the end of the doctoral training programme. Activities will therefore not be refused if the maximum number of points in that category has already been reached. The PhD student must therefore enter all activities with the correct number of points in SisA.
- g) Activities followed after obtaining the diploma that provides access to the registration for the preparation of the dissertation, but before the actual enrolment, may be eligible for funding in full or in part within the framework of the doctoral training programme. To do this, a motivated application must be submitted to the FDOC upon registration, supported by the necessary documents.

**Art. TI17.** The list of activities in Appendix 1 is not exhaustive. If an activity is not included in the pointstable, a reasoned proposal for the number of points to be awarded can be submitted to the FDOC.

**Art. TI18.** In very exceptional circumstances, candidates with special qualifications may be exempted from the obligations and restrictions set out in Articles 13 to 16. This concerns activities and competencies acquired before the start of the doctoral training programme that can be charged for the doctoral training programme. To this end, the student submits a motivated proposal to the FDOC, supported by the necessary documents.

## V. Evaluation

**Art. TI19.** Every year before 1 May, each PhD student submits a progress report for the doctoral training programme via SisA Selfservice. In this report, the candidate demonstrates which activities have been carried out and to what extent the 30 credits of the doctoral training programme have already been obtained. ADS organizes the communication about this. The evaluation is done by a faculty peer review committee, composed by ADS.

**Art. TI20.** The progress of the study is evaluated by the IPC at least every two years. The timing of the progress report is linked to the effective start date of the doctoral research. This date will be communicated by the supervisor to the faculty doctoral administration upon registration. At the start of the PhD, the PhD students take the initiative for an informal introduction to the members of their IPC.

**Art. TI21.** In the first half of the second year of research (based on the effective start date), the PhD student submits the progress report via SisA. The PhD student receives the necessary communication and the template for the progress report from the faculty doctoral administration. The PhD student checks the deadline for the progress report research in SisA. After submitting the progress report, the PhD student will contact the IPC members to set a date for a meeting in which the PhD student will explain the progress report orally with the help of a presentation. The meeting must take place between 15 and 18 months after the start of the doctoral research. The evaluation report is submitted no later than 2 months after the meeting.

**Art. TI22.** In the meeting, the IPC provides feedback on the progress and results of the doctoral work and possibly provides recommendations for further research plans. Based on the meeting, the IPC evaluates whether the PhD student has made sufficient progress to continue the PhD trajectory. The IPC may decide that the student will be heard again in the third year according to the same procedure.



**Art. TI23.** At the start of the fourth research year, the PhD student submits a written report in SisA between 36 and no later than 42 months after the start of the doctoral research. The faculty doctoral administration provides a template for this. The IPC assesses this report. The IPC can also always ask for an oral explanation as in Article 21.

**Art. TI24.** The reporting in the fourth year of research will lapse if the PhD student submits a first version of the thesis to the IPC before the deadline of the research progress report before the start of the defence procedure.

**Art. TI25.** If the PhD has not been completed after four years, the PhD student will be evaluated by the IPC at the beginning of each research year as provided for in Article 23. In the case of fellowship assistants with a six-year research trajectory, an evaluation will follow at the start of the first half of the sixth research year as described in articles 23 and 24. If their PhD has not been completed after six years, an annual evaluation will also follow as described in article 23.

**Art. TI26.** The evaluations are sufficiently motivated.

In the case of a 'favourable and subject to change' evaluation, the IPC judges that progress requires additional follow-up. The evaluation report formulates the SMART points for improvement and/or action. The IPC requests the PhD student to submit a progress report on the requested action points by a feasible deadline. The IPC may always request an oral explanation as provided for in Article 21. The IPC assesses the progress and submits a new evaluation report.

In the case of a negative evaluation, it is formulated in detail why the progress is insufficient. The IPC chair will immediately report this decision to the faculty doctoral administration. The latter submits the evaluation dossier to the FDOC for advice, which may decide to hear both parties.

**Art. TI27.** After consensus of the IPC, the IPC chairman uploads the evaluation into SisA, after which the FDOC takes note of the evaluation conducted.

**Art. TI28.** Failure to submit a progress report after two reminders and without a valid reason will automatically lead to a negative assessment.

#### **4. Public defence of the doctoral thesis**

22. The thesis may take the form of a monograph, a collection of manuscripts, an artistic or design work or a combination of these forms. If the thesis consists of a collection of academic manuscripts, the faculty may impose the condition that at least one of these manuscripts has been published.

23. The thesis should be written and defended in Dutch or English. It may be written and defended in another language provided that written permission has been obtained for this from the faculty. This permission is not necessary if the topic of the thesis is another language, culture or literature. Dutch and English abstracts must be included in all theses.



24. The thesis must contain the identification details listed in Appendix 4 of these regulations.

25. The faculty determines the composition of the doctoral jury after having verified that the PhD researcher is enrolled as a PhD student at the University of Antwerp and has fulfilled the requirements of the doctoral study programme. The composition of the jury does not imply that the thesis (or draft) has been approved.

26.a. The doctoral jury consists of a minimum of five and a maximum of eight members.

26.b. All supervisors are members of the doctoral jury.

26.c. No more than half of the doctoral jury may be made up of the PhD researcher's supervisors.

26.d. Ideally, the members of the IPC should be members of the doctoral jury.

26.e. At least three members of the doctoral jury must be UAntwerp senior academic staff (ZAP) or an emeritus from UAntwerp (regardless of their statute: with assignment, with occasional activity or without assignment or activity for the university), also taking into account sub i and Article 45.

26.f. At least two members of the doctoral jury should be external to AUHA.

26.g. In order to guarantee the referee function of the doctoral jury, at least two members of the jury must not be directly involved in the PhD project. The faculty assesses the doctoral jury members' neutrality.

26.h. The following persons can never be appointed as members of the doctoral jury: the PhD researcher's husband, wife or legally cohabiting partner, partner or blood or other relatives up to and including the fourth degree.

26.i. In the case of a PhD in the study areas "Audiovisual and Visual Arts", "Music and Performing Arts" and "Nautical Sciences", at least one member of the doctoral jury must have a statutory appointment as a member of teaching staff at one of AUHA's university colleges. In the event of deviation from sub e, at least two other members must belong to the UAntwerp senior academic staff (ZAP).

26.j. When the doctoral jury is appointed, maximum attention is given to the diversity of its composition, including gender balance. It is strongly recommended that the composition of the doctoral jury - where possible - should not be homogeneous in terms of gender identity.

27.a. The members of the doctoral jury must hold PhD degrees or a degree of *'geaggregeerde voor het hoger onderwijs'*, also taking into account the stipulations of sub b, c and d.

27.b. Supervisors and other members of the IPC who do not hold PhDs but have been appointed according to Article 19 can also be designated as members of the doctoral jury.

27.c. For PhDs in the study areas "Architecture", "Movement and Rehabilitation Sciences", "Conservation and Restoration", "Applied Engineering and Technology", "Product Development", "Applied Language Studies", "Audiovisual and Visual Arts", "Music and Performing Arts" and "Nautical Sciences", a deviation from the PhD requirement mentioned in sub a may be possible for persons external to the University of Antwerp if this is important for the evaluation of the PhD.

27.d. The deviation from the PhD requirement as described in sub b and c can be granted to a maximum of three members of the doctoral jury, but never to more than half of the jury members.

28. The faculty appoints a chair from amongst the members of the doctoral jury. The chair of the doctoral jury should be a member of the senior academic staff (ZAP) at UAntwerp, but not one of the PhD researcher's supervisors.

29. With regard to study areas or parts of study areas in which UAntwerp provides only Bachelor-level courses, the doctoral jury must include at least one member from a university that is able to offer Master's degrees within the study area concerned (Higher Education Codex, Art. II.73 §3).

30. The procedure for the public defence of the thesis begins when the PhD researcher sends the appropriate number of copies of the draft thesis to the chair of the IPC. The chair is responsible for distributing the draft thesis among the other members of the IPC. Article 6 applies if the procedure for the defence of the thesis extends into the next academic year.

31. The IPC has a maximum of four weeks to issue a written recommendation to the PhD researcher with respect to the draft thesis. If the individual PhD commission's response is negative, it will inform the PhD researcher of its objections and remarks. If their recommendation is positive, the IPC may also formulate a limited number of suggestions for improving the draft thesis. When the IPC consents to the submission of the thesis, the PhD researcher sends sufficient copies of the draft, along with a written application to defend the thesis publicly, to the chair of the doctoral jury. The chair is responsible for distributing the draft thesis among the other members of the doctoral jury.

