



PTThU

Protestantse Theologische **Universiteit**

PhD Regulations

Adopted by the Doctorate Board
18 November 2025

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	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	the board referred to in Article 5.14 of the Management Regulations; all members hold the ius promovendi
Examination Committee	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 upon meeting the requirements set out in these Regulations, has been admitted to a PhD defence or is preparing a dissertation
supervisor	the full professor designated as such by the Doctorate Board pursuant to Article 7.18(5) of the Act and referred to in Article 5.3 and Article 5.4 of the Management Regulations
second supervisor	the full professor designated as such by the Doctorate Board in accordance with Article 4.1 paragraph 2 of these Regulations, who assists the supervisor in supervising the PhD candidate
co-supervisor	the PhD-holding expert designated as such by the Doctorate Board in accordance with Article 5.1 of these Regulations, who assists the supervisor in supervising the PhD candidate
Assessment Committee	the committee that assesses whether the submitted manuscript is accepted as a dissertation
dissertation	the academic treatise in book or article form referred to in Article 7.18(2)(b) of the Act
propositions	the statements included with the dissertation that the author wishes to have accepted as true
PhD defence	the ceremony during which the public defence of the dissertation and the accompanying propositions takes place and – if the relevant requirements are met – 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. With due observance of the provisions laid down in the Act, the PhD Regulations were adopted by the Doctorate Board on 15 October 2020 and entered into force on 1 January 2021.

Article 1.3

If the positions referred to in these Regulations are (also) held by a woman, the masculine designations and words used are (also) to be read in the feminine form.

Article 1.4

1. Where these Regulations refer to supervisor and/or co-supervisor, in cases where more than one appointment has taken place this is to be read as supervisors and co-supervisors respectively.
2. In the absence of the Rector, or if the Rector has been appointed as supervisor or wishes to participate as a member of the Assessment Committee, the Rector's powers will be exercised by another full professor of the University designated by the Rector for that occasion.
3. With regard to matters discussed in the closed meetings referred to in Article 6.2 paragraph 6 and Article 8.6 paragraph 4, as well as to matters discussed during the appeal procedure, those present are bound to confidentiality.

Article 1.5

The PhD Regulations of the PThU apply to all PhD defences at the University and, subject to the provisions of Chapters 12 and 13, to PhD defences that take place elsewhere as a result of collaboration agreements between the University and other academic education institutions, insofar as no different arrangements have been made when such agreements were concluded.

Article 1.6

The PhD candidate, the supervisor and the co-supervisor must at all times observe the standards of scientific 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 relative by marriage of the PhD candidate in the first or second degree, or other persons who are in such a relationship with the PhD candidate that they cannot reasonably be expected to give an impartial judgement, may not be appointed as supervisor, co-supervisor or member of the Assessment Committee.
2. The partner of a supervisor and the partner of a possible co-supervisor may not be appointed as a member of the Assessment Committee.

A. The Initial Phase of the Graduate School

Article 2.1 – Conditions for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School

1. Admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School will be granted, on the request of the applicant for admission to the Graduate School, by the Graduate School and PhD Admission Committee on behalf of the Doctorate Board. The composition and appointment of the members of the Graduate School and PhD Admission Committee are laid down in the Rules for Admission to PhD Studies, which form an integral part of the PhD Regulations.
2. Admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School will be granted to an applicant:
 - a) who, pursuant to Article 7.10a(1), (2) or (3) of the Act, has been awarded a master's degree as evidenced by a certificate, or who has successfully completed the corresponding and equivalent examination at a foreign higher education institution, as evidenced by a certificate;
 - b) who has found a full professor or a senior lecturer to whom the Doctorate Board has granted the right to supervise PhD candidates, and who meets the requirements laid down in these Regulations for designation as supervisor, willing to supervise the PhD research proposed by the prospective PhD candidate as supervisor;
 - c) who submits a preliminary research proposal that has received a positive recommendation from the full professor referred to under b) and the chair group of which that full professor forms part, and which demonstrates that the person requesting admission to the Graduate School possesses sufficient academic skills to develop the preliminary research proposal into a fully fledged research proposal, showing the potential to complete the PhD studies and conclude them with an approved dissertation;
 - d) who, in order to demonstrate that he or she possesses the academic skills referred to under c), can provide a positive recommendation to that effect, preferably from the full professor or (senior) lecturer who acted as supervisor of the thesis and who supervised the applicant during the master's programme referred to under a), or from a comparable academic from the university at which the master's degree was obtained on the basis of which admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School is requested.
3. At the request of the Admission Committee, the Examination Committee will assess the equivalence of the diploma of the programme completed abroad referred to in paragraph 2 subparagraph a) with the master's degree referred to in Article 7.10a(1), (2) or (3) of the Act. In its 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 exceptional cases, the Doctorate Board may, on the proposal of the Admission Committee, admit a prospective PhD candidate to PhD studies who satisfies the conditions set out in paragraph 2 subparagraphs b) to d), but not the condition set out in paragraph 2 subparagraph a), provided that the applicant demonstrates in another manner that he possesses sufficient knowledge.
5. In that case, the request for admission must be accompanied by a statement from the Examination Committee showing that the level of education and knowledge of the person requesting admission has been deemed equivalent to that of a person who has been awarded a master's degree by the University.
6. A person who has already obtained a doctorate or an equivalent thereof will not be admitted to PhD studies, unless he intends to obtain a doctorate on the basis of a dissertation based on research in a different domain of knowledge from that on which the earlier dissertation was based.
7. The age of the PhD candidate will not constitute an impediment to admission.

Article 2.2 – Procedure for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School

1. A request for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School will be submitted to the Admission Committee and consists of the application form accompanied by the documents referred to in paragraph 3; it is also signed and dated by the proposed supervisor.
2. The request for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School must be received by the Admission Committee no later than the last day of the period for submitting an application for admission. The final date by which a request for admission must be received by the Admission Committee will be announced in good time by the Admission Committee.
3. A request for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School will only be admissible if the following documents are submitted together with the application form:
 - a) A written statement from the full professor or senior lecturer(s) referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2

- subparagraph b who holds the *ius promovendi*, declaring willingness to supervise the applicant in developing the preliminary research proposal into a full research proposal, including a training and supervision plan;
- b) A preliminary research proposal determined in consultation between the full professor or senior lecturer referred to under a) and the applicant;
 - c) A certified copy of the certificate referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph a, where applicable accompanied by the statement from the Examination Committee referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 3;
 - d) A transcript of grades associated with the certificate referred to under c);
 - e) The applicant's curriculum vitae;
 - f) A copy of the thesis written as part of the examination programme of the master's programme for which the applicant obtained the master's degree;
 - g) The positive recommendation from the supervisor of the thesis referred to under f);
 - h) A copy of the applicant's identity document.
4. The application form referred to in paragraph 1 will state the name and address of the PhD candidate; the nature, place and date of the examination on the basis of which the certificate referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph a was obtained; the topic of the dissertation; and the name, address and chair held by the supervisor proposed by the PhD candidate.
 5. The preliminary research proposal will be assessed by the Admission Committee on the basis of criteria established by the Doctorate Board.
 6. The assessment of the preliminary research proposal referred to in paragraph 5 will not take place until two referees have issued advice to the Admission Committee. The referees will be appointed by the Head of the Graduate School in consultation with the chair of the chair group to which the full professor or lecturer referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b belongs. Persons holding a doctorate and/or the *ius promovendi* and possessing sufficient expertise in the field of research to which the preliminary research proposal relates may be appointed as referees.
 7. On the basis of the request for admission, and taking into account the advice issued by the two referees, the Admission Committee will decide whether the candidate is admissible or not admissible to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School.
 8. If the candidate believes that he may qualify for exemption from all or part of the programme of the Initial Phase of the Graduate School, he must submit a reasoned request for exemption together with the request for admission to PhD studies. The Admission Committee, having heard the Head of the Graduate School, will decide on the matter and will send a copy of the decision to the full professor or senior lecturer referred to in paragraph 1.
 9. When taking its decision, the Admission Committee will observe the procedural rules set out in the 'Implementation Regulations for the Graduate School and PhD Admission Procedure', which form part of the University's PhD Regulations.
 10. The candidate may lodge an objection against the decision of the Admission Committee in accordance with the dispute settlement procedure set out in Chapter 11 of these Regulations.

