

UNESCO-IHE PhD programme Guidelines

Version approved by the Academic Board on:

25 July 2013

Effective as per:

1 September 2013

Table of Content

Chapter 1

Article 1
Article 2
Article 3
Article 4

General conditions

Definitions
Joint PhD programme
Admission and registration
The PhD degree

Chapter 2

Article 5
Article 6

The PhD candidate

The PhD candidate, appointment of promotor and the registration with the Partner University
Draft thesis preparation and the responsibilities of the PhD candidate

Chapter 3

Article 7
Article 8
Article 9
Article 10

The promotor

The promotor
The promotor's tasks and responsibilities
The co-promotor
Approval of the draft thesis

Chapter 4

Article 11
Article 12
Article 13

The Promotion Committee and the assessment of the draft thesis

Composition of the Promotion Committee
Installation of the Promotion Committee
Assessment of the draft thesis by the Promotion Committee, the results of the ITSP implemented by the PhD candidate and the role of the PhD candidate therein

Chapter 5

Article 14
Article 15
Article 16
Article 17

The PhD thesis and propositions

Contents of the PhD thesis
Language of the thesis
Form of the thesis
Propositions

Chapter 6

Article 18
Article 19

Admission to the PhD defence ceremony

Approval of the PhD thesis and propositions
Distribution of the thesis and propositions

Chapter 7

Article 20
Article 21

The PhD defence ceremony

Preparations
The defence ceremony

Article 22 Protocol
Article 23 Investiture with a PhD degree
Article 24 Investiture with a PhD degree *with distinction*

Chapter 8 Procedure for settling disputes

Article 25 Disputes

Chapter 9 Final and interim provisions

Article 26 Final provisions

Annexes

Annex 1 The order of events

Annex 2 The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice (VSNU), Principles of good scientific teaching and research

Acknowledgement

Parts of these guidelines benefited from the regulations from Delft University of Technology and the Wageningen University.

Chapter 1

General Conditions

Article 1

Definitions

1.1 These guidelines employ the following definitions:

Academic Board:	the Academic Board of UNESCO-IHE;
Act:	the Dutch Higher Education and Scientific Research Act, known in the Netherlands as the <i>Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek</i> , or <i>WHW</i> ;
Beadle:	official responsible for the administrative and ceremonial aspects of the PhD Defence Ceremony and for ensuring compliance with protocol;
Co-promotor:	member of the Supervisory Team appointed by the Academic Board to serve on the Promotion Committee; he assists the promotor in supervision of the PhD candidate. He holds at the least the rank of an associate professor at an internationally well recognised university or higher education institute;
Diploma:	the certificate, signed by the chairperson of the Academic Board, the promotor(s) and the co-promotor, which confers the degree of Doctor to the recipient;
Draft thesis:	the draft text of the PhD thesis which is presented for approval to the promotor and co-promotor, and then to the Promotion Committee for review;
Institute:	the UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education, established as a category 1 institute of UNESCO;
ITSP:	mandatory Individual Training and Study Plan implemented by the PhD candidate;
Mentor:	person appointed by the Academic Board to assist the promotor in supervising the PhD candidate;
Partner university:	legally recognized university in the country in which it is established and with which UNESCO-IHE issues the PhD degree;
PhD candidate:	research fellow registered in the PhD programme;
PhD defence ceremony:	the public session of the Promotion Committee during which the PhD candidate defends his PhD thesis together with its propositions and appendices in order to obtain the conferral of a doctorate;
PhD programme:	the period from registration of candidacy up to and including the PhD defence ceremony;
PhD proposal defence:	meeting between the PhD candidate, the Supervisory Team and an independent member of the Academic Board in which the PhD candidate defends his PhD proposal and further to which the promotor issues a 'Go/No go' statement for consideration of the Academic Board. The 'Go/No go' decision shall be based on an assessment if the PhD candidate is capable of achieving a PhD study within four years, including the time spent on developing the PhD proposal;
PhD thesis:	the academic dissertation, within the meaning of Article 7.18, section 2b of the Act, which meets the requirements defined in these Guidelines;
Professor:	a professor within the meaning of Article 9.19 of the Act and Article 7.2 of these Guidelines;
Promotor:	professor who has reached agreement on a PhD research topic with a PhD candidate and chairs the Supervisory Team. Later on, the professor or emeritus professor appointed by the Academic Board in accordance with Article 7.18, section 5 of the Act;

Promotion Committee:	the committee appointed by the Academic Board whose presence is required for the conferral of a PhD degree;
Propositions:	the claims attached to the PhD thesis, the truth of which the PhD candidate wishes to demonstrate;
Rector:	the Rector of UNESCO-IHE and chairperson of the Academic Board;
SENSE:	the Research School of which UNESCO-IHE is member and to which the PhD candidate will be registered;
Supervisory Team:	the team consisting of the promotor, the second promotor and/or the first and second mentor if applicable, and one or more (external) experts that provides feedback to the PhD candidate and advises the promotor throughout the PhD study. The Supervisory Team is chaired by the promotor and has a minimum of three, and maximum of five members;
University:	a university recognized according to national legislation of the country in which it is established; and
Vice-Rector:	the Vice-Rector of UNESCO-IHE and the deputy chair of the Academic Board.

- 1.2 Where these Guidelines, the explanatory notes or the appendices
 - a. make use of male pronouns, these should be read as female pronouns in the event that they refer to a female person; and
 - b. refer to Articles, they refer to Articles in these Guidelines, unless otherwise specified.
- 1.3 Where these Guidelines make reference to:
 - a. a promotor, this should be understood to mean 'promotors' in the event that more than one promotor has been appointed;
 - b. a thesis, then this can mean part of a thesis; and
 - c. a professor in the sense of the promotor, this should be read as 'professors' in the event that more than one promotor has been appointed.

Article 2

Joint PhD programme

- 2.1 UNESCO-IHE confers PhD degrees jointly with at least one Partner University that has the legal right to confer PhD degrees according to the prevailing legislation in the country where it is established. This ensures that the PhD degree is legally embedded and internationally recognized and accepted.
- 2.2 In addition to being registered in the UNESCO-IHE PhD programme, PhD candidates will also be registered in the PhD programme of the Partner University. The joint PhD programme is governed by both the UNESCO-IHE PhD programme Guidelines and the PhD Regulations of the Partner University.
- 2.3 In the event that (parts of) the UNESCO-IHE PhD programme Guidelines are incompatible with the regulations of the Partner University, the responsible bodies of the cooperating parties (in casu the Academic Board for UNESCO-IHE) will negotiate an agreement to adopt regulations that are acceptable to the institutions involved in the cooperation.

Article 3

Admission and Registration

- 3.1 In order to be admitted to a PhD programme the applicant must:
- a. hold an UNESCO-IHE MSc degree with high qualification or a Master degree from another university or internationally well-recognised higher education institute - at least equal to UNESCO-IHE's standards.
 - b. consult with a professor in the discipline and decide on a research topic, a working title for the thesis and whether the professor is willing to act as promotor. In this process the professor will have at least one interview with the applicant. After admission of the applicant, the professor will be referred to as the promotor.
 - c. submit an application form (downloadable from the UNESCO-IHE website) and furnish the following documents:
 - Curriculum vitae,
 - One passport photo,
 - Originally certified photocopies of academic transcripts (BSc and MSc),
 - Originally certified photocopies of academic diplomas (of BSc and MSc degrees),
 - PhD research pre-proposal (4-5 pages),
 - Overview of costs and finances,
 - Abstract of MSc thesis,
 - Two reference letters,
 - Copy of passport, and
 - Result of an IELTS or TOEFL test (for non-native speakers of English).
- 3.2 Actual registration as a PhD candidate takes place after UNESCO-IHE has assessed the documents contained in the application file against European standards, after acceptance of the PhD candidate by the proposed promotor, and after acceptance by UNESCO-IHE of the financial plan for the PhD study.
- 3.3 The Institute ensures that the applicant as soon as possible receives a statement signed by the Rector to confirm his registration as a PhD candidate. The letter will mention a starting date of the PhD research, which is determined by agreement between the promotor and the PhD candidate.
- 3.4 After receiving the statement referred to in Article 3.3, the PhD candidate is required to:
- a. acquire a copy of the UNESCO-IHE PhD programme Guidelines;
 - b. reach agreement with the proposed promotor on the nature of the supervision (including the composition of the Supervisory Team) and the content of the ITSP; and
 - c. register with the SENSE Research School.
- 3.5 The Academic Board may grant exemption for registering with the SENSE Research School on the basis of a motivated written request from the PhD candidate. Such request should always be accompanied by a support letter from the promotor.

PhD proposal defence and 'go/no go' decision

- 3.6 The Institute ensures that a PhD proposal defence takes place between the PhD candidate, the Supervisory Team, and an independent member of the Academic Board, before the end of the first year (ref. 'STEP 2', Annex 1). The promotor decides in good time, based on the advice of the Supervisory Team, whether he regards the PhD candidate as capable of successfully completing the PhD programme within four years. The four years period include the time spent on developing the PhD proposal.
- 3.7 The 'go' decision of the Academic Board is based on acceptance of the PhD Proposal. The PhD Proposal contains administrative data, a concise description of the research, an updated budget for the research, and the ITSP.

