



PhD Regulations

Adopted by the Doctorate Board
15 October 2020

PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY PHD REGULATIONS

Chapter 1 – General provisions

Article 1.1

The following definitions apply within these Regulations:

University	Protestant Theological University
Act	Higher Education and Research Act (WHW)
Management Regulations	(<i>bestuursreglement</i>) the regulations pursuant to Article 9.4 of the Act and Ordinance 13-8-3 of the Church Order of the Protestant Church in the Netherlands
Doctorate Board	(<i>college voor promoties</i>) the board referred to in Article 5.14 of the Management Regulations; all of the members have <i>ius promovendi</i>
Examination Committee	(<i>examencommissie</i>) the committee referred to in Article 5.8 of the Management Regulations
PhD candidate	a person who, pursuant to Article 7.18(2) and Article 7.18(3) of the Act and having fulfilled the requirements stipulated in these Regulations, has been admitted to a PhD defence or is preparing a dissertation
supervisor	(<i>promotor</i>) the full professor referred to in Article 5.3 and Article 5.4 of the Management Regulations, appointed in this capacity by the Doctorate Board, pursuant to Article 7.18(5) of the Act
second supervisor	the full professor who assists the supervisor in supervising the PhD candidate, appointed in this capacity by the Doctorate Board, in accordance with Article 4.1 paragraph 2 of these Regulations
co-supervisor	the PhD-holding expert who assists the supervisor in supervising the PhD candidate, appointed in this capacity by the Doctorate Board, in accordance with Article 5.1 of these Regulations
Assessment Committee	(<i>beoordelingscommissie</i>) the committee that assesses whether the submitted manuscript will be accepted as a dissertation
dissertation	the academic treatise in the form of a book or a collection of articles, as referred to in Article 7.18(2)b of the Act
propositions	statements appended to the dissertation that have been formulated by the PhD candidate, who wishes them to be accepted as true
PhD defence	the ceremony at which the public defence of the dissertation and its related propositions takes place and – provided that the relevant requirements have been fulfilled – the PhD degree is conferred.

Article 1.2

1. A doctorate can be obtained at the University on the basis of the PhD defence. These Regulations are the PhD Regulations referred to in Article 5.15 of the Management Regulations.
2. The PhD Regulations were adopted by the Doctorate Board on 15 October 2020, with due regard to the relevant provisions of the Act, and came into effect on 1 January 2021.

Article 1.3

If the roles referred to in these Regulations are (in certain cases) fulfilled by a woman, the masculine terms and words should (in those cases) be read in the feminine form.

Article 1.4

1. Where reference is made in these Regulations to supervisor and/or co-supervisor, these should be read as supervisors or co-supervisors if more than one appointment has been made.
2. In the absence of the Rector, or if the Rector has been appointed as the supervisor or wishes to be a member of the Assessment Committee, his powers will be temporarily exercised by another full professor of the University, to be appointed for this occasion by the Rector.
3. With respect to the matters discussed in the non-public meetings referred to in Article 6.2 paragraph 6 and Article 8.6 paragraph 4 and during the appeal procedure, all the persons present are bound by an obligation of secrecy.

Article 1.5

The PhD Regulations of the PThU are applicable to all PhD defences at the University and, with due regard to the

provisions of Chapters 12 and 13, to PhD defences that take place elsewhere in consequence of collaboration agreements between the University and other academic education institutions, insofar as different arrangements were not made when the partners entered into these collaboration agreements.

Article 1.6

The PhD candidate, supervisor and co-supervisor must comply at all times with the standards of academic integrity, as formulated in the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (VSNU, 2018).

Article 1.7

1. The partner of the PhD candidate, a blood relative or first- or second-degree relative of the candidate, or other persons whose relationship with the candidate should preclude them from assessing the candidate's work may not be appointed as a supervisor, co-supervisor or member of the Assessment Committee.
2. The partner of a supervisor and, where applicable, the partner of a co-supervisor may not be appointed as a member of the Assessment Committee.

Article 2.1 – Conditions for admission

1. Admission to PhD studies is granted by the PhD Admission Committee, on behalf of the Doctorate Board, at the request of the prospective PhD candidate. The composition and appointment procedure for the members of the PhD Admission Committee are laid down in the Rules for Admission to PhD Studies, which form an integral part of these PhD Regulations.
2. Admission to PhD studies will be granted to applicants who:
 - a) pursuant to Article 7.10a(1), (2) or (3) of the Act have been awarded a master's degree, as evident from a certificate, or have passed the corresponding and equivalent final examination of a foreign higher education institution, as evident from a certificate;
 - b) have found a full professor or senior lecturer (US: associate professor) to whom the Doctorate Board has granted *ius promovendi* and who fulfils the requirements stipulated in these Regulations to be appointed as a supervisor, who is willing to supervise the PhD studies proposed by the prospective PhD candidate as the supervisor; and have found a full professor or senior lecturer who has *ius promovendi* at either the University or another academic education institution, who is willing to supervise the PhD studies proposed by the prospective PhD candidate as the second supervisor and/or have found a senior lecturer or lecturer (US: assistant professor) who fulfils the requirements stipulated in these Regulations to be appointed as a co-supervisor, who is willing to supervise the PhD studies proposed by the prospective PhD candidate as the co-supervisor;
 - c) have demonstrably studied the current insights and requirements relating to academic integrity;
 - d) have demonstrably studied the current scientific methods and techniques in the research field;
 - e) can submit an approved research proposal, including a training and supervision plan;
 - f) can submit an approved data management plan;
 - g) have endorsed the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity;
 - h) have fulfilled the other requirements stipulated in or pursuant to these Regulations.
3. At the request of the Admission Committee, the Examination Committee will assess the extent to which the diploma awarded by the foreign study programme referred to in paragraph 2 subparagraph a is equivalent to the master's degree referred to in Article 7.10a(1), (2) or (3) of the Act. When making this assessment, the Examination Committee will take into account the advice received on behalf of the Admission Office of the University of Groningen, at the request of the Admission Committee.
4. In special cases, the Doctorate Board can grant admission to PhD studies, on the proposal of the Admission Committee, to a prospective PhD candidate who satisfies the conditions stipulated in paragraph 2 subparagraphs b to h, but not the condition stipulated in paragraph 2 subparagraph a, provided that the applicant can prove in another way that he has sufficient knowledge.
5. In this case, the request for admission must be accompanied by a statement issued by the Examination Committee, showing that the applicant's level of education and knowledge is equivalent to that of persons to whom the University has awarded the master's degree.
6. Persons who have already been awarded a doctorate or equivalent degree will not be admitted to PhD studies, unless their intended dissertation is based on research in a different domain of knowledge than their earlier dissertation.
7. The age of the PhD candidate may not form an obstacle to admission.