B. The phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School

Article 2.3 – Conditions for admission to the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School

Admission to the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School

1. will be granted, at the request of the prospective PhD candidate, by the Head of the Graduate School on behalf of the Doctorate Board.

Admission to the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School

2. will be granted to an applicant:
 - a. who satisfies the conditions for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School as referred to in Article 2.2 paragraph 2;
 - b. who has successfully completed the educational programme of the Initial Phase of the Graduate School.

Article 2.4 – Procedure for admission to the phase of the Graduate School for developing the research

proposal

1. A request for admission to the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School will be submitted to the Head of the Graduate School.
2. A request for admission as referred to in paragraph 1 will only be admissible when it is accompanied by a written statement from the full professor or senior lecturer(s) referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b who holds the *ius promovendi*, declaring willingness to supervise the applicant in developing the preliminary research proposal into a full research proposal, including a training and supervision plan.
3. The Head of the Graduate School will determine whether the applicant has successfully completed the educational programme of the Initial Phase of the Graduate School.
4. On the basis of the determination that the applicant has successfully completed the educational programme of the Initial Phase of the Graduate School and the determination that the statement referred to in paragraph 2 has been submitted by the full professor or senior lecturer holding the *ius promovendi*, the Head of the Graduate School will decide that the applicant is admitted to the phase for developing the research proposal.
 - a.
 - b. Proof provided to the candidate on behalf of the Head of the Graduate School
5. The applicant may lodge an objection against the decision of the Head of the Graduate School in accordance with the dispute settlement procedure set out in Chapter 11 of these Regulations.

C. PhD studies

Article 2.5 – Conditions for admission to PhD studies

1. Admission to PhD studies will be granted, at the request of the prospective PhD candidate, by the PhD Admission Committee on behalf of the Doctorate Board.
2. Admission to PhD studies will be granted to a candidate:
 - a) who, pursuant to Article 7.10a(1), (2) or (3) of the Act, has been awarded a master's degree as evidenced by a certificate, or who has successfully completed the corresponding and equivalent examination at a foreign higher education institution, as evidenced by a certificate;
 - b) who has found a full professor or a senior lecturer to whom the Doctorate Board has granted the right to supervise PhD candidates, and who meets the requirements laid down in these Regulations to be designated as supervisor, willing to supervise the PhD studies proposed by the prospective PhD candidate as supervisor; and who has found a full professor or senior lecturer who holds the right to supervise PhD candidates either at the University or at another higher education institution willing to supervise the PhD studies proposed by the prospective PhD candidate as second supervisor and/or a (senior) lecturer who meets the requirements laid down in these Regulations to be designated as co-supervisor willing to supervise the PhD studies proposed by the prospective PhD candidate as co-supervisor;
 - c) who can demonstrate having received training regarding the current insights and regulations concerning research integrity;
 - d) who can demonstrate having received training in current scientific methods and techniques in the relevant research field;
 - e) who can submit an approved research proposal including a training and supervision plan;
 - f) who can submit an approved data management plan;
 - g) who, insofar as necessary in relation to the research, can submit a favourable decision from an Ethics Committee;
 - h) who has endorsed the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice;
 - i) who has satisfied the other requirements laid down by or pursuant to these Regulations.

Article 2.6 – Procedure for admission to PhD studies

1. A request for admission to PhD studies will be submitted to the Admission Committee and consists of the

application form accompanied by the documents referred to in paragraph 3; it is also signed and dated by the proposed supervisor.

2. A request for admission will only be admissible when the following documents are submitted together with the application form:

- a) A written statement from the full professor(s) and/or senior lecturer(s) and/or lecturer(s) referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b, in which they declare their willingness to act respectively as supervisor, second supervisor or co-supervisor;
- b) A research proposal established in consultation between the proposed supervisor and the prospective PhD candidate, including a training and supervision plan and a data management plan;
- c) Written proof that the prospective PhD candidate has received training concerning the current insights and regulations concerning research integrity;
- d) Written proof that the prospective PhD candidate has received training in current scientific methods and techniques in the relevant research field;
- e) Insofar as necessary in relation to the research, a favourable decision from an Ethics Committee.

3. The request for admission to PhD studies must be received by the Admission Committee no later than the final day of the period for submitting a request for admission. The final date by which a request for admission must be received by the Admission Committee will be announced in good time by the Admission Committee.

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 criteria established by the Doctorate Board.

5. The assessment of the research proposal referred to in paragraph 4 will not take place until the chair group to which the full professor or lecturer referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b belongs has issued advice on the research proposal, including the training and supervision plan and the data management plan; and the full professor concerned has considered that advice and taken a decision on whether to adopt the advice in full, in part, or not at all.

6. On the basis of the request for admission, the Admission Committee will decide whether the candidate is unconditionally admissible or not admissible to PhD studies.

7. When taking its decision, the Admission Committee will observe the procedural rules set out in the 'Implementation Regulations for the PhD Admission Procedure', which form part of the University's PhD Regulations.

8. The candidate may lodge an objection against the decision of the Admission Committee in accordance with the dispute settlement procedure set out in Chapter 11 of these Regulations.

1. The applicant for admission to PhD studies will receive written confirmation of the decision on admission on behalf of the chair of the Admission Committee. This decision will state which full professor or senior lecturer holding the *ius promovendi* has been designated by the Doctorate Board as supervisor and, where applicable, as co-supervisor. A copy of this decision will be sent to the Doctorate Board, the supervisor, the co-supervisor if applicable and the Head of the PThU Graduate School.

2. Together with the written notification of admission, the PhD candidate will receive:

- a) A copy of these PhD Regulations;
- b) A document, as adopted by the Doctorate Board, providing an overview of 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 2.7

The Doctorate Board may, by way of derogation from the provisions laid down in Articles 2.1, 2.3 and 2.5 concerning the admission requirements, decide to admit a prospective PhD candidate if the application of these articles would lead to a manifestly unreasonable outcome for the candidate.

Chapter 3 – The participant in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School, the participant in the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School and the PhD candidate

Article 3.1 – The prospective participant in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School

1. A person who wishes to prepare a dissertation at the University – and who has not indicated, through participation in a recruitment procedure relating to a vacancy for a PhD candidate to be appointed under an employment contract, that he wishes to undertake PhD studies at the University – will, prior to submitting a request for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School, consult with the full professor or senior lecturer to whom the right to supervise PhD candidates has been granted at the University and whom he considers most appropriate regarding the research he intends to conduct.
2. At his request, the prospective participant in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School will receive from the full professor or senior lecturer referred to in paragraph 1 the written statement referred to in Article 2.2 paragraph 3 subparagraph a.
3. The prospective participant in the Graduate School may submit a request for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School only after receiving the statement referred to in paragraph 2. Such a request will only be admissible if it satisfies the requirements laid down in Chapter 2 for a request for admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School.

