

CENTRAL REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE CONFERRING OF THE ACADEMIC PhD DEGREE

Dutch version approved by the Academic Council on October 5th 2015

Translation note: Only the Dutch version is considered legally binding.

Supplementary Faculty PhD Regulations of the Faculty of Physical Education and Physiotherapy are approved by the 'Faculteitsraad' the 27th of April 2016 and the 'Onderwijsraad' the 19th of May 2016.

Table of Contents

PREAMBLE	3
SECTION I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE	4
Article 1 – General	4
Article 2 – Academic title of doctor	4
SECTION II. CONDITIONS OF ADMISSION	5
Article 3 - Registration	5
Article 4 – Diplomas	5
Article 5 – Derogations	7
Article 6 - Foreign final diploma	8
Article 7 – PhD Progress Monitoring Commission	8
Article 8 – PhD examination	9
Article 9 - Learning outcomes	9
SECTION III. OMBUDSPERSON FOR PHD CANDIDATES	10
Article 10 – General	11
Article 11 – Appointment of an Ombudsperson	11
Article 12- Duties of the Ombudsperson	11
Article 13 - Operational procedures of the Ombudsperson	11
Article 14 - The Ombudsperson's right of inspection	12
Article 15 - Reporting	12
Article 16 - Conflict of interest	12
SECTION IV. PROCEDURE FOR THE PREPARATION OF A DOCTORAL THESIS	13
Article 17 – Written application	13
Article 18 – Guidance arrangements	13
Article 19 – Guidance and responsibility of the PhD thesis	14
Article 20 – Advisory Commission	14
Article 21 – The Charter for Researchers	14

Article 22 – Breach of Scientific Integrity	15
Article 23 – Progress report	15
Article 24 – Progress Evaluation	16
Article 25 – Disputes	17
Article 26 – Supporting doctoral candidates	17
SECTION V. PROCEDURE FOR THE PHD EXAMINATION	18
Article 27 - Submission	18
Article 28 – Intellectual property rights	19
Article 29 - Conservation of the PhD thesis	21
Article 30 – Language use	21
Article 31 - PhD jury	22
Article 32 - Deadline for assessment of the PhD thesis	22
Article 33 - Consultation and assessment procedure	23
Article 34 – Quorum requirements	23
Article 35 - Announcement	24
Article 36 - Venue for the public defense	24
Article 37 Public defense content and proceedings	24
SECTION VI. DELIBERATION AND PROCLAMATION	25
Article 38 - Quorum requirements	25
Article 39 – Deliberations	25
Article 40 – Assessment	25
Article 41 - Awards	25
Article 42 - Announcement of the results	25
SECTION VI. FINAL AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS	26
Article 43 - Publication of the results	26
Article 44 – Entry into force	26
APPENDIX I THE ACADEMIC TITLE OF DOCTOR	27
APPENDIX II THE CHARTER OF RESEARCHERS	28
APPENDIX III DECLARATION - RIGHT TO USE THE PHD THESIS	42

Preamble

These regulations are complemented by the *Doctoral Schools Regulations of the VUB* and the *Decision concerning the establishment of the PhD programme at the VUB* (Besluit inzake het inrichten van de Doctoraatsopleiding van de VUB).

The following terms as used in these regulations are defined as follows:

- Dean (decaan): the dean of the faculty in which the PhD candidate registers;
- PhD Training Programme (doctoraatsopleiding): the educational framework organised within every faculty by the Doctoral Schools, as stated in the *Decision concerning the establishment of the PhD course at the VUB*;
- PhD candidates within the joint PhD framework (doctorandi in het kader van een gezamenlijk doctoraat): incoming and outgoing PhD candidates;
- EhB: Erasmushogeschool Brussel;
- Joint PhD (gezamenlijk doctoraat): a PhD thesis written and defended under the joint responsibility of the VUB and one or more partner institution(s). This method leads to a "double" PhD degree or "joint" PhD degree, in which the requirements of Article.II.82 of the Codex Higer Education of December 20th 2013 (Codex Hoger Onderwijs van 20 december 2013) are met.
- ICDO: Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Commission (Interdisciplinaire Commissie voor Doctoraatsopvolging);
- Incoming PhD candidate (inkomende doctorandus): a PhD candidate preparing a joint PhD for which the VUB is the host institution;
- Interdisciplinary PhD (interdisciplinair doctoraat): a PhD thesis for preparation for the award of the academic title of PhD in Interdisciplinary Studies that exceeds various fields of expertise, which means the PhD candidate can be linked to several faculties;
- KCB: Koninklijk Conservatorium Brussel;
- OZR: Research Council (Onderzoeksraad);
- Outgoing PhD candidate (uitgaande doctorandus): a PhD candidate preparing a joint PhD for which the VUB is the home institution;
- VUB: Vrije Universiteit Brussel

References to persons and functions in these regulations can refer to either men or women.

Section I. Purpose and Scope

Article 1 – General

§1. These regulations establish the general requirements and the procedure governing the acquisition of an academic PhD degree at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB). The Faculty Council may supplement the general stipulations contained in this document by supplementary faculty regulations which are subject to approval by the Education Council (Onderwijsraad).

Supplementary Faculty PhD Regulations of the Faculty of Physical Education and Physiotherapy are mentioned in blue/Italic and are part of the supplementary Faculty regulations concerning the conferring of the academic PhD Degree (approved by the 'Faculteitsraad' the 27th of April 2016).

§2. In the event of a joint PhD, derogations may be granted from the provisions included in these Regulations and in the Supplementary PhD Regulations for the faculty to which the joint PhD relates, provided that they do not conflict with the prevailing legislation and that the approval of the Faculty Council is obtained for each derogation in each specific case.

Article 2 – Academic title of doctor

§1. The VUB awards academic PhD degrees in disciplines mentioned in Appendix I of these regulations. The Faculty Council may modify and supplement Appendix I of these regulations following advice by the Educational Board (Onderwijsraad). Appendix I can be subject to change at all times.