Article 4

The PhD degree

- 4.1 The PhD degree may be awarded after the PhD candidate has successfully defended his thesis in public in the presence of the Promotion Committee.

Chapter 2

The PhD candidate

Article 5

The PhD candidate, appointment of promotor and the registration with the Partner University

- 5.1 A PhD candidate can only be recognised and designated as such after he has received the statement from the Rector (referred to in Article 3.3 of these Guidelines).
- 5.2 PhD research carried out at the Institute must be clearly related to an academic area being researched by one or more professorial chairs at the Institute, given the desirability of involving the Institute's academic staff in the preparation of the thesis.
- 5.3 If the research underlying the thesis has been carried out under the supervision of a given professor, then that professor is normally designated as the promotor. An exception may be made only after a detailed written request has been submitted to the Academic Board; after hearing the parties involved, the Academic Board will act according to its discretion.
- 5.4 No more than two professors may supervise any PhD programme.
- 5.5 In the event that the PhD candidate requests that a promotor be a professor from an institute other than UNESCO-IHE, the Academic Board reserves the right, after having consulted the proposed promotor, to nominate a professor from within the Institute as second promotor.
- 5.6 Within three months after registration of the PhD candidate, the promotor submits a proposal to the Academic Board for the appointment of a Supervisory Team. The committee consists of the promotor, the second promotor and/or the first and second mentor if applicable, and one or more (external) experts. The experts are PhD degree holders with a proven track record in research and with a certain affinity with the topic of the PhD study. The Supervisory Team will have a minimum of three members and a maximum of five members.
- 5.7 Within three months after registration of the PhD candidate, the promotor instructs the beadle to register the PhD candidate with the Partner University.
- 5.8 At the request of the promotor and within a month of the PhD proposal defence attended by the Supervisory Team, an independent member of the Academic Board and the PhD candidate, the Academic Board will be asked to issue a 'go/no go' statement to allow the PhD candidate to proceed with his PhD programme. This decision request must be accompanied by the recommendation of the promotor stating that the PhD candidate is capable of successfully completing the doctorate within four years (including the time spent on the development of the PhD proposal). The outcome of the external review (according to the criteria of the Research School SENSE) will also be considered in the decision of the Academic Board.
- 5.9 After the 'go/no go' decision has been taken, the Academic Board will inform the promotor and PhD candidate as soon as possible in writing. If it is a 'no go' decision, the reasons will be stated in a written notification and the PhD research will be terminated.
- 5.10 After approval of the PhD proposal and the subsequent 'go' decision by the Academic Board, the PhD candidate proceeds to the actual PhD research implementation phase.

Article 6

Draft thesis preparation and the responsibilities of the PhD candidate

- 6.1 The PhD candidate shall carry out the research underlying the thesis independently or shall be responsible for an essential contribution thereto.
- 6.2 The PhD candidate is responsible for the academic contribution made by the thesis.
- 6.3 The PhD candidate is responsible for ensuring that the research:
 - a. takes place in accordance with the professional code of conduct applying to professional activities carried out in the academic field concerned. Reference is made to Annex 2, *'The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice (VSNU)'*;
 - b. has the full and informed consent of those involved, or of their appointed representative, in the event that the thesis requires that tests be carried out on or with the cooperation of test subjects;
 - c. conforms to the laws concerned, in the event that the research makes use of laboratory animals, hazardous (e.g. radioactive) materials, hazardous (e.g. biological) substances etc.;
 - d. is not subjected to the imposition of restrictions inconsistent with academic freedom and the freedom of publication of research data and results, including where research has been partly or wholly financed by third parties;
 - e. concerns work of his own, except where stated explicitly otherwise, in which case proper acknowledgement is made to the contributions by others to the work.

Chapter 3

The promotor

Article 7

The promotor

- 7.1 The Academic Board appoints an Institute professor as promotor.
- 7.2 A professor attached to an institution of academic education and research having equal standing can also act as a promotor at the Institute in the event that he possesses this authority in the country of the institution concerned.
- 7.3 Close relatives of the PhD candidate or other persons whose relationship with the PhD candidate is such that they cannot reasonably be expected to state an impartial opinion about him do not come into consideration as promotor.
- 7.4 Emeritus professors retain the *ius promovendi* for a period of five years following their retirement or for five years after termination of a temporary contract of employment. They should submit a written request to the Academic Board no less than 30 days before their retirement date in order to receive permission to act as promotor for one or more named PhD candidate(s) after their retirement, with the proviso that they must already have been appointed as promotor by the Academic Board for the named PhD candidate(s). This request, together with a list of PhD candidates, must be co-signed by the Rector, and be accompanied by details of how continuity of supervision is to be assured.
- 7.5 If the PhD candidate has carried out his research outside the Institute within a particularly specialised academic subject area for which no professor is employed by the Institute, the Academic Board' appointment of a promotor shall depend on the results of consultations with the Rector and the Head of the Department in which the retired professor was employed.
- 7.6 In the event that the former professor appointed as promotor has not given his approval of the thesis and its propositions to the Academic Board in accordance with Article 18.2 within five years of his departure date, or should it become evident that the promotor has become protractedly or permanently incapable of carrying out his supervisory tasks, then his appointment becomes invalid. The Academic Board shall then, after having consulted with the PhD candidate, appoint another promotor, unless the Academic Board is of the opinion that no new appointment is necessary; this can be the case if more than one promotor was originally appointed.
- 7.7 The Academic Board shall send written notification of the appointment of a promotor to both PhD candidate and promotor within 30 days of the receipt of the application.

Article 8

The promotor's tasks and responsibilities

- 8.1 The promotor shall ascertain that the PhD candidate has been granted admission to the PhD programme in accordance with Article 3 and, after the PhD proposal defence, has received a 'go' decision from the Academic Board to proceed with his PhD research. He shall supervise the PhD candidate's preparation of the thesis, ensuring in this connection that the research is carried out in accordance with Article 6.3.
- 8.2 The promotor shall send the Academic Board his written acceptance of his appointment as promotor and after approving the draft thesis he shall submit a proposal concerning the composition of the Promotion Committee, shall approve the final version of the PhD thesis with propositions and shall make the necessary preparations for the PhD defence ceremony to proceed.
- 8.3 The supervision described in Article 8.1 is also aimed at ensuring that the draft thesis is presented and approved within a reasonable time after the start of the PhD programme (i.e. the date of registration as a PhD candidate). If the PhD research takes place on a full-time basis, then this 'reasonable time' is deemed to be four years.
- 8.4 The promotor shall review the draft thesis in its entirety or in instalments, and shall assess the text presented to him on the grounds he has determined, with a view to his responsibility for the thesis, to be the foundation of the doctorate. He shall also give the co-promotor, if one has been appointed, timely opportunity to give his opinion of the draft thesis.

- 8.5 In assessing the draft thesis, the promotor will devote attention to:
- a. the relevance of the subject;
 - b. the importance of the research question and its precise formulation;
 - c. the originality of the research;
 - d. the academic content of the research work: its organisation, analysis, data processing and synthesis;
 - e. the presence of creative proposals in the academic area to which the thesis belongs;
 - f. the critical confrontation of the PhD candidate's own conclusions with existing theories and concepts;
 - g. a well-balanced layout of the thesis, the clarity of its style, and the correct use of language;
 - h. the absence of anything contrary to public order or decency.
- 8.6 If more than one promotor is appointed, the promotors will determine the division of their tasks in consultation with the PhD candidate. The division of tasks shall be laid down in writing if one of the promotors or the PhD candidate requests this.
- 8.7 The promotor may propose changes and/or additions to the thesis in consultation with the PhD candidate, the co-promotor (if applicable) and others involved in the preparation of the draft thesis.

Article 9

The co-promotor

- 9.1 On receipt of a written proposal from the promotor the Academic Board may appoint one of the members of the Supervisory Team - typically (one of) the mentor(s) - as co-promotor. A full professor cannot be a co-promotor.
- 9.2 A request for a person to be nominated as co-promotor may be presented to the Academic Board at any time up to the approval of the draft thesis.
- 9.3 In the event that the proposed co-promotor refuses his nomination or wishes to revoke a previous acceptance of this nomination, then he must give the Academic Board written notification of his decision; the Academic Board shall then act according to its discretion.
- 9.4 It is the co-promotor's responsibility to supervise the PhD candidate in the preparation of the thesis. The promotor and the PhD candidate must be involved in discussions on the nature of this supervision.
- 9.5 The co-promotor shall provide the promotor with a written assessment of the PhD proposal and the draft PhD thesis.