Article 3.2 – The participant in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School

The participant in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School will follow the educational programme of the Initial Phase of the Graduate School amounting to a total of 15 ECTS as referred to in Article 4.1 and will be required to participate in the courses forming part of this educational programme, except where exemptions have been granted to the participant in the decision on admission to the Initial Phase of the Graduate School.

Article 3.3 – The participant in the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School

1. The participant in the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School will prepare a research proposal, including a training and supervision plan and a data management plan, that satisfies the requirements laid down by the Doctorate Board and that are conditional for admission to PhD studies.
2. The participant in the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School will receive guidance from the full professor or senior lecturer referred to in Article 3.1 paragraph 1 in developing a research proposal, including a training and supervision plan and a data management plan, that satisfies the requirements laid down by the Doctorate Board.
3. At the request of the participant in the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School, the full professor or senior lecturer referred to in Article 3.1 paragraph 1 will assess whether, in his or her opinion, the research proposal developed by the participant satisfies the requirements laid down by the Doctorate Board for admission to PhD studies. If the full professor or senior lecturer is of the opinion that the research proposal submitted to him or her for assessment satisfies the requirements laid down by the Doctorate Board, he will take a provisional decision that the assessment is satisfactory.
4. On the basis of a provisional decision of satisfactory assessment as referred to in paragraph 3, the full professor or senior lecturer will submit the research proposal, including the training and supervision plan, to the chair group to which the assessing full professor or senior lecturer belongs for advice.
5. On the basis of the advice issued by the chair group, the full professor or senior lecturer will determine whether he converts the provisional decision of satisfactory assessment of the research proposal into a final decision of satisfactory assessment. He will inform the participant in the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School thereof in writing.
6. The prospective PhD candidate may submit a request for admission to PhD studies only after receiving a statement of satisfactory assessment of the research proposal as referred to in paragraph 5. Such a request will only be admissible if it satisfies the requirements laid down in Chapter 2 for a request for admission.

Article 3.2 – The PhD candidate

1. The PhD candidate will prepare a dissertation on the basis of the research proposal, including the training and

supervision plan and the data management plan, approved for admission to PhD studies.

2. The PhD candidate will follow at least the educational programme of the University's Graduate School amounting to a total of 15 ECTS, except where exemptions have been granted by the Rector.
3. The PhD candidate will submit the manuscript, in whole or in part, to his supervisor, second supervisor and/or co-supervisor for assessment and will make the agreed amendments.
4. After the PhD candidate has made the agreed amendments, he will submit the manuscript in its entirety to the supervisor and second supervisor and will request them in writing to accept it as a dissertation, without prejudice to the responsibility of the PhD candidate as referred to in Article 7.1 paragraph 8.
5. The PhD candidate will not proceed to reproduce the manuscript as a dissertation until having obtained the approval of the Rector referred to in Article 6.2 paragraph 7.

Chapter 4 – The training

Article 4.1 – The scope and content of the training in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School

1. The training in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School is intended to enable the programme participant to acquire sufficient knowledge of current insights and regulations concerning research integrity and of current scientific methods and techniques in the field relevant to the research, so that the programme participant may satisfy the conditions for admission to the phase for developing the research proposal of the Graduate School as referred to in Article 2.3.
2. The training in the Initial Phase of the University's Graduate School consists of the following courses:
 - a. Research Skills for 5 ECTS;
 - b. Research Design for 5 ECTS;
 - c. Research Management for 5 ECTS.
3. The assessment of whether the participant in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School has successfully completed the courses referred to in paragraph 2 will be carried out by the full professor or senior lecturer designated as assessor for that course by the Head of the Graduate School.
4. After determining that the participant in the Initial Phase of the Graduate School has successfully completed all the courses referred to in paragraph 2, the Head of the Graduate School will issue the training certificate.
5. The certificate referred to in paragraph 4 will constitute the proof referred to in Article 2.3 paragraph 3c.

Article 4.2 – The scope and content of the training after admission to PhD studies

1. The training following unconditional admission to PhD studies will comprise at least 15 ECTS.
2. Following unconditional admission to PhD studies, the PhD candidate will be enrolled in the research school relevant to the research.
3. The Executive Board will ensure that an adequate range of training of sufficient quality is offered and that sufficient time and resources are available to follow this training.
4. At the request of the (prospective) PhD candidate, the Rector may grant exemption from parts of the training, provided that the exemption decision states the reasons on the basis of which the (prospective) PhD candidate has already satisfied the learning outcomes of the relevant component.
5. The Rector may authorise the Head of the Graduate School to perform the duties referred to in paragraph 4.

Article 7a.3 – Assessment of the training after admission to PhD studies

1. After the supervisor has approved the manuscript, the PhD candidate will submit a request to the Head of the Graduate School to issue the training certificate.
2. The training will be assessed in the manner laid down by the Head of the Graduate School following approval by the Doctorate Board.
3. The Head of the Graduate School will inform the PhD candidate and the supervisor of the assessment.
4. The Head of the Graduate School will issue the training certificate to the PhD candidate.

Article 5.1

1. On the proposal of the person who, in accordance with Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b, has declared to be willing to act as supervisor, the Doctorate Board will designate the full professor or senior lecturer concerned who holds the *ius promovendi* as supervisor.
2. On the proposal of the person who, in accordance with Article 2.1 paragraph 2 subparagraph b, has declared to be willing to act as supervisor, the Doctorate Board will designate a second supervisor for each PhD candidate: a supervisor or co-supervisor.
3. If two supervisors are designated, the provisions of these Regulations concerning the supervisor will apply to both.
4. Full professors affiliated with another Dutch university or with an equivalent foreign academic education institution may act as supervisor at the University. Full professors affiliated with a foreign institution may act as supervisor if they also possess that authority in the country of that institution and if procedures comparable to those applicable to the appointment of full professors at Dutch universities apply to their appointment.
5. A full professor as referred to in paragraph 4 may be designated as second supervisor if he is actively engaged in (part of) the topic dealt with in the dissertation.
6. No more than two supervisors may be designated for each PhD defence. If more than one supervisor has been designated, the supervisors will determine the division of tasks among themselves, having heard the PhD candidate.
7. The full professor or (senior) lecturer is authorised to withdraw, in writing and with reasons, from a statement as referred to in Article 2.2 paragraph 2 subparagraph a.
8. The PhD candidate has the right, following the decision referred to in the previous paragraph, to lodge an objection with the Doctorate Board in accordance with the dispute settlement procedure set out in Chapter 11 of these Regulations.

Article 5.2

1. Full professors who have been granted honourable discharge will retain the right to act as supervisor for a further five years after their discharge up to the date of the PhD defence. If a full professor designated as supervisor is granted honourable discharge after his designation, the decision to admit the PhD candidate to the defence of his dissertation must therefore be taken within five years of the date of discharge.
An extension of the five-year period may be granted only on the basis of a decision of the Doctorate Board.
2. Endowed full professors and full professors in temporary employment will be voting members of the Doctorate Board. At the request of the Doctorate Board, their membership of that Board may continue for up to five years after the date of their departure.
3. If the decision to admit a PhD candidate to the defence of his dissertation is not taken within the period referred to in paragraph 1, the designation as supervisor will lapse and the Doctorate Board will designate another supervisor, having heard the PhD candidate.