Article 2.2 – Procedure for admission to PhD studies

1. A request for admission is submitted to the Admission Committee and consists of the admission form, accompanied by the documents referred to in paragraph 2; it is signed by both the prospective PhD candidate and the intended supervisor, and dated.
2. A request for admission will only be accepted for consideration if the admission form is accompanied by the following documents:
 - a) A written statement issued by the full professor(s) and/or senior lecturer(s) and/or lecturer(s) referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b, confirming his/their willingness to act as the supervisor, second supervisor or co-supervisor.
 - b) A research proposal, including a training and supervision plan and a data management plan, established in consultation between the intended supervisor and the prospective PhD candidate.
 - c) An authenticated copy of the certificate referred to Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph a, accompanied by the Examination Committee's statement referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 3, where applicable.
 - d) A list of grades relating to the certificate referred to in subparagraph c.
 - e) The applicant's curriculum vitae.
 - f) A copy of the thesis written as part of the final examination curriculum of the master's programme for which the applicant received the master's degree.
 - g) A copy of the applicant's identity document.
3. The admission form referred to in paragraph 1 states the name and address of the prospective PhD candidate; the nature, place and date of the final examination that formed the basis for awarding the certificate referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph a; the topic of the dissertation; and the name, address and teaching & research remit of the intended supervisor.
4. The research proposal, including the training and supervision plan and the data management plan, will be assessed by the Admission Committee on the basis of the criteria established by the Doctorate Board on the advice of the Research Practice Committee.
5. After receiving a request for admission, the Admission Committee will decide whether the prospective PhD candidate is unconditionally admissible, conditionally admissible or non-admissible to PhD studies.
6. When making its decision, the Admission Committee will comply with the rules of procedure laid down in the Implementation Regulations for the PhD Admission Procedure, which form an integral part of the University's PhD Regulations.
7. The prospective PhD candidate has the right to object against the Admission Committee's decision, in accordance with the dispute settlement procedure laid down in Chapter 11 of these Regulations.

Article 2.3

Persons who have already been awarded a doctorate or equivalent degree will not be admitted to PhD studies, unless their intended dissertation is based on research in a different domain of knowledge than their earlier dissertation.

Article 2.4

1. A request for admission is submitted by means of an admission form, and is accompanied by the Admission Committee's decision, as referred to in Article 2.2. paragraph 5. It is submitted to the Rector of the University, for the attention of the Official Secretary of the Doctorate Board, after being signed by both the prospective PhD candidate and the intended supervisor and dated.
2. The request for admission will only be accepted for consideration if the following documents are appended to the admission form:
 - a) The written statement referred to in Article 2.2 paragraph 2 subparagraph a;
 - b) The research proposal referred to in Article 2.2. paragraph 4, including the training and supervision plan, accompanied by positive advice of the Research Practice Committee. The plan specifies periodic meetings between the supervisor and the PhD candidate and written reports of these meetings.
 - c) An authenticated copy of the certificate(s) referred to in Article 2.2 paragraph 2 subparagraph c, or the Examination Committee's statement referred to there.

Article 2.5

1. The Doctorate Board decides on admission of the prospective PhD candidate to PhD studies. On behalf of the Rector, as chair of the Doctorate Board, written confirmation of the decision relating to admission to PhD studies is sent to the applicant. The decision states which full professor has been appointed by the Doctorate Board as the supervisor and, where applicable, as the co-supervisor. A copy of this decision is sent to the supervisor, the co-supervisor, where applicable, and the Head of the Graduate School of the PThU.
2. Together with the written confirmation of admission, the following documents are sent to the PhD candidate:
 - a) A copy of these PhD Regulations;
 - b) A document produced by the Doctorate Board, stating the mutual rights and obligations of the PhD candidate and the supervisor;
 - c) A copy of the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (VSNU, 2018).

Article 2.6

By way of derogation from the provisions of Articles 2.1 and 2.2 concerning the admission requirements, the Doctorate Board can decide to grant admission to a prospective PhD candidate if applying these articles would result in a situation of extreme unfairness for the prospective PhD candidate.

Article 3.1 – The prospective PhD candidate

1. Before submitting a request for admission to PhD studies, a prospective candidate who wishes to write a dissertation at the University – and who has not given notification that he wishes to engage in PhD studies at the University by participating in an application procedure relating to the job opening for a PhD candidate to be appointed on the basis of an employment contract – will approach the full professor or senior lecturer (US: associate professor) granted *ius promovendi* by the University whom he considers to be most appropriate, in order to discuss his intended research.
2. At the request of the prospective PhD candidate, the full professor or senior lecturer referred to in paragraph 1 will provide him with a written statement as referred to in Article 2.2 paragraph 2 subparagraph a.
3. The prospective PhD candidate may only submit a request for admission to PhD studies after receiving the statement referred to in paragraph 2. This request will only be accepted for consideration if it fulfils the requirements stipulated in Chapter 2 for a request for admission.
4. The request for admission to PhD studies must have been received by the Admission Committee no later than the last day of the time period for submitting a request for admission. The latest date before which a request for admission must have been received by the Admission Committee will be announced in good time by the Admission Committee.
5. If the prospective PhD candidate believes he can claim exemption from all or parts of the (Initial) Graduate School's curriculum, he must submit a reasoned request for exemption at the same time as the request for admission to PhD studies. After consulting the Head of the Graduate School, the Admission Committee will make a decision on this and send a copy of this decision to the full professor or senior lecturer referred to in paragraph 1.

Article 3.2 – The PhD candidate

1. The PhD candidate submits the manuscript to his supervisor, second supervisor and/or co-supervisor for assessment, either in its entirety or in parts, and incorporates the agreed changes.
2. After incorporating the agreed changes, the PhD candidate submits the entire manuscript to the supervisor and second supervisor, with the written request to accept it as a dissertation, without prejudice to the PhD candidate's responsibility referred to in Article 7.1 paragraph 8.
3. The PhD candidate may not proceed to make copies of the manuscript as a dissertation until the Rector has given his approval, as referred to in Article 6.2 paragraph 7.

Article 4.1

1. On the proposal of the person who has stated that he is willing to act as the supervisor, in accordance with Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b, the Doctorate Board appoints the relevant full professor or senior lecturer (US: associate professor) with *ius promovendi* as the supervisor.
2. On the proposal of the person who has stated that he is willing to act as the supervisor, in accordance with Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b, the Doctorate Board appoints a second person to supervise each PhD candidate: a supervisor or co-supervisor.
3. If two supervisors are appointed, the provisions of these Regulations relating to the supervisor apply for both of them.
4. Full professors of a different Dutch university or equivalent foreign academic education institution can act as a supervisor at the University. Full professors of a foreign institution can only act as a supervisor if they have the authority to do this in the country where that institution is located and if their appointment is subject to procedures similar to those for appointing full professors in Dutch universities.
5. A full professor as referred to in paragraph 4 can only be appointed as a second supervisor if he is actively involved in research on the topic (or an aspect of the topic) covered in the dissertation.
6. No more than two supervisors may be appointed for each PhD degree. If more than one supervisor has been appointed, the supervisors will decide on the division of tasks between them, after consulting the PhD candidate.
7. The full professor, senior lecturer or lecturer (US: assistant professor) is entitled to withdraw a statement as referred to in Article 2.2 paragraph 2 subparagraph a, in writing and stating the reasons.
8. The PhD candidate has the right to lodge an objection with the Doctorate Board against the decision referred to in the previous paragraph, in accordance with the dispute settlement procedure in Chapter 11 of these Regulations.