§2. An academic PhD degree can only be awarded by the VUB in the fields of expertise, or parts of the fields of expertise in which the University has the authority to offer training programmes leading to a master's degree, by virtue of Article II.82 of the Codex Higer Education of December 20th 2013 (Codex Hoger Onderwijs van 20 december 2013). Where the VUB can offer only bachelor programmes in certain fields of expertise or parts of fields of expertise, the PhD degree in or about these fields of expertise can be awarded only on condition that the public defense of the PhD thesis takes place before a inter-University jury composed in consultation with a university that has the authority to offer master programmes in these specific fields of expertise as provided by the Article.II.82 of the Codex Higer Education of December 20th 2013 (Codex Hoger Onderwijs van 20 december 2013)

Section II. Conditions of Admission

Article 3 - Registration

§1. Once the PhD candidate has received official permission to prepare the academic PhD examination in accordance with article 17 of these regulations, the candidate must register as a PhD candidate at the VUB without delay. In the case of a joint PhD the same rule applies; the PhD candidate must register as a PhD candidate at the VUB.

§2. Registration as a PhD candidate is possible at any time during the academic year. The tuition fee that is due is mentioned on the WebPages of the VUB Student Administration Center: <http://www.vub.ac.be/downloads/studiegelden.pdf>

§3. Registration needs to be repeated every academic year in which the PhD is being prepared, including the academic year in which the PhD examination takes place.

§4. Upon first registration the PhD candidate will automatically be assigned to one of the Doctoral Schools as stipulated in art. 9 of the *Doctoral School Regulations of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel* (Doctoral Schools reglement Vrije Universiteit Brussel). This gives the PhD candidate the right to follow the Doctoral Training Programme to the tune of 60 ECTS study points, in accordance with art. 3 of the "*Decision concerning the establishment of the PhD course*" (Besluit inzake het inrichten van de Doctoraatsopleiding Vrije Universiteit Brussel). The supplementary faculty regulations stipulate when and in which cases participation in the Doctoral Training Programme (or parts of it) is compulsory and possibly within which period of time this programme (or parts of it) needs to be successfully completed.

In the Faculty LK there is no obligation to follow (a part of) a Doctoral Training Programme.

§5. The Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Committee (ICDO) may, on the basis of the application by the candidate applying for a PhD of Arts or in Interdisciplinary Studies, make some or all of the PhD training programme mandatory. Where this is the case, the mandatory study package will be a prerequisite for permission to defend a PhD thesis. The ICDO may impose a maximum period within which the study package must be completed.

Article 4 – Diplomas

§1. To be admitted to the preparation of the PhD thesis, candidates must:

1° Hold one of the following qualifications:

- a. A master's degree or, as stipulated in the Codex Higher Education of December 20th 2013 (Codex Hoger Onderwijs van 20 december 2013), a degree of equal

value, including a Polytechnic Civil Engineering degree or a master's degree awarded by the Royal Military School in Brussels (Koninklijke Militaire School).

- b. A degree obtained outside the Flemish Community (Vlaamse Gemeenschap), which is considered equivalent to a master's degree in accordance with the stipulations of the Codex Higher Education of December 20th 2013 (Codex Hoger Onderwijs van 20 december 2013).
- c. A master's degree obtained from the French Community (Franse Gemeenschap) or a degree considered equivalent in accordance with the decree of the French Community and which is equivalent to a master's degree obtained within the Flemish Community.
- d. A foreign degree obtained upon successful completion of a course of study of minimum 240 ECTS study points and which is equivalent to a master's degree in accordance with a decree, a European Guideline or a bilateral agreement.

2° Have a supervisor (promotor) and have finalised their choice of subject.

3° Have obtained permission to prepare the PhD thesis in accordance with art. 17 of these regulations.

§2. With the exception of the PhDs in the Arts and in Interdisciplinary Studies, the Supplementary Faculty Doctorate Regulations determine which diploma gives access to which academic PhD as specified in Appendix 1.

§3. To be permitted to prepare a PhD of Arts, the applicant must, in principle, be the holder of a Master's diploma in a course in the fields of the audio-visual arts, music, performing arts, literature, architecture or visual arts. In this regard, a non-binding opinion may be obtained from the Brussels Arts Platform on PhDs falling within the common research framework established by the VUB and the Erasmus University College Brussels' (*EhB*) schools of arts Royal Conservatory of Brussels (*KCB*) and Royal Institute for Theatre, Cinema and Sound (*RITS*).

Applicants not holding a Master's diploma (or the equivalent) in one of the above fields may be admitted to the PhD programme if an examination by the Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Committee of the applicants' previously acquired competencies confirms that those competencies are, overall, at a level equivalent to a Master's diploma in the field of the arts.

§4. The Faculty Council or the Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Committee, as the case may be, will assess each application for admission to a PhD in Interdisciplinary Studies against the diploma requirements, in accordance with Articles 5 and 6.

§5. These same conditions apply for admission to the PhD examination, a supplementary condition being that the degree that grants admission to the PhD examination must have

been obtained at least two years prior to admission. Moreover, before PhD candidates are allowed to participate in the PhD examination, they will need to show they are able to conduct independent academic research.

Are admitted to defend the thesis in order to get the academic degree of Doctor in Physical Education and Movement Science:

- *the holders of a Master of science degree in Physical Education*
- *the holders of a Master of science degree in Physical education and movement sciences*
- *the holders of a Master of science degree of European MBA Sports Management (EMBASM)*
- *the holders of a master degree an institution of higher education (university college degree) after approval of the Faculty Council, based on the scientific CV including scientific track record and after a positive advice of the PhD Progress Monitoring Commission*

Are admitted to defend the thesis in order to get the academic degree of Doctor in Rehabilitation Sciences and Physiotherapy:

- *the holders of a Master of science degree in Rehabilitation (sciences) and/or Physiotherapy*
- *the holders of a diploma of Advanced Master in Neurological Rehabilitation, Advanced Master or 'Licentiaat' or 'GGS' (Certified and specialized studies) in Manual Therapy*
- *the holders of a master degree an institution of higher education (university college degree) after approval of the Faculty Council, based on the scientific CV including scientific track record and after a positive advice of the PhD Progress Monitoring Commission*

Article 5 – Derogations

§1. The Faculty Council may, if they consider it necessary, insist on an additional review of the candidate's file in order to assess the candidate's suitability to carry out academic research in the discipline concerned and to express the research results in a PhD thesis, even if the candidate has obtained the necessary master's degree or a degree equivalent to the master's degree.