Article 10

Approval of draft thesis

- 10.1 If the promotor is of the opinion that the draft PhD thesis meets the requirements made of it and can be accepted as evidence of the PhD candidate's competence to carry out independent academic work, then he shall give the draft PhD thesis his approval and may, if applicable, also state the co-promotor's assessment.
- 10.2 In the event that the co-promotor is of the opinion that the draft thesis does not merit approval, and this opinion is not shared by the promotor, then this shall be regarded as a difference of opinion within the meaning of Article 25.1.
- 10.3 The promotor is obliged to provide both the Academic Board and the PhD candidate with written notification of his approval of the draft thesis, or his refusal to give it this approval, within two months of its receipt. The promotor may postpone this notification only in the event that and as long as the PhD candidate gives his permission.
- 10.4 In the event that the PhD candidate is of the opinion that the draft thesis is completed and that the promotor has not produced an approval or a rejection within the period specified in Article 10.3, then the PhD candidate can request the Academic Board to instruct the promotor to take a decision on such approval within a given time period. The Academic Board shall take a decision on such a request within a period of 30 days.
- 10.5 In the event that more than one promotor has been nominated, then the approval of the draft thesis is arrived at in a process of mutual consultation. Should the promotors fail to reach agreement, then each promotor shall

bring his own detailed written assessment to the attention of the Academic Board, while sending a copy to the PhD candidate. The Academic Board shall then act according to its own discretion.

- 10.6 If approval is withheld from the draft thesis, and the requirements of Article 10.3 have been met, then at the PhD candidate's request the Academic Board, after hearing both the PhD candidate and the promotor, may choose to release the promotor from his obligations. The Board shall then appoint another promotor, unless it is of the opinion that such an appointment is unnecessary, as might be the case for instance if more than one promotor was originally appointed. The appointment of another promotor shall take place only after the head of the department in which the promotor is/was employed has been given an opportunity to put forward a recommendation.

Chapter 4

The Promotion Committee and the assessment of the draft thesis¹

Article 11

Composition of the Promotion Committee

- 11.1 A Promotion Committee consists of members having voting powers. With the exception of the chair (and co-chair if applicable), they should all be experts in the academic field of the thesis or part of it.
- 11.2 The composition of the Promotion Committee is as follows:
- as chairperson, either the Rector of UNESCO-IHE or the Rector of the Partner University, or their replacement;
 - as co-chairperson (optional in case the Rector of UNESCO-IHE is the chairperson), the Rector of UNESCO-IHE or the Partner University who is not the chairperson, or his replacement;
 - The promotor;
 - The second promotor (if applicable);
 - The co-promotor (if applicable);
 - Four opponents, as further described in Article 11.3, of whom a minimum of three have the rank of professor, of whom at least one is professor of UNESCO-IHE, and at least two are external professors.
- 11.3 Professors or individuals who have earned PhD degrees can be appointed as opponents after the Academic Board has evaluated these individuals and determined that they are sufficiently qualified to be a member of the Promotion Committee.
- In order to ensure independence of the 'opposition', the opponents must not have been directly involved in the PhD research programme. They should not be affiliated with or employed by the chair group of the PhD candidate or the chair group of one of the promotors or the co-promotor. They must not have a family relationship with the PhD candidate or a relationship with him that could impair the independent judgment. The promotor must detail the committee's independence in his proposal for committee composition.
- 11.4 The following provisions apply to emeritus professors:
- a. Former professors who still possess the *ius promovendi* in accordance with Article 9.1.9, section 3, of the Act, are regarded as professors for the purposes of this article.
 - b. Former professors who are entitled to bear the title 'professor' in the Netherlands in accordance with Article 9.19, section 4, of the Act but who no longer possess the *ius promovendi* may be admitted as members of the Promotion Committee after the promotor has submitted a written application to this end, with reasons, to the Academic Board.
- 11.5 A professor of the Institute shall be appointed as substitute Promotion Committee member. The substitute member shall hold himself in readiness up to ten minutes before the start of the PhD defence ceremony, and is called on to participate only if one of the members is unable to attend.

Article 12

Installation of the Promotion Committee

- 12.1 The promotor, through the intermediation of the beadle, shall submit, no later than 20 to 18 weeks before the provisional defence date, a written proposal for the installation of a Promotion Committee, after he has satisfied himself that the proposed Promotion Committee members are prepared to accept their nominations.

¹ The issues dealt with in this section typically require alignment with standing regulations of Partner Universities (ref. Article 2 of these Guidelines).

- 12.2 Within one month of receipt of the proposal mentioned in Article 12.1, the Academic Board shall make a decision to install the Promotion Committee and shall inform the promotor, the PhD candidate and the members of the Promotion Committee of this decision in writing.
- 12.3 Within three weeks of receipt of their nomination, the members of the Promotion Committee shall inform the beadle in writing whether they accept this nomination.
- 12.4 If the Academic Board does not agree with the composition of the Promotion Committee proposed by the promotor, it shall ask him to make a new proposal. The Academic Board reserves the right to nominate one member of the Promotion Committee itself.

Article 13

Assessment of the draft thesis by the Promotion Committee, the results of the ITSP and the role of the PhD candidate therein

- 13.1 After the draft thesis has been approved by the promotor in accordance with Article 10.1 and after the ITSP Programme has been completed, the PhD candidate may apply for admission to the PhD defence procedure. To this end he should, in consultation with the beadle, apply for permission to hold the PhD defence ceremony on a date that is also acceptable to the promotor. This application must include:
 - a. the final title of the thesis and three copies of the draft thesis;
 - b. a written statement by the promotor that the enclosed draft thesis has been approved by him; and
 - c. the written statement by the SENSE director that the PhD candidate has successfully completed the ITSP Programme;
- 13.2 The PhD candidate - through the beadle - shall send, no later than the seventeenth week before the defence date a copy of the draft thesis to each proposed member of the Promotion Committee.
- 13.3 Within nine weeks of being appointed, the members of the Promotion Committee shall send the Academic Board, through the intermediation of the beadle and with a copy to the promotor, a written report indicating whether in their opinion the draft thesis provides adequate evidence that the PhD candidate is capable of carrying out independent academic work, and whether the PhD candidate may be allowed to defend the thesis in public.
- 13.4 The members of the Promotion Committee may make their approval for the defence conditional, by sending written proposals for modification of and/or additions to the draft thesis to the promotor and the PhD candidate within three weeks of receipt of the draft thesis. They will receive a written reply from the promotor as to whether these proposals are accepted, copies of this reply being sent to the other members of the Promotion Committee and to the Academic Board. If a difference of opinion arises between the Committee members on the one hand and the promotor on the other concerning the inclusion of the proposed changes, the promotor shall report this in writing to the Academic Board, which will deal with the matter at its own discretion.
- 13.5 If one of the members of the Promotion Committee produces an adverse judgement, this member may not be removed from the Committee for this reason. In order to ensure proper monitoring of the level of the PhD research, one must in such a case oppose the awarding of the PhD degree and must inform the Rector of this fact without delay.
- 13.6 If one or more members of the Promotion Committee consider the draft thesis to be of inferior quality, the decision as to whether to give approval for the defence is taken in a meeting of the Promotion Committee chaired by the Rector or his replacement, by a majority of the votes cast. The chairperson has the right to abstain from voting. Those who cannot attend the meeting shall give their vote in writing, with reasons, to the chairperson before the meeting. In the event that the votes are equally divided, admission to the defence ceremony is assumed to be withheld.
- 13.7 The Promotion Committee may only refuse permission for the PhD candidate to defend the thesis in public on the grounds of major objections to the content, academic quality, size or language usage in the draft thesis, or if the Promotion Committee is of the opinion that the PhD candidate failed to successfully complete the ITSP programme without acceptable justification.
- 13.8 The promotor passes the decision referred to in Article 13.6, in writing and countersigned by the chair of the Promotion Committee, to the Academic Board, the PhD candidate and the beadle. If the Promotion Committee refuses to give approval for the defence, the grounds for this refusal are also mentioned. The Academic Board shall deal with the matter further at its own discretion.

Chapter 5

The PhD thesis and propositions²

Article 14

Content of the PhD thesis

- 14.1 The subject of the PhD thesis is related to the fields of academic research dealt with in one or more professorial chairs at the Institute. The content of the thesis is in the public domain.
- 14.2 The PhD thesis should provide clear evidence of the PhD candidate's ability to engage in independent academic activity. It consists of an academic dissertation, a collection of previously published papers or a combination of the two, which is the original work of the PhD candidate. If one or more papers were produced by more than one author, only those articles may be included in the thesis which may be largely ascribed to the PhD candidate; moreover, the co-authors must have given their written permission for use of these papers.
- 14.3 If the thesis consists wholly or in part of previously published papers, then:
 - a. these papers must have been published, or accepted for publication, in academic journals of international renown;
 - b. they must be in line, or have been brought in line by means of suitable added comments, with current academic insights at the time of submission of the thesis;
 - c. the topics dealt with should show a logical cohesion;
 - d. the thesis should be provided with an introduction in which the cohesion between the topics is elucidated by means of summarising, connecting text.
- 14.4 The thesis shall contain a title page, a contents list, a summary, a reference list and the PhD candidate's biography. The summary shall in any case contain a statement of the problem considered and a brief description of the method of investigation, the results obtained and possible applications.
- 14.5 The thesis shall not contain any advertisements or other matters not directly related to the topic under investigation. Institutions or persons that have made financial contributions or helped in other ways to make the production of the thesis possible may if desired be mentioned on the reverse of the title page.
- 14.6 The thesis shall comply with the regulations of the Partner University. Reference is made to the PhD regulations of the Partner University for further directions.