Article 4.2

1. Full professors who have been granted honourable discharge retain their right to act as a supervisor for five years after their discharge until the date of the PhD defence. If a full professor is granted honourable discharge after being appointed as a supervisor, the decision to admit the PhD candidate to the defence of his dissertation must therefore be made within five years from the date of his discharge.
This five-year time limit can only be extended by a decision of the Doctorate Board.
2. Endowed professors and full professors with a temporary position are voting members of the Doctorate Board. At the request of the Doctorate Board, their membership of this Board may be extended for up to five years after the date of their leaving.
3. If the decision to admit the PhD candidate to the defence of his dissertation has not been made within the time limit referred to in paragraph 1, the appointment as supervisor will lapse and the Doctorate Board will appoint another supervisor, after consulting the PhD candidate.

Article 4.3

1. The supervisor is responsible for supervising the PhD candidate in producing his dissertation in accordance with the training and supervision plan referred to in Article 2.4 paragraph 2 subparagraph b.
2. During the supervision and production of the dissertation, regular meetings will take place between the supervisor and the PhD candidate, as agreed in advance in the training and supervision plan. The supervisor will discuss any changes that he thinks should be made in the manuscript with the PhD candidate and, if applicable, the second supervisor or co-supervisor.
3. During the supervision, the supervisor is responsible for ensuring that:
 - a) the PhD candidate conducts his research independently;
 - b) the PhD research is conducted according to the University's code of conduct for research integrity and the code of conduct and/or professional code that applies to professional conduct in the relevant academic field;
 - c) insofar as the PhD research (or an aspect of the research) is funded by third parties, as few restrictions as possible are imposed on the research; and if restrictions are imposed on the freedom to publish data and results of the research, they do not conflict with academic freedom.
4. The supervision referred to in paragraphs 1 to 3 will aim to encourage completion of the dissertation within the time limit specified in the training and supervision plan.
5. The supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the dissertation fulfils the requirements imposed pursuant to these Regulations.

Chapter 5 – The second supervisor and co-supervisor

Article 5.1

1. On the proposal of the supervisor, the Doctorate Board can appoint a second supervisor and/or one or, if necessary, two co-supervisors.
2. A co-supervisor is a PhD-holding lecturer or senior lecturer (US: assistant or associate professor) in active employment at an academic education institution in the Netherlands or another country, who is actively involved in research on the topic (or an aspect of the topic) covered in the dissertation. In special cases, a PhD-holding expert who is not (or no longer) in active employment at an academic education institution can be appointed as a co-supervisor.
3. The supervisor will check that the person concerned is willing to accept the appointment as second supervisor or co-supervisor.
4. As a general rule, a second supervisor or co-supervisor may act in this capacity until five years after the end of his active employment.

Article 5.2

1. The second supervisor or co-supervisor assists the supervisor, as referred to in Article 4.1, in supervising the PhD candidate.
2. The second supervisor or co-supervisor informs the supervisor in writing about his assessment of the quality of the manuscript presented to him as a dissertation.
3. If the second supervisor or co-supervisor is from a different Dutch university or a foreign academic education institution, the supervisor from this University is expected to advise the external second supervisor or co-supervisor, where necessary, with regard to compliance with the requirements stipulated in or pursuant to these Regulations.
4. The supervisor and second supervisor and co-supervisor will decide in consultation with the PhD candidate how the co-supervisor will be involved in the regular meetings between the supervisor and the PhD candidate, as referred to in Article 4.3 paragraph 2.

Article 6.1

1. No more than four weeks after receiving the supervisor's approval referred to in Article 7.4, the Doctorate Board will appoint an Assessment Committee, comprising at least five voting members. The following conditions apply for the composition of this Committee:
 - at least three full professors of the University or another Dutch university or foreign academic education institution;
 - at least one and no more than two members from the academic staff of the University, no more than one of whom is a member of the supervisor's research group;
 - at least three members of the Committee are from a university other than the university awarding the degree;
 - members of the Committee may not be co-authors of articles included in the PhD candidate's dissertation.
2. The members of the Committee must hold a doctorate and/or *ius promovendi*. The majority of members of the Assessment Committee must be full professors.
3. The Assessment Committee is chaired by a full professor of the University. The Rector appoints one of the members of the Assessment Committee as its chair. The chair of the Assessment Committee reports to the Doctorate Board on behalf of this Committee.
4. The Rector, supervisor and co-supervisor may not be appointed as a member of the Assessment Committee.
5. The Rector appoints the members of the Assessment Committee on the written proposal of the supervisor, after consulting the Doctorate Board. The supervisor has checked that the persons concerned are willing to accept the appointment as a member of the Assessment Committee. The proposal is made using the appropriate form. The power to discharge the members of the Assessment Committee from their duties lies with the Rector of the University.
6. After consulting the Doctorate Board, the Rector may differ from the supervisor's proposal referred to in paragraph 5, stating the reasons. After checking that the persons concerned are willing to accept the appointment as a member of the Assessment Committee, the Rector informs the supervisor in writing about the names of the appointed members.
7. The supervisor is responsible for ensuring that each of the members of the Assessment Committee receives a copy of the manuscript in due time.

Article 6.2

1. Within six weeks after receiving the manuscript, the Assessment Committee will assess whether the PhD candidate has shown proof of competence in independently conducting research by means of the dissertation and can therefore be admitted to defence of the dissertation. In special cases, the Doctorate Board can extend this period once by 30 days.
2. The Assessment Committee's task is to make the assessment referred to in paragraph 1 on the basis of a qualitative assessment of the submitted manuscript as a whole, from the perspective of the problem statement agreed between the supervisor and the PhD candidate. The Assessment Committee will check the manuscript against the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2 of these Regulations.
3. The individual members of the Committee are free to attach suggestions and/or recommendations to their positive or negative assessment.
4. The members of the Assessment Committee will send their assessment in writing to the chair of the Committee.
5. If all the members of the Assessment Committee consider that the manuscript satisfies the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, the chair establishes that the manuscript has been approved as a dissertation. The chair records the decision in writing on behalf the Committee. The written record of the Assessment Committee's decision as set down by the chair is based on the assessments of the Committee members. The chair presents the written record of the Assessment Committee's decision to the Committee members for their advice, to be given within a period that he will determine. After the period set for the Committee members has elapsed and the chair has incorporated the advice of the Committee members, the chair sends the decision to the Doctorate Board for the attention of the Rector. After receiving the written decision, the Doctorate Board or, if so authorised, the Rector as chair of the Doctorate Board, decides – having read the Assessment Committee's decision – whether the PhD candidate can be admitted to the PhD defence. On behalf of the Doctorate Board, the Rector communicates the decision to the supervisor, the second supervisor and/or co-supervisor, the Assessment Committee and the PhD candidate.