Article 5.3

1. The supervisor will bear responsibility for the supervision of the PhD candidate during the preparation of the dissertation in accordance with the training and supervision plan referred to in Article 2.4 paragraph 2b.
2. During the supervision and preparation of the dissertation, periodic consultation will take place between the supervisor and the PhD candidate, as agreed in advance in the training and supervision plan. The supervisor will consult with the PhD candidate and any second supervisor or co-supervisor concerning the amendments which, in his opinion, should be made to the manuscript.
3. In the course of supervision, the supervisor will ensure:
 - a) that the PhD candidate conducts his research independently;
 - b) that the PhD research is conducted in accordance with the rules of conduct for the practice of scholarship within the University and the code of conduct and/or professional code applicable to professional conduct in the relevant academic field;
 - c) that, insofar as (part of) the PhD research is financed by third parties, as few restrictions as possible are imposed on the research, and that, if restrictions are imposed on the freedom to publish data and the results of the research, such restrictions are not contrary to academic freedom.
4. The supervision referred to in paragraphs 1 to 3 will also be aimed at facilitating completion of the dissertation within the stipulated period, as laid down in the training and supervision plan.
5. The supervisor will ensure that the dissertation satisfies the requirements imposed on it pursuant to these Regulations.

Chapter 6 – Second supervisor and co-supervisor

Article 6.1

1. On the proposal of the supervisor, the Doctorate Board may designate a second supervisor and/or one or, if necessary, two co-supervisors.
2. A co-supervisor is a PhD-holding (senior) lecturer in active service affiliated with an academic education institution in the Netherlands or abroad, who is actively engaged in (part of) the topic dealt with in the dissertation. In special cases, a PhD holder who is no longer in active service at an academic education institution may be designated as co-supervisor.
3. The supervisor will ascertain that the person concerned is willing to accept designation as second supervisor or co-supervisor.
4. As a rule, a second supervisor or co-supervisor may act as such for up to five years after the end of his active employment.

Article 6.2

1. The second supervisor or co-supervisor will assist the supervisor as referred to in Article 5.1 in the supervision of the PhD candidate.
2. The second supervisor or co-supervisor will communicate his opinion on the quality of the manuscript submitted to him as a dissertation to the supervisor in writing.
3. If the second supervisor or co-supervisor comes from another Dutch university or a foreign academic education institution, the University's supervisor is expected, where necessary, also to guide the external co-supervisor or second supervisor in observing the provisions laid down by or pursuant to these Regulations.
4. The supervisor and the second supervisor and the co-supervisor will determine, in consultation with the PhD candidate, the manner in which the co-supervisor is involved in the periodic consultations between the supervisor and the PhD candidate as referred to in Article 5.3 paragraph 2.

Article 7.1

1. Admission to the PhD defence is granted to a person:
 - who has written a dissertation as proof of competence for the independent practice of scholarship;
 - who has received the positive decision of the Doctorate Board as referred to in Article 6.2 paragraph 12 or Article 11.6 paragraph 1;
 - who has satisfied the other requirements laid down by or pursuant to these Regulations.

Persons who have been refused admission to a PhD defence at one of the Dutch universities will not be admitted to the PhD defence at the University during the period of refusal.
2. The dissertation may consist either of a scholarly monograph on a particular subject or of a collection of a number of separate scholarly articles, all or some of which have already been made public, provided that they exhibit sufficient coherence with one another in relation to a particular topic.
3. If the dissertation consists of the collection of articles referred to in paragraph 2, the required coherence between those articles will be set out in an introductory and a concluding chapter. These chapters will be of comparable and substantial length.
4. If the dissertation consists of the collection of articles referred to in paragraph 2, the PhD candidate's own contribution per article must be demonstrated sufficiently. The supervisor will submit to the Assessment Committee, as referred to in Chapter 6, a written statement showing that the PhD candidate's share forms an essential part of the research in question, on the basis of which the PhD candidate has sufficiently demonstrated that he is capable of the independent conduct of scholarly research.
5. Scholarly articles already published which are compiled into a dissertation in accordance with paragraph 2 must have been published within a period of five years prior to admission to the PhD defence, unless the Doctorate Board has granted dispensation from this at the request of the supervisor.
6. Insofar as the scholarly articles referred to in paragraph 2 were produced in collaboration with other authors, the PhD candidate must submit to the supervisor a written statement from those other authors showing that the publications may be used for the dissertation.
7. The research on which the dissertation is based must satisfy the following requirements:
 - the PhD candidate has conducted the research independently or has made an essential contribution to it;
 - the research has been conducted in accordance with the code of conduct or professional code applicable to professional conduct in the academic field concerned, as set out in the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (VSNU, 2018).
8. The PhD candidate is responsible for the dissertation as a scholarly contribution.

Article 7.2 Learning outcomes

1. Through original research, the PhD candidate has contributed to extending the boundaries of knowledge by means of a substantial body of work that withstands peer review.
2. The PhD candidate has demonstrated a systematic understanding of a substantial domain of knowledge and mastery of the skills and methodologies of research in that domain.
3. The PhD candidate has demonstrated the ability to design, develop, conduct and adapt 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 colleagues and the broader scholarly community about the domain of knowledge in which he is an expert.

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

1. The supervisor bears responsibility for the assessment of the manuscript as a dissertation. The supervisor will assess whether the PhD candidate has satisfied the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2 by examining the manuscript submitted to him at least on the basis of 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) balance in the structure of the dissertation and clarity of style.

The supervisor will also assess whether the manuscript satisfies the other requirements laid down in these Regulations. In assessing the manuscript, the supervisor will take note of the opinion of any co-supervisor in accordance with Article 7.4 paragraph 2.

2. The supervisor may instruct the PhD candidate – after consultation with him and with any co-supervisor – to amend the manuscript on certain points.

Article 7.4

1. The supervisor will decide on the request for approval of a manuscript as a dissertation if the PhD candidate has satisfied the requirements referred to in these Regulations.
2. The supervisor will give the co-supervisor a timely opportunity to provide an opinion on a manuscript submitted for approval as a dissertation. The co-supervisor will give his opinion in writing. The supervisor will not grant approval of the manuscript until he has taken note of the opinion of the co-supervisor. The supervisor will attach that opinion to his decision concerning approval of the manuscript for the PhD candidate.
3. The supervisor will decide on approval as a dissertation within two months of receiving the manuscript, unless the PhD candidate agrees to a longer decision period. The supervisor will notify the PhD candidate in writing of the decision on approval of the manuscript and will send a copy of the decision on approval to the Doctorate Board.
4. If the period referred to in paragraph 3 is exceeded, the PhD candidate may request the Doctorate Board to instruct the supervisor to take the decision on approval by a specified date. The Doctorate Board will decide within thirty days of receipt of 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 withholds approval of the manuscript as a dissertation, the Doctorate Board may, at the request of the PhD candidate – having heard both the PhD candidate and the supervisor – designate another supervisor in accordance with the provisions of Article 4.1.