Article 15

Language of the thesis

- 15.1 The thesis shall be written in English. Another language may only be used in highly exceptional cases. The PhD candidate must then submit a letter of application (including written approval from the promotor) to the Academic Board via the beadle before submitting the draft thesis to the promotor. The Board will inform its decision on this matter to the PhD candidate in writing, also sending a copy to the promotor.
- 15.2 If, in highly exceptional cases, the thesis is written in a language other than English, a translation of the title and the summary into English shall be appended.

Article 16

Form of the thesis

- 16.1 The thesis shall be produced as a conveniently sized book, unless in the opinion of the promotor another format is desirable. The PhD candidate shall use the templates provided by the Institute via the beadle.
- 16.2 A standard text shall be used for the title page of the thesis (including the reverse of this page), based on the Institute's own template or a template prescribed by the regulations of the Partner University. Directions will be provided by the beadle.

² The issues dealt with in this section typically require alignment with standing regulations of Partner Universities (ref. Article 2 of these Guidelines).

Article 17

Propositions

- 17.1 Propositions are appended to the thesis. All propositions shall be academically sound, shall lend themselves to opposition and be defensible by the PhD candidate, and shall be approved by the promotor.
- 17.2 The propositions shall be written in English and, if, in highly exceptional cases, the thesis is written in a language other than English, the propositions may also be written in that same language, provided that a translation of the propositions into English shall be appended.
- 17.3 The PhD candidate may be exempted from drafting and appending propositions to the thesis if the Partner University PhD regulations do not require the propositions to be drafted. In such case the PhD candidate will be timely informed thereof by the beadle.

Chapter 6

Admission to the PhD defence ceremony³

Article 18

Approval of the PhD thesis and propositions

- 18.1 The PhD thesis is subject to the approval of the promotor, in the same way as the draft thesis.
- 18.2 The promotor gives his approval if he is of the opinion that the thesis meets the requirements stipulated in Article 14. If he does not give his approval, he shall report this in writing, with reasons, to the Academic Board, with copies to the PhD candidate and the members of the Promotion Committee. The Academic Board will deal with the matter further at its discretion.
- 18.3 The PhD candidate shall submit the propositions to be appended to the thesis to the promotor no later than the ninth week before the defence date. The promotor may, if he deems this appropriate, advise the PhD candidate to discuss a proposition with a professor in whose field the proposition lies.
- 18.4 If the promotor considers that the propositions submitted to him lend themselves to opposition and are defensible, he approves the propositions.
- 18.5 The promotor will inform the beadle in writing of the approval of the thesis and propositions.
- 18.6 The PhD candidate is given permission to proceed to the public defence of the thesis and propositions after:
 - a. the opinion of all members of the Promotion Committee, requested in accordance with Article 13.1, has been received by the beadle;
 - b. if at least one member gave his approval conditionally as described in Article 13.4, the promotor has stated that the suggestions for improvement made by that member have been adopted;
 - c. in the case mentioned in Article 13.6, the Promotion Committee has approved the draft thesis by a majority vote;
 - d. the promotor has approved the thesis and propositions, and
 - e. the requirements of Article 18.5 have been met.
- 18.7 Permission to proceed to the PhD defence ceremony must be given no later than the ninth week before the defence date. The beadle shall then, within a week, inform the PhD candidate that permission has been granted for the public defence of the thesis and its propositions on the date fixed. The beadle will also inform the promotor(s) and the members of the Promotion Committee.

Article 19

Distribution of the thesis and propositions

- 19.1 The final version of the thesis may not be reproduced until the PhD candidate has received written permission to proceed to the defence ceremony as laid down in Article 18.7. The PhD candidate shall liaise with the beadle, who is responsible for the coordination and commissioning of the printing. The PhD candidate must submit the thesis in an electronic format as per the instruction of the beadle.
- 19.2 No later than the third week before the defence date, the PhD candidate shall - through the beadle - send copies of the thesis with its propositions to:
 - a. the chairperson, members and substitute member of the Promotion Committee (1 copy each);
 - b. the Institute's library (1 copy);
 - c. the Office of the beadle of the Partner University (3 copies)
 - d. the Institute's Communication Office (1 copy).
- 19.3 The following provisions apply to the digital publication of the thesis:
 - a. the library is not granted exclusive publication rights;
 - b. the PhD candidate retains the copyright;
 - c. the digital version does not replace the hard copies of the thesis.

³ The issues dealt with in this section typically require alignment with standing regulations of Partner Universities (ref. Article 2 of these Guidelines).

Chapter 7

The PhD defence ceremony⁴

Article 20

Preparations

- 20.1 The definitive date and time of the defence ceremony is fixed on behalf of the Rector by the beadle, in consultation with the promotor, the co-promotor if applicable, the PhD candidate, and the Partner University Office of the beadle in accordance with the provisions of Articles 13.1 and 18.7.
- 20.2 The beadle shall ensure that the defence ceremony is announced at least two weeks before the defence date, and that the PhD candidate is aware of the protocol during the defence ceremony.
- 20.3 The PhD candidate is most strongly advised to give a presentation in which he explains the essence of the PhD thesis, the results obtained and the possible applications of these results in terms which are understandable to non-experts in the specific field of his research. Details of this presentation should be arranged with the beadle well in advance.

Article 21

The defence ceremony

- 21.1 The thesis and propositions are defended at a public meeting of the Promotion Committee appointed by the Academic Board. The entire ceremony will in principle be conducted in English.
- 21.2 The Rector of the Institute or the Rector of the Partner University shall chair the defence ceremony. The Rectors may also agree to co-chair the defence ceremony. Members of the Academic Board can also take the place of the Rector for this purpose.
- 21.3 The PhD candidate may be accompanied by one or two *paranymphs* (supporters) during his defence of the thesis and propositions.
- 21.4 The Promotion Committee shall meet 30 minutes (or 45 minutes if a 'distinction' proposal has been made) before the defence ceremony. The following rules apply to the presence of members of the Committee at this meeting:
 - a. If the chairperson of the Promotion Committee is unable to attend the meeting, this shall be reported without delay by intermediation of the beadle to the Vice-Rector, or in his absence to another member of the Academic Board, who will deal with the matter at his discretion.
 - b. If one of the members of the Promotion Committee is unable to attend the meeting, this shall be reported to the chairperson who will deal with the matter at his discretion - on the understanding that the defence ceremony can only take place if the minimum number of professors laid down in Article 11.2 is present. The chairperson determines, in consultation with the members of the Promotion Committee, the order in which the 'opposition' questions are to be asked and objections made.
- 21.5 The defence ceremony is generally held in the Auditorium of the Institute. The chairperson can restrict access to this room if considerations of good order or (fire) safety require this.
- 21.6 If persons other than the members of the Promotion Committee and members of the Academic Board wish to participate in the opposition during the public defence of the thesis and propositions, they should apply for permission to do so in writing to the Rector at least two weeks before the defence date. The Rector shall decide whether to grant this request within one week. The person making this request should have a doctorate or be qualified to act as a promotor.

⁴ The issues dealt with in this section typically require alignment with standing regulations of Partner Universities (ref. Article 2 of these Guidelines).

Article 22 Protocol

- 22.1 The PhD candidate shall defend the PhD thesis and propositions for one hour against objections expressed by the Promotion Committee, or by other persons who have received permission to take part in the opposition in accordance with the provisions of Article 21.6.
- 22.2 During the defence ceremony, the chairperson, the promotor, the members of the Promotion Committee, the PhD candidate and his *paranymphs* (if any) shall be clothed as follows:
- a. PhD candidate and paranymphs, gentlemen: tuxedo with black shoes and black socks.
 - b. PhD candidate and paranymphs, ladies: festive clothing in subdued colours.
- Promotion Committee:
- c. Professors, gentlemen: gown and ceremonial cap or a dark suit with black shoes and black socks.
 - d. Professors, ladies: gown and ceremonial cap or festive clothing in subdued colours.
 - e. Non-professors, gentlemen: dark suit or morning coat with black shoes and black socks.
 - f. Non-professors, ladies: festive clothing in subdued colours.
 - g. The beadle: gown and ceremonial cap and beadle's staff.
 - h. Professors from Institutions other than UNESCO-IHE may wear the academic dress of their own institution, or a gown and ceremonial cap of UNESCO-IHE.

Professors wear the ceremonial cap while acting as opponents and after the reopening of the defence ceremony in accordance with Article 23.2; the chair wears the ceremonial cap throughout the entire ceremony.

In special cases, on written application by the PhD candidate and after consultation with the promotor, the Rector can grant dispensation against the obligation to wear the prescribed clothing during the defence ceremony.