32. The doctoral jury evaluates the draft thesis. This evaluation may include a pre-defence, depending on the additional faculty PhD regulations. If no pre-defence is to be held and a member of the doctoral jury has objections to the public defence of the thesis, the jury must convene for a meeting on this matter. In this case, the member(s) concerned has/have to formulate their criticism in writing prior to the meeting.

33. The doctoral jury has a maximum of six weeks to communicate in writing its decision and justification to the PhD researcher and the faculty. If the jury agrees to the public defence of the thesis, the PhD researcher informs the faculty and the Registrar's Office of this in writing. The PhD researcher can then be registered for the public defence.

34. The public defence can take place no earlier than three weeks after the doctoral jury's decision has been communicated to the Registrar's Office by the PhD researcher. A date must be selected for the defence within six weeks of the communication of the jury's decision. The public defence should take place within a reasonable time period. This period excludes the UAntwerp holiday periods listed in the academic calendar and any maternity or parental leave taken by the PhD researcher. No public defences can take place between 20 July and 20 August.

35. The doctoral jury may decide to accept the public defence of the thesis on the condition that a number of changes are made to the content; these changes must be communicated to the PhD researcher in writing. For the exact procedure to be followed in this situation, please refer to the additional faculty PhD regulations. In this case, the time period described in Article 34 begins when the doctoral jury approves the corrected version of the thesis.

36. The defence of the thesis is public.

37. The public defence of the thesis must not take longer than two hours, including examination by the doctoral jury. The defence cannot take place if fewer than two thirds of the doctoral jury members are in attendance, if necessary via teleconferencing; at least two of those in attendance must not be involved in the doctoral thesis. If the chair is unable to attend the defence, the faculty appoints a replacement chair from the UAntwerp senior academic staff (ZAP) who is not one of the PhD researcher's supervisors.

38. The doctoral jury meets immediately after the defence and decides whether the PhD researcher has been successful or not before officially announcing the results. Grades are not awarded.

39. The decisions of the IPC and doctoral jury should ideally be made by consensus. If no consensus can be reached, a positive decision can only be issued as a result of a simple majority vote in which the supervisors together have one vote. If the supervisors cannot reach a consensus, they too must reach a decision by a simple majority vote.

40. The successfully defended thesis should be submitted to the UAntwerp Library Office for safekeeping according to [the procedure set out for that purpose](#). As part of this procedure, the PhD researcher should submit at least a digital version of the thesis prior to the defence.

## **VI Defence of the doctoral thesis**

**Art. TI29.** The PhD student has at least one accepted A1/P1 publication.

**Art. TI30.** The form of the dissertation is in accordance with the General PhD regulations. If the dissertation consists of a collection of scientific manuscripts, this is a compilation of papers grouped around the doctoral topic, supplemented with an introduction and general conclusion.

**Art. TI31.** The thesis must show a homogeneous structure and layout. The faculty guidelines in this

regard are:

- The document may be made in A4 format. Please note that this will be reduced to book size 18 x 26 cm.
- Interior:
  - o Page numbers: this is placed in function of a letterpress (recto-verso, left and right page or centered);
  - o Margins: depending on a letterpress (recto-verso, left and right page or centred);
- Cover/title page:
  - o The dissertation must contain at least the identification data as provided for in Appendix 4 of the PhD Regulations of the University of Antwerp;
  - o For the layout of the cover, the PhD student contacts the New Media Service. The information provided (title, supervisor(s), image, etc.) is processed into the faculty cover;
  - o On the first page of each dissertation, the integrity statement is included in Dutch or English, as provided for in Appendix 4 of the PhD Regulations of the University of Antwerp.

**Art. TI32.** The doctoral student concludes the doctoral training programme before the official composition of the doctoral jury and according to the procedure stated on the website of the Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS).

**Art. TI33.** When the supervisor(s) decide(s) that the dissertation is sufficiently final to be sent to the IPC, and provided that the doctoral training programme can be concluded by ADS, they formulate (preferably after consultation with the IPC) a proposal for the composition of the doctoral jury. The composition of the doctoral jury meets the conditions as provided for in the doctoral regulations of the University of Antwerp. The supervisors cannot take on the role of secretary. Based on this proposal, the FDOC formulates a recommendation for the composition of the doctoral jury, with a proposal for a chair and secretary to the Faculty Council.

**Art. TI34.** The PhD student starts the procedure for defending the thesis by providing sufficient copies of the draft thesis to the members of the IPC or, subject to the explicit approval of the IPC, at least a table of contents and an abstract. The IPC will issue written advice to the PhD student within 4 weeks. If the IPC advises unfavourably, it informs the PhD student of its objections and comments. In case of positive advice, the IPC can also formulate limited suggestions for adjustments to the draft thesis.

**Art. TI35.** The pre-defence of the thesis is mandatory.

The PhD student provides a sufficient number of copies of the draft thesis to the members of the doctoral jury. The pre-defence will take place within six weeks after the submission of the draft thesis to the members of the doctoral jury. Holiday periods extend this period. At least two-thirds of the members of the doctoral jury must be present at the pre-defence, if necessary via teleconferencing, of which at least two members are not involved in the doctoral thesis. The pre-defence starts with a presentation in which the PhD student presents the research. After the presentation, which may last 15 to 20 minutes, the discussion follows. The pre-defence may last a maximum of 3 hours. During the deliberation immediately after the pre-defence, the doctoral jury decides preferably by consensus (see article 39 of the PhD regulations of the University of Antwerp) whether the candidate will be admitted to the public defence.

The secretary draws up a report of the pre-defence. The report states the decision and the desired adjustments to the thesis.

The pre-defence can lead to one of the following decisions:

- a) the dissertation is accepted without further conditions;
- b) The dissertation is accepted with a number of limited adjustments ("minor revision"). The responsibility for the follow-up of the revision lies with the promoter;
- c) The dissertation is accepted subject to a number of important adjustments ("major revision"). The report of the pre-defence states the requested substantive adjustments and the deadline by which the PhD student must submit the adapted PhD thesis. The period is a maximum of six months. In exceptional circumstances, the PhD student may, subject to a motivated request, ask the jury for an extension. In that case, the total period may not exceed one year. The full jury must agree to the new version of the thesis before the thesis is admitted to public defence. If the doctoral jury judges that the adjustments made are insufficient, or if the doctoral student has not made the adjustments within the set period, a new pre-defence must be organised. The jury concerned informs the candidate in writing of the steps necessary for a new pre-defence;
- d) The dissertation is refused and will be subjected to a pre-defence again after a thorough revision.

The jury concerned informs the candidate in writing of the steps necessary for a new pre-defence. In total, a maximum of two pre-defences can take place.

**Art. TI36.** If, after the pre-defence, the doctoral jury agrees to the public defence of the thesis, the chair of the doctoral jury will inform the PhD student and the faculty doctoral administration in writing.

The PhD student informs the Central Education Administration via SisA and provides a sufficient number of copies of the final thesis to the doctoral jury. The public defence can take place at the earliest three weeks after the PhD student has communicated the decision of the doctoral jury to the Central Education Administration. A date for the public defence must be set within six weeks following this notification. The public defence must take place within a reasonable time.

**Art. TI37.** The PhD student decides, in consultation with the chair of the doctoral jury, whether the jury in gown attends the public defence. It is important not to discriminate between jurors. If it is decided to wear a gown, this applies to all members of the jury. Loan gowns are available in the faculty.

**Art. TI38.** Half an hour before the public defence, the doctoral jury is convened by the chair. At least two-thirds of the members of the doctoral jury must be present at the public defence, if necessary via teleconferencing, of which at least two members are not involved in the doctoral thesis. The public defense of the thesis consists of the following components:

- a) introduction of the procedure and presentation of the PhD student by the chairman;
- b) presentation of the dissertation and presentation of the members of the doctoral jury by the chair;
- c) presentation of the thesis (max 40 minutes) by the PhD student;
- d) questions by the members of the doctoral jury and answers by the doctoral student (max 50 minutes) led by the chair;
- e) public debate led by the chairman;
- f) deliberation by the doctoral jury led by the chairman. The secretary takes care of the signing of the deliberation report by all jury members present (incl. teleconferencing) and sends the signed report to the faculty doctoral administration (template with evaluation criteria in appendix 1);
- g) proclamation by the chairman (mandatory in Dutch). No degrees are awarded.