§2. The Faculty Council may choose to grant permission to the candidate to prepare a PhD thesis if they find the candidate suitable, even though the candidate does not hold the necessary master's degree or a degree equivalent to the master's degree. This permission may however be made dependent on an investigation concerning the suitability of the PhD candidate to perform academic research in the concerned discipline and to express the research results in a PhD thesis. Admission can also be made dependent on the successful participation in an examination set up by the faculty. The supplementary faculty PhD regulations further describe the organisation of this examination.

The exam in the Faculty LK, is an evaluation of a research CV submitted by the candidate. The PhD Progress Monitoring Commission evaluates the submitted research CV and advises the Faculty Council hereof.

§3. In the case of an application for admission to a PhD programme in the Arts, the ICDO will fulfil the role of the Faculty Council, as set out in this article.

Article 6 - Foreign final diploma

§1. Holders of a diploma awarded by a foreign university or foreign academic institution may be exempted from the entry requirements as specified under article 4, b & d and can therefore be granted admission to the preparation of a PhD thesis and/or examination.

§2. When the Faculty Council considers that the foreign qualification cannot be deemed equivalent to a master's degree, admission can be made dependent on the investigation concerning the suitability of the PhD candidate to perform scientific research in the concerned discipline and to express the research results in a PhD thesis. Admission can also be made dependent on the successful participation in an examination set up by the faculty. The supplementary faculty PhD regulations contain the further organisation of this examination.

The exam in the Faculty LK, is an evaluation of a research CV submitted by the candidate. The PhD Progress Monitoring Commission evaluates the submitted research CV and advises the Faculty Council hereof.

§3. In the case of an application for admission to a PhD programme in the Arts, the Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Committee will fulfil the role of the Faculty Council, as set out in this article.

Article 7 – PhD Progress Monitoring Commission

§1. Every faculty sets up one PhD Progress Monitoring Commission (Commissie voor de Doctoraatsopleiding or CDO), including a minimum of five professors (members of the Senior Academic Staff - "Zelfstandig Academisch Personeel" or ZAP), supplemented by at least one teaching assistant ("Assisterend Academisch Personeel" or AAP) acting as an observer. The supplementary faculty PhD regulations precisely stipulate the composition and working of the Commission.

In the faculty LK there are no additional stipulations regarding the composition and the working methods of the PhD Progress Monitoring Commission.

§2. If the PhD is of an interdisciplinary nature and exceeds the competence of the faculty or is a PhD in Arts, monitoring will be guaranteed by an Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Commission (Interdisciplinaire Commissie voor de Doctoraatsopvolging or ICDO), including the three Doctoral School Directors, the Vice-Rector for Education and the Vice-Rector for Research, supplemented by a minimum of one teaching assistant (AAP) as an

observer. In monitoring progress with a PhD programme in the Arts, the Chairman of the Brussels Arts Platform serves on the Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Committee in an advisory capacity.

The authority to judge whether or not PhD research work is interdisciplinary lies with the Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Commission.

§3. It is the task of each PhD Progress Monitoring Commission to monitor the progress of all PhD research conducted in the faculty. It is the task of the Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Commission to monitor the progress of all interdisciplinary PhDs that exceed the competence of the faculty and the PhD programme in the arts.

§4. PhD candidates who work within the framework of a joint PhD also need to be monitored by the relevant Commissions.

§5. In their monitoring activities the Commissions will use the principles laid down in the "Charter for Researchers" annexed to these regulations in Appendix II. The Commissions evaluate the annual progress made by all PhD candidates in their faculties, as stipulated in articles 23 and 24 of these regulations. The same evaluation procedure is used by the Interdisciplinary PhD Progress Monitoring Commission to evaluate the progress made by PhD candidates who are working on an interdisciplinary PhD that exceeds the competence of the faculty or to prepare a PhD of Arts.

Article 8 – PhD examination

The PhD examination comprises the submission and public defense of an original thesis which meets the requirements specified in article 9.

Article 9 - Learning outcomes

§1. The PhD examination demonstrates the PhD candidate's capacity to independently contribute to the development and growth of academic knowledge, as well as his/her ability to report about their contribution both orally and in writing. The PhD thesis has to reflect the ability to create new academic knowledge in a certain field of expertise or across fields of expertise based on independent academic research, including the arts, and has to be able to lead to academic publications. The thesis needs to be shaped in the form allowed by the supplementary faculty PhD regulations (for example a completely unpublished text, or a body of publications).

In the faculty LK there are different options for the form of the thesis. Regardless the option, the PhD dissertation has to be a scientific coherent entity and has to be of a significant contribution in the domain of movement and sport sciences or the rehabilitation sciences and physiotherapy. The faculty however stimulates, if the scientific domain of the doctoral project allows, the use of option 1.

In option 1 the thesis has to be submitted as a coherent entity of valuable and acceptable publications, published, in review or in press. The overview has to be in such a way that the global question and the coherence between the publications is clearly recognizable. This implies that the entity is provided with a global introduction with a definition of the problem, a general discussion, conclusion, summary and bibliography. The publications to which the overview refers have to be assembled in the printed thesis.

If option 1 is chosen, the faculty LK requires that the collection should include a minimum of 3 related publications from international peer-reviewed journals, of which at least 1 is accepted when the dissertation is being submitted.

Option 2 is a completely unpublished text, comprising at least
(1) an introduction with the global question and literature study
(2) a section used methods and used materials
(3) a section obtained results
(4) a section discussion and general conclusions
(5) a summary
(6) the bibliography.