- 22.3 The chairperson opens the meeting and invites the PhD candidate to take his place at the lectern (and the *paranymphs* to take their places on the chairs provided for this purpose). He then invites each opponent in turn to state his objections or to ask a question; after each opponent has spoken, the chairperson gives the PhD candidate the opportunity to reply. Opponents remain seated while making their comments or putting their questions; only the chairperson may interrupt them. If the PhD candidate is interrupted by an opponent, he is given the chance to reply. The order of opposition is governed by the following rules:
- a. If a member of the audience has been granted permission to make a comment or ask a question, this is given first priority - with a time limit of five minutes for comment or question and answer together;
 - b. Within the Promotion Committee, external members are allowed to speak first; the promotor speaks last;
 - c. The co-promotor speaks before the promotor.
 - d. All members of the Promotion Committee will, as far as possible, be given an opportunity to speak. The chairperson, however, does not normally take part in the opposition.
- 22.4 The opposition to and defence of the thesis and propositions shall take place in English.
- 22.5 In highly exceptional cases, the Academic Board may permit opposition to and defence of the PhD thesis wholly or in part in a *language* other than English. If this is desired, the promotor should submit an application to this end via the beadle to the chairperson of the Promotion Committee no later than two weeks before the set defence date. The chairperson of the Promotion Committee will decide on this application within a week, and communicate this decision to the members of the Promotion Committee and any other persons involved.
- 22.6 Members of the Promotion Committee (and any opponents speaking from the audience) address the PhD candidate as *worthy PhD candidate*. The PhD candidate addresses the members of the Promotion Committee as follows:
- Chairperson: *Mr/Madam Rector*,
 - Promotor: *esteemed promotor*,
 - Co-promotor: *learned promotor*, or if he does not have a doctorate *honourable promotor*,
 - Professors: *most learned opponent*,
 - Committee members with a PhD degree: *learned opponent*,

Any persons making comments or asking questions from the audience shall be addressed as *learned opponent* - or *most learned opponent* in the case of a professor.

- 22.7 If any events occur during the defence ceremony which in the opinion of the chair interfere with the normal procedure, he shall decide what course of action should be taken. If he decides to suspend the meeting this decision shall be communicated as quickly as possible to the Rector, who will deal with the matter further at his discretion.
- 22.8 Unless decided otherwise by the chair, the session lasts for precisely one hour. The beadle announces the end of this hour by saying '*hora est*'. The chair then asks the PhD candidate (and the *paranymphs*) to return to their seats in the audience, and announces that the committee will retire for further deliberation. After he has adjourned the session, all stand and the Promotion Committee leaves the room preceded by the beadle.

Article 23

Investiture with a PhD degree

- 23.1 The decision whether to confer the PhD degree in accordance with Article 4.1 is taken in a concealed meeting of the Promotion Committee, held immediately after the closure of the public ceremony. If at least one member of the Promotion Committee desires this, a poll shall be taken concerning the decision. Members vote for or against, or abstain. The PhD degree is only conferred if a majority of the members vote for this. If the PhD degree is conferred, the chair of the Promotion Committee signs the degree certificate together with the promotor (and possibly the co-promotor).
- 23.2 If it has been decided to confer the PhD degree, the chairperson, after reopening the defence ceremony, invites the PhD candidate (with his *paranymphs*, if any) to stand facing the Promotion Committee and declares that the Promotion Committee has decided on behalf of the Academic Board to confer the PhD degree. If the PhD degree is awarded *with distinction*, mention is also made of this fact. The promotor then performs the investiture ceremony and presents the signed degree certificate to the PhD candidate. The statement by the chair and the investiture formula are spoken in English, while all present are standing.
- 23.3 As soon as the members of the Promotion Committee and the audience are seated, the promotor or co-promotor addresses the newly graduated doctor while standing, expressing his opinion of the thesis and if desired the academic qualities of its author, and ends by congratulating him. The chair congratulates the new doctor on behalf of the Academic Board, invites him (and his *paranymphs*, if any) to take their places in the body of the hall again, and closes the meeting. The Promotion Committee then leaves the room, preceded by the beadle, while all stand.
- 23.4 If the doctorate is not conferred,
- the chair informs the PhD candidate of this fact during the meeting mentioned in Article 23.1;
 - after reopening the public meeting, the chair announces that the investiture has been suspended and closes the meeting, and
 - the chair informs the Rector in writing of the decision of the Promotion Committee. The Rector then convenes a special meeting of the Promotion Committee together with the Academic Board.
- 23.5 At the meeting mentioned in Article 23.4, subsection c, it may be decided to allow the PhD candidate to proceed to the defence of his thesis and propositions again or it may be decided that the doctorate should not be conferred. In the latter case the Rector informs the PhD candidate of this decision in writing, with reasons.

Article 24

Investiture with a doctorate *with distinction*

- 24.1 If the promotor or another member of the Promotion Committee considers that the thesis gives evidence of the PhD candidate's exceptional ability to engage in independent academic activity, he can submit a written proposal that the PhD candidate should be awarded a doctorate *with distinction*. This proposal may only be submitted on approval of the promotor. The proposal must be accompanied by at least two letters of recommendation from leading external experts in the same scientific field as the thesis. The criteria for conferring a doctorate *with distinction* are that the PhD research was pioneering, innovative, and performed with a high degree of independence. The thesis must have been completed in a reasonable time span. The Promotion Committee may also take exceptional scientific performance outside the scope of the dissertation into consideration.
- 24.2 The proposal mentioned in Article 24.1 shall be sent no later than the ninth week before the defence date to the chair, the other members of the Promotion Committee, with a copy to the beadle. The date of dispatch shall be mentioned in the proposal. This proposal shall be treated with strict confidentiality. The beadle will

submit the *with distinction* proposal to the Academic Board for consideration. The Board will inform the person who submitted the proposal and the members of the Promotion Committee of its decision.

- 24.3 If a proposal for awarding the doctorate *with distinction* has been made and there are no objections from members of the Academic Board, the chair (via the intermediation of the promotor) may, if desired, call a meeting of the Promotion Committee before or on the day of the defence to discuss this matter. If this deliberation has not taken place beforehand, the Promotion Committee shall meet 45 minutes before the start of the defence ceremony.
- 24.4 A proposal to award a doctorate *with distinction* shall be discussed during the meeting mentioned in Article 23.1 or, as discussed in Article 24.3, in a previous meeting. This discussion will consider the content of the thesis and propositions and the defence of the thesis and propositions by the PhD candidate, the criteria for awarding the accolade and the letters of recommendation together with the arguments put forward by the proposer(s), including the duration of the PhD study and other exceptional scientific performance outside the scope of the dissertation.
- 24.5 After the deliberation mentioned in Article 24.4, the members of the Promotion Committee vote on the proposal to award the PhD degree *with distinction* by filling in anonymous voting slips. The members of the committee (including the chairperson) may vote for or against the proposal, or may leave their voting slip blank.
- 24.6 The proposal to award the doctorate *with distinction* is rejected if:
- a. there is more than once vote against it;
 - b. there is one vote against and more than one blank voting slip;
 - c. there are no votes against, but more than two blank voting slips.
- In all other cases the proposal is accepted and the accolade *with distinction* is added to the degree certificate.

Chapter 8

Procedure for settling disputes

Article 25

Disputes

- 25.1 If a difference of opinion should arise between the PhD candidate, the (co-)promotor and/or members of the Promotion Committee before permission has been granted for the PhD candidate to proceed to the public defence of his thesis and its propositions, but after the nomination of the promotor in accordance with Article 7.1 and if this difference cannot be resolved amicably by consultation between the parties involved, the promotor shall inform the Academic Board of this fact in writing within 30 days. The Board shall then deal with the matter at its own discretion.
- 25.2 If, after permission has been granted for the PhD candidate to proceed to public defence of his thesis and its propositions in accordance with the terms of Article 18.6, new facts become known which might have influenced the decision to grant the above-mentioned permission had they been known before this decision was taken, the person who is aware of these facts shall inform the Academic Board of them in writing without delay, with copies to the PhD candidate and the promotor. The Academic Board shall then convene a special meeting of the Promotion Committee as soon as possible, but in any case within two weeks (except during the summer vacation).
At this meeting, after the PhD candidate has been heard, a decision as to whether the defence shall proceed or must be cancelled shall be taken by a simple majority of votes. In the event that votes are equally divided, the defence shall be cancelled.
- 25.3 If a difference of opinion between the PhD candidate, members of the Promotion Committee or other opponents arises during the PhD defence ceremony, the chair of the Promotion Committee shall deal with the matter at his own discretion.
- 25.4 If a conflict arises concerning the behaviours or decisions of promotors, co-promotor, the Academic Board itself, or individuals who are acting on behalf of the Academic Board, the complainant shall bring this matter to the attention of the Academic Board within six weeks of the taking of the decision in question. The Academic Board shall set up an advisory committee consisting of two members of the Academic Board and one chairperson who is not a member of and is not responsible to the Academic Board. The members of the advisory committee shall not have been involved in the PhD procedure that is the subject of the complaint.
- 25.5 The advisory committee mentioned in Article 25.4 shall give its recommendations, with reasons, within 60 days of its having been set up, after having heard all parties involved and - if necessary - other experts and with due regard to the general principles governing the handling of disputes. The Academic Board shall then come to a decision concerning the conflict within 30 days of the reception of the above-mentioned advice and shall inform all parties concerned of this decision in writing, stating the reasons which led it to this decision.
- 25.6 If necessary, the Academic Board can extend the periods mentioned in Articles 25.4 and 25.5 by a further 30 days.