## **5. Joint, double and multiple PhDs**

41. UAntwerp can award a joint, double or multiple PhD with another Belgian or international university provided that the PhD researchers have done at least six months of research (not necessarily consecutively) at each partner university involved as part of their thesis. Unless otherwise stipulated in the articles below or in the partnership agreement (Art. 43), these general PhD regulations also apply to all joint, double and multiple PhDs. For incoming joint, double and multiple PhDs, a limited IPC is sufficient, consisting of the UAntwerp supervisor(s) and the chair, to monitor the progress of the doctoral research in accordance with articles 13-14 of these regulations.

42. PhD researchers wishing to obtain a joint, double or multiple PhD degree must submit applications to all of the universities in question at least one year before the submission of the draft thesis. At UAntwerp, a procedure for this has been established by the Antwerp Doctoral School. If the application is approved by the faculty, the PhD researcher has to comply with the administration requirements of both universities regarding enrolment as a PhD student.

43. For every joint, double or multiple PhD, a partnership agreement is drawn up between the PhD researcher and the two or three universities involved, in which exceptions to the standard procedures or additional rules can be established. The regulations of the main institution (see article 44) take priority, unless otherwise stipulated in the partnership agreement. The defence can take place no earlier than six weeks after the signing of the agreement by all relevant legal entities. In this context, the faculty can exempt PhD researchers whose home institution is not UAntwerp from the UAntwerp doctoral study programme.

44. The designation of the main institution can be determined based on one or more of the following elements: a) Funding: the institution that funds (most of) the doctoral research or the institution to which the supervisor belongs under whose authority the application of the external funding occurred; b) Presence: the institution where most of the doctoral research takes place, where the PhD researchers will spend most of their working hours; c) Start: the institution where the doctoral research was initiated, where the PhD researcher first registered. If these criteria are not sufficient to distinguish between the two institutions, the main institution will be designated by mutual agreement.

45. The thesis has to be defended publicly before a doctoral jury containing at least one member of the senior academic staff (ZAP, or corresponding category in the partner institution) from each institution involved.

46. Only one public defence can take place, the date of which is to be included on the diploma or diploma supplement or – if applicable – on all diplomas or diploma supplements.

47. The diploma supplement(s) for the joint, double or multiple PhD must clearly indicate that the research was carried out at all universities involved.

## **6. Interdisciplinary PhD**

48. UAntwerp can award an interdisciplinary PhD if the PhD researcher has conducted research for which the expertise, knowledge and research methods from two (or more) study areas were substantial and essential for the research proposal to be carried out successfully. An interdisciplinary PhD is a combination of two existing PhD degree titles at UAntwerp, and cannot be incorporated in a joint, double or multiple PhD.

49. PhD researchers wishing to obtain an interdisciplinary PhD must submit their motivated application to the qualified entity within the faculty. The application must be supported by at least one supervisor from each study area. In case of an interdisciplinary PhD between two faculties, the application must be submitted to both faculties and one of the faculties will be designated as the managing faculty. More information regarding the enrolment and admission procedure can be found in appendix 3.

The interdisciplinary nature of the doctorate will be evaluated at the time of the initial application as well as during, and at the end of, the PhD trajectory based on the following three criteria:

- 1) The study areas and the expertise that each faculty brings to the PhD research, are far enough apart;
- 2) The input of expertise, knowledge and research methods from each faculty is substantial and strictly necessary for carrying out the research proposal correctly. The research is not a combination of monodisciplinary lines of research carried out under the supervision of different researchers. Not one of the study areas is an 'additional/incidental' study area.
- 3) The insights gathered from carrying out the research proposal, result in new scientific insights in both study areas or extends the knowledge in a new (emerging) study area.

Applicants for an interdisciplinary PhD must clearly motivate these criteria. The motivation should be understandable enough to non-specialists without overgeneralising the application.

In the application phase, the initial application for an interdisciplinary PhD will be assessed by the Registrar's Office.

50. Each faculty involved in the interdisciplinary PhD must grant approval for the enrolment in the interdisciplinary degree. The same applies to ongoing PhDs that need to be converted. The application for the interdisciplinary PhD as well as the enrolment in the interdisciplinary programme must be finalised at least one year before the defence.

51. The faculty managing the PhD is responsible for informing the other faculty (faculties) about changes in the enrolment and modalities of the PhD in question. Generally speaking the PhD regulations of the managing faculty take priority.

52. For existing combinations of study areas, the managing faculty is already designated, which can be consulted in the student administration system SisA. In case of a new combination, the designation of the managing faculty can be determined based on one or more of the following elements: a) Funding: the faculty that funds (most of) the doctoral research or the faculty to which the supervisor belongs under whose authority the application of the external funding occurred; b) Presence: the faculty where most of the doctoral research takes place, where the PhD researchers will spend most of their working hours; c) Start: the faculty where the doctoral research was initiated, where the PhD researcher first registered as a PhD student. If these criteria are not sufficient to distinguish between the two faculties, the managing faculty will be designated by mutual agreement.

53. Regarding the composition of the interdisciplinary IPC and the doctoral jury, an equal representation from both study areas will be strived for. When the interdisciplinary IPC evaluates the progress of the PhD research (preferably each year, otherwise every 2 years), it will verify the interdisciplinary nature of the doctorate, taking into account the criteria described in article 49.

54. During the evaluation of the PhD research and considering the defence, the doctoral jury will additionally evaluate the interdisciplinary nature of the doctorate based on the three criteria stated in article 49. In case the criteria cannot be met, the possibility for the interdisciplinary PhD expires and the defence cannot take place. The doctoral jury can in that case propose a fitting (non-interdisciplinary) PhD degree title for which a new application must be submitted to the Registrar's Office. For the application, the respective procedure of the PhD regulations applies.

55. The thesis has to be defended publicly before a doctoral jury containing at least one member of the senior academic staff (ZAP) from each faculty involved.

56. Only one public defence can take place.

## **7. Mediation and appeal procedure**

57. PhD researchers who do not comply with these regulations may find that the deadlines which the faculty must otherwise comply with may be extended.

58. PhD researchers who believe there to be negligence in the application of these regulations are requested to notify the dean of their faculty. The dean will decide on the consequences of the complaint.

59. If the relationship between the PhD researcher and the supervisor(s) breaks down, either party may notify the chair of the IPC and ask that the IPC be convened. The IPC will assist in rectifying any misunderstandings, mediate between the parties involved and help establish a solution that is acceptable to all parties.

60. To ensure a high-quality mediation procedure for disputes involving PhD researchers, each faculty and the IOB appoints at least one ombudsperson for PhD researchers. The ombudspersons for PhD researchers are appointed for a period of three years, which is renewable after a positive evaluation by a council or commission in which PhD researchers are also represented. The names of the appointed ombudspersons for PhD researchers are communicated to the Council of the Antwerp Doctoral School annually, before the start of the academic year. The ombudspersons for PhD researchers follow a training programme before taking up their assignment. They comply with the regulations regarding well-being at work and participate annually in the intervision moments organised for them.

61. Candidate ombudspersons belong to the AP, OP or ATP, provided that their appointment (min. 80%) does not end or decrease during their mandate as ombudsperson. To avoid conflicts of interest, it is recommended that the policy advisor research, members of the doctoral administration or the faculty director are not eligible for this. The mandate of ombudsperson for PhD researchers is not compatible with the position of (vice) rector, (vice) dean or (vice) chairman of a (faculty) council or committee. The faculties and IOB can impose additional conditions to the fulfilment of the mandate of ombuds for PhD researchers.



62. Notwithstanding §d of this article, the ombudspersons for PhD researchers are a first point of contact for all PhD researchers who during the course of their PhD experience problems in relation to the PhD procedure or in case of interpersonal conflicts which can impede the smooth progress of a PhD, such as disputes with their supervisor and/or PhD committee, or problems for which they cannot turn to their supervisor or individual PhD commission (IPC).

63. The ombudspersons for PhD researchers are not authorised for content related problems with regard to the PhD trajectory. For these, PhD researchers turn in the first place to their supervisors and the individual PhD commission, who can take on a mediating role in this. In case of administrative problems, PhD researchers turn to the doctoral administration of their faculty or institute.

64. The ombudspersons for PhD researchers act as an impartial third party who listen, give advice, and only at the request of and in consultation with the PhD researchers, mediate between the parties involved and help to seek a solution that is acceptable to all concerned. If the problems identified are of an interpersonal nature, the ombudspersons refer to the network of confidential counsellors, in which the choice of a particular confidential counsellor lies with the PhD researchers.

65.d. For cases of transgressive behaviour at work and for interpersonal problems, whether or not related to the doctorate, PhD researchers can also turn directly to the confidential counsellors of UAntwerp or to Mensura's occupational psychologists. In case of sexually transgressive behaviour, referrals will always be made to Mensura's occupational psychologists, with the ombudspersons retaining their mediating role.