6. If one or more of the members of the Assessment Committee consider that the manuscript does not satisfy the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, the chair arranges for a discussion within the Committee. After this has taken place, the chair decides whether the PhD candidate needs to amend the manuscript, or whether the manuscript should be submitted to the Rector with advice. If the chair decides that amendments must be made to the manuscript, the chair will judge whether the PhD candidate will be able to change the manuscript within a short time in such a way that all the Committee members will consider that it satisfies the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2. If this is the case, then the chair, on behalf of the Assessment Committee, will offer the PhD candidate the opportunity to change the manuscript within a period of 120 days. After receiving the changed manuscript, paragraph 1 will again become applicable. If the manuscript cannot be amended within a short time, the chair of the Committee will report to the Rector about the situation that has arisen. The written record of the situation as set down by the chair is based on the assessments of the Committee members.
7. After receiving the Committee's report, the Rector will decide whether or not to approve the manuscript.
8. The following points are applicable for making a decision as referred to in paragraph 7:
 - a) If one member of the Assessment Committee considers that the manuscript does not satisfy the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, while the other Committee members consider that the manuscript satisfies those learning outcomes, the Rector can approve the manuscript, provided that explicit reasons are appended to this decision;
 - b) If two members of the Assessment Committee consider that the manuscript does not satisfy the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, while the other Committee members consider that the manuscript satisfies those learning outcomes, the Rector can only approve the manuscript after consulting the Doctorate Board and with a statement of compelling reasons that justify this decision;
 - c) If more than two members of the Assessment Committee consider that the manuscript does not satisfy the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, the Rector will not approve the manuscript.
9. If the Rector does not approve the manuscript, the PhD candidate has the opportunity to submit a revised manuscript within a period to be determined by the Rector of no more than one year, unless the Rector thinks there are good reasons to assume that the PhD candidate will not be able to submit a revised manuscript that satisfies the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2 within this period. In this latter case, the Rector decides to terminate the PhD track.
10. A manuscript that has been revised pursuant to paragraph 9 will be assessed in accordance with the procedure set down in paragraphs 1 to 7. The Rector will decide whether the revised manuscript is approved or rejected. If the Rector rejects the revised manuscript, the PhD track will be terminated.
11. If the Rector makes a decision by exercising the power granted to him in paragraph 8, the Rector will render account for this decision to the Doctorate Board, in writing and stating the reasons, before the decision is made to admit the PhD candidate to the PhD defence, as referred to in paragraph 12.
12. After the decision has been made to approve the manuscript, the Doctorate Board or, if so authorised, the Rector as chair of the Doctorate Board, decides – having read the Assessment Committee's decision and, if paragraph 11 is applicable, the account rendered for the Rector's decision – whether the PhD candidate can be admitted to the PhD defence. On behalf of the Doctorate Board, the Rector communicates the decision to the supervisor, the second supervisor and/or co-supervisor, if applicable, the Assessment Committee and the PhD candidate. The PhD candidate can lodge an objection in writing against a decision as referred to in paragraph 9 or paragraph 10, in accordance with the provisions of Article 11.2 of these Regulations.

Chapter 7 – The dissertation

Article 7.1

1. Admission to the PhD defence is granted to persons who:
 - have written a dissertation as proof of competence in independently conducting research;
 - have received a positive decision of the Doctorate Board as referred to in Article 6.2 paragraph 12 or Article 11.6 paragraph 1.
 - have fulfilled the other requirements stipulated in or pursuant to these Regulations.Persons who have been rejected for a PhD defence at one of the other Dutch universities will not be admitted to the PhD defence at this University for the period of that rejection.
2. A dissertation may consist of either an academic monograph about a specific topic or a collection of several separate academic articles, all or some of which have already been published, provided that they are sufficiently related to one another with regard to a specific topic.
3. If the dissertation consists of the collection of articles referred to in paragraph 2, the required relationship between those articles must be explained in an introductory chapter and a closing chapter. The length of these chapters should be similar and substantial.
4. If the dissertation consists of the collection of articles referred to in paragraph 2, the PhD candidate's own contribution must be sufficiently demonstrated for each article. The supervisor will submit a written statement to the Assessment Committee, as referred to in Chapter 6, showing that the contribution of the PhD candidate is an essential component of the research concerned, and therefore sufficiently demonstrates that the PhD candidate is able to independently conduct scientific research.
5. If previously published academic articles are combined to form a dissertation, in accordance with paragraph 2, they must have been published within a period of five years preceding the admission to the PhD defence, unless the Doctorate Board has granted dispensation from this requirement at the supervisor's request.
6. Insofar as the academic articles referred to in paragraph 2 were written in collaboration with other authors, the PhD candidate must provide the supervisor with a written statement from those other authors, showing that the publications may be used for the dissertation.
7. The research that forms the basis for the dissertation must fulfil the following requirements:
 - the PhD candidate conducted the research independently or made an essential contribution to the research;
 - the research was conducted in compliance with the code of conduct and/or professional code that applies to professional conduct in the relevant academic field and as set down in the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (VSNU, 2018)
8. The PhD candidate is responsible for the dissertation as an academic contribution.

Article 7.2 Learning outcomes

1. By conducting original research, the PhD candidate has contributed to extending the boundaries of knowledge, through a substantial amount of work that withstands assessment by peers.
2. The PhD candidate has demonstrated that he systematically understands a substantial knowledge domain and has mastered the skills and methods of research in this knowledge domain.
3. The PhD candidate has demonstrated that he can design, develop, execute and adjust a substantial research programme.
4. The PhD candidate is capable of critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis of new and complex ideas.
5. The PhD candidate communicates with other scholars in his discipline and the wider academic community about the knowledge domain in which he has expertise.

Article 7.3 Assessment of the manuscript by the supervisor and co-supervisor

1. The supervisor is responsible for assessment of the manuscript as a dissertation. The supervisor assesses whether the PhD candidate has satisfied the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2 by checking the manuscript submitted to him against at least the following points:
 - a) the importance of the topic;
 - b) the importance of the problem statement and its precise definition;
 - c) the originality of the treatment;
 - d) the academic standard of the arrangement, analysis and processing of the material;
 - e) the soundness of the methodology used for this analysis;
 - f) the derivation of new insights and views;
 - g) a critical confrontation of the author's own conclusions with existing theories or views;
 - h) a creative approach to the academic field covered in the dissertation;
 - i) restraint in producing the text;
 - j) balanced structure of the dissertation and clarity of style.

The supervisor will also assess whether the manuscript fulfils the other requirements stipulated in these Regulations. When assessing the manuscript, the supervisor will, if applicable, take into account the view of the co-supervisor, in accordance with the provisions of Article 7.4 paragraph 2.

2. After consulting the PhD candidate and, if applicable, the co-supervisor, the supervisor can require the PhD candidate to change certain aspects of the manuscript.