If the PhD student chooses option 2, the possibility to include peer-reviewed publications in the thesis remains. The PhD student will choose between the 2 options in dialogue with his supervisor(s) and announces this choice at the time of the second progress report. If applicable in the scientific domain of the thesis' subject, the LK Faculty encourages to choose for a coherent collection of publications.

§2. In the case of a PhD of Arts, the thesis is a single whole consisting of two components, each of which must be taken fully into account:

- 1° an artistic part, consisting of a series of artistic outcomes that arose during the research and that are presented in a manner specific to the artistic process concerned;
- 2° a discursive part, that consists of a relevant and academically sound consideration of the specific artistic process and of the methods and skills used, taking into account the specific features of the artistic research conducted.

These two component elements must result in the original thesis referred to earlier in this article. This provision also applies to the works produced in the artistic part of the thesis. Insofar as the artistic research permits, the thesis, consisting of the artistic and discursive parts, must be presented in a manner that makes it possible to check and reproduce its component parts.

Section III. Ombudsperson for PhD candidates

Article 10 – General

Every year the VUB appoints an Ombudsperson for PhD candidates in order to ensure high-quality support. Details concerning the functions of the Ombudsperson can be found as set out below.

Article 11 – Appointment of an Ombudsperson

§1. The Academic Council appoints, at the proposal of the OZR (*Research Council*) and before the beginning of each academic year, an Ombudsperson for PhD candidates. The Ombudsperson for PhD candidates is a full-time Senior Academic Staff member (Zelfstandig Academisch Personeel or ZAP) with preferably the title of Full Professor (gewoon hoogleraar). At the same time and as part of the same procedure, a substitute Ombudsperson is appointed from a different faculty. The mandate of the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates and of the substitute Ombudsperson can in principle not be combined with another function in a central or faculty body.

§2. The name of the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates and his/her substitute as well as information on how they can be reached will also be made available to PhD candidates in print and on a yearly basis.

Article 12- Duties of the Ombudsperson

§1. PhD candidates' remarks and complaints relating to difficulties involving the supervisor(s) or (Interdisciplinary) PhD Monitoring Commission during the preparation and the execution of their PhD research can be addressed to the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates.

§2. At the request of the PhD candidate, the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates may operate as a mediator between the PhD candidate and the supervisor(s), chair person of the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission, the Dean and members of the academic staff. The goal of the Ombudsperson is to arrive at a friendly settlement of complaints.

Article 13 - Operational procedures of the Ombudsperson

§1. All remarks and complaints are recorded by the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates in a confidential file. The Ombudsperson for PhD Candidates is bound to secrecy and has a duty of discretion.

§2. The Ombudsperson for PhD candidates decides, in consultation with the PhD candidate, how they will proceed after the first meeting initiated by the candidate. After the first meeting, the necessity of a further procedure will be considered. When a complaint is confirmed in writing, there will always be a written follow-up.

§3. In the case of a written complaint concerning article 12, §1, the ombudsperson for PhD candidates will, within three weeks, propose a friendly settlement to the Dean, notwithstanding the possible application of article 25 of these regulations. The PhD candidate and the Ombudsperson are informed immediately, and in writing, of the solution proposed by the Dean.

Article 14 - The Ombudsperson's right of inspection

The Ombudsperson for PhD candidates has the following rights that enable him/her to carry out his/her function:

- 1° The right to participate in the meetings of the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission;
- 2° The right to consult all documents concerning the stipulations of article 12, §1.

Article 15 - Reporting

Every year, before November 15th, the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates is required to report to the University Council on the previous year's occurrences. This report was previously presented to the Research Council. This report consists of a statistical overview of all contacts and of all cases in which actual mediation took place; care should be taken not to breach confidentiality.

Article 16 - Conflict of interest

If the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates is a member of the same faculty as the PhD candidate who has made a remark or filed a complaint or if there is too close a tie between the Ombudsperson and the PhD candidate, it is the substitute Ombudsperson for PhD candidates who will take action. An exception from this rule is possible if the Ombudsperson, or his alternate, acts on another campus as a contact person and is linked to the same faculty as the PhD candidate solely in that capacity. An exception to this rule is possible if the Ombudsperson or his/her substitute is located as contact person at the other campus and is therefore connected to the same faculty as the PhD candidate.

Section IV. Procedure for the Preparation of a Doctoral Thesis

Article 17 – Written application

§1. Those who wish to obtain a PhD degree at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (including incoming and outgoing PhD candidates), are required to get permission to prepare the PhD Thesis. Applicants must therefore submit an application through the Student Administration Centre's on-line application website; the Centre will check it and then forward it in its entirety to the Dean, or, in the case of a PhD of Arts, to the Chairman of the ICDO. The Student Administration Centre forwards the request to the Dean of the relevant faculty after confirming the documents are complete. The written request specifies the subject of the thesis, the name(s) of the supervisor(s) and the discipline(s) to which the proposed PhD project belongs, a curriculum vitae, a research plan, a description of the material means and framework available for the intended research (written by the supervisor) and the choice of Doctoral School. The application must include a sworn copy of the degree, except for PhD candidates who have a degree awarded by a recognised Belgian institution. These candidates present, upon registering, the original version of their degree when they have been accepted for the preparation of the PhD Thesis.

§2. Within three months after the date of receipt, the Faculty Council or the ICDO decides on the application. Once the Faculty Council or the ICDO has decided positively on an application, the Council ratifies the candidate's choice of Doctoral School. In the case of a PhD of Arts, in conjunction with the Erasmus University College Brussels, the ICDO obtains the prior opinion of the Brussels Arts Platform.

§3. Following the decision of the Faculty Council or ICDO, the file will be sent to the Vice-Rector for Student Policy for approval. The latter does not apply to PhD candidates with a degree awarded by a recognised Belgian institution; in this case the file only needs to be approved by the Faculty Council or the ICDO.

§4. A positive decision by the Faculty Council Or the ICDO and possibly by the Vice-Rector for Student Policy may only count as admission to the preparation of the PhD thesis providing the PhD candidate registers in accordance with article 3, §1, §2, §3 of these regulations.