63. The PhD researcher preferably contacts the ombudsperson for PhD researchers of their own faculty or institute; if desired, the PhD researcher can also turn to an ombudsperson for PhD researchers of another faculty or institute. If necessary or if the ombudsperson for PhD researchers and the PhD researcher belong to the same research group, the ombudspersons for PhD researchers can assist each other or in consultation with the questioner take over files from each other.

64. The ombudspersons for PhD researchers determine in consultation with the PhD researchers the way in which the PhD researchers' question is followed up. The timing of feedback to the supervisor is also agreed upon with the PhD researchers. At the request of the PhD researchers, the ombudsperson for PhD researchers can also attend, as an observer, the meetings of the individual PhD commission.

65. The ombudspersons for PhD researchers and all persons involved in the mediation procedure are bound to discretion, and agree in advance with the PhD researchers what can be shared and with whom.

66. Annually, the ombudspersons for PhD researchers report anonymously to the Central Ombudspersons, the Faculty (or Institute) Council, the Council of the Antwerp Doctoral School and the Committee for Prevention and Protection at Work on their activities over the past year.

67. If the mediation measures described in Article 59 are insufficient to solve a conflict, the central ombudsperson shall prepare a report which is then submitted to a mediation committee composed of the relevant dean (chair), the faculty or departmental academic PhD coordinator, the Antwerp Doctoral School ZAP coordinator for the relevant scientific field and the chair of the IPC, who will hear the testimony of the parties involved and then make a binding decision. No further internal appeals can be lodged against this decision.

68. A PhD researcher who believes that a decision made by the IPC or doctoral jury represents a violation of their rights, can – with assistance of an ombudsperson if required – submit an appeal, addressed to the dean in the form of a written request for reconsideration of the original decision. The request must be submitted within a period of seven calendar days following the communication of the original decision to the PhD researcher. The request shall contain a factual description of and justification for the objections raised.

69. The dean decides whether the appeal is admissible. Appeals which are declared admissible are then addressed by the body which made the original decision. This body offers the PhD researcher an oral explanation of their decision if this was requested in the written appeal.

70. All admissible appeals give rise either to a confirmation of the original decision or to a revision of that decision, accompanied by a justification.

71. The decision described in Article 70 is to be communicated to the PhD researcher within a period of twenty calendar days, which begins the day after the submission of the appeal. The PhD researcher will also be informed about who can be contacted for more information about the decision.

After the internal appeal, the PhD researcher can lodge an appeal against a study progress decision with the Council for Disputes about Decisions on Study Progress (<https://onderwijs.vlaanderen.be/nl/raad>). The PhD researcher must submit the appeal within a period of seven calendar days, starting on the day after the decision of the internal appeal procedure was communicated. The PhD researcher will at the same time send a copy of the appeal petition to the Rector by registered letter (postal address: Rector of the University of Antwerp, Middelheimlaan 1, 2020 Antwerp). In case the Council for Disputes about Decisions on Study Progress nullifies an unlawfully taken decision, and if the PhD researcher decides to challenge a new unfavourable decision that was taken following the verdict of the Council, the obligation to use the internal appeal procedure before lodging an appeal with the Council no longer applies.

## **8. Final provisions**

72. The PhD researcher strives to comply with the stipulations of the Code of Ethics for scientific research in Belgium, as endorsed by UAntwerp. The Code of Ethics for scientific research in Belgium aims to ensure that high-quality research is carried out and that publications are truthful. Researchers are required to describe their research methods and results in such a way that the research can be replicated by other researchers. The information included in publications must be verifiable. This means that, at a minimum, the results of the literature review, the hypotheses, experimental set-up, research and analysis methods and sources must be correctly reported in a field log, lab notebook or progress report. If the object of the observations is destroyed (e.g. in the case of excavations), the observations must be registered as accurately as possible. All decisions, arrangements and agreements must be recorded and saved. The primary data and the protocols of the study should be retained and remain accessible for at least five years. If publications – especially reviews and syntheses – do not include all of the details necessary for verification, these must nevertheless remain available. Finally, the PhD researcher and supervisor(s) declare in the thesis that the PhD research was conducted according to the principles of scientific integrity (see Appendix 4).

73. In all phases of the research, the PhD researcher demonstrates compliance with ethical recommendations such as those published by or available from the Committee for Medical Ethics UZA-UAntwerp, the Ethics Committee for Animal Testing, the Ethics Committee for the Social Sciences and Humanities and/or the Ethics Committee for Misuse, Human Rights & Security, where applicable and according to the relevant laws and regulations.

74. Any publication which proceeds from research conducted by a PhD researcher as part of a PhD being undertaken at UAntwerp must include an explicit reference to the University of Antwerp and, under the author's contact details, an official University of Antwerp address formatted according to the journal's guidelines. All relevant publications are to be reported at the time of their first publication (whether online or on paper) in order to ensure their inclusion in the Academic Bibliography, in accordance with the guidelines included in the Open Access procedure.

75.a. With regard to scholarship holders and PhD researchers paid by the university, Article IV.48 of the Higher Education Codex states that all rights to potentially valorisable research results are legally transferred to the university.

75.b. Upon enrolment at UAntwerp, and unless otherwise agreed in a joint, double or multiple PhD agreement with another university, PhD researchers who are not covered by Article 75a relinquish any rights to potentially valorisable research results to the University of Antwerp, namely research results that appear to be suitable for societal implementation and/or commercialisation and which came into being through the PhD researcher's participation in a research project in which use was made of knowledge, resources and/or equipment belonging to the University of Antwerp. If the PhD researchers referred to in this article have made no use of University of Antwerp knowledge, resources and/or equipment, the results will accrue to these researchers. If necessary, the rights can then still be transferred by means of a written agreement.

75.c. It is the responsibility of supervisors to make their PhD researchers aware of the provisions of Articles 75a and 75b at the beginning of each PhD research project and to report any findings to the Valorisation Office immediately, including reference to the potential involvement of the PhD researcher.

76. In the event that a PhD is terminated ahead of time, the PhD researcher must cancel the enrolment in line with the enrolment procedure. The PhD researcher should inform the supervisor(s), faculty administration and Antwerp Doctoral School of the termination as soon as possible.

77. By enrolling in a PhD programme, the PhD researcher enters into an agreement with the university with mutual rights and obligations. A PhD researcher cannot hold staff members or administrators as well as all other (whether or not self-employed) appointees engaged by the university to perform this agreement with the PhD researcher (in whole or in part) liable. There are four exceptions to this exoneration in which a direct non-contractual liability claim by a PhD researcher against a staff member or member of an administrative or decision-making body or another university appointee remains possible under Belgian law:

1. in the event that the claim has no connection whatsoever with the performance of this agreement;
2. in the event of fraud by a staff member, board member or other employee of the university;
3. in the event that a staff member, board member or other employee of the university intentionally causes damage to the PhD researcher; or
4. in the event of a violation of the physical or psychological integrity of the PhD researcher.

## **VII. Special provisions**

**Art. TI39.** In case of deviations, omissions, problems, the procedure to be followed is described in chapter 7. Mediation and appeals of the General Regulations of the University of Antwerp. A PhD student can always call on the faculty and central ombudspersons for PhD students.

**Art. TI40.** The individual doctoral committees and juries that have already been composed in accordance with the guidelines of previous versions of the supplementary faculty regulations remain valid, even if they deviate from the provisions of these regulations.

**Art. TI41.** These regulations will enter into force on 17/10/2025.

## Appendix TI1 to the Supplementary Faculty Regulations for the PhD of Applied Engineering

approved by the FDOC FTI on 12/09/2025

Doctoral Training Programme Transcripts				
Competency category	Activity + number	Points per activity	Max. per activity	Category SisA
A. Research skills and techniques	A.1. Course <sup>1</sup>	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour = 0.2p ≤1 hour = no points	Max. 0,7p/day	1.
	A.2. Research stay <sup>2</sup>	0.5p/working day	Max. 5p in total (including F.2)	1.
	A.3. Jury member/co-reader (thesis, project proposal, prize, ...)	0.2p/jury or co-reader/year	Max. 1p per year	2. (Evaluate/judge)
	A.4. Review book/article, evaluation proposal, manuscript	1p	Max. 5p in total	3.
	A.5. Summer school	0,5p/day	Max. 5p in total	1.
B. Adapting to the research environment	B.1. Course <sup>3</sup>	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour = 0.2p ≤1 hour = no points	Max. 0,7p/day	1.
	B.2. Membership of the council/commission <sup>4</sup>	1p/year/council or committee	Max. 4p in total	2.
	B.3. Mentoring, coaching <sup>5</sup> , ombudsperson	1p/year		2.
	B.4. Course 'Mind the gap' <sup>6</sup>	1p		1.
C. Research management	C.1. Course <sup>7</sup>	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour = 0.2p ≤1 hour = no points	Max. 0,7p/day	1.
	C.2. Supervision of the master's thesis <sup>8</sup>	2p/master's thesis	Max. 8p in total	2.
	C.3. Supervision of the bachelor's thesis <sup>7</sup>	1p/bachelor's thesis		2.
	C.4. Organisation of a conference or scientific activity <sup>9</sup>	0.5p/day of activity		4.
	C.5. Application for a <u>personal</u> grant (FWO, Baekeland and similar)	2p	Max. 2p	5.
	D.1. Course <sup>10</sup>	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour =	Max. 0,7p/day	1.