Article 7.4

1. The supervisor will only decide on the PhD candidate's request for approval of a manuscript as a dissertation if the PhD candidate has fulfilled the requirements stipulated in these Regulations.
2. The supervisor will provide the co-supervisor with the opportunity in due time to give his assessment of a manuscript submitted for approval as a dissertation. The co-supervisor will give his assessment in writing. The supervisor will not approve the manuscript until he has received the co-supervisor's assessment. The supervisor will attach this assessment when communicating his decision about approval of the manuscript to the PhD candidate.
3. The supervisor will decide within two months after receiving the manuscript about whether to approve it as a dissertation, unless the PhD candidate consents to a longer time limit for this decision. The supervisor will notify his decision about approval of the manuscript to the PhD candidate in writing and will send a copy of his decision to the Doctorate Board.
4. If the time limit referred to in paragraph 3 is exceeded, the PhD candidate can request the Doctorate Board to order the supervisor to make his decision about approval before a specific date. The Doctorate Board will decide within 30 days after receiving the request.
5. After the supervisor has approved the manuscript, it will be submitted for assessment to the members of the Assessment Committee, as referred to in Article 6.1 of these Regulations.

Article 7.5

If the supervisor does not approve the manuscript as a dissertation, then the Doctorate Board, at the request of the PhD candidate and after consulting the PhD candidate and the supervisor, can appoint another supervisor in accordance with the provisions of Article 4.1.

Article 7.6

1. Every manuscript that serves as a dissertation for the PhD defence must be published in a printed version, i.e. a bibliographically traceable version.
2. The PhD candidate is responsible for making copies of the dissertation and distributing them.
3. At least four weeks before the date of the PhD defence, the PhD candidate will deliver 40 copies of the dissertation and the propositions to the University Office.
4. A digital version of the dissertation will be published by the University Library at least four weeks after the PhD defence. If all or part of the dissertation is under embargo, the digital publication will be limited to the parts that are not under embargo, and also the cover, title page, table of contents and summary of the dissertation in Dutch and English. The parts that are under embargo will be published when the stated embargo is lifted.
5. For the purpose of the digital publication of the dissertation referred to in paragraph 4, the PhD candidate will supply the dissertation in digital format, in a manner to be determined by the University Librarian, at least four weeks before the PhD defence.
6. For the purpose of the digital version of the dissertation referred to in paragraph 5, the following points apply:
 - a) At least four weeks before the date of the PhD defence, the PhD candidate will provide the University

- with a licence for non-exclusive publication of the dissertation in digital format, if necessary with a temporary embargo;
- b) The PhD candidate is obliged to sign the standard licence agreement produced by the Executive Board for providing this licence;
 - c) The licence agreement provides for payment to the PhD candidate for supplying the dissertation in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4.
7. The Rector can exempt the PhD candidate from the provisions of paragraph 1, provided that a printed version of the dissertation is published no more than two years after the PhD defence. A request for this exemption must be accompanied by a written statement from a publisher.

Article 7.7

1. At least ten propositions must be appended to the dissertation.
2. At least four of the propositions referred to in paragraph 1 must relate to the content of the dissertation; at least four of the propositions must relate to the other areas of theology, and no more than two propositions must relate to a topic or topics of the PhD candidate's choice.

Article 7.8

1. The dissertation and the propositions must be written in Dutch, German, English or French, or – with the approval of the Doctorate Board – in another language.
2. If the dissertation is written in Dutch, then at least a translation in German, English or French of the title and a summary of the content will be added.
3. If the dissertation is written in German, English or French, then a translation in Dutch at least of the title and a summary of the content will be added.
4. If the dissertation is written in a language other than Dutch, German, English or French, then at least a translation in Dutch of the title and a summary of the content, and a translation in German, English or French of the title and a summary of the content will be added.

Article 7.9

1. The dissertation includes:
 - a title page in accordance with the model appended to these Regulations, stating the first name(s) and family name of the author as registered in the Civil Register, the title and subtitle of the dissertation and the date of the PhD defence;
 - a table of contents;
 - the necessary indexes. If the supervisor has agreed that the dissertation does not need to contain a subject index, it must include a detailed table of contents.
2. The reverse of the title page must only show the following information:
 - the supervisor's name, and the statement that he is acting in this capacity;
 - the co-supervisor's name, and the statement that he is acting in this capacity;
 - the CIP data National Library of the Netherlands, The Hague.

The organisation that has financially supported or enabled the realisation of the dissertation can, if so wished, be stated at the foot of the page referred to in this paragraph.
3. The title page and its reverse must be submitted for approval to the chair of the Doctorate Board.
4. The dissertation should be no more than 100,000 words in length, including footnotes, excluding bibliography and appendices. At the written request of the supervisor, the Doctorate Board may allow this limit to be exceeded.

Article 7.10

1. The dissertation includes a brief curriculum vitae of the PhD candidate.
2. This curriculum vitae contains at least:
 - date and place of birth;
 - the years in which the PhD candidate followed pre-university and university education, or comparable education, and the institution(s) where this took place;
 - any special honours classifications awarded with the certificates;
 - if applicable, details of professional practice after completing the university education;
 - if applicable, details of the institute where the PhD research was conducted.

Chapter 7A – The training**Article 7a.1 – The scope and content of the training**

1. The PhD candidate and the supervisor discuss the content of the training, which is then set down in the training and supervision plan. After unconditional admission to PhD studies, the training is worth at least 15 ECTS.
2. Unconditional admission to PhD studies is only possible if the Admission Committee considers that the prospective PhD candidate has sufficient knowledge of current insights and requirements relating to academic integrity and of current scientific methods and techniques in the field that is relevant for the research. If the Admission Committee considers that the prospective PhD candidate does not have sufficient knowledge of the two elements referred to in the previous sentence, the Admission Committee will refer the prospective PhD candidate to the University's Initial Graduate School, where the curriculum includes modules on academic integrity and research methods and techniques, each worth 5 ECTS.
3. In addition to the modules referred to in paragraph 2, the Initial Graduate School curriculum also includes a module on writing a research proposal, which is worth 5 ECTS. The Admission Committee will refer the prospective PhD candidate to this module if he cannot be granted unconditional admission to PhD studies because he does not have an approved research proposal.
4. After receiving unconditional admission to PhD studies, the PhD candidate will be registered in the research school that is relevant for the research.
5. The Executive Board is responsible for providing an adequate range of sufficiently high-quality training, and sufficient time and resources to follow this training.
6. At the request of the (prospective) PhD candidate, the Rector can grant exemption from parts of the training, provided that the decision to grant exemption explains how the (prospective) PhD candidate has already met the learning outcomes of that part of the training.
7. The Rector can authorise the Head of the Graduate School to perform the tasks referred to in paragraph 6.