Chapter 9

Final and interim provisions

Article 26

Final provisions

- 26.1 The Academic Board is entitled to formulate further rules governing the implementation of the provisions of these Guidelines.
- 26.2 In cases not covered by these PhD Guidelines, or when any provision is found to lend itself to differing interpretations, the Academic Board shall decide what course to follow.
- 26.3 If anyone wishes a particular provision from these Guidelines to be waived, he shall submit a written application to this end, with reasons, to the Academic Board. The Board shall come to a decision on this matter within 30 days.
- 26.4 Decisions concerning changes to these Guidelines shall be taken by the Academic Board by a simple majority of votes. In special cases, the Academic Board can authorise departures from these Guidelines for which adequate reasons have been put forward.
- 26.5 These Guidelines come into effect on the first day of September 2013.

Annex 1

The order of events

Step 0:

1. The person who wishes to register for the PhD programme presents authenticated copies of certificates which confer the right of admission to the PhD programme and follow the procedure laid down in Article 3. He reaches agreement with a proposed promotor on the subject of his research.
2. The Student Affairs section verifies the completeness of the required documentation for admission, including the financial coverage, and after confirmation of a professor that he is prepared to act as promotor, registers the applicants to the PhD programme.

Step 1:

1. The PhD candidate starts working on his PhD proposal and ITSP. He reaches agreement with his promotor on the nature of the supervision, including the composition of his Supervisory Team.
2. The promotor asks the Academic Board to approve the composition of the Supervisory Team. Members will confirm their appointment.
3. The PhD candidate registers with the SENSE Research School and starts with the implementation of his ITSP.
4. The promotor requests the beadle to coordinate the process to register the PhD candidate with the Partner University.

Step 2:

1. The PhD candidate drafts his PhD proposal, including the ITSP.
2. UNESCO-IHE organises the external review of the PhD proposal by two independent experts according to the SENSE criteria. The reviewers provide their feedback to the promotor(s) and PhD candidate.
3. The PhD candidate processes the comments provided by the external reviewers, submits the PhD proposal and ITSP to the Supervisory Team and the independent member of the Academic Board attending the PhD Proposal Defence, and schedules the PhD Proposal Defence.

Step 3:

1. The PhD Proposal Defence is held in a session bringing together the PhD candidate, the members of the Supervisory Team and the independent member of the Academic Board.
2. Further to the PhD Proposal Defence, the promotor submits an advice to the Academic Board concerning the (dis)continuation of the PhD programme, thus requesting for a 'Go/No go' decision from the Academic Board.
3. The Academic Board issues a 'Go' or 'No go' statement.

Step 4 and 5:

1. After the 'go' decision, the PhD candidate continues implementing his research and ITSP. He has regular consultations with his promotor(s) and mentor(s).
2. In January of each year up and until the PhD Defence Ceremony, the PhD candidate will submit progress reports to the Supervisory Team. These reports will describe the overall progress made, publications, fulfilled ITSP components, conferences attended, competencies achieved, a reflection on successes and bottlenecks, and a work plan for the next period.
3. The Supervisory Team assesses the progress and advises the promotor and the PhD candidate on the way forward. The PhD candidate organizes an annual meeting with the Supervisory Team to present the progress made and to receive feedback and guidance for the coming period.
4. The progress reports are forwarded by the promotor to the PhD Coordinator, who will prepare a consolidated annual PhD programme progress report for the Academic Board.

Step 6:

1. The PhD candidate successfully completes the ITSP Programme.

Step 7:

1. The PhD candidate submits the draft thesis to the Supervisory Team for review.
2. The Supervisory Team provides feedback to the PhD candidate and the promotor.
3. The promotor(s) approve(s) the draft thesis.
4. The beadle checks whether the ITSP programme has been successfully completed.
5. The promotor submits a proposal for the composition of the Promotion Committee to the Academic Board for approval, after ascertaining that the persons concerned are willing to participate.
6. The Academic Board approves the composition of the Promotion Committee.

Step 8:

1. After the composition of the Promotion Committee has been approved by the Academic Board, the promotor convenes a meeting between himself, the PhD candidate, the mentor and the beadle.
2. The beadle will prepare an activity plan for the period up to the PhD Defence Ceremony.
3. The beadle collects all relevant information required by the Partner University to administer the upcoming PhD Defence Ceremony and dispatches it to the Partner University.
4. The PhD candidate sends the draft thesis to the beadle.

Step 9:

1. In consultation with the Partner University, the Promotion Committee and the PhD candidate, the beadle fixes a date for the PhD Defence Ceremony.
2. The beadle notifies the Promotion Committee of their appointment, sends them the draft thesis, and asks them to confirm promptly that they will be present at the Defence Ceremony and for the assessment of the draft thesis.

Step 10:

1. The members of the Promotion Committee have a maximum of six weeks to review the draft thesis and send their comments to the PhD candidate and promotor.
2. The beadle has received responses from all Promotion Committee members regarding admission to the defence of the thesis.

Step 11:

1. The promotor responds to proposed changes and/or objections from Promotion Committee members regarding the draft thesis (if any).
2. The PhD candidate processes the proposed changes (if applicable) in consultation with the promotor and prepares the final version of the thesis.
3. The PhD candidate also prepares the propositions and sends them for approval to the promotor.
4. The promotor approves the final version of the thesis as well as the propositions, and signs an approval form.
5. If applicable, the promotor and/or members of the Promotion Committee send a proposal for the (strictly confidential) accolade of '*with distinction*' together with two letters of recommendation to all other parties involved and a copy to the beadle. The proposal for '*distinction*' is submitted to the Academic Board for consideration. The PhD candidate may never be informed of a possible '*distinction*'.
6. The beadle receives the approval form from the promotor and the final version of the thesis and propositions from the PhD candidate. The beadle approves the proofs of the title page and the reverse side, and arranges that the final version of the thesis and the propositions are printed in sufficient copies.

Step 12:

1. The beadle sends hard copies of the final version of the thesis and the propositions to the PhD candidate, the Promotion Committee, the Office of the beadle of the Partner University and to other relevant stakeholders.
2. SENSE delivers the ITSP/SENSE certificate to the beadle in case of successful completion.

Step 13:

1. The beadle arranges meetings with the PhD candidate and relevant stakeholders to discuss the logistics of the PhD Defence Ceremony.
2. The beadle arranges the announcement of the PhD Defence Ceremony, no later than two weeks before the PhD Defence Ceremony date.

Step 14:

1. Members of the Promotion Committee assemble for deliberation 30 (or 45) minutes before the start of the PhD Defence Ceremony.
2. The beadle assists in ensuring strict compliance with protocol during the PhD Defence Ceremony.
3. The PhD candidate explains the content of the thesis in terms which are understandable to non-experts.

A timetable for the PhD Defence procedure is given on the next page. It should be stressed that all activities mentioned here must take place no later than the time indicated to ensure -with reasonable certainty- that the PhD Defence Ceremony can indeed be held on the planned date, given the time required for the various formalities. It is highly advisable to allow some leeway in the planning.

Time Schedule / Preparations for the PhD Defence

(the numbers in brackets refer to the Articles in these Guidelines)

Step	When	PhD candidate	Promotor	Supervisory Team	SENSE	Beadle	Student Affairs	Partner University
application								
0	before enrolment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> applies to the PhD programme submits an outline of the envisaged research topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> accepts to act as promotor ensures supervision capacity 	•	•	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> coordinates the procedure leading to academic admission registers the PhD candidate in to the PhD programme 	
from the start of the programme								
1	within 3 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> starts developing the research proposal and ITSP proposes the Supervisory Team applies with SENSE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sends the composition of the Supervisory Team to the Academic Board for approval. instructs the beadle to register the PhD candidate with the Partner University. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> members confirm their appointment in the committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> registers the PhD candidate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> coordination of the registration with the Partner University. 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> registration of the PhD candidate
2	in 6 to 8 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> finalises the research proposal and ITSP and submits to SENSE for external review processes comments of SENSE external reviewers submits research proposal and ITSP to the Supervisory Team schedules the PhD proposal defence 	•	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 experts carry out the external review of the PhD proposal 	•	•	•
3	within 12 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PhD proposal defence. ultimate date to comply with entry requirements of the Partner University. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> based on the assessment of the PhD proposal, submits 'Go/No go' statement to AB for approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assesses the quality of the PhD proposal 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> informs parties concerned of the AB decision. ultimate date to register PhD candidate with Partner University. 	•	•
4	in January following the PhD proposal defence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> submits a progress report to the Supervisory Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> approves the progress report and fills-in a Progress Evaluation Form the main data from the evaluation form are reflected in the annual Chair Group report that is submitted to AB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assesses the progress made so far 	•	•	•	•
5	every following January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> submits progress report to the Supervisory Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> approves the progress report and fills-in a Progress Evaluation Form the main data from the evaluation form are reflected in the annual Chair Group report that is submitted to AB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assesses the progress made so far 	•	•	•	•
6	later on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> completes the ITSP 	•	•	•	•	•	•
countdown from PhD Defence Ceremony								
7	20 to 18 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> submits draft thesis to the Supervisory Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> approves the draft thesis prepares the composition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reviews the draft thesis and fills-in 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> checks completion of ITSP 	•	•