<sup>1</sup> Vb. E-sources, Excel, Access, Scientific Reasoning and Reporting

<sup>2</sup> Research stays (not sampling) can be considered under A.2. (or F.2.) will be honoured. A research stay can only be counted if someone is part of a research group. Attach a brief description of the assignment

<sup>3</sup> Vb. Innovation Management & Entrepreneurship, First Aid, Fire Extinguishing Techniques

<sup>4</sup> Peer review committee doctoral training programme (docop), secretary of the examination board

<sup>5</sup> Mentoring focuses on colleagues, where coaching focuses on students.

<sup>6</sup> Only applicable for PhD students starting from academic year 2022-2023

<sup>7</sup> Vb. Project Management, Word, Mind Mapping

<sup>8</sup> The name of the PhD student must be mentioned as a supervisor on the cover page.

<sup>9</sup> Also moderator for a session at a conference

<sup>10</sup> Vb. Timemanagement, Achieving your goals.

D. Personal effectiveness		0.2p ≤ 1 hour = no points		
	Scientific publication with peer review <sup>11</sup> : (no grant applications, e.g. FWO; no abstract) D.2. as first author (or equivalent) D.4 conference article as first author (or equivalent) <sup>12</sup> D.3. as other author	3p 2p 1p	Max. 9p in total	3.
	D.4. Scientific publication without peer review <sup>10</sup>	1p		3.
	D.5. Scientific prize	1.5p		5.
	D.6. Patent or License Agreement <sup>13</sup>	3p		5.
	D.7. Membership of the editorial board of a scientific journal	1p/year		3.
E. Communication skills	E.1. Course <sup>14</sup>	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour = 0.2p ≤ 1 hour = no points	Max. 0,7p/day	1.
	E.2. Language training	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour = 0.2p ≤ 1 hour = no points	Max. 6p in total	1.
	E.3. Teaching in higher education (failure to correct examinations) <sup>15</sup>	0.2p/hour	Max. 3p per subject per year, max. 9p for E.3 and E.4 together for whole docop	2.
	E.4. Practical and educational guidance (failure to correct examinations) <sup>13</sup>	0.1p/hour		2.
	Active participation in international congress (or similar): <sup>16</sup> E.5. Presentation E.6. Poster presentation	3p/presentation 2p/poster	Max. 9p in total	4.
	Active participation in national congress (or similar) <sup>15</sup> : E.7. Presentation E.8. Poster presentation	2p/presentation 1p/poster		4.
	E.9. Presentation of own research, not within the research group <sup>17</sup>	0.5p		4.
	E.10. Teaching in business/wider audience	2p		4. (presentation)

<sup>11</sup> Publications can only be honored after acceptance (proof of editor or copy of publication). Abstracts of conferences are not publications. This remuneration is already included in the poster/presentation. Reports and applications for projects/grants/etc. do not count as publications, e.g. FWO proposal.

<sup>12</sup> To be honored as a conference article, the contribution must consist of at least 8 pages.

<sup>13</sup> Filed patent

<sup>14</sup> Vb. Giving presentations, Writing, Communication, PowerPoint, Speed reading, Web design, Writing proposals

<sup>15</sup> The efforts are checked and confirmed by the supervisor of the PhD student.

<sup>16</sup> Passive participation will not be honored.

<sup>17</sup> Presentations at meetings don't count. Presentations for e.g. companies, visitors, etc. can be charged.

	E.11. Participation in children's university, science week, Open Campus Day, Sid-in or similar	1p/day		4. (presentation)
	E.12. Publication, opinion piece, article for various media, for a wide audience (e.g. newspaper, PINTRA-magazine, University of Antwerp magazine), website management	1p		4. (presentation)
F. Networking and teamwork	F.1. Course <sup>18</sup>	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour = 0.2p ≤ 1 hour = no points	Max. 0,7p/day	1.
	F.2 Attending lectures or similar <sup>19</sup>	0.1p/hour	Max. 9p in total	1.
	F.3. Research stay <sup>20</sup>	0.5p/working day	Max. 5p in total (including A.2)	1.
	F.4. Member of the Board of the Scientific Society	1p/year		1. (networking)
G. Career management	G.1. Course <sup>21</sup>	0.7p/day – 0.3p/half day < 3 hours but > 1 hour = 0.2p ≤ 1 hour = no points	Max. 0,7p/day	1.
	G.2. Trade fairs and thematic meetings <sup>22</sup>	1p	Max. 3p in total	1. (internship or profession serv.)
	G.3. User committees in the field <sup>21</sup>	1p		1. (internship or profession serv.)
	G.4. Internship in a non-academic work environment (= work stay in company)	0.5p/ working day	Max. 5p in total	1. (internship or profession serv.)

<sup>18</sup> Vb. Leadership and Teamwork

<sup>19</sup> Only if there is proof of active participation in the file (e.g. a critical discussion, a copy of one's own notes, a short report, etc.). Meetings and doctoral defenses are not lectures or training. Attending lectures at conferences is seen as passive participation in conferences. No points will be awarded for this.

<sup>20</sup> See A.2.

<sup>21</sup> Vb. Application techniques

<sup>22</sup> Lectures, workshops, study days, trade fairs, etc. with partners from the business world (e.g. TETRA, SBO, etc.) can be counted if there is proof of active participation. Meetings are not lectures/active contributions, but they are the organization of and active participation in (giving presentations, presenting results, etc.) such activities.

## Evaluation form PhD public defence

---

Title:

During his/her/their PhD, the private defence on <date> and the public defence, <name> has met following criteria:

- a. The research performed by the candidate is of both qualitative and comprehensive level.
- b. The thesis manuscript is well-written, clearly structured and scientifically sound.
- c. The candidate situates his/her/their research within the existing field of study and demonstrates the added value compared to the existing literature.
- d. The candidate shows a critical approach towards both the existing research in the literature and the own research.
- e. The candidate has the skills to present his/her/their research at a technical level during the private defence as well as in an accessible way during the public defence.
- f. The candidate demonstrates a strong command of the research topics addressed in the thesis.
- g. The candidate answers the questions from the jury members in an adequate manner.

The candidate successfully defended his/her/their PhD, obtaining the degree of Doctor in Applied Engineering.

Informative remarks for administrative use only:

Chair,

Secretary,

Supervisor(s),

Jury members,

Antwerp, <date>



# **ANNEXES TO THE GENERAL REGULATIONS REGARDING THE OBTAINING OF THE ACADEMIC DEGREE OF DOCTOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ANTWERP**

## **Appendix 1: Charter for PhD researchers**

### **Introduction**

The charter for PhD researchers prescribes common practice for all parties involved in the PhD process. This document complements the university's PhD regulations, the faculty PhD regulations, as well as the various staff regulations that may apply to PhD researchers.

The charter is intended for and is endorsed by all key players in the PhD process at the University of Antwerp: the PhD researchers, their supervisor(s) and the representative of the research group. The commitments expressed in the charter are not legally binding, however.