Article 7a.2 – Assessment of the training

1. After the supervisor has approved the manuscript, the PhD candidate submits a request to the Head of the Graduate School to issue the training certificate.
2. The training will be assessed in the manner stipulated by the Head of the Graduate School and approved by the Doctorate Board.
3. The Head of the Graduate School will inform the PhD candidate and the supervisor about the outcome of the assessment.
4. The Head of the Graduate School will present the training certificate to the PhD candidate.

Chapter 8 – The PhD defence

Article 8.1

1. The PhD defence takes place in public in a special session of the Doctorate Board.
2. The supervisor, the co-supervisor and the members of the Assessment Committee, who are not members of the Doctorate Board, will in any case be added to the Doctorate Board for each PhD defence.

Article 8.2

1. The Doctorate Board has the task of preparing the opposition. The Doctorate Board or, at the Board's request, the supervisor has the task of arranging a sufficient number of opponents to ensure a reasonable opposition.
2. All members of the Doctorate Board have the right to put forward objections. The members of the Assessment Committee are also invited to participate in the opposition.
3. With the permission of the Rector, other persons may also participate in the opposition. Those eligible are:
 - persons who hold a doctorate and have expertise in the field of the dissertation topic
 - or – in exceptional cases – persons who do not hold a doctorate but have recognised expertise relating to the dissertation topic.

Article 8.3

1. The opposition must fulfil the requirements of being relevant and of an academic standard.
2. The contents of the proposed opposition will be notified in due time to the Rector.
3. The PhD candidate will not receive advance notification of the opposition's contents.

Article 8.4

1. The PhD defence takes place in public. The time and place of this public meeting are determined by or on behalf of the Rector in consultation with the supervisor and the PhD candidate.
2. The Rector is responsible for ensuring that the date and place of the defence are announced at least three weeks in advance. This is done by displaying the title page and the propositions on the University notice board or in another, similar way.
3. The Rector acts as the chair of the public meeting referred to in paragraph 1. In the absence of the Rector, or if the Rector has been appointed as the supervisor, his powers as the chair will be temporarily exercised by another full professor of the University, to be appointed for this occasion by the Rector.
4. For one academic hour (i.e. 45 minutes) the PhD candidate will defend his dissertation against the objections put forward by the members of the Doctorate Board, in particular by the members of the Assessment Committee referred to in Article 6.1, and by all those who have been given permission to do this by the Rector, in accordance with Article 8.2.

Article 8.5

1. The protocol for this public meeting and the formula for the defence, the formula after the defence and the formula for awarding the PhD are determined by the Doctorate Board and attached as an appendix to these Regulations. The Doctorate Board is entitled to make different arrangements for each location.
2. The defence will preferably take place in Dutch. On the proposal of the supervisor, the Rector can grant exemption from this, and the language in which the dissertation was written can be used.
3. The Rector's permission is required for making video and/or sound recordings. This permission must be requested at least three working days before the PhD defence.

Article 8.6

1. The chair opens the public meeting, says the academic prayer and then invites the opponents to present their objections in a pre-arranged order.
2. The chair regulates the proceedings in such a way that the PhD candidate has the opportunity to answer each objection in turn, ensuring that the opposition does not take up a disproportionate share of the time allowed for the discussion.
3. The public meeting is suspended 45 minutes after it started. This suspension is announced by the Beadle, with the words 'Hora est'.
4. The Doctorate Board then withdraws for deliberations.

Article 8.7

1. The deliberations referred to in Article 8.6 paragraph 4 are not public.

2. The dissertation and propositions, together with their defence, are assessed by the Doctorate Board, including the opponents referred to in Article 8.1 paragraph 2.
3. In the deliberations referred to in paragraph 1, the supervisor and the chair of the Doctorate Board report on their findings and make a proposal about awarding the doctorate. Other members of the Doctorate Board and the added members may also address the meeting, if they so wish.
4. The Doctorate Board awards the title of doctor to the PhD candidate by simple majority of votes, where each of the present members of the Doctorate Board has one vote. The supervisor and, if applicable, the co-supervisor have an advisory vote with respect to the decision about awarding the doctorate. Voting takes place by means of the members present expressing their consent, also taking account of the PhD candidate's defence of the dissertation. In the event of a tie, the doctorate is not awarded.
5. If the doctorate is awarded, the certificate is signed by the Rector of the University and the supervisor.

Article 8.8

1. After the deliberations referred to in Article 8.6 paragraph 4 have concluded, the chair of the Doctorate Board reopens the public meeting and announces the Doctorate Board's decision.
2. If the doctorate is awarded, the supervisor – at the chair's request – confers the awarded title on the PhD candidate and presents him with the certificate.
3. The supervisor or, with the chair's permission, the second supervisor or co-supervisor then addresses the PhD graduate.
4. The Rector then says the doxology and closes the meeting.

Article 9.1

1. If the supervisor or, if applicable, the second supervisor or co-supervisor considers that the PhD candidate has demonstrated exceptional competence in his dissertation, he should submit a written, reasoned request for the award of the ‘cum laude’ distinction to the Rector at least 60 days before the PhD defence. A request of this nature may be submitted by any member of the Assessment Committee before this stipulated time limit.
2. If a proposal is made for award of the ‘cum laude’ distinction, the Rector will submit the request immediately to the Assessment Committee for advice. The Committee will assess whether the manuscript fulfils at least the following criteria, in addition to the conditions referred to in Article 7.2:
 - a) Excellent academic quality and originality, measured by national and international standards;
 - b) Demonstrable added value to the discipline with respect to theory development and genuinely new insights;
 - c) High level of independence in conducting the research;
 - d) Excellent written presentation.
3. The Assessment Committee will provide the Rector with written advice on the request for award of the ‘cum laude’ distinction within 14 days. If more than one member of the Assessment Committee votes against this request, the advice will be that the ‘cum laude’ distinction should not be awarded.
4. If the Assessment Committee gives positive advice on awarding the ‘cum laude’ distinction, the Rector will immediately appoint two external referees. The supervisor will suggest four possible names, from which the Rector will choose two.
5. The referees are full professors or senior lecturers (US: associate professors) and experts in the field of the dissertation. The referees may not be members of the Assessment Committee or the Doctorate Board.
6. The referees are asked to provide the Rector with their advice in writing.
7. If the Assessment Committee has given positive advice on awarding the ‘cum laude’ distinction and this advice is supported by the advice of the external referees, the Rector will send the written request for award of the ‘cum laude’ distinction to the Doctorate Board. In such a case, the members and added members of the Doctorate Board will receive copies of the request and the advice.

Article 9.2

1. If the Doctorate Board receives a proposal as referred to in Article 9.1 paragraph 7, a meeting of the Doctorate Board will be held before the PhD defence.
2. During the meeting referred to in paragraph 1, the Doctorate Board deliberates on the request for award of the ‘cum laude’ distinction and on the advice received.
3. A definitive decision on awarding the ‘cum laude’ distinction will be made during the deliberations referred to in Article 8.6 paragraph 4. The definitive decision-making during these deliberations will also take account of the defence of the dissertation.
4. The ‘cum laude’ distinction will not be awarded if more than one of the members and added members of the Doctorate Board present at the PhD defence objects to it being awarded. The supervisor and co-supervisor have an advisory vote with respect to the decision about awarding the ‘cum laude’ distinction.
5. If the doctorate is awarded with the ‘cum laude’ distinction, the Rector will announce this after reopening the public meeting, as referred to in Article 8.8.