Article 7.6

1. Every manuscript serving as a dissertation for the PhD defence must appear in a printed version – that is to say, a bibliographically traceable version.
2. The PhD candidate will arrange for the reproduction and distribution of the dissertation.
3. At least four weeks before the time of the PhD defence, the PhD candidate will deliver forty copies of the dissertation and the propositions to the University Office.
4. A digital version of the dissertation will be made public by the University Library at least four weeks after the PhD defence. If the dissertation is wholly or partly subject to an embargo, the digital publication will be limited to those parts not covered by the embargo, as well as the cover, title page, table of contents and the summary of the dissertation in Dutch and in English. The parts that are covered by an embargo will be made public at the time when the stated embargo expires.
5. For the purpose of the digital publication of the dissertation referred to in paragraph 4, the PhD candidate will submit the dissertation in digital form at least four weeks before the PhD defence in a manner to be determined by the University Librarian.
6. For the purpose of the digital version of the dissertation referred to in paragraph 5, the following will apply:
 - a) At least four weeks before the time of the PhD defence, the PhD candidate will grant the University a licence for non-exclusive publication of the dissertation in digital form, if necessary subject to a temporary embargo;
 - b) For the granting of this licence, the PhD candidate will be required to sign the standard licence agreement adopted by the Executive Board;
 - c) The licence agreement will provide for remuneration to the PhD candidate for supplying the dissertation in accordance with paragraphs 3 and 4.
7. The Rector may grant exemption from the provision laid down in paragraph 1, on the understanding that in such case a printed version of the dissertation must nevertheless appear no later than two years after the PhD defence. A request to that effect must be accompanied by a written statement from a publisher in this regard.

Article 7.7

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

Article 7.8

1. The dissertation and the propositions will 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, a translation of the title and a summary of the content in German, English or French will in any event be added.
3. If the dissertation is written in German, English or French, a translation of the title and a summary of the content in Dutch will in any event be added.
4. If the dissertation is written in a language other than Dutch, German, English or French, a translation of the title and a summary of the content in Dutch will in any event be added, as well as a translation of the title and a summary of the content in German, English or French.

Article 7.9

1. The dissertation will contain:
 - a title page in accordance with the model appended to these Regulations, containing the first name(s) registered in the civil register, family name, title and subtitle of the dissertation and the date of the PhD defence;
 - a table of contents;
 - the necessary indexes. If, with the consent of the supervisor, the dissertation does not contain a subject index, an extensive table of contents must be included.
2. The reverse side of the title page will contain only:
 - the name of the supervisor, together with a statement of their capacity;
 - the name of the co-supervisor, together with a statement of their capacity;
 - the CIP data of the National Library of the Netherlands, The Hague.At the bottom of the page referred to in this paragraph, it may, if desired, be stated which body financially supported the preparation of the dissertation or made it possible.
3. The title page and its reverse side must be submitted to the chair of the Doctorate Board for approval.

4. *The length of the dissertation should not exceed 100,000 words, including footnotes but excluding bibliography and appendices.*
5. *If the supervisors determine that there are substantive reasons justifying an excess of the maximum length standard laid down in paragraph 4, and that excess does not exceed 25% of that standard, the chair of the Doctorate Board will decide, on the basis of a written and reasoned request by the supervisors, whether to allow that excess.*
6. *The supervisors will submit their request no later than before their decision, as referred to in Article 7.3, on whether the manuscript satisfies the requirements imposed on it as a dissertation.*
7. *The chair of the Doctorate Board will inform the Board of the decision taken.*

Article 7.10

1. A concise curriculum vitae of the PhD candidate will be included in the dissertation.
2. This curriculum vitae will contain at least:
 - date and place of birth;
 - the years in which the PhD candidate received preparatory and academic or comparable education, and the institution or institutions at which this was received;
 - any special distinctions attached to the certificates obtained;
 - any details concerning professional practice after the completion of academic education;
 - any details of the institute where the PhD research was carried out.

Article 8.1

1. No later than four weeks after receipt of the approval by the supervisor referred to in Article 7.4, the Doctorate Board will appoint an Assessment Committee consisting of at least five voting members. The following conditions apply to the composition of this Committee:
 - The Committee will have a balanced and, where possible, diverse composition;
 - at least three full professors affiliated with the University or another Dutch university or foreign academic education institution;
 - at least one and no more than two members from the University’s academic staff, of whom no more than one member will be affiliated with the supervisor’s chair group;
 - at least three members of the Committee will be affiliated with 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 will hold the degree of Doctor and/or the ius promovendi. The majority of the members of the Assessment Committee will be full professors.
3. The Assessment Committee will be chaired by a full professor affiliated with the University. The Rector will appoint one of the members of the Assessment Committee as chair. The chair of the Assessment Committee will report to the Doctorate Board on behalf of the Committee.
4. The Rector, the supervisor and the co-supervisor may not be appointed as members of the Assessment Committee.
5. The Assessment Committee will be appointed by the Rector on the written proposal of the supervisor and after hearing the Doctorate Board. The supervisor will have ascertained the willingness of those concerned to accept appointment as members of the Assessment Committee. The proposal will be made by means of a form designated for that purpose. In the written proposal to the Rector, the supervisor will account for the efforts he or she has made to achieve a diverse composition of the Committee. The power to relieve members of the Assessment Committee of their duties rests with the Rector of the University.
6. After consultation with the Doctorate Board, the Rector may depart from the supervisor’s proposal referred to in paragraph 5, stating the reasons. After ascertaining the willingness of those concerned to accept appointment as members of the Assessment Committee, the Rector will notify the supervisor in writing of the names of the appointed members.
7. The supervisor will ensure that the members of the Assessment Committee each receive a copy of the manuscript in good time.

Article 8.2

1. Within six weeks of receiving the manuscript, the Assessment Committee will assess whether the PhD candidate has, by means of the dissertation, provided proof of competence for the independent practice of scholarship and on that basis is admissible to the defence of the dissertation. In special cases, the Doctorate Board may extend this period once by 30 days.
2. The Assessment Committee will have the task of carrying out the assessment referred to in paragraph 1 on the basis of a qualitative assessment of the submitted manuscript as a whole, viewed from the problem statement as agreed between the supervisors and the PhD candidate. The Assessment Committee will assess the manuscript against the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2 of these Regulations.
3. The individual members of the Committee will be free to accompany their positive or negative opinion with suggestions and/or recommendations.
4. The members of the Assessment Committee will send their written opinions to the chair of the Committee.
5. If all members of the Assessment Committee are of the opinion that the manuscript satisfies the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, the chair will determine that the manuscript has been approved as a dissertation. The chair will record the assessment in writing on behalf of the Committee. The written record of the opinion of the Assessment Committee as drawn up by the chair will be based on the assessments of the members of the Committee. The chair will submit the written record of the opinion of the Assessment Committee to the members of the Committee for advice within a period set by him. The chair will send the assessment to the Doctorate Board for the attention of the Rector after the period set for the Committee members has expired and after the chair has incorporated the advice of the members of the Assessment Committee. After receiving the written opinion, the Doctorate Board, or by delegation the Rector as chair of the Doctorate Board, having considered the opinion of the Assessment Committee, will decide that the PhD candidate may be admitted to the PhD defence. On behalf of the Doctorate Board, the Rector will notify the supervisor, the second supervisor

and/or co-supervisor, the Assessment Committee and the PhD candidate of the decision.