### **PhD researcher**

The PhD researchers are expected to:

1. take the necessary administrative steps to start the PhD process, including registration as a PhD student, and renewing this registration each year;
2. draw up a research plan with the supervisor(s) as soon as possible, and carry out research efficiently and to the appropriate standard, within the proposed time frame;
3. conduct research according to the principles of research integrity, as endorsed by the University of Antwerp. Violations of research integrity include plagiarism, fabrication and falsification of data, and conflicts of interest;
4. be committed to participating in the mandatory doctoral study programme organised by the Antwerp Doctoral School and to following up on their progress on a regular basis;
5. submit their work on a regular basis to the supervisor(s), ensuring a reasonable time frame to review the texts;
6. submit a progress report on the PhD research according to the agreed deadlines;
7. submit an annual progress report on the doctoral study programme;
8. submit the written report of their research within the agreed deadlines to allow sufficient time for comments and discussion;
9. decide when they will submit their thesis, taking into account the opinion of the supervisor(s);
10. inform the department/faculty administration office, the Antwerp Doctoral School and the Registrar's Office, as well as their supervisor(s), if they decide to terminate the PhD ahead of time;
11. bring any problems, including those of a social or medical nature, to the attention of their supervisor(s), highlighting any issues that could affect their PhD work;
12. act in accordance with the core values of the University of Antwerp;
13. make arrangements with the supervisor(s) about working hours and leave within the prescribed regulations of the University of Antwerp and of the research group;
14. be aware of the social provisions available for illness, pregnancy, etc. according to the applicable staff regulations;
15. inform themselves about their role and responsibilities in the field of intellectual property and confidentiality, which can be found on the Antwerp Doctoral School website, and to reach out to the Valorisation Office (Technology Transfer Office - TTO) in case of questions or for further assistance regarding these matters.

### **Supervisor**

The supervisor(s) is (are) closely involved with the doctoral study programme of the PhD researcher. The supervisor(s) is (are) expected to:

1. arrange the initial reception of the PhD researcher within the research group, the department and/or faculty. The supervisor explains the daily operation of the research group, introduces the PhD researcher to colleagues and makes the PhD researcher aware of concrete agreements within the research group;
2. facilitate contact between the PhD researcher and members of the individual PhD commission (IPC);
3. inform the PhD researcher about the principles of research integrity, as endorsed by the University of Antwerp. The supervisor should set an example in the realisation of these principles;
4. make the PhD researcher aware of the core values of the University of Antwerp;
5. guide the PhD researcher in developing a research plan, and discuss with the PhD researcher a realistic timetable and associated research methods;
6. notify the PhD researcher when specific steps need to be taken in the context of intellectual property

rights (IPR) (article 75c), in collaboration with the Valorisation Office of the University's Department of Research, Innovation and Valorisation Antwerp (RIVA);

7. provide information to the PhD researcher, where necessary, on sourcing funding for additional research activities in the framework of the PhD, as well as for the equipment necessary for the PhD research;
8. be available to discuss all aspects of the research at least twice per semester;
9. encourage the PhD researcher to present their scientific work at various forums; keep the PhD researcher informed of relevant conferences, seminars, summer schools, workshops and similar opportunities; and explain how the PhD researcher can keep up to date with such opportunities;
10. encourage the PhD researcher to publish their scientific work and help the PhD researcher find the appropriate channels for this purpose;
11. discuss the division of time between research and education and ensure that the teaching assignments and other tasks of the PhD researcher are carefully planned, so that the completion of the PhD within the prescribed period is not compromised;
12. discuss the PhD researcher's training needs with him/her/them, based on the competence profile of the ADS, and provide advice on how these needs can be met within the framework of the doctoral study programme;
13. determine a realistic and detailed timetable with the PhD researcher for the completion of their research and for the writing of their thesis;
14. regularly review draft versions of the thesis and give constructive feedback to the PhD researcher;
15. review incremental progress made and, in consultation with the PhD researcher, adjust the objectives of the PhD research in light of this progress and any external factors (for example newly published findings);
16. support the PhD researcher as far as possible in valorising their research work through publications, and in the case of co-authorship, by acknowledging the actual share of work performed by the PhD researcher;
17. inform the PhD researcher about the faculty/department regulations and administration relevant to the PhD;
18. make the PhD researcher aware of various career options, even in the non-academic sector;
19. make arrangements with the PhD researcher about working hours and leave within the prescribed regulations of the University of Antwerp and the research group;
20. if the nature of the research requires confidentiality, in consultation with the Valorisation Office and prior to the discussions by the IPC, contact the chair of the IPC to take the necessary measures to maintain confidentiality.

## **The representative of the hosting research group**

The representative of the hosting research group is expected to:

1. facilitate the involvement of the PhD researcher in the activities of the research group, for example by inviting the PhD researcher to internal research meetings and social activities;
2. encourage the PhD researchers to share or present their work during internal research meetings of the research group;
3. facilitate access to the research group's infrastructure;
4. in case of problems, mediate within the research group, for example between different PhD researchers;
5. call the supervisor and/or the PhD researcher to order if either of them expresses unrealistic expectations.

## **Individual PhD commission (IPC)**

Each PhD researcher is assigned an individual PhD commission (IPC) at the start of the PhD. This commission includes the supervisor(s) and a chairperson who is not the supervisor. The commission is responsible for monitoring the progress of the PhD research. The following expectations apply to the individual PhD commission:

1. the IPC meets according to the deadlines specified in the faculty's PhD regulations for evaluating the PhD thesis progress report;
2. the IPC can ask the PhD researcher for additional clarifications if needed;
3. the IPC's recommendation may be positive, positive with some conditions or negative, and the PhD researcher receives feedback on this recommendation;
4. the IPC (impartially) mediates in case problems arise between the PhD researcher and the supervisor(s);
5. the IPC evaluates the draft thesis, and decides whether the thesis can be submitted to the full doctoral jury.

## **Chair of the individual PhD commission (IPC)**

The chair of the individual PhD commission (IPC) is expected to:

1. if the nature of the research requires confidentiality (reported by the supervisor(s)), take the necessary

- measures to maintain confidentiality, prior to the discussions by the IPC;
2. if it is believed that this would benefit the supervision of the PhD, invite additional experts to advise during IPC meetings;
  3. distribute the draft thesis among the members of the IPC, after the draft thesis has been handed over by the PhD researcher;
  4. if the relationship between the PhD researcher and the supervisor(s) breaks down, and either party asks the chair to convene the IPC, listen to this request and convene the IPC. The IPC will assist in rectifying any misunderstandings, mediate between the parties involved and help establish a solution that is acceptable to all parties.

## **Faculty/department**

The faculty/department has the following responsibilities in the PhD process:

1. inform the PhD researcher about the administrative procedures involved in doing a PhD;
2. make efforts to organise an adequate range of scientific activities for its PhD researchers;
3. coordinate the progress reports on the PhD research;
4. provide the PhD researcher the opportunity to be heard in the event that the IPC returns a negative assessment of the progress reports.

## **Faculty academic PhD coordinator**

Each faculty has an academic PhD coordinator. An overview of all faculty coordinators can be found on the Antwerp Doctoral School website. The faculty academic PhD coordinator is expected to:

1. provide advice on the faculty and administrative regulations concerning PhDs;
2. initiate the organisation of discipline-related scientific activities in the faculty;
3. act as the contact person for the faculty's PhD initiatives;
4. gather and provide information about the allocation of faculty funds for the doctoral study programme;
5. coordinate the annual progress reports of the doctoral study programme, in collaboration with the Antwerp Doctoral School;
6. be a point of contact in case there are problems between PhD researchers and their supervisor(s).

## **PhD researcher representatives in the policy and administrative bodies of the University of Antwerp**

An overview of all PhD researcher representatives in the various policy and administrative bodies of the University of Antwerp can be found on the Antwerp Doctoral School website.

Each PhD researcher representative is expected to:

1. act as the faculty contact for all PhD researchers who have suggestions, comments and questions about the policy and management of the University of Antwerp with regard to conducting a PhD;
2. represent the interests of PhD researchers in the policy and administrative bodies;
3. provide feedback to PhD researchers.

## **Central contact persons at the Antwerp Doctoral School**

The Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS) has a central coordinator and various administrative staff. Their contact details and specific responsibilities are available on the ADS website.

The central contact persons:

1. are familiar with the central and faculty/department regulations and procedures regarding conducting a PhD at the University of Antwerp. They can be contacted for administrative problems regarding the PhD and can refer the PhD researcher to the appropriate persons and agencies;
2. keep the PhD researcher informed of the training opportunities offered by the Antwerp Doctoral School (via a newsletter and the website);
3. draft the supplement to the certificate regarding the doctoral study programme;
4. coordinate the annual progress reports on the doctoral study programme, in collaboration with the faculty academic PhD coordinators.

## **Faculty and (deputy) central ombudspersons**

Each faculty and research institute has at least one faculty ombudsperson for PhD researchers. In addition, the university has a central ombudsperson and a deputy central ombudsperson. The contact details are available on the Antwerp Doctoral School website. The faculty ombudspersons for PhD researchers and (deputy) central ombudspersons:

1. provide assistance to the PhD researchers (at their request) in the case of a hearing before the faculty or department board in the event that an individual PhD commission issues a negative evaluation of a

progress report;

2. mediate in conflicts at the request of the PhD researchers;
3. intervene during the procedure leading to the public defence of the thesis in the event of disputes;
4. handle inquiries and complaints discreetly and confidentially;
5. respond and act within a reasonable timeframe.