Chapter 10 – The honorary doctorate

Article 10.1

1. The Doctorate Board is entitled to confer an honorary doctorate at the recommendation of the Board of Professors and having consulted the Executive Board.
2. In accordance with the provisions of Article 7.19 of the Act, the honorary doctorate can be conferred on a Dutch citizen or citizen of another country who fulfils one or more of the following criteria:
 - has accomplished a professional academic achievement without formal academic recognition, as reflected in publications of generally recognised high quality;
 - has conducted multidisciplinary academic research, as reflected in publications of generally recognised high quality and in invited addresses at international academic conferences and to academic institutes;
 - has performed activities of societal and/or cultural significance befitting the special character of the Protestant Theological University, or activities that reflect the special character of the University, which can be verifiably confirmed by oral and written work, or in another verifiable manner;
 - has made a highly exceptional contribution to the church and theology.

Article 10.2

1. If the Doctorate Board intends to make a recommendation as referred to in Article 10.1 paragraph 1, the Executive Board will be consulted in confidence. In preparation for this, the Doctorate Board may appoint an ad hoc committee to formulate a reasoned proposal, stating at least why the doctorate is requested for the recommended person.
2. After receiving the Executive Board's advice, the Doctorate Board makes a decision about conferring the honorary doctorate.
3. All the members of the Doctorate Board have the right to vote on whether to confer the honorary doctorate. The decision to confer the honorary doctorate can only be made if a positive vote is cast by at least all but one of the members present when the vote is taken.

Article 10.3

1. If the Doctorate Board decides to confer the honorary doctorate, it will appoint a full professor of the University to act as the supervisor.
2. The decision referred to in Article 10.2 paragraph 3 will be communicated confidentially to the candidate, the supervisor, the Executive Board and the Board of Trustees.
3. The decision will not be made public until the candidate has confirmed that he is willing to accept the honorary doctorate.

Article 10.4

1. The conferral of the honorary doctorate takes place in public in a special session of the Doctorate Board. The Rector issues invitations to the ceremony on behalf of the Doctorate Board.
2. At the request of the Rector, the appointed supervisor states the reasons for conferring the honorary doctorate and confers the awarded title on the candidate.
3. A special text is formulated for the presented certificate, which is embellished with the University's wax seal.
4. The honorary doctor is presented with a gown, to which a medal is attached. The gown is made in the colours of the PThU house style. The medal bears the same image as the University seal.

Article 11.1 – Scope of the dispute settlement procedure

1. A PhD candidate can ask the Doctorate Board for mediation or complaint handling in the event of a problem or dispute pertaining to acts or decisions of supervisors, co-supervisors, the Doctorate Board itself or persons acting on behalf of the Doctorate Board, in particular the PhD Admission Committee, and the Head of the Graduate School.
2. The provisions of the General Administrative Law Act (Awb) are applicable.
3. The chair of the Doctorate Board will provide appropriately for mediation or complaint handling within the meaning of Chapter 9 of the General Administrative Law Act.
4. The dispute settlement procedure of the PhD Regulations is not applicable to disputes relating to legal status.
5. The dispute settlement procedure of the PhD Regulations is not applicable to complaints or disputes arising from acts or statements to which the University's Complaint Regulations on Undesirable Conduct are applicable.

Article 11.2 – Evaluation and assessment of the progress of the PhD research

1. The supervisor and the PhD candidate together evaluate the progress of the PhD research each year on the basis of the training and supervision plan.
2. If the PhD candidate was granted unconditional admission to PhD studies and works full-time on his PhD research, the supervisor will assess the progress of the research on the basis of the agreements set down in the training and supervision plan no later than one month before the end of the second year after unconditional admission to PhD studies. Based on this assessment, the supervisor will make an intended decision on whether or not to maintain his willingness to continue with supervision of the PhD candidate in his PhD research.
3. If the PhD candidate was granted unconditional admission to PhD studies and works part-time on his PhD research, the evaluation and assessment of the progress of the research project is subject to the same provisions as set down in the other paragraphs of this article, with the exception that the assessment on which the supervisor bases his decision on whether or not he is willing to continue with supervision of the PhD candidate will be carried out by the supervisor no later than the end of the third year after unconditional admission to PhD studies.
4. If the assessment gives the supervisor cause to consider that the PhD research will not result in the award of a doctorate, in view of insufficient effort or competence of the PhD candidate or for any other reason, the supervisor will notify this to the PhD candidate and the Rector. The same applies if the supervisor thinks that, for a similar reason, the PhD track will take an unacceptably long time to complete. After receiving the notification, the Rector will discuss the situation with the supervisor, the second supervisor and/or co-supervisor, if applicable, the PhD candidate and the Head of the Graduate School. The Rector will then make a reasoned decision to:
 - a) ask the supervisor to continue the PhD track, possibly with additional measures to address the supervisor's concerns; or
 - b) ask the Doctorate Board to appoint a different supervisor; or
 - c) terminate the PhD track.
5. If a PhD candidate considers that, due to deficiencies in the supervision, a PhD track will not result in the award of a doctorate, or will take an unacceptably long time to complete, he will notify this to the supervisor and the Rector. After receiving the notification, the Rector will discuss the situation with the supervisor, the second supervisor and/or co-supervisor, the PhD candidate and the Head of the Graduate School. The Rector will then make a reasoned decision to:
 - a) instruct the supervisor or co-supervisor to continue the PhD track and to offer better supervision within this; or
 - b) ask the Doctorate Board to appoint a different supervisor or co-supervisor.
6. A PhD candidate who wishes to terminate the PhD track will notify the supervisor and the Rector of this. If the PhD candidate is working on the PhD research on the basis of an employment contract, he should take account of the statutory notice period. The Rector will then terminate the PhD track as from the first day of the month following that in which the PhD candidate gave written notification that he wished to terminate the PhD track, except where a longer period is required due to a mandatory notice period imposed by law and regulations.
7. If a supervisor does not approve the dissertation, the PhD candidate can ask the Doctorate Board to appoint a different supervisor. The Doctorate Board will not make a decision about the PhD candidate's request until it has consulted the Rector, the supervisor, the second supervisor and/or co-supervisor and the Head of the Graduate School about the matter.
8. If a request to appoint a different supervisor is made to the Doctorate Board pursuant to this article, both the Rector and the PhD candidate can make suggestions about who this should be. If the Doctorate Board does not find a suitable person who is willing to take over the supervisor's task, the Rector will terminate the PhD track.

Article 11.3 – Mediation in disputes and submitting the request

1. If a dispute arises during the PhD research or concerning the supervisor's approval of the manuscript as a dissertation, the Rector will provide mediation.
2. If the mediation does not result in agreement within eight days, the Rector will communicate this in writing to both of the parties. Either of the parties can then submit a clearly defined request to the Doctorate Board within six weeks after the date of the Rector's communication.