6. If one or more members of the Assessment Committee are of the opinion that the manuscript does not satisfy the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, the chair will arrange for an exchange of views within the Committee. After this has taken place, the chair will assess whether it is necessary for the PhD candidate to amend the manuscript, or whether the manuscript should be submitted to the Rector with advice. If the chair is of the opinion that amendments must be made to the manuscript, the chair will assess whether the PhD candidate will be able to amend the manuscript within a short period in such a way that the manuscript will nevertheless be assessed by all members of the Committee as satisfying the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2. If this is the case, the chair, on behalf of the Assessment Committee, will give the PhD candidate the opportunity to amend the manuscript within a period of 120 days. Upon receipt of the amended manuscript, paragraph 1 will apply again. If amendment within a short period is not possible, the chair of the Committee will report the situation to the Rector. The written record of the situation as drawn up by the chair will be based on the assessments of the members of the Committee.
7. After receiving the Committee's report, the Rector will decide whether or not to approve the manuscript.
8. The following will apply to a decision as referred to in paragraph 7:
 - a) If one member of the Assessment Committee is of the opinion that the manuscript does not satisfy the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, while the other members of the Committee are of the opinion that the manuscript does satisfy those learning outcomes, the Rector may approve the manuscript, provided that an explicit statement of reasons is added to that decision;
 - b) If two members of the Assessment Committee are of the opinion that the manuscript does not satisfy the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2, while the other members of the Committee are of the opinion that the manuscript does satisfy those learning outcomes, the Rector may approve the manuscript only after consultation with the Doctorate Board and stating compelling grounds justifying that decision;
 - c) If more than two members of the Assessment Committee are of the opinion 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 will be given the opportunity, within a period to be determined by the Rector of no more than one year, to submit a revised manuscript, unless the Rector considers that there are good grounds for assuming that the PhD candidate will not be able to submit a revised manuscript satisfying the learning outcomes referred to in Article 7.2 within that period. In the latter case, the Rector will decide to terminate the PhD track.
10. A manuscript revised pursuant to paragraph 9 will be assessed in accordance with the procedure described 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 takes a decision on the basis of exercising the power conferred on him in paragraph 8, the Rector will account for that decision to the Doctorate Board, in writing and with reasons, before the decision on admission to the PhD defence referred to in paragraph 12 is taken.
12. After the decision approving the manuscript, the Doctorate Board, or by delegation the Rector as chair of the Doctorate Board, having considered the opinion of the Assessment Committee and – in the event that paragraph 11 applies – the statement of reasons for the decision taken by the Rector, will decide whether the PhD candidate may be admitted to the PhD defence. On behalf of the Doctorate Board, the Rector will notify the supervisor, any second supervisor and/or co-supervisor, the Assessment Committee and the PhD candidate of the decision.
13. The PhD candidate may lodge a written objection against a decision as referred to in paragraph 9 or paragraph 10 in accordance with the provisions of Article 11.2 of these Regulations.

Article 9.1

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

Article 9.2

1. The Doctorate Board will be responsible for preparing the opposition. The Doctorate Board, or the supervisor on its instructions, will be responsible for ensuring a sufficient number of opponents for a proper opposition.
2. All members of the Doctorate Board will be entitled to raise objections. In addition, the members of the Assessment Committee will be invited for the opposition.
3. With the consent of the Rector, others may also conduct the opposition. Those eligible are:
 - persons who themselves hold a doctorate and are experts in the field of the topic dealt with in the dissertation;
 - or, by way of exception, persons without a doctorate who possess recognised expertise in the topic of the PhD research.

Article 9.3

1. The opposition must be relevant and of a scholarly standard.
2. The content of the intended opposition will be communicated to the Rector in good time.
3. The PhD candidate will not be informed in advance of the content of the opposition.

Article 9.4

1. The PhD defence will take place in public. The time and place of this public session will be determined by or on behalf of the Rector in consultation with the supervisor and the PhD candidate.
2. At least three weeks in advance, the Rector will ensure that the date and place of the defence are announced. This will be done by posting the title page and the propositions on the University notice board, or in another comparable manner.
3. The public session referred to in paragraph 1 will be chaired by the Rector. In the absence of the Rector, or if the Rector has been designated as supervisor, the Rector's powers as chair will be exercised by another full professor of the University designated by the Rector for that occasion.
4. The dissertation will be defended by the PhD candidate, during one academic hour (i.e. 45 minutes), against the objections of the members of the Doctorate Board, in particular the members of the Assessment Committee referred to in Article 6.1, as well as anyone who has been granted permission by the Rector in accordance with Article 9.2.

Article 9.5

1. The protocol for this public session, as well as the formula for the defence, the formula after the defence and the formula for awarding the doctorate, will be determined by the Doctorate Board and are attached as an appendix to these Regulations. The Doctorate Board is authorised to adopt different arrangements for different locations.
2. The defence will preferably be conducted in Dutch. On the proposal of the supervisor, the Rector may grant exemption from this and the language in which the dissertation is written may be chosen.
3. The permission of the Rector is required for making visual and/or sound recordings. Permission must be requested no later than three working days before the PhD defence.

Article 9.6

1. The chair will open the public session, pronounce the academic prayer and then, in a sequence agreed in advance, give the floor to the opponents for the opposition.
2. The chair will regulate the proceedings in such a way that the PhD candidate is given the opportunity to respond after each opposition. In doing so, the chair will ensure that the opposition does not take up a disproportionately large part of the time available for the exchange of ideas.
3. The public session will be adjourned three quarters of an hour after it has begun. This adjournment will be announced by the Beadle with the words 'hora est'.
4. The Doctorate Board will then retire for deliberations.

Article 9.7

1. The deliberations referred to in Article 8.6 paragraph 4 will be closed deliberations.

2. The dissertation and the propositions, as well as the defence thereof, will be subject to the assessment of the Doctorate Board, including the opponents referred to in Article 8.1 paragraph 2.
3. During the deliberations referred to in paragraph 1, the supervisor and the chair of the Doctorate Board will report their findings and make a proposal about awarding the doctorate. If desired, other members of the Doctorate Board or the added members may also speak.
4. The Board will, by simple majority of votes, confer the title of Doctor on the PhD candidate, with each member of the Doctorate Board present having one vote. The supervisor and any co-supervisor will have an advisory vote with regard to the decision to award the doctorate. The vote will take place on the basis of the spoken assent of the members present, taking into account the defence of the dissertation by the PhD candidate. In the event of a tied vote, the doctorate will not be awarded.
5. When the doctorate is awarded, the certificate will be signed by the Rector of the University and the supervisor.

Article 9.8

1. After the conclusion of the deliberations referred to in Article 8.6 paragraph 4, the chair of the Doctorate Board will reopen the public session and announce the decision taken by the Board.
2. If the doctorate has been awarded, the supervisor will, on the instructions of the chair, confer the awarded title on the PhD candidate and present him with the certificate.
3. The supervisor, or with the permission of the chair the second supervisor or the co-supervisor, will then address the person who has obtained the doctorate.
4. The Rector will then pronounce the words of commendation and close the session.