## **Additional information**

Up-to-date information about doing a PhD, the doctoral study programme, the PhD regulations and procedures, are available on the [website of the Antwerp Doctoral School \(ADS\)](#). Information about the social rights associated with the statute of the PhD researcher can be found on [the Human Resources Department's subsite on Pintra](#).

## **Appendix to the Charter for PhD researchers: Integrity charter for PhD researchers and supervisors affiliated with the University of Antwerp**

Given the economic and societal importance of conducting and supporting thorough research, the University of Antwerp expects its researchers to adhere to the current standards of research integrity. The university subscribes to the [Code of Ethics for Scientific Research in Belgium](#) and [the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity](#)<sup>3</sup>. Some of the basic principles in these codes are briefly described below.

Each PhD researcher and supervisor is expected to be aware of these values and to take them into account in the implementation and supervision of PhD research.

### Basic principles of research integrity and ethical research

#### **1. Diligence**

Researchers should conduct their research in an accurate, nuanced and truthful manner, while always observing the applicable protocols. They should develop sufficient knowledge of the status quo and should be sufficiently qualified to conduct research. A research leader always exercises adequate supervision over the research of colleagues.

#### **2. Caution**

While the concern of the researchers focuses primarily on gaining and expanding their knowledge, it is important to avoid unnecessary or excessive risk. The researchers should always show respect for people, animals and objects that are part of the research. If mistakes are made, they should assume responsibility and try to repair the damage to the best of their ability.

#### **3. Reliability**

Research results should always be presented in an accurate and precise manner, and all unauthorised additions, deletions or manipulations are to be avoided. The applicable principles regarding intellectual property are always respected in this regard.

#### **4. Verifiability**

The results of all phases of the research and the resources used should be described correctly so that research accuracy can be tested through replication. The primary data and the protocols of the study should be retained and remain accessible for a sufficiently long time (see also article 72 supra).

#### **5. Independence**

Research commissioned by external parties should be conducted without any involvement from these parties. The client and external financiers, as well as their relationship to the researcher should be made public with the publication of the research results. Clients and researchers/research institutions should always make clear contractual agreements.

#### **6. Impartiality**

Researchers are entitled to their own opinions and preferences but these should not interfere with their academic work or when performing a peer review. In such cases, the distinction between scientific assessment and personal preference should be clearly indicated.

---

<sup>3</sup> More information: [www.uantwerpen.be/research-integrity](http://www.uantwerpen.be/research-integrity)

## Appendix 2: University of Antwerp PhD degree titles

(Approved by the Board of Governors on 27/05/2008, 31/01/2012, 23/04/2013, 24/06/2014, 15/12/2015, 30/01/2018, 17/05/2022, 28/06/2022 & 20/02/2024)

Study areas and qualifications	In Dutch	Faculties responsible
Study area: Architecture Doctor of Architecture Doctor of Heritage Studies Doctor of Interior Architecture Doctor of Urbanism and Spatial Planning	Studiegebied Architectuur Doctor in de architectuur Doctor in de erfgoedstudies Doctor in de interieurarchitectuur Doctor in de stedenbouw en ruimtelijke ordening	Faculty of Design Sciences
Study area: Audiovisual and Visual Arts* <i>see combined study areas</i>	Studiegebied Audiovisuele en beeldende kunst* <i>zie gecombineerde studiegebieden</i>	Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts (ARIA)
Study area: Biomedical Sciences Doctor of Biomedical Sciences	Studiegebied Biomedische wetenschappen Doctor in de biomedische wetenschappen	Faculty of Pharmaceutical, Biomedical and Veterinary Sciences
Study area: Conservation and Restoration Doctor of Conservation-Restoration	Studiegebied Conservatie-Restauratie Doctor in de conservatie-restauratie	Faculty of Design Sciences
Study area: Veterinary Medicine Doctor of Veterinary Sciences	Studiegebied Diergeneeskunde Doctor in de diergeneeskundige wetenschappen	Faculty of Pharmaceutical, Biomedical and Veterinary Sciences
Study area: Pharmaceutical Sciences Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences	Studiegebied Farmaceutische wetenschappen Doctor in de farmaceutische wetenschappen	Faculty of Pharmaceutical, Biomedical and Veterinary Sciences
Study area: History Doctor of History	Studiegebied Geschiedenis Doctor in de geschiedenis	Faculty of Arts
Study area: Industrial Sciences and Technology Doctor of Applied Engineering	Studiegebied Industriële Wetenschappen en Technologie Doctor in de toegepaste ingenieurswetenschappen	Faculty of Applied Engineering
Study area: Medical Sciences Doctor of Medical Sciences	Studiegebied Geneeskunde Doctor in de medische wetenschappen	Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

Study area: Music and Performing Arts* <i>see combined study areas</i>	Studiegebied Muziek en podiumkunsten* <i>zie gecombineerde studiegebieden</i>	Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts (ARIA)
Study area: Nautical Sciences* Doctor of Nautical Sciences	Studiegebied Nautische wetenschappen* Doctor in de nautische wetenschappen	Associated Faculty of Nautical Sciences
Study area: Education Sciences Doctor of Education Sciences	Studiegebied Onderwijskunde Doctor in de onderwijswetenschappen	Faculty of Social Sciences
Study area: Product Development Doctor of Product Development	Studiegebied Productontwikkeling Doctor in de productontwikkeling	Faculty of Design Sciences
Study area: Political and Social Sciences Doctor of Social Sciences Doctor of Social Sciences: Sociology Doctor of Social Sciences: Communication Studies Doctor of Social Sciences: Political Science Doctor of Social Sciences: Political Communication Doctor of Social Sciences: Social Work Doctor of Information and Library Science Doctor of Film Studies and Visual Culture	Studiegebied Politieke en sociale wetenschappen Doctor in de sociale wetenschappen Doctor in de sociale wetenschappen: sociologie Doctor in de sociale wetenschappen: communicatiewetenschappen Doctor in de sociale wetenschappen: politieke wetenschappen Doctor in de sociale wetenschappen: politieke communicatie Doctor in de sociale wetenschappen: sociaal werk Doctor in de informatie- en bibliotheekwetenschap Doctor in de filmstudies en visuele cultuur	Faculty of Social Sciences  Dr of Information and Library Science: Faculties of Social Sciences & Arts
Study area: Law, Notarial Law and Criminology Doctor of Law	Studiegebied Rechten, notariaat en criminologische wetenschappen Doctor in de rechten	Faculty of Law
Study area: Linguistics and Literary Studies Doctor of Linguistics and Literary Studies Doctor of Literary Studies Doctor of Linguistics Doctor of Theatre Science and Intermediality	Studiegebied Taal- en Letterkunde Doctor in de taal- en letterkunde Doctor in de letterkunde Doctor in de taalkunde Doctor in de theaterwetenschap en de intermedialiteit	Faculty of Arts
Study area: Biological Sciences Doctor of Bioscience Engineering	Studiegebied Toegepaste biologische wetenschappen Doctor in de bio-ingenieurswetenschappen	Faculty of Science
Study area: Applied linguistics Doctor of Translation Studies Doctor of Translation Studies: Interpreting Studies Doctor of Translation Studies: Transcultural Studies Doctor of Translation Studies: Media Accessibility	Studiegebied Toegepaste taalkunde Doctor in de vertaalwetenschap Doctor in de vertaalwetenschap: tolkwetenschap Doctor in de vertaalwetenschap: transculturele studies Doctor in de vertaalwetenschap: mediatoegankelijkheid	Faculty of Arts