Article 11.4 – Dispute Advisory Committee

1. The Doctorate Board will appoint a Dispute Advisory Committee within four weeks after receiving a request as referred to in Article 11.3 paragraph 2.
2. The Dispute Advisory Committee consists of three full professors who are not involved in the PhD research to which the dispute pertains.
3. The secretary of the Doctorate Board will be appointed as the secretary of the Committee.

Article 11.5 – Procedure of the Dispute Advisory Committee

1. The Committee first gives the party about whom the complaint was made the opportunity to reply in writing to the submitted request, and will then hear the parties concerned in a closed session and, where necessary, will consult experts.
2. The secretary will produce a report of the hearing. The report will be sent for information to the parties who were heard at the hearing.
3. The Committee will issue written advice to the Doctorate Board within six weeks after the Committee was appointed by the Doctorate Board. The reasons for the advice will be stated, and the advice will include at least a report of the hearing of the parties and, where applicable, the experts.

Article 11.6 – Decision of the Doctorate Board

1. Within four weeks after receiving the advice, but in any case within ten weeks after receiving the request, the Doctorate Board will communicate its written, reasoned decision to the person who submitted the request and to the other parties involved in the dispute procedure.
2. The written advice of the Dispute Advisory Committee will be enclosed with the Doctorate Board's decision.
3. If the decision with respect to the request differs from the advice issued by the Dispute Advisory Committee, the reasons for this will be stated in the decision.

Article 11.7 – Time limits

The Doctorate Board can extend the time limits referred to in Article 11.5 paragraph 3 and Article 11.6 paragraph 1 once by 30 days, if there is a compelling reason for this.

Chapter 12 – Joint doctorate

Article 12.1 – Definition

1. Arrangements can be made between the PThU and one or more Dutch or foreign academic education institutions about the conditions under which the institutions will award a joint doctorate on the basis of a dissertation that complies with the provisions of this chapter.
2. The arrangements referred to in paragraph 1 will be set down in a formal agreement with the collaborative partner.

Article 12.2 – Approval of Doctorate Board

1. A joint doctorate is awarded by the Doctorate Board, together with a similar body at the Dutch or foreign academic education institution or institutions with which arrangements have been made, as referred to in Article 12.1.
2. A joint doctorate at the PThU can only take place after the Rector's written permission has been obtained before commencement of the PhD track.
3. If a joint doctorate is proposed, the supervisor will submit a written request for a joint doctorate to the Rector. This request will document the content and composition of the joint PhD track, and will demonstrate that the dissertation will be prepared in a formal collaboration with the partner institution(s). The partner institution(s) will make a substantial contribution to the PhD track.
4. The joint PhD defence is subject to the rules of the institution where the dissertation is defended. If the defence takes place at the PThU, these Regulations are fully applicable.
5. The doctorate is awarded by the Doctorate Board, together with a similar body at the Dutch or foreign institution or institutions with which the PThU entered into an agreement to jointly award the doctorate.

Article 12.3 – The responsible supervisors

1. The research for a joint doctorate is conducted under the responsibility of a full professor of the PThU and a full professor of each of the partner institutions with which there is a collaboration agreement as referred to in Article 12.1. Both or all of these full professors are appointed as supervisors by the Doctorate Board.
2. Full professors of partner institutions with which the PThU entered into the agreement referred to in Article 12.1 and under whose responsibility the research is conducted must satisfy the conditions stipulated in Article 4.1 paragraph 4.

Article 12.4 – Joint doctorate with a foreign partner

If the research relates to a joint doctorate with one or more foreign partners, the PhD candidate will spend at least six months at the partner institution(s) to conduct research for the dissertation. A statement to this effect will be submitted to the Rector.

Article 12.5 – Approval of the dissertation

1. The dissertation for a joint doctorate has to be approved by an Assessment Committee that is appointed in consultation with the collaborative partner(s). This Committee will include at least one full professor who is a member of the Doctorate Board of the PThU.
2. Without prejudice to the provisions of this chapter, the dissertation must fulfil the requirements referred to in these Regulations.

Article 12.6 – The PhD defence

The PhD defence will take place entirely or partly in the language of at least one of the countries where the academic education institution as referred to in Article 12.1 is located.

Article 12.7 – Certificate

As evidence of the award of the joint doctorate, the PhD graduate will receive a certificate. The format of this certificate will be agreed in consultation with the collaborative partner(s).

Chapter 13 – Double doctorate

Article 13.1 – Definition

A double doctorate means the simultaneous award of a doctorate at the PThU and at another Dutch or foreign academic education institution with which the PThU has entered into an agreement to this effect.

Article 13.2 – Approval by the Doctorate Board

1. A double doctorate at the PThU can only take place after the Rector's written permission has been obtained in advance.
2. The supervisor must submit the written request for a double doctorate to the Rector. This request must demonstrate that the dissertation was prepared in a formal collaboration of the two institutions.

Article 13.3 – The responsible supervisors

1. The research for a double doctorate is conducted under the responsibility of a full professor of the PThU and a full professor of the partner institution with which there is a collaboration agreement as referred to in Article 13.1. Both of these full professors are appointed by the Doctorate Board as supervisors.
2. Full professors of partner institutions with which the PThU entered into the agreement referred to in Article 13.1 and under whose responsibility the research is conducted must satisfy the conditions stipulated in Article 4.1 paragraph 4.

Article 13.4 – Approval of the dissertation

1. The dissertation for a double doctorate has to be approved by the Assessment Committee that is appointed in accordance with Chapter 7 of these Regulations or by the relevant Doctorate Committee or Assessment Committee or equivalent body of the partner academic education institution.
2. Without prejudice to the provisions of this chapter, the dissertation must fulfil the requirements referred to in these Regulations.

Article 13.5 – The PhD defence

1. The PhD defence at the PThU will take place in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 8 of these Regulations.
2. The agreement referred to in Article 13.1 will include the provision that the double PhD defence will first take place at the PThU and then at the partner academic education institution.
3. The dissertation will be defended at both the PThU and the partner academic education institution within a period of four months.

Article 13.6 – Certificate

In the case of a double doctorate, the reverse of the certificate will include a reference to the certificate of the institution with which the PThU entered into the agreement referred to in Article 13.1.

Chapter 14 – Other provisions

Article 14.1

In cases for which these Regulations do not provide, the Doctorate Board will decide.

Article 14.2

These Regulations entered into effect on 1 January 2021.

Article 14.3

Decisions concerning amendment of these Regulations are taken by the Doctorate Board by simple majority of votes.

Article 14.4

Where procedures for assessment of a manuscript by the Assessment Committee and admission to the defence of the dissertation had already started on the date when these Regulations were adopted, as evident from a decision of the Doctorate Board on the composition of the Assessment Committee, these will take place in accordance with the relevant provisions of the PhD Regulations 2017.