Article 10.1

1. If the supervisor or, where applicable, the second supervisor or the co-supervisor is of the opinion that the PhD candidate has demonstrated exceptional competence in his dissertation, he will, following the decision of approval referred to in Article 7.4, submit a written and reasoned request to the Rector to award the distinction ‘cum laude’.
2. If a proposal to award the distinction ‘cum laude’ is made by a supervisor or co-supervisor, the Rector will, at the same time as requesting the Committee to assess the manuscript in accordance with Chapter 6 of the Regulations, submit the request to the members of the Committee in order to assess whether, in accordance with the opinion of the supervisor, they are of the opinion that the PhD candidate has demonstrated exceptional competence in his dissertation. For that purpose, the Committee will assess whether, in addition to the conditions referred to in Article 7.2, the manuscript satisfies at least the following criteria:
 - 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. A proposal to the Rector to award the distinction ‘cum laude’ on the initiative of the Assessment Committee as referred to in Chapter 6 will only be admissible if at least four members of the Committee have, in their assessment of the manuscript, indicated that the manuscript satisfies the criteria referred to in paragraph 2 subparagraphs a to d, such that the PhD candidate has demonstrated exceptional competence in his dissertation and on that ground deserves the award of cum laude.
4. If there is more than one dissenting vote in the Assessment Committee, the award will be withheld.
5. If the Assessment Committee is unanimously positive on awarding the distinction cum laude, or if no more than one member has a negative opinion on awarding the distinction cum laude, the Rector will immediately appoint two external referees. For that purpose, the supervisor will submit four possible names, from which the Rector will choose two.
6. The referees will be full professors or senior lecturers and experts in the field of the dissertation. The referees will be neither members of the Assessment Committee nor members of the Doctorate Board.
7. The referees will be requested to submit their advice to the Rector in writing.
8. If the Assessment Committee has given a positive opinion on awarding the distinction cum laude and both external referees support that opinion of the Assessment Committee, the Rector will notify the Doctorate Board in writing of the request to award the distinction cum laude. Together with this request, the members and added members of the Doctorate Board will receive a copy of the request and the advice.

Article 10.2

1. If the Doctorate Board receives a proposal as referred to in paragraph 7 of Article 9.1, it will meet prior to the PhD defence.
2. During the deliberations referred to in paragraph 1, the Doctorate Board will take note of the request to award the distinction cum laude as well as the advice received.
3. A final decision on the award of the distinction ‘cum laude’ will be taken during the deliberations referred to in Article 8.6 paragraph 4. During these deliberations, the defence of the dissertation will be taken into account in the final decision-making.
4. The award of the distinction cum laude will be withheld if more than one of the members and added members of the Doctorate Board present at the PhD defence speaks against it. The supervisor and co-supervisor will have an advisory vote regarding the decision to award the distinction cum laude.
5. If the distinction cum laude is attached to the doctorate, the Rector will announce this after the reopening of the public session referred to in Article 8.8.

Article 11.1

1. The Doctorate Board has the right, having heard the Executive Board, to confer the honorary doctorate upon a nomination by a member of the Board of Professors.
2. This doctorate may, in accordance with the provisions laid down for this purpose in Article 7.19 of the Act, be conferred on a Dutch national or foreign national who satisfies one or more of the following criteria:
 - who has achieved an accomplishment in a specialist field without formal scholarly recognition, as evidenced by publications of generally recognised high quality;
 - who has carried out multidisciplinary scholarly research, as evidenced by publications of generally recognised high quality, invited lectures at international scholarly meetings and at scholarly institutes;
 - who has performed acts of social and/or cultural significance fitting the special character of the Protestant Theological University, or in whose acts the special character of the University is expressed, as verifiably confirmed in speech and writing, or in another verifiable manner;
 - who has made a very exceptional contribution to the Church and to theology.

Article 11.2

1. If the Doctorate Board intends to make a nomination as referred to in Article 10.1 paragraph 1, the Executive Board will be heard on the matter in confidence. In preparation for this, the Doctorate Board may appoint an ad hoc committee to draw up a statement of reasons, indicating at least why the doctorate is sought for the person to be nominated.
2. After receiving the advice of the Executive Board, the Doctorate Board will take a decision on conferring the honorary doctorate.
3. In the vote on conferring the doctorate, all members of the Doctorate Board will have a vote. The award may be decided upon only if at least all but one of the members present at the vote express themselves in favour.

Article 11.3

1. If the Doctorate Board decides to confer the honorary doctorate, it will designate a full professor of the University as 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 Supervisory Board.
3. The decision will not be made public until the candidate has declared that he will accept the honorary doctorate.

Article 11.4

1. The conferral of the honorary doctorate will take place at a public special session of the Doctorate Board. On behalf of the Board, the Rector will send the invitations for this.
2. On the instructions of the Rector, the designated supervisor will announce the statement of reasons for conferring the honorary doctorate and will confer the awarded title on the candidate.
3. A special text will be drawn up for the certificate to be presented, which bears the wax seal of the University.
4. The honorary doctor will be presented with a hood, in the colours of the PThU house style, to which a medal is attached bearing the same image as the seal of the University.

Article 12.1 – Applicability of the dispute settlement procedure

1. A PhD candidate may request mediation or complaint handling from the Doctorate Board in the event of a problem or dispute relating 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 apply.
3. The chair of the Doctorate Board provides for an appropriate form of 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 does not apply to disputes concerning legal status.
5. The dispute settlement procedure of the PhD Regulations does not apply to complaints or disputes arising from conduct or statements to which the University's Complaints Regulations on Undesirable Conduct apply.

Article 12.2 – Evaluation and assessment of the progress of the PhD research

1. A supervisor will annually evaluate the progress of the PhD research together with the PhD candidate on the basis of the training and supervision plan.
2. If, after unconditional admission to PhD studies, the PhD candidate works full-time on his PhD research, the supervisor will assess the progress of the research on the basis of the arrangements laid 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. On the basis of this assessment, the supervisor will take a preliminary decision on whether or not to maintain his willingness to continue supervising the PhD candidate in his PhD research.
3. If, after unconditional admission to PhD studies, the PhD candidate works part-time on his PhD research, the same will apply with regard to evaluation and assessment of the progress of the research project as provided in the other paragraphs of this article, on the understanding that the assessment on the basis of which the supervisor decides whether or not he is willing to continue supervising the PhD candidate will take place no later than by the end of the third year after unconditional admission to PhD studies.
4. If the assessment leads the supervisor, in view of the PhD candidate's inadequate commitment or ability or for another reason, to consider that the PhD research will not lead to a doctorate, the supervisor will report this to the PhD candidate and the Rector. The same will apply if the supervisor considers that, for such reason, the PhD track will take an unacceptably long time. Following that notification, the Rector will discuss the situation with the supervisor, any second supervisor and/or co-supervisor, the PhD candidate and the Head of the Graduate School. Thereafter, the Rector will give a reasoned decision:
 - a) to request the supervisor to continue the PhD track, possibly with additional measures to address the supervisor's concerns; or
 - b) to request the Doctorate Board to designate another supervisor; or
 - c) to terminate the PhD track.
5. A PhD candidate who considers that, owing to shortcomings in supervision, a PhD track cannot lead to a doctorate, or will take an unacceptably long time, will report this to the supervisor and the Rector. Following that 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. Thereafter, the Rector will give a reasoned decision:
 - a) to instruct the supervisor or co-supervisor to continue the PhD track and to provide better supervision in it; or
 - b) to request the Doctorate Board to designate another supervisor or co-supervisor.
6. A PhD candidate who wishes to terminate the PhD track will notify the supervisor and the Rector accordingly. A PhD candidate working on the PhD research under an employment contract will observe the statutory notice period. The Rector will then terminate the PhD track with effect from the first day of the month following the month in which the PhD candidate has given written notice of termination of the PhD track, subject to the need to observe a longer period pursuant to a mandatory notice period imposed by laws and regulations.
7. If a supervisor does not approve the dissertation, the Doctorate Board may, at the request of the PhD candidate, designate another supervisor. The Doctorate Board will not decide on 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 on the matter.
8. If, pursuant to this article, a request is made to the Doctorate Board to appoint another supervisor, both the Rector and the PhD candidate may make suggestions to that end. If the Doctorate Board cannot find a suitable person willing to take over the supervisor's task, the Rector will terminate the PhD track.