Article 18 – Guidance arrangements

The registered PhD candidate can rely on the guidance arrangements described under articles 19 to 21 and article 26 of these regulations.

Article 19 – Guidance and responsibility of the PhD thesis

§1. The PhD thesis is written under the guidance and responsibility of at least one member of the Senior Academic Staff (ZAP), the ZAP-supervisor, who may be assisted by:

- 1° An external supervisor who is a member of the Senior Academic Staff (ZAP) not affiliated with the Vrije Universiteit Brussel;
- 2° A supervisor who is an emeritus member of the Senior Academic Staff (ZAP) of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel;
- 3° A supervisor who is not a member of the Senior Academic Staff (ZAP) and holds a PhD title.

This may be further specified in the supplementary faculty regulations.

§2. In the case of a PhD of Arts, in addition to a ZAP VUB supervisor, there is always a supervisor who provides artistic guidance. This artistic supervisor is exempt from the requirement to hold a PhD based on a thesis.

§3. In the case of a joint PhD, the PhD thesis may also be written under the additional guidance and responsibility of a member of ZAP of the partner institution, who may be assisted.

Article 20 – Advisory Commission

§1. Each PhD candidate is supported by an Advisory Commission consisting of the ZAP-supervisor(s) as defined in Article 19 and at least one member who is in principle the holder of a PhD and preferably comes from outside the department/research group/ VUB.

§2. The Advisory Committee will be convened by the Faculty Council - or, in the case of a PhD of Arts or in Interdisciplinary Studies extending beyond the areas of expertise of the faculty itself, the ICDO - ideally when the application submitted by the PhD candidate is examined but in any event within 18 months of the candidate's registration. The Supplementary Faculty PhD Regulations may set out the composition and rules of procedure for the Monitoring Committee in greater detail.

Article 21 – The Charter for Researchers

§1. The supervisor(s) is (are) obliged to counsel and stimulate the PhD candidate as he/she prepares the PhD thesis. In doing so, the supervisor(s) need(s) to observe the principles described in the "Charter for Researchers", which are annexed to these regulations in Appendix II.

§2. The PhD candidate is required to inform his/her supervisor regularly of the progress made on his/her PhD thesis.

§3. The PhD candidate or supervisor(s) concerned must report any failure to comply with the requirements of the Charter for Researchers to the Dean and/or the Ombudsperson for PhD Candidates.

Article 22 – Breach of Scientific Integrity

§1. PhD students must refrain from committing any form of infringement of scientific integrity.

§2. If it is determined that there has been an infringement of scientific integrity, this must be reported to the point of contact for Scientific Integrity using the procedure set out in the Regulations on breaches of scientific integrity.

§3. If an infringement of scientific integrity by a PhD student is strongly suspected during the preparation of a thesis or with regard to a thesis submitted, this may give rise to one of following examination-related disciplinary sanctions:

- 1° The obligation to rework the doctoral thesis so that it no longer contains plagiarisms;
- 2° Rejection of the doctoral thesis: the PhD student is not permitted to submit or defend a thesis on the same or a closely related subject;
- 3° Rejection of the doctoral project and exclusion from the PhD programme: the PhD student is not permitted to submit or defend a thesis on the same or a closely related subject and is prohibited from enrolling again with the University for a number of academic years to be determined.

§4. If an infringement on scientific integrity is established after the public defence of a doctoral thesis, this may lead to award of the title of doctor being revoked. The Commission may also impose the examinations sanctions set out in paragraph 3. The severity of the infringement and of the penalties is determined on the basis of the following criteria:

- 1° the nature and scale of plagiarisation;
- 2° the intention to commit the fraud.

§5. If the Commission on Scientific Integrity establishes that plagiarisation has been committed, it will draw up a proposal for sanctions for submission to the Academic Council. The Academic Council will then take a formal decision.

§6. If the PhD student is also a member of the VUB staff, the organisational and disciplinary measures shall also apply, as will the relevant staff regulations.

Article 23 – Progress report

§1. Every PhD candidate will compile a progress report outlining the progress made on his/her PhD research project. By 30 April, at the latest, he/she will provide his/her supervisor(s), the Dean and the Chairperson of the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission with a copy of the progress report, and the Chairperson of the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission will ensure that all Commission members receive a copy. The annual progress report will comprise a minimum of four sections:

- The PhD candidate's activities over the previous year (including a list of publications);
- The PhD candidate's plans for the year ahead;
- An overview of the problems encountered;
- A report by the supervisor assessing the PhD candidate's achievements.

§2. The required and concrete content of the progress report can be further determined by the supplementary faculty regulations. Also, the faculties may decide, in the supplementary faculty regulations, to further extend the four sections mentioned above. Such an extension will also count for the progress report of an outgoing PhD candidate. The progress report of an incoming PhD candidate only needs to comprise the original four sections.

Supplementary to the Central PhD regulations, the PhD student of the Faculty LK has to include the following in the progress report:

- *a list of publications which clearly indicates which publications will be a part of the PhD dissertation*
- *a summarized content of the situation regarding the preparation of the dissertation*
- *a summary in English or Dutch of the presentation during the Dag van de Doctorandi LK (Day of the PhD students LK).*
- *a concrete timeline, with the expected end date of the PhD process*
- *an overview of the current and previous mandates or functions, e.g. "PhD student X is presently, and this since 1/1/2003, 100% BAP in the department Y financed by OZR funds XXX. Between 1/10/2003-31/12/2003 PhD student X was 20% honorary BAP in the same department".*
- *Explanation in which way the PhD student has considered the suggestions of the PhD Progress Monitoring Commission after the previous progress report (not applicable for the PhD students who submit their progress report for the first time).*

Not to be joined to the report: Reprints of publications, proof of participation to congresses, proof of participation to additional courses and so on. The PhD student is personally responsible for keeping the evidence which can be asked for at any time.