Study area: Economics and Business Economics Doctor of Applied Economics Doctor of Transport and Maritime Economics <sup>4</sup> Doctor of Management	Studiegebied Economische en Toegepaste economische wetenschappen Doctor in de toegepaste economische wetenschappen, Doctor of Transport and Maritime Economics Doctor in de managementwetenschappen	Faculty of Business and Economics
Study area: Science Doctor of Science Doctor of Biochemistry and Biotechnology Doctor of Science: Biology Doctor of Science: Chemistry Doctor of Science: Physics Doctor of Science: Computer Science Doctor of Science: Mathematics	Studiegebied Wetenschappen Doctor in de wetenschappen, Doctor in de biochemie en biotechnologie Doctor in de wetenschappen: biologie Doctor in de wetenschappen: chemie Doctor in de wetenschappen: fysica Doctor in de wetenschappen: informatica Doctor in de wetenschappen: wiskunde	Faculty of Science Faculty of Pharmaceutical, Biomedical and Veterinary Sciences (Biochemistry)
Study area: Philosophy Doctor of Philosophy	Studiegebied Wijsbegeerte Doctor in de wijsbegeerte	Faculty of Arts
<b>Combined study areas / Gecombineerde studiegebieden</b>		
Study area: Economics and Business Economics Study area: Political and Social Sciences Study area: Law, Notarial Law and Criminal Sciences Doctor of Development Studies	Studiegebied Economische en Toegepaste Economische Wetenschappen Studiegebied Politieke en Sociale Wetenschappen Studiegebied Rechten, notariaat en criminologische wetenschappen Doctor of Development studies	Institute of Development Policy
Study area: Audiovisual and Visual Arts Study area: Music and Performing Arts Doctor of Arts*	Studiegebied Audiovisuele en Beeldende kunst Studiegebied Muziek en Podiumkunsten Doctor in de kunsten*	Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts (ARIA)
Study area: Political and Social Sciences Study area: Sciences Doctor of Environmental Science	Studiegebied Politieke en Sociale Wetenschappen Studiegebied Wetenschappen Doctor in de milieuwetenschap	Faculty of Social Sciences Faculty of Science
Study area: Economics and Business Economics Study area: Political and Social Sciences Doctor of Social and Economic Sciences	Studiegebied Economische en Toegepaste economische wetenschappen Studiegebied Politieke en Sociale Wetenschappen Doctor in de sociaal-economische wetenschappen	Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty of Social Sciences

<sup>4</sup> This programme is being faded out. Consequently, this doctoral title can no longer be chosen in case of a new enrolment in a PhD.

Study area: Economics and Business Economics Study area: Law, Notarial Law and Criminal Sciences Doctor of Safety Sciences	Studiegebied Economische en Toegepaste economische wetenschappen Studiegebied Rechten, notariaat en criminologische wetenschappen Doctor in de veiligheidswetenschappen	Faculty of Business and Economics Faculty of Law
Study area: History Study area: Linguistics and Literary Studies Study area: Applied Linguistics Study area: Philosophy Doctor of Digital Humanities	Studiegebied Geschiedenis Studiegebied Taal- en Letterkunde Studiegebied Toegepaste Taalkunde Studiegebied Wijsbegeerte Doctor in de digitale geesteswetenschappen	Faculty of Arts

\*: Codification (11 October 2013) of the decree provisions governing higher education, Art. II.74: "A university can confer the degree of doctor in the fields of Audiovisual and Visual Arts, Music and Performing Arts, and Nautical Sciences, or in specific disciplines within these fields, provided the PhD project is embedded in a joint research environment consisting of the university and one or more university colleges. According to Articles II.83 to II.101, such university colleges should be authorised to offer Master-level courses in the field of study concerned."

## Appendix 3: Procedure for enrolling as a PhD student at the University of Antwerp

- In order to obtain permission to enrol, the candidate PhD student should send a written application for admission to start a PhD to the Registrar's Office (Dutch: *Centrale Onderwijsadministratie*) via [Mobility Online](#).
- The Registrar's Office transfers the application to the faculty via Mobility Online. The faculty aims to decide within a reasonable time frame (i.e. within six to eight weeks) whether the candidate PhD student can be granted permission to enrol in the desired study area and qualification. This time frame cannot be guaranteed between 20 July and 31 August.  
If the faculty accepts the candidate and the subject, it will immediately establish the individual PhD commission and appoint the supervisors, taking into account articles 14-19.
- The faculty informs the Registrar's Office of its decision regarding the application using Mobility Online. The Registrar's Office then informs the candidate PhD student and, in the event of a positive decision, provides further information about the next steps in the enrolment procedure.
- Mobility Online must also be used if the PhD student decides to change study area or qualification, as a result of new doctoral research. The application must be submitted before reenrolment and at least one year before the public defence of the doctoral thesis. The change is then recorded at the start of the academic year following the application. If it only concerns a change of study area or qualification within the same research and the same faculty, a motivated decision of the faculty board is sufficient, which is sent via email to the head of service of the Registrar's Office. This announcement must happen at the latest six months before the public defence of the PhD thesis. The advice of the Bureau of the Antwerp Doctoral School can be requested before the alteration is done in SisA.
- An application for enrolment as a new PhD student can be made until 31 May of the academic year in question. An application for a joint PhD can be submitted all year round (there is no strict deadline for this).
- The PhD student must reenrol every academic year using the SisA self-service. Reenrolment must be completed before the end date of the standard enrolment period as determined in the [academic calendar](#) of the academic year in question. Reenrolment after this date (and until 31 May) during the academic year in question is only possible if the faculty has granted permission for this in SisA. The provisions of the enrolment procedure apply. If the PhD student has any questions about the administrative procedure, he or she should contact the Registrar's Office through the helpdesk [http://uahost.uantwerpen.be/helpdesk/ro\\_helpdesk/](http://uahost.uantwerpen.be/helpdesk/ro_helpdesk/).
- Tuition fees are payable for PhD programmes, including joint or double PhDs<sup>5</sup>, in accordance with the enrolment procedure. Tuition fees must be paid for the first enrolment as a PhD student and for the public defence of the PhD. If both of these events occur in the same academic year, both tuition fees must be paid. PhD students can find the payment details regarding the tuition fee for the public defence in the SisA self-service after they have announced their public defence [according to the procedure set out for that purpose](#).
- The tuition fees payable for the defence may be waived for incoming joint or double PhD<sup>5</sup> students if the defence will take place at the other institution (i.e. not at the University of Antwerp) *and* if the other institution also or solely provides the degree certificate. The faculty can waive the tuition fee for the public defence provided that both these conditions are met and following a motivated request from the PhD researcher. In this case, the faculty communicates its decision as soon as possible to the Antwerp Doctoral School so that it can be included in the partnership agreement. With regard to joint or double PhDs<sup>5</sup> undertaken in cooperation with another Flemish university, no tuition fees are payable to the University of Antwerp for these incoming joint or double PhD<sup>5</sup> students.

---

<sup>5</sup> This also includes multiple PhDs.

## Appendix 4: Required identification details for the doctoral thesis

The thesis should include the following details *on the cover* of the thesis as a minimum (see footnotes):

<b>UANTWERP LOGO</b>	
<b>(faculty)</b> <b>(department, if applicable)</b>	
<b>Title of the thesis</b> <b>in the language in which the thesis is written<sup>6</sup></b>	
<b>Thesis submitted for the degree of doctor of (qualification of the degree)<sup>7</sup> at the University of Antwerp to be defended by</b> <b>First Name<sup>8</sup> SURNAME</b>	
<b>Name of supervisor(s)<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Antwerp, year</b>

Please contact the New Media Service (Dutch: *Nieuwe Media Dienst*) for advice on layout.

The following **declaration of integrity** must be included on the first page of **each thesis**:

*The PhD researcher and supervisor(s) declare that the PhD research was conducted according to the principles of scientific integrity, as mentioned in the general PhD regulations and charter for PhD researchers of UAntwerp and the integrity charter for PhD researchers and supervisors affiliated with the University of Antwerp.*

On the cover of a **confidential PhD thesis** (regardless of the duration of the embargo, limited or unlimited in time), the text '**confidential**' must be explicitly included.

- In case of an **embargo period (limited in time)**, the following disclaimer must be included on the first page of the PhD thesis:

*The author of this thesis declares that this document is marked confidential from [date] until [date] (embargo period), and becomes freely accessible after this embargo period. During the embargo period the content of this doctoral thesis is confidential and is reserved solely for use by the supervisors and the doctoral jury to evaluate the doctoral quality of the thesis. Any distribution, copying or dissemination of this document in whole or in part shall comply with all applicable legal stipulations governing the use of confidential information. The use of the information contained herein by any other person or entity is prohibited.*

- In case of a **full embargo (unlimited in time)**, the following disclaimer must be included on the first page of the PhD thesis:

*The author of this thesis declares that this document is marked confidential. The content of this doctoral thesis is confidential and is reserved solely for use by the supervisors and the doctoral jury to evaluate the doctoral quality of the thesis. Any distribution, copying or dissemination of this document in whole or in part shall*

<sup>6</sup> The Dutch translation of the title should be included inside the thesis if the thesis is written in another language.

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix 2. The qualification of the degree (PhD degree title) should be included in Dutch inside the thesis if the thesis is written in another language.

<sup>8</sup> First name according to the preferences of the author or supervisor(s), written in full.

*comply with all applicable legal stipulations governing the use of confidential information. The use of the information contained herein by any other person or entity is prohibited.*