Article 12.3 – Mediation in disputes and submitting the request

1. If a dispute arises during the PhD research or concerning the supervisor's acceptance of the manuscript as a dissertation, the Rector will mediate.
2. If the mediation does not lead to agreement within eight days, the Rector will notify each of the parties thereof in writing. Within six weeks of the date of the Rector's notice, either party may submit a clearly defined request to the Doctorate Board.

Article 12.4 – Dispute Advisory Committee

1. Within four weeks of receiving a request as referred to in Article 12.3 paragraph 2, the Doctorate Board will appoint a Dispute Advisory Committee.
2. The Dispute Advisory Committee will consist of three full professors who are not involved in the PhD research to which the dispute relates.
3. The secretary of the Doctorate Board will be appointed as secretary to the Committee.

Article 12.5 – Procedure of the Dispute Advisory Committee

1. The Committee will hear the parties concerned in a closed meeting and, where appropriate, consult experts, after giving the party complained of by the applicant the opportunity to respond in writing to the request submitted.
2. The secretary will draw up minutes of the hearing. The minutes will be sent to the parties heard at the hearing for their information.
3. Within six weeks after the Committee has been appointed by the Doctorate Board, the Committee will submit written advice to the Doctorate Board. The advice will be reasoned and contain at least a report of the hearing of the parties and, where applicable, experts.

Article 12.6 – Decision of the Doctorate Board

1. Within four weeks of receiving the advice, but in any event within ten weeks of receiving the request, the Doctorate Board will notify the applicant and the other parties involved in the dispute settlement procedure of its decision in writing and stating reasons.
2. The written advice of the Dispute Advisory Committee will be enclosed with the decision of the Doctorate Board.
3. If the decision on the request departs from the advice issued by the Dispute Advisory Committee, the reason for that departure will be stated in the decision.

Article 12.7 – Time limits

The Doctorate Board may extend the periods referred to in Article 12.5 paragraph 3 and Article 12.6 paragraph 1 once by thirty days if there is a compelling reason for doing so.

Chapter 13 – Joint doctorate

Article 13.1 – Definition

1. The PThU and one or more Dutch or foreign academic education institutions may conclude agreements on the conditions under which the institutions jointly award a joint doctorate on the basis of a dissertation that satisfies the provisions of this chapter.
2. The agreements referred to in paragraph 1 will be laid down in a formal agreement with the partner institution.

Article 13.2 – Approval by the Doctorate Board

1. A joint doctorate will be awarded by the Doctorate Board, together with a comparable body at the (foreign) academic education institution with which agreements as referred to in Article 13.1 have been concluded.
2. A joint doctorate at the University may take place only after written permission from the Rector has been obtained prior to the start of the PhD track.
3. If it is intended to award a joint doctorate, the supervisor will submit a written request for a joint doctorate to the Rector. This request will document the content and structure of the joint PhD track and demonstrate that the dissertation is being prepared within 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 will be subject to the rules of the institution where the dissertation is defended. If the defence takes place at the PThU, these Regulations will apply in full.
5. The doctoral degree will be conferred by the Doctorate Board, together with a comparable body of the (foreign) institution with which an agreement for the joint conferral of the doctorate has been concluded.

Article 13.3 – Responsible supervisors

1. In the case of a joint doctorate, the research will be carried out under the responsibility of a full professor at the PThU and a full professor at each partner institution with which the collaboration agreement referred to in Article 13.1 has been concluded. Both or all full professors will be designated as supervisors by the Doctorate Board.
2. The full professor from the partner institution with which the agreement referred to in Article 13.1 has been concluded and under whose responsibility the research is carried out will satisfy the conditions laid down in Article 4.1 paragraph 4.

Article 12.4 – Joint doctorate with a foreign partner

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

Article 12.5 – Approval of the dissertation

1. In the case of a joint doctorate, the dissertation must be approved by an Assessment Committee composed in consultation with the collaborating 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 satisfy the requirements set out in these Regulations.

Article 12.6 – The PhD defence

The PhD defence will take place wholly or partly in the language of at least one of the countries in which the partner academic education institution referred to in Article 13.1 is established.

Article 12.7 – Certificate

As proof of the award of the joint doctorate, the person who has obtained the doctorate will receive a certificate. The form of this certificate will be determined in consultation with the collaborating partner(s).

Chapter 14 – The double doctorate

Article 14.1 – Definition

A double doctorate means the simultaneous acquisition of a doctorate at the University and at a Dutch or foreign academic education institution with which an agreement to that effect has been concluded.

Article 14.2 – Approval by the Doctorate Board

1. A double doctorate at the University may take place only after prior written permission from the Rector.
2. The request for a double doctorate will be submitted in writing to the Rector by the supervisor. This request must demonstrate that the dissertation has been prepared within a formal collaboration between both institutions.

Article 14.3 – Responsible supervisors

1. In the case of a double doctorate, the research will be carried out under the responsibility of a full professor at the PThU and a full professor at the partner institution with which the collaboration agreement referred to in Article 14.1 has been concluded. Both full professors will be designated as supervisors by the Doctorate Board.
2. The full professor from the partner institution with which the agreement referred to in Article 14.1 has been concluded and under whose responsibility the research is carried out will satisfy the conditions laid down in Article 4.1 paragraph 4.

Article 14.4 – Approval of the dissertation

1. In the case of a double doctorate, the dissertation must be approved by the Assessment Committee composed in accordance with Chapter 8 of these Regulations and by the Doctorate or Assessment Committee, or a comparable body, of the partner academic education institution.
2. Without prejudice to the provisions of this chapter, the dissertation must satisfy the requirements set out in these Regulations.

Article 14.5 – 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 14.1 will stipulate that the double doctorate will first take place at the PThU and thereafter at the partner academic education institution.
3. The dissertation will be defended at both the University and the partner academic education institution within four months.

Article 14.6 – Certificate

In the case of a double doctorate, a reference will be included on the reverse side of the certificate to the certificate of the institution with which the agreement referred to in Article 14.1 has been concluded.

Chapter 15 – Other provisions

Article 15.1

In cases not provided for in these Regulations, the Doctorate Board will decide.

Article 15.2

These Regulations enter into force on 1 January 2026.

Article 15.3

Decisions to amend these Regulations will be taken by the Doctorate Board by a simple majority of votes.

Article 15.4

For procedures concerning the assessment of a manuscript by the Assessment Committee and admission to the defence of the dissertation that had already commenced on the date of adoption of these Regulations, as evidenced by a decision of the Doctorate Board concerning the composition of the Committee, the provisions of the PhD Regulations 2021 will continue to apply.

Article 15.5

In the event of any discrepancy between the wording of this translated English version and the Dutch version of these regulations, the original Dutch version shall prevail.