Article 24 – Progress Evaluation

§1. Every academic year the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission will discuss the progress made on the PhD thesis projects. Should the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission note lack of progress, the PhD candidate and the supervisor(s) will be heard at a subsequent Commission meeting. The PhD candidate can ask the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates to attend this hearing.

§2. The (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission will report by 15 June its findings to the Research Council (Onderzoeksraad). In its report, the Commission gives the Research Council a reasoned and detailed opinion on the re-registration of PhD candidates. That opinion may be positive, negative or reserved.

§3. The ICDO has until 31 August to submit a new opinion to the Research Board on the cases submitted to it earlier.

§4. The Research Board's decision on whether or not a PhD candidate may re-register is based on the progress reports.

Article 25 – Disputes

Should a dispute arise during the preparation of a PhD thesis between the supervisor(s) and the PhD candidate or between the supervisor(s)/PhD candidate and the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission, the following actions will be taken:

- 1° The Dean and /or the Ombudsperson for PhD candidates will intervene to mediate.
- 2° If their mediation fails to produce results, the Academic Council – acting at the request of the supervisor or the PhD candidate and having heard both sides – will decide whether and under which conditions work on the thesis is to be continued.

Article 26 – Supporting doctoral candidates

The Vrije Universiteit Brussel has taken the following steps to support the PhD candidate:

- 1° The setting up of a personal online documentation system for the research process:

The University provides the PhD candidate with an access to an electronic portfolio system (personal documentation system for the research process) allowing him/her:

- a. to gather all necessary data online for the annual progress report that will be submitted to the PhD Progress Monitoring Commission;
- b. to record optional data online regarding personal achievements in the margin of the candidate's research project, which benefit the University and academia in general;
- c. to create a dossier of the PhD process, which may be used in presentations for future employers.

- 2° The organisation of discipline-dependent and discipline-independent workshops, seminars, etc. which support the research process and train generic skills.
- 3° The identification and announcement of a selection of workshops, seminars, etc. which support the research process and train generic skills.
- 4° The issuing of certificates and the "Certificate of the Doctoral Training Programme":
With the "Certificate of the Doctoral Training Programme", the successful completion of the 60-credit VUB Doctoral Training Programme, is established, in accordance with article 4 of the *Decision regarding the Organisation of the Doctoral Training Programme at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel*. This document is signed by the Rector of the VUB. The certificate includes an overview of the PhD candidate's activities carried out as part of the research or in the margin of the research, within the framework of the Doctoral Training Programme. This overview will be based on the personal documentation system of which the inserted activities are approved yearly by the supervisor. PhD candidates who did not complete the entire Doctoral Training Programme of 60 credits, receive, at their request and after (early) termination of the PhD process, an attestation including an overview of the PhD candidate's activities carried out as part of the research or in the margin of the research. This overview will be based on the personal documentation system of which the inserted activities are approved yearly by the supervisor-

Section V. Procedure for the PhD Examination

Article 27 - Submission

§1. When the PhD candidate wishes to take the PhD examination, he/she will send a written request to the Dean co-signed by the supervisor(s). This request will state the title of the PhD thesis.

§2. PhD candidates preparing a PhD in Interdisciplinary Studies or in the Arts must submit their application in writing to the Dean of the faculty to which the senior staff supervisor is primarily attached.

§3. The PhD candidate will enclose, together with the request, one copy of his/her thesis at the faculty secretariat. The Faculty may add to the number of copies in the Supplementary Faculty Doctorate Regulations. The PhD candidate will also deliver an electronic version of his/her PhD thesis, as further explained in article 28 below.

In the faculty of physical education and physiotherapy, the PhD researcher provides 1 printed copy of the thesis per jury member.

§4. The obligations mentioned above are equally binding for PhD candidates with a joint PhD who wish to publicly defend their PhD at the VUB. To submit the PhD thesis in electronic form is however mandatory for all PhD candidates with a joint PhD, irrespective of where the public defense takes place.

§5. When the supplementary faculty regulations make it compulsory to follow the Doctoral Training Programme (or parts of the Doctoral Training Programme), PhD candidates need to have successfully completed the (parts of the) Doctoral Training Programme before he/she can publicly defend his/her PhD thesis.

§6. The PhD candidate is only granted permission to publicly defend his/her PhD thesis when he/she has signed a declaration form in accordance with previous paragraphs of which a prototype is included in appendix III of these regulations. Under the terms of article 28, the PhD candidate grants user rights to the University over the doctoral thesis which he/she has been granted permission to defend publicly.

Article 28 – Intellectual property rights

§1. The PhD candidate preserves all copyrights of his/her doctoral thesis.

§2. The PhD candidate grants irrevocable and non-exclusive permission to the VUB to reproduce and publish the PhD thesis, as it was submitted, in accordance with aforementioned article 27, in its whole and unaltered form, unless explicitly stipulated otherwise. According to this permission, the PhD thesis can be reproduced and published as follows:

1. On paper:

The thesis may be made available at the VUB university library for possible consultation by visitors;

2. In electronic form:

- a) For preservation in the electronic archives of the VUB university library.
- b) For consultation through special terminals at the VUB university library. The VUB pledges to take all necessary and reasonable measures to provide the PhD thesis

with adequate technological protection against downloading, printing and/or sending the thesis to third parties.

The PhD thesis may be reproduced in order to index the full text and facilitate searching the text, even when the complete text is not made available.

c) Availability to the online public.

The PhD candidate has the **choice**, upon handing in the PhD thesis, to immediately make the thesis available, in its whole or partly, through a publicly accessible network (internet). The modalities of this availability will be indicated by the PhD candidate on the form referred to in article 27, §6. . The bibliographical description of the thesis (title, author, year, abstract, etc.) will always immediately be included in the (online) library catalogue of the university library of the VUB.

The PhD candidate has two years to exploit the PhD thesis, commercially or otherwise, and to reproduce and publish it in its original or reworked form at the time of the public defense. If the thesis is not (commercially) published within this two-year term, the VUB has the right to reproduce and publish the thesis in full (without profit purpose) by making it available to the public via an open network (for example the internet). This two-year term can be extended if the PhD candidate can offer a founded reason for the extension (for example the negotiations concerning a signed publishing contract in which a reasonable term is provided to produce and distribute the agreed number of copies of the thesis, even though publishing has not yet been achieved.

§3. The use of the PhD thesis in electronic form, in accordance with this article, implies that it can be reproduced on all possible digital carriers so it can be used in accordance with best practices. In the context of current technological evolutions, the PhD thesis may be reproduced and technically altered in any way, in order to ensure the most suitable techniques are used as provided for in this article.

§4. This non-exclusive licence has worldwide authority for the whole protection term of the copyright and all other intellectual and commercial owner rights inherent to the PhD thesis.

§5. The PhD candidate will receive no compensation for any of the aforementioned user rights granted to the VUB.

§6. The PhD candidate guarantees that he/she will not (or has not) grant(ed) any exploitation rights to third parties which are irreconcilable with the user right he/she has granted the VUB.

§7. The PhD candidate guarantees that he/she is the author of the PhD thesis and that he/she has received the authorization to use protected third-party material (for example text, graphics, illustrations, recordings, etc) in his/her PhD thesis and to grant the VUB the aforementioned user rights over these materials.

§8. The PhD candidate will protect the VUB without any restrictions against all possible third-party claims (for example for breaches of intellectual owner rights, personality rights, etc.).

§9. The artistic part of the PhD thesis in the Arts is exempt from the requirement laid down in this article to provide non-exclusive permission to reproduce the PhD thesis and publish it. It is recommended that this permission be granted but this is not mandatory.

Article 29 - Conservation of the PhD thesis

§1. One copy of the PhD thesis will remain at the secretariat of the faculty concerned; it will be available for the benefit of the Senior Academic Staff (ZAP). Following the public defense, and provided the PhD candidate has been awarded the degree of Doctor, one copy of the PhD thesis will be put on file by the faculty secretariat in the university library. This copy is published under the conditions specified in the standard form in Article 27 §6. If the PhD candidate is not awarded the degree of Doctor, the copy of the PhD thesis intended for the library will be filed in the Faculty archives.

§2. The aforementioned is also applicable in the case of a joint PhD, irrespective of where the public defense takes place.

Article 30 – Language use

§1. The PhD thesis will be written and defended in Dutch or in English. If the thesis has another language as its subject, it may be written in the language concerned.

§2. The defense of the thesis will be in Dutch or in English.

§3. The PhD candidate can ask for the PhD thesis to be written and defended in another language than Dutch or English. This can only be done after due permission has been granted by the Faculty Council.

§4. The joint PhD will be written and defended in the language stipulated in the contract concerning the joint PhD and signed by all parties.

§5. If the joint PhD is written and defended in another language than Dutch, an abstract in Dutch is required.

Article 31 - PhD jury

§1. On proposal by the supervisors, the Faculty Board will set up an examinations panel. In the case of a PhD of Arts undertaken in conjunction with the Erasmus University College Brussels, this proposal must be accompanied by a non-binding opinion of the Brussels Arts Platform.

§2. An examinations panel consists of at least three ZAP members of the VUB and a minimum of two external members. In principle, the composition of the panel must include at least 1 person of the opposite sex. Any departures from this must be justified.

§3. In principle, all members will hold a PhD. Any departures from this must be justified.

§4. The PhD jury must consist of no more than eight voting members. The Advisory Committee may not constitute the majority of the voting members in the PhD jury. The supervisor(s) form(s) part of the jury, and in the case there is more than one supervisor the supervisors as a whole shall have a single vote. The votes of VUB members must always account for the majority of the votes cast.

§5. The chair of the examination jury appointed by the Faculty Council will under no circumstances be supervisor or co-supervisor of the PhD candidate.

§6. If the PhD thesis under scrutiny has an interdisciplinary character, transgressing the borders of a faculty, each faculty needs to be represented on the examination jury by minimum one member of the Senior Academic Staff (ZAP).

§7. The examination jury set up for a joint PhD will consist of the supervisors and a minimum of four other members. Each partner institution will be represented on the jury by a minimum of two members, including the supervisor. Additionally, two external members who are not connected to either of the partner institutions will have a seat on the jury. The members connected to the VUB will be appointed by the Faculty Council. The Chair and the external members of the examination jury will be appointed in accordance with the stipulations of the contract establishing the joint PhD.

§8. If the PhD candidate can show that there is a serious conflict of interests with respect to one of the jury members, the Faculty Council may submit a reasoned request for that member's replacement.

Article 32 - Deadline for assessment of the PhD thesis

§1. The PhD jury has two full months to examine the submitted PhD thesis and reach a decision.

§2. If unanimous, the board may reduce this period by a maximum of one month or – provided the PhD candidate agrees – extend the period by a maximum of one month. An extension will always be substantiated.

Article 33 - Consultation and assessment procedure

§1. When the term, as defined in the previous article, expires, the jury members will initiate a two-phase negotiation and assessment procedure:

- 1° Phase 1: the jury members enter into closed (internal) negotiations, orally and/or in writing.
- 2° Phase 2: the internal defense of the thesis. The jury members hear the PhD candidate, who may defend him/herself. The use of interactive electronic means of communication (chat, teleconferencing, etc.) is allowed.

§2. Subsequently, the examination jury will reach a decision and announce its decision to the PhD candidate:

- 1° Should the jury decide to allow the candidate to publicly defend his/her PhD thesis, the chair of the examination jury will determine when the public defense is to take place and he/she will take all necessary measures to publicize the date of the defense. The public defense will take place no later than one month following the decision to allow the PhD candidate to defend his/her thesis.
- 2° Should the examination jury decide that the PhD thesis needs to be reworked, the procedure will be suspended. From the moment the revised thesis is submitted, the provisions of article 33 apply.
- 3° Should the examination jury decide that the thesis may not be defended, the procedure will be terminated. In this case, the examination jury can request the (Interdisciplinary) PhD Progress Monitoring Commission to advise the Rector to refuse re-enrolment in accordance with the stipulations of article 24 of these regulations.

If the votes are tied, the decision will be made in favour of the PhD candidate.

§3. In any case, the examination jury will inform the PhD candidate in writing of the evaluation by its members, of the report on its findings and of its decision.

Article 34 – Quorum requirements

At least half the members of the examination jury need to be present in order to meet and deliberate validly. Members who have submitted their recommendations in writing will be taken into account for the required quorum. The PhD jury may only validly convene and deliberate on whether or not to permit a public defense if at least half of its voting members

are present. For the purposes of this quorum, members who have submitted a written opinion are also taken into account.

Article 35 - Announcement

§1. The faculty secretariat will ensure that an announcement of the public defense is published on the VUB-website. Each faculty is free to provide additional methods to announce public defenses in their supplementary faculty regulations.

There are no additional requirements regarding the announcement of the public defense in the Faculty LK.

§2. The announcement, which will be made at least eight days before the public defense, will include the name of the PhD candidate, the title of his/her PhD thesis, the date, time and place of the public defense.

§3. The PhD candidate must also draw up a brief, non-specialist, scientific abstract of the PhD thesis in Dutch and in English, approved by the supervisor. This 200-500 word text must be provided to the Science Communications Expertise Unit at least three weeks before the public defense. This text may be used for press releases and notices.

Article 36 - Venue for the public defense

§1. The public defense usually takes place on VUB premises. Exceptions need to be approved by the Faculty Council.

§2. The public defense of a joint PhD takes place on the premises of the home-institution of the PhD candidate, unless otherwise decided in the contract establishing the joint PhD.

Article 37 - Public defense content and proceedings

§1. A public defense will take no less than one hour and no more than two hours. It will include a brief summary of the PhD thesis intended for the examination jury and the lay audience, followed by a discussion.

§2. In the case of a PhD of the Arts, presentations forming part of the PhD examination are not governed by the time restrictions specified above.

§3. Both the examination jury and the audience may question the PhD candidate, who will then proceed to defend his/her PhD thesis.

Section VI. Deliberation and proclamation

Article 38 - Quorum requirements

The examination jury cannot validly consult on the possible awarding of the doctoral degree and the doctoral grade if not at least half the members of the jury are present. Only attending members are taken into account for the quorum.

Article 39 – Deliberations

Immediately following a public PhD thesis defense, the examination jury will leave the room to deliberate on awarding the PhD in private and, if so stipulated by the supplementary faculty regulations, decide on awarding a doctoral grade.

In the Faculty LK there are no graduation honours.

Article 40 – Assessment

The examination jury declares the PhD candidate has passed on the strength of a majority of the votes cast, taking into account the intrinsic academic value of the PhD thesis and the manner in which the candidate has conducted his/her defense. If there is no majority, the decision will always be made in favour of the PhD candidate.

Article 41 - Awards

If the PhD candidate has been declared passed, no doctoral grade will be awarded unless otherwise provisioned in the supplementary faculty regulations. In this case the jury shall announce whether the candidate has passed with satisfaction, distinction, high distinction or the highest distinction.

Article 42 - Announcement of the results

Immediately following the deliberation, the chair of the examination jury shall proceed to confer the degree of PhD. He/she shall publicly declare that all the relevant rules and regulations have been observed.

Section VI. Final and transitional provisions

Article 43 - Publication of the results

Upon his/her first enrolment for the preparation of the PhD thesis as specified in article 17, the PhD candidate will receive a copy of the Central Regulations regarding the conferment of PhD degrees as well as the supplementary faculty regulations and the "The Charter for Researchers", included with these regulations as Appendix II.

Article 44 – Entry into force

These Regulations shall come into effect on approval of the Academic Council.

APPENDIX I The academic title of doctor

The VUB awards the following academic PhD degrees.

	Nederlandse benaming	Engelse benaming
1	Doctor in de wijsbegeerte en de moraalwetenschappen	Doctor of Philosophy and Moral Sciences
2	Doctor in de taalkunde	Doctor of Linguistics
3	Doctor in de letterkunde	Doctor in Literary Studies
4	Doctor in de taal- en letterkunde	Doctor of Linguistics and Literary Studies
5	Doctor in de toegepaste taalkunde	Doctor of Applied Language Studies
6	Doctor in de geschiedenis	Doctor of History
7	Doctor in de kunstwetenschappen en de archeologie	Doctor of Art Studies and Archaeology
8	Doctor in de kunstwetenschappen en de archeologie: cultureel erfgoed studies	Doctor of Art Studies and Archaeology: Cultural Heritage Studies
9	Doctor in de rechten	Doctor of Laws
10	Doctor in het notariaat	Doctor of Notarial Law
11	Doctor in de criminologische wetenschappen	Doctor of Criminology
12	Doctor in de psychologische wetenschappen	Doctor of Psychology
13	Doctor in de pedagogische wetenschappen	Doctor of Educational Sciences
14	Doctor in de pedagogische wetenschappen: agogische wetenschappen	Doctor of Adult Educational Sciences
15	Doctor in de economische wetenschappen	Doctor of Economics
16	Doctor in de toegepaste economische wetenschappen	Doctor of Business Economics
17	Doctoraat in de toegepaste economische wetenschappen: handelsingenieur	Doctor of Business Economics
18	Doctor in de politieke wetenschappen	Doctor of Political Science
19	Doctoraat in de sociale wetenschappen: sociologie	Doctor of Sociology
20	Doctor in de media- en communicatiestudies	Doctor of Media and Communication Studies
21	Doctor in de media- en communicatiestudies: journalistieke studies	Doctor of Media and Communication Studies: Journalism Studies
22	Doctor in de bewegings- en sportwetenschappen	Doctor in Movement and Sport Sciences
23	Doctor in de revalidatiewetenschappen en de kinesitherapie	Doctor in Rehabilitation Sciences and Physiotherapy
24	Doctor in de wetenschappen	Doctor of Sciences
25	Doctor in de bio-ingenieurswetenschappen	Doctor of Bio-Engineering Sciences
26	Doctor in de ingenieurswