

Supplementary faculty regulations for PhDs and doctoral programmes Association Faculty Nautical Sciences

Unofficial translation of the official version in Dutch. The latter was approved by the University of Antwerp Association Faculty of Nautical Sciences on June 2019. In case of conflict, the official version prevails.

I General provisions

Art. 1. These regulations apply to doctoral studies in Nautical Sciences carried out in the University of Antwerp Association Faculty Nautical Sciences. These studies comprise the doctoral programme and the earned doctorate. They are supplementary to the mandated provisions and to the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations. These additional regulations are supplementary to the provisions specified in the Higher Education Codex of 11 October 2013, ratified by the Decree of 20 December 2013, and to the general regulations on obtaining the academic degree of doctor at the University of Antwerp (University of Antwerp PhD Regulations), approved by the University of Antwerp's Board of Governors on 30 January 2018.

Art. 2. Within the Association Faculty Nautical Sciences, the following boards and commissions are authorised to oversee the doctorate studies: the Association Faculty Nautical Sciences (AFR), the faculty admission commission (FTC), the individual doctoral committee (IDC), the faculty doctoral program committee (FDC), the interfaculty doctoral commission (FADOSI) in collaboration with the faculty of sciences and the faculty of design sciences, the faculty doctoral coordinator (FCD) and the Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS). The authority of these boards and commissions with regard to the doctoral studies is addressed in the articles below.

Art. 3. The Association Faculty Nautical Sciences (AFR) has decision-making authority with regard to the following aspects of doctoral studies:

- §1. admission to doctoral studies, based on an aptitude test for prospective PhD students and on the proposed research project; (cf. art. 8 en 9 General Phd regulations of UAntwerp)
- §2. determination of any additional training to be taken during the PhD; (cf. art 4 General Phd regulations of UAntwerp)
- §3. determination of any additional educational programme for prospective PhD students who all under Article 10 or 11 of the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations and the appointment of the exam committee responsible for assessing it (FTC);
- §4. composition of the individual PhD commissions (IDC) and designation of the chair (cf. Art 14 General Phd regulations of UAntwerp);
- §5. designation of the faculty doctoral coordinator (FCD), who is also a member of the FADOSI and chair of the faculty Doctoral program committee (FDC) (see Art. 23 of these supplementary regulations);
- §6. coordination and organisation of discipline-specific activities in the doctoral study programme;
- §7. approval of the IDCs' evaluation reports following the submission of PhD progress reports (cf. Art. 20 of General Phd regulations of the University of Antwerp);
- §8. granting of permission to write the thesis in a foreign language (see the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations);
- §9. composition of the PhD jury, designation of the chair and the secretary and specification of the details for the public defence of the thesis (cf. Art. 25 of the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations);
- §10. the points in Art. 4 of these supplementary regulations, as advised by the IDC;
- §11. approval and possibility to change this supplementary faculty regulations in Nautical Sciences.

Art. 4. The IDC plays an advisory role for the AFR with regard to the following aspects of doctoral studies:

- §1. evaluation of the progress report on the doctoral programmes of individual PhD students; (cf. Art. 20 General Phd Regulations UAntwerp)
- §2. disputes between PhD students and their supervisors;
- §3. admission to the preliminary defence based on the draft thesis.

Art. 5. The FDC plays an advisory role for the FADOSI with regard to the following aspects of doctoral studies:

- §1. In case of discussion of the given points to a specific education component will be further discussed in the next FADOSI meeting (cf. Art. 20 of this supplementary faculty phd regulations Nautical Sciences);
- §2. The FDC gives yearly to FADOSI the evaluation of the annual progress report on the doctoral programme of individual PhD students in Nautical Sciences. Discussions points about the evaluation of educational or research component will be put to the next FADOSI meeting (cf. Art. 24 of this supplementary faculty phd regulations Nautical Sciences);

Art. 6. ADS is responsible for the administrative procedure of

- §1. The approval of the phd educational program and gives the certificate of the phd education program;
- §2. Organises free courses for phd students who follows the phd education program (ADS courses of UAntwerp)
- §3. Gives educational credits so that phd students can participate to relevant activities and so partly this costs are then covered by ADS.

Art. 7. The phd admission committee (FTC) has decision-making authority with regard to the fulfilment of conditions for the preparatory programme which the AFR may impose upon PhD candidates falling under Art. 3.§3 of these supplementary regulations.