			proposal for the Promotion Committee and submits it for approval to the AB via the beadle	supervisory approval form				
8	18 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sends e-copy of the draft thesis to the beadle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> arranges a meeting between PhD candidate, promotor and beadle fill in forms of the Partner University concerning supervisory approval of the draft thesis and the composition of the Promotion Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prepares an activity schedule for the period until the promotion. sends forms to the Office of the beadle of the Partner University 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> administer the details of the upcoming PhD Defence Ceremony.
9	17 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sends draft thesis to the Promotion Committee and to the Partner University fixes a date for the PhD Defence Ceremony in consultation with the Partner University 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> administers the date of the PhD Defence Ceremony
10	no later than 11 weeks in advance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> receives comments from the Promotion Committee on the draft thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> receives assessments of Promotion Committee members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
11	no later than 9 weeks in advance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> processes comments of the Promotion Committee in consultation with the promotor delivers final thesis and propositions to the beadle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> approves the final thesis and the propositions if applicable, submits a proposal to award the degree 'with distinction' supported by letters of recommendation to the AB via the beadle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sends the approval of the final thesis by the promotor and the propositions (and if applicable the proposal to award the degree 'with distinction') to the Office of the beadle of the Partner University sets in motion the printing of the final thesis and the propositions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> designates a Chairperson for the PhD Defence Ceremony if applicable, arranges decision-making concerning the proposal to award the degree with distinction.
12	no later than 3 weeks in advance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sends SENSE certificate to the beadle if the ITSP has been successfully completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sends hard copies of the final thesis to the PhD candidate, the Promotion Committee and the Office of the beadle of the Partner University 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
13	no later than 2 weeks in advance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> last meeting with beadle on arrangements for the PhD Defence Ceremony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> arranges announcement of the PhD Defence Ceremony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
14	Doctorate Defence Ceremony	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> gives presentation and defends thesis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the promotor and the Promotion Committee are present in good time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assists with strict execution of protocol (if ceremony is held at UNESCO-IHE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assists with strict execution of protocol (if ceremony is held at Partner University)

ITSP: Individual Training and Study Plan

Annex 2

The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice (VSNU)

Principles of good scientific teaching and research

The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice

Principles of good scientific teaching and research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice

Preamble	3
Principles and best practices	5
I. Scrupulousness	5
II. Reliability	6
III. Verifiability	7
IV. Impartiality	8
V. Independence	9
Commentary	10
Dilemmas	11

NB: to enhance the readability, this Code uses 'he' to refer to the third person singular; in all instances the reader is requested to interpret this as 'he/she'.

The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice

Preamble

1. This *Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice* was drawn up at the request of the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (Vereniging van Universiteiten, VSNU). The wish for a Code of Conduct stems from the generally shared conviction that (employees of) institutes that fulfil a societal role are held to a proper exercise of their duties. Rules that establish correct practice should be entrusted to paper to provide common ground and, if necessary, ground for admonishment.
2. The Code applies to scientific practice, which is understood to include scientific teaching and research at all universities in the Netherlands. More precisely, the Code is intended for the individual scientific practitioner. This Code does not aim to provide guidelines for university administration.
3. The Code presumes the administratively autonomous university that safeguards the academic liberty of the scientific practitioners engaged there. It is the university's responsibility to let this liberty fit in to the frameworks of the established education and research programmes.
4. At the same time, the Code presumes that the university is a collaborative venture of diverse stakeholders in the university. Stakeholders are the staff and the students, but also the government, community entities and the corporate world. The integrity of each scientific practitioner is an essential condition for maintaining stakeholders' faith in science. Integrity is the cornerstone of good scientific practice.
5. The Code contains principles that all scientific practitioners allied with a university (teachers and researchers) should observe individually, among each other and towards society. The principles can be read as general notions of good scientific practice; they are not intended as supplementary judicial rules. The overarching principle is that every scientific practitioner is bound to the frameworks established by Dutch and international legislation. These legal frameworks are not discussed in this Code of Conduct. A second overarching principle is transparency; every scientific practitioner must (be able to) demonstrate how he puts these principles into practice.
6. The Code describes *desirable* conduct and is, in this regard, complementary to the regulations established by the universities and the National Committee for Scientific Integrity Regulations (Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit, LOWI) on how to deal with *undesirable* conduct. Therefore, this Code does not contain sanction rules or complaints procedures.
7. The principles defined in this Code are detailed further in 'best practices'. These best practices, which provide a certain set of norms for the conduct of teachers and researchers, reflect the national and international understanding of good scientific teaching and research. Under particular circumstances, deviation may be justified. The applicability of the provisions depends on the concrete circumstances under which the scientific practitioner operates. Moreover, the circumstances under which the university operates are also regularly subject to change. Nonetheless, every practitioner must, if required, be able to explain and motivate if – and if so, to what extent and why – he is at variance with the best practices of the university Code of Conduct (the rule “apply or explain”).

8. The Code consists of this preamble, the principles and the best practices. The Code is divided into five parts:

- I. Scrupulousness
- II. Reliability
- III. Verifiability
- IV. Impartiality
- V. Independence

The Code is followed by a commentary on the principles. Finally, a number of dilemmas have been added to encourage reflection and discussion.

9. All universities and their scientific staff will make the necessary effort to familiarise themselves with the content of this Code without delay. In addition, the universities will ensure that the Code is discussed by the academic community, particularly by incorporating the Code of Conduct into the teaching of aspiring scientists (in the graduate and post-graduate courses). This will enhance the awareness of what good scientific teaching and research entails.
10. The *Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice* was established by the General Board of the Association of Universities (Algemeen Bestuur van de Vereniging van Universiteiten) on 17 December 2004, and came into force as from 1 January 2005.

PRINCIPLES AND BEST PRACTICES

I. Scrupulousness

Principle

Scientific activities are performed scrupulously, unaffected by mounting pressure to achieve.

Best Practice

- I.1 Scrupulousness is expressed through precision and nuance in providing scientific instruction and conducting scientific research and the publishing of results thereof.
- I.2 Every scientific practitioner demonstrates respect for the people and animals involved in scientific teaching and research. Research on human subjects is only permitted upon their freely given informed consent and if there are no or just the slightest of risks. The privacy of subjects involved is sufficiently protected. If research on humans or animals poses any kind of risk, the significance of the research must justify taking that risk.
- I.3 Accurate source references serve to ensure that credit is awarded where credit is deserved. This also applies to information gathered via the Internet.
- I.4 Authorship is acknowledged. Rules common to the scientific discipline are observed.
- I.5 Scrupulousness is not restricted to the transfer of information, but also applies to relations among scientific practitioners and with students.
- I.6 Good mentorship is essential: a student and junior staff member are in a position of dependency. The responsibilities of persons involved in teaching and research are clearly defined and observed at all times.
- I.7 A scientific practitioner avoids personal relationships that may give rise to reasonable doubt concerning the objectivity of his decisions, or that may result in any form of coercion or exploitation of a hierarchically subordinate person.
- I.8 The assessment of study performance is based on explicit criteria that have been announced in advance. Teachers are prepared to explain every assessment, while students are sufficiently aware of the matter on which they will be assessed.
- I.9 A scientific practitioner ensures that he maintains the level of expertise required to exercise his duties. He does not accept duties for which he lacks the necessary expertise. If necessary, he actively indicates the limits of his competence.
- I.10 Damages as a result of errors or negligence are repaired to the best of one's ability.
- I.11 A scientific practitioner is co-responsible for the quality of the educational programme in which he provides instruction, and for the scientific and societal value of the research programmes in which he participates. He acts according to his own preferences only insofar as this is reconcilable with this responsibility.

II. Reliability

Principle

Science's reputation of reliability is confirmed and enhanced through the conduct of every scientific practitioner. A scientific practitioner is reliable in the performance of his research and in the reporting, and equally in the transfer of knowledge through teaching and publication.

Best Practice

- II.1 The selective omission of research results is reported and justified. The data has indeed been collected. The statistical methods employed are pertinent to the acquired data.
- II.2 Speculation spurred by results of scientific research is recognizably presented as such. This does not include conclusions on the basis of the presented results. Suggestions for follow-up research may rest on speculation, in the form of an interpretation of the acquired results.
- II.3 The system of peer review can only function on the assumption that intellectual property is recognized and respected.
- II.4 A scientific practitioner provides a complete and honest overview of his skills whenever a decision concerning his career or duties is pending.
- II.5 In transferring information in education, a selective representation of available knowledge is either avoided or justified. A clear distinction is made between transferred knowledge and personal opinion or related speculation.

III. Verifiability

Principle

Presented information is verifiable. Whenever research results are publicized, it is made clear what the data and the conclusions are based on, where they were derived from and how they can be verified.

Best Practice

- III.1 Research must be replicable in order to verify its accuracy. The choice of research question, the research set-up, the choice of method and the reference to sources studied is accurately documented.
- III.2 The quality of data collection, data input, data storage and data processing is guarded closely. All steps taken must be properly reported and their execution must be properly monitored (lab journals, progress reports, documentation of arrangements and decisions, etc.).
- III.3 Raw research data are stored for at least five years. These data are made available to other scientific practitioners at request.
- III.4 Raw research data are archived in such a way that they can be consulted at a minimum expense of time and effort.
- III.5 The source of all educational material, including oral information transfer, is stated.

IV. Impartiality

Principle

In his scientific activities, the scientific practitioner heeds no other interest than the scientific interest. In this respect, he is always prepared to account for his actions.

Best Practice

- IV.1 Scientific practitioners give others room to take their own intellectual stance. This applies particularly in case of a hierarchical relation, like the relation between a teacher and a student or a tutor and a PhD student.
- IV.2 The choice of methods and criteria is guided solely by the goal of truth-finding, and not by external goals such as commercial success or political influence.
- IV.3 A reviewer consults his conscience as to whether he can offer an impartial assessment of a manuscript, for instance when it concerns a competing research group.
- IV.4 In assessing the performance of others (peer review in education, research and manuscripts), a scientific practitioner heeds arguments of scientific substance. He refrains from assessing a manuscript if he is in any way involved in the education or research concerned.
- IV.5 A scientific practitioner only defends a certain scientific viewpoint if that viewpoint is based on sufficient scientific grounds. Competing viewpoints must be mentioned and explained.
- IV.6 Exclusively assigning one's own study books in education is avoided, in any case at undergraduate level.
- IV.7 In its annual report, every university reports on its registration of sideline activities by its staff. Every university registers the sideline activities relevant to scientific practice. Preferably, this register is made publicly accessible.
- IV.8 Every scientific practitioner allied with a university provides the institution with an up-to-date overview of his sideline activities for registration purposes.

V. Independence

Principle

Scientific practitioners operate in a context of academic liberty and independence. Insofar as restrictions of that liberty are inevitable, these are clearly stated.

Best Practice

- V.1 Whenever a scientific practitioner is commissioned to provide instruction or conduct research, he is allowed – once the parameters have been defined – to execute the assignment without interference by the commissioning party. The research question is of interest to science, aside from the commissioning party's particular concern. The method employed is scientifically valid. The commissioning party has no influence on the research results.
- V.2 Commissioned assignments demonstrably contribute to scientific teaching or research.
- V.3 There is no unclarity as to the identity of the commissioning party of a certain scientific activity, the relation between the commissioning party and the executing party, the existence of consultancy relations or other connections, etc.
- V.4 The publication of scientific research results is guaranteed. Arrangements with an external financier always stipulate that the scientific practitioner is at liberty to publish the results within a specified, reasonable period.
- V.5 External financiers of executed projects are identified by name. For research this means that their names are stated in the publication; for education this means that they are referred to in the course announcement and teaching material.

Commentary on the principles set forth in the Code

I. **Scrupulousness:**

Main entry: *Scrupulous*

1: *having moral integrity : acting in strict regard for what is considered right or proper*

2: *punctiliously exact : <working with scrupulous care>*

The actions of a scientific practitioner are scrupulous if they are performed with the dedication and the precision that the proper exercise of the profession requires. Although the scientific practitioner's concern in regard to this principle shall be primarily aimed at promoting the aims for which the profession is intended, the principle of scrupulousness also means not inflicting unnecessary or disproportional damage to the interests of third parties.

II. **Reliability:**

1: *the quality or state of being reliable*

2: *the extent to which an experiment, test, or measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials*

A scientific practitioner acts reliably if he does not fail the justified expectations of others regarding the exercise of his profession.

Reliability concerns both the conduct of the scientific practitioner and his written work. A very specific meaning of the term reliability is found in the statistical concept of reliability, which concerns the analysis of experimentally acquired data. Whenever relevant, publications make mention of this statistical uncertainty of research results. Within the context of this Code, the principle of reliability is understood in its broadest sense.

III. **Verifiability:**

capable of being verified [Verify: to establish the truth, accuracy or reality of]

Conduct is verifiable if it is possible for others to assess whether it complies with relevant standards (for instance of quality or decency).

IV. **Impartiality:**

Main Entry: *impartial*

not partial or biased : treating or affecting all equally

A scientific practitioner is impartial if he does not let personal interest, preference, affection or prejudice affect his judgment and decisions.

V. **Independence:**

the quality or state of being independent [Independent: not subject to control by others; not requiring or relying on something else]

When presenting insights as correct and relevant, a scientific practitioner is independent if he allows himself to be influenced by another person's judgement only to the degree that this judgement is deserving of scientific authority.

The definitions of the principles provided in cursive derive from Merriam Webster Online (www.m-w.com).

Dilemmas

The authors of this Code of Conduct are well aware that this Code does not solve all problems. One can think or actually know of 'grey areas' and dilemmas to which the Code is not directly applicable. To encourage discussion of the Code and its limitations, a number of such cases are set out below.

I. Dilemmas regarding scrupulousness

- I.a A well-known scientist has a reputation for his intuitive approach. This approach tends to result in a number of 'loose ends' which he leaves to his subordinates to tie up. Without their contribution ('the dirty work'), his ideas would not progress beyond the status of interesting observations. Nevertheless, the scientific community wholly credits this group production to the well-known figure, who clearly relishes the recognition. Is this acceptable?
- I.b May you relinquish restraint in formulating moral and political viewpoints in the media, if your colleagues see no need for preserving nuance and casually express viewpoints which you perceive to be wrong?
- I.c A certain researcher is a true perfectionist. Because he refuses to publish research results before they comply with standards that exceed those of his colleagues, the total output of his research group threatens to be lower than seems desirable for the upcoming visitation. May his colleagues expect him to lower his standards?

II. Dilemmas regarding reliability

- II.a A teacher is held in high esteem by his students because of his enthusiasm and eloquence. However, carried away by his own passion he sometimes paints pictures that transgress the limits of current knowledge, without indicating this transgression. Is this acceptable?
- II.b A researcher has collected a large amount of data and has published results on a socially relevant subject. On the basis of these results, he expresses critical views on this subject. Subsequent to receiving a commission in his area of competence from a third-party stakeholder (the government), he writes a report that is markedly more positive in tone. This shift is based on a slight modification in a number of presuppositions and statistical significance levels, which he attributes to an advance in insight and improved measuring methods. The report is assigned a key role in the government's decision making, but colleague researchers are outraged. Is the researcher reproachable?

III. Dilemmas regarding verifiability

- III.a A researcher has performed commissioned research on the basis of an agreement that the results remain confidential for two years; in that period the client can use the results for his own (financial) gain. After two years, the researcher publishes the results in a renowned journal. An interested yet sceptical colleague wishes to access the raw data to verify whether the claims in the article are justified, but the researcher refuses to release the data on the basis of the commission contract. This states that the raw data should remain confidential for five years, after which the researcher may destroy the data. Is this acceptable?
- III.b A teacher has written a study book intended for first year students. To increase its readability he has not used source references, offering instead a list of further reading recommendations

per chapter. In writing the book, he nevertheless made extensive use of the work of colleagues from all over the world. Should he have made detailed mention of this?

IV. Dilemmas regarding impartiality

- IV.a A scientist is asked for a reference to support a candidate for a substantial individual subsidy. He strongly suspects that other candidates have received inflated references. Should he nevertheless offer a thoroughly honest and impartial assessment?
- IV.b A teacher is involved in compiling a list of compulsory literature for a course. He proposes a book of his own, for which he receives royalties. If his book is listed, should he be required to transfer the ensuing income?
- IV.c Researchers have patented a certain discovery, and now wish to capitalize on this patent. This requires additional research, which they would like to perform at their own institute. Is this acceptable or should they establish an independent entity (e.g. an Ltd.)?

V. Dilemmas regarding independence

- V.a How much influence may a client have on the research problem statement? Or on the intended approach and method? (When) is he entitled to steer the course of the research? Or of the research reporting?
- V.b A particular research project that has been submitted to open tender is amenable to two different research methods. Method A is expensive but very reliable. Method B is much cheaper, yet much less reliable. A researcher is considering submitting a proposal, and judges Method A to be the most appropriate. May he nevertheless choose for Method B in his proposal, in an attempt to increase his chances of winning the commission?
- V.c May you modify a research proposal in an NWO*-programme to suit the theoretical preferences of the heads of the programme, which can sometimes be deduced from the programme description?

(*Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research)

Colophon

The text of the *Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice* was written by a VSNU-working group consisting of the following persons:

- Prof. P.F. van der Heijden, Rector Magnificus Universiteit van Amsterdam (chairman);
- Prof. J. Fokkema, Rector Magnificus Delft University of Technology;
- Prof. S.W.J. Lamberts, Rector Magnificus Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Prof. G.P.M.F. Mols, Rector Magnificus Universiteit Maastricht;
- Prof. G.A. den Hartogh, professor of Ethics and its history, Faculty of Humanities, Universiteit van Amsterdam;
- Dr. M.E.A. Stouthard, research manager Amsterdam Centre for Health and Health Care Research, Universiteit van Amsterdam;
- Dr. A.A. Post, senior research policy advisor, Universiteit van Amsterdam (secretary).

Amsterdam, 25 October 2004