Art. 8. The chairman of the Association Faculty Nautical Sciences (AFR) has a mediator role between supervisors and the phd student when the relationship between the PhD student and the supervisor(s) breaks down or when the relationship between PhD student and IDC commission breaks down. Appeal against the decision of the IDC or PhD exam jury is only possible towards the chairman of the Association faculty of Nautical Sciences. The chairman will hear the testimony of the parties involved and then make a binding decision. No further internal appeals can be lodged against this decision. (cf. General PhD regulations of UAntwerp).

II Conditions of admission

Art. 9. Doctoral studies in the Association Faculty of Nautical Sciences (AFR) are open to any prospective PhD student who fulfils the conditions of the decree, and who have received explicit notification of admission from the AFR following an aptitude test.

Art. 10. The aptitude test for prospective PhD students is carried out by the AFR on the basis of a file, as determined in the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations. A language test may form part of the aptitude test.

Art. 11. The results of the aptitude test must be announced to the candidate within a reasonable period. Six weeks is assumed to be a reasonable period. If the results of the aptitude test taken within the framework of Article 9 or Article 10 of the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations have not been announced to the candidate within three months, a positive decision is to be assumed. This does not apply to aptitude tests conducted in the case of Article 10 or 11 of the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations, although decisions on such tests should also be reached within the reasonable period of six weeks.

Art. 12. If the AFR requires the candidate to complete an additional educational programme (see Art. 3.§2 of these supplementary regulations), the AFR will announce this to the candidate along with the results of the aptitude test. This programme can consist of no more than 30 credits and is part of the candidate's doctoral study programme. The AFR also sets the period within which the educational programme must be completed. The candidate will contact the Association faculty Nautical Sciences student administration office to find out the practical arrangements regarding the classes to be followed.

Art. 13. If the AFR requires the candidate to complete a preparatory programme and exams (see Art. 3.§3 of these supplementary regulations), the AFR will announce this to the candidate along with the results of the aptitude test. This programme can consist of no more than 30 credits. In justified cases, recognition of prior learning and/or qualifications may compensate for all or a portion of the preparatory programme. This programme does not form part of the candidate's doctoral study programme. The candidate must sign a degree contract with the Central Student Administration (UAntwerp) for the components of this preparatory programme. The AFR imposing the preparatory programme designates the exam committee responsible for assessing it.

Art. 14. The IPC is composed by the AFR when the candidate is admitted to enrol as a PhD student, as specified in the University of Antwerp doctoral regulations. (cf. Art. 14 –to Art. 19) of the General Phd regulations of UAntwerp. At least one member of the IDC is not directly involved with the Phd research.

In any case a co-author of a publication of the phd research is considered as a direct involvement.

III Doctoral programme

Art. 15. As part of the doctoral programme, PhD students are expected to hone their competences as young researchers. Using the competence profile for PhD students at the University of Antwerp, and in consultation with their supervisors, PhD students determine the activities that they will undertake. In order to complete the doctoral programme successfully, PhD students are required to submit a file with their activities according to the following general rules:

- the activities undertaken must amount to a total of at least 30 credits;
- at least one credit must have been earned in at least four categories of the competence profile.
- no more than half of the total number of credits may be earned in a single competence category.
- For all activities one need to show certificates and proves of participation when one ends its phd educational program.

Competence categories (from the competence profile)
1. Research skills and techniques
2. Adaptation to the research environment
3. Research management
4. Personal efficiency
5. Communication skills
6. Networking and teamwork
7. Career managemen

The phd student must close its phd educational program before the AFR selects the phd exam jury the so called PhD defense jury.

Art. 16

The allocation of credits to each activity must correspond to the following chart containing specifications and limitations, as described in Art. 16 to Art. 17 of these supplementary regulations.

ADS-courses followed by the PhD student from academic year 2015-2016 are automatic enrolled in to the activity table of SisA.

Competence categories	Activity	Distribution of credits	Maximum
A. Research skills and techniques	Taking a course ¹	0,1p/Hour	
	Attending a lecture ²	0,1p/Hour	
	Follow or attending a conference (national/ international) ³	Split the points from comp. category A and F (0,1p/day in both categories)	
	Research stay, Research residency at another institution (in the student's own country or abroad) lasting at least one month (no taking of samples), a stay can only count if the PhD student works together with a research group at that institute	0,1p/workday	5p
	Online training	0,1p/Hour ⁴	

¹ For example E-sources, Excel, Access, Scientific Reasoning and Reporting

² Under the form of studydays, workshops, conferences, congres, enz.

³ This activity is associated with competence category A and F. One need to divide the points by two. The PhD student can always add a clear motivation letter why an activity suits only with one of the two competence category.

⁴ The training centre shows the amount of hours given.

	Review of book/article, evaluation of proposal/manuscript	0,1p/review	
	Review book	0,5p/review	
	Member of examination board (Final work master, project proposals, prizes,...)	0,1p/per activity	0,5p/year
B. Adaptation to the research environment	Membership of a board or commission (for example nautical sector, faculty council, VABAP, ADS)	0,1p/boardmeeting	
	Chair in a board	0,1p/board meeting	
	Taking a course ⁵	0,1p/Hour	
C. Research management	Supervising an Academic Bachelor dissertation	0,5p/dissertation	
	Supervising an Academic Master dissertation	1p/dissertation	
	Organising or helping to organise an academic conference lasting at least one day	1p/day	
	Formal godfather-/ mother-system	0,5p/ academiejaar	
	Supervising Erasmus mundus project	1p/project	3p/year
	Supervising ASO-project	In peer review evaluation upon details given by PhD student 0,5p/year	
	Writing and submitting proposals of research project	1p	3p/year
	Taking a course ⁶	0,1p/Hour	
D. Personal efficiency ^{7 8}	Article in a refereed academic journal, reader or series (from third author until previous last author)	1p	
	Scientific article with no peer review	0,2p	
	Author or co-author of a refereed book	1p	
	Patent acquired	3p	
	Applying for a patent	1p	
	Taking a course ⁹	0,1p/Hour	

⁵ bv Innovation Management & Entrepreneurship

⁶ bv Project Management, Word, Mindmapping

⁷ Publications can only be valued after accepting (proof of editor necessary, or copy of publication)

⁸ For publications with peer review in ISI journals (from the SSCI-list or the SCI-list) can be doubled the points.

⁹ For example Time Management, Achieving your goals of other education programs

	Article in a refereed academic journal, reader or series (first or second author or last author)	3p	3p/year
E. Communication skills ¹⁰	Practical Teaching in higher education-	0,1p/contact Hour	3p/year
	Giving an academic presentation at a conference - international congres (or similar) in the field of nautical sciences - national congres (or similar)	3p (international) 2p (national)	3p/year
	Posterpresentation - international congres (or similar) - national congres (or similar) in the field of nautical sciences	2p (international) 1p (national)	3p/year
	Presentation for a wider audience (incl. companies)	1p	3p/year
	Interview or panel discussion for a wider audience (conference)	Aantal punten in peer review te bepalen o.b.v. details (locatie, duur, organisatie,...) 0,5p	3p/year
	Teleconference presentations	0,5p/presentation	3p/year
	Presentation to a research group ¹¹	0,1p/presentation	1p/year
	Taking a course ¹²	0,1p/Hour	
	Follow language courses	0,1p/Hour	9p
	Teaching in higher education ¹³	0,1p/contact Hour	3p/year
F. Networking and teamwork	Taking a course ¹⁴ (for example E-bronnen, Excel, Access, Scientific Reasoning and Reporting)	0,1p/Hour	
	Attending a conference ¹⁵ (national/international)	Split the points from comp. category A and F (0,1p/day in both categories)	
G. Career management	Taking a course ¹⁶	0,1p/Hour	
No credits for:	- A meeting is not attending a lecture or a part of an educational course		

¹⁰ Presentations are only valid if the PhD student is presenting author.

¹¹ It is valid if it is a presentation and not a meeting.

¹² For example to give presentations, writing, communication, Powerpoint, Webdesign, Writing proposals and write=coaching.

¹³ Presentation from your own research inside the association faculty or inside the lesson can be validated by the prof of the same course.

¹⁴ For example E-sources, Excel, Access, Scientific Reasoning and Reporting

¹⁵ This activity is part of competence category A and F. So the activities need to be divided by two. . The PhD student can always add a clear motivation letter why an activity suits only with one of the two competence category.

¹⁶ For example E-sources, Excel, Access, Scientific Reasoning and Reporting

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publications:: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o no abstracts from conferences e.d. (is already contained into posters and presentations); o no reports or requests; o no points as als referee of a publication. - no presentations on meetings; - The same poster counts only once; - Education evacuation leader; - Exam jury/inspection of an exam; - Member of a peer review commission; - For setting up a education study; - Webmaster of a website; - Price for a artikle/publication; - Stakeholdermeetings; - Media conference project; - Guidance of an interview research task; - Interviews broader public; - Interviews national radio or national media. 	
--	---	--

Art. 17. In general, the following specifications apply:

- The credits per activity determined by the AFR apply to all PhD students in this faculty (Nautical Sciences), FADOSI and/or FCD has the right to apply to the AFR to adjust the education points table.
- Activities which were undertaken after completion of the degree which enabled enrolment to prepare a thesis but before actual registration took place may be counted in part or in full within the framework of the doctoral study programme. The PhD student must submit requests for such recognition at the start of the PhD in the first year of subscription at the moment of filing in the first PhD education report in SisA. The list above can be extended. The PhD student can apply to validate new activities in his/her PhD educational yearly report in SisA.

IV Assessment of the PhD and the doctoral study programme

Art. 18. In order to steer the progress reports in the right direction, the AFR appoints a faculty doctoral coordinator (FCD) within the association faculty. This coordinator is also a member FADOSI, member of the ADS council and the AFR and chairman of the FDC.

Art. 19. The PhD progress report consists of two components: a research component and an educational component (doctoral study programme). The educational component is assessed annually by the FDC. The research component is assessed every year by the IDC. The monitoring of the doctoral programme is linked to the actual start date of the PhD. The candidate reports this date to the association faculty secretariat when enrolling in the programme. The yearly report must be filled in the SisA system. Immediately after the composition of the IDC, the PhD student sets up an informal introduction with the members of the IDC. This step will not be supported by the administration or monitored by the association faculty secretariat.

Art. 20. Every year before the 1st of May (depending on the actual start date), each PhD student delivers a research report to the entire IDC. Also the student needs to deliver a yearly education report to the FCD. This latest report will be checked by the FDC. The FDC gives a report to the PhD student and to the ADS. In matter of discussion between the PhD student and the FDC, FADOSI will grant the the education points.

Art. 21. The IDC gives feedback on the research progress and results of the doctorate and provides advice for further research plans. The IDC decides whether the student has made sufficient progress to continue the PhD process.

The IDC chair informs both SisA and the faculty doctoral coordinator (FCD) of the IDC's decision. In case of a negative assessment, the decision must be immediately communicated in writing to the chair of association faculty and the faculty doctoral coordinator (FCD), along with a justification. Not sending in a report by the PhD student without reason means automatically a negative assessment (cf. Art. 20 of the General PhD regulations of UAntwerp).

Art. 22. The FCD reports yearly to the AFR about the evaluations of the PhD students.

Art. 23. The IDC can be assembled at the request of the PhD student or one of the members

Art. 24. The FCD reports yearly to FADOSI about the results of the evaluations to FADOSI. Discussions about the evaluation of the educational and research report will be put at the next meeting of FADOSI.

Art. 25. In case of a negative assessment by the IDC and after advice from AFR, the IDC may advise the rector to refuse a subsequent enrolment. (cf. Art. 20 of the general PhD regulations of UAntwerp) Appeal possibilities can be found in Art. 54 to Art. 57 of the general PhD regulations of UAntwerp. The PhD student can receive assistance from the ombudsperson if this goes ahead.

V Doctoral thesis and public defence

Art. 26.

- §1. International testing of the research results are part of the PhD research.
- §2. Published and accepted peer reviewed articles can form an integral part of the dissertation. (cf. Art. 27 of this faculty regulation rules)

Art. 27. Published articles may form an integral part of the thesis, but a homogeneous layout must be ensured. The thesis may be presented either as a monograph or as a coherent collection of publications intended for academic journals, or as a combination of the two. The individual PhD commission and doctoral jury assess its independence, originality, academic contribution to the study area and coherence. In a doctoral thesis presented as a coherent collection of publications or papers with co-authors¹, the contribution of the PhD student and of all other co-authors should be made clear at the end. Quantitative indications of the contribution of each author are not imperative.

Art. 28. The PhD student must cover the printing costs.

Art. 29. The internal defence of the thesis is part of the assessment of the thesis. During the defence, the members of the IDC will evaluate the thesis. (cf. Art. 32 of the general PhD regulations of Uantwerp)

Art. 30. After submitting the thesis to the individual PhD commission (IDC), the IDC should decide within four weeks whether the PhD student may proceed to the procedure of the preliminary defence of the thesis.

Art. 31. In case of a positive decision, a five-week period between the PhD commission's decision (IDC) and the preliminary defence is to be observed.

Art. 32. The PhD jury is composed by the AFR at least three weeks before the preliminary defence after the checking of all conditions (cf. Art. 25 of the general PhD regulations of UAntwerp). The IDC chair is academic member of the UAntwerp (level ZAP) and is not a supervisor of the PhD student. The IDC secretary is member of the educational staff of the Antwerp Maritime Academy (level, ass. Prof, Prof, Full Prof.) and can be supervisor or member of the PhD jury.

Art. 33. Article 26g of the general PhD regulations of Uantwerp states that 2 members of the PhD jury are not directly involved with the Phd research. In any case a co-author of a publication of the phd research is considered as a direct involvement. The AFR decides the direct involvement of the jury members.

The IDC chair is also the PhD jury chair.

Art. 34. The chair of the PhD jury invites the jury members to the preliminary defence. The chair delivers the draft thesis to the other members of the PhD jury.

Art. 35. The PhD jury contains the same members for both the preliminary and public defences.

Art. 36. At least 66% of the members of the PhD jury must be present at the preliminary defence and at the public defense. If the Phd jury chair is not present then the AFR chooses a replacement chair who is also academic personnel of Uantwerp (level ZAP) and who is also not a supervisor of the PhD student.

Art. 37. During the preliminary defence, the PhD student is expected to deliver a presentation of no more than 30 minutes on the doctoral research project. Afterwards, the members of the PhD jury will ask some questions. The entire preliminary defence will take no longer than three hours.

Art. 38. The preliminary defence can be held in Dutch or in English in consultation between the candidate, the chair and the members of the PhD jury. The preliminary defence is held at the Antwerp Maritime Academy. For incoming double Phd's the preliminary defence can be held in another place.

Art. 39. The secretary of the Phd Jury organises the preliminary defence and writes a short report of this defence. This report needs to be signed by all members of the present jury.

Art. 40. After the internal defence, the PhD student will receive some advice. This advice can be formulated in three ways:

- Positive: The dissertation is accepted without any further conditions;
- positive: The dissertation is accepted with a limited number of adaptations ("minor revision"). This revision is the supervisor's responsibility;
- positive, The dissertation is accepted on condition of a number of important adaptations ("major revision"). The entire jury must agree to the revised text before the dissertation is accepted for public defence;
- negative: fundamental alterations are necessary and a new internal defence will be organised.

Art. 41. The public defence should be held after three weeks following the PhD student has delivered the PhD decision to the central student administration of UAntwerp (cf. Art. 34 of the general PhD regulations of UAntwerp). If major revisions are required, this period begins following the jury's approval of the adaptations. The PhD student is to submit the final version (paper and digital) of the thesis to the chair at least one week before the public defence.

Art. 42. If the individual PhD commission or jury returns a negative assessment of the (draft) thesis, the procedure concerning the public defence of the thesis will be suspended. The relevant PhD jury will notify the candidate in writing of the steps needed to resume the procedure. The PhD jury will also determine who is to monitor the implementation of these steps (chair or IDC or the entire committee).

VI Public defence

Art. 43. The secretary of the Phd Jury organises the public defence and writes a short report of this defence. This report needs to be signed by all members of the present jury. For incoming double Phd's the preliminary defence can be held in another place.

Art. 44. The doctoral jury convenes at least half an hour before the start of the public defence. The public defence consists of the following components:

- The PhD student presents his/her dissertation (max. 40 minutes);
- Interrogation by the members of the doctoral jury;
- Interrogation by the public debate;
- Deliberation by the Phd Jury;
- Proclamation by the chair of the PhD jury
- Laudatio by the supervisors
- Closing remarks by the chair of the Associate Faculty Nautical Sciences

VI Special provisions

Art. 45. These regulations take effect as of 1st of July 2019.

Art. 46. Educational points of the Doctorate study program granted by the FDC before the 1st of July 2019 are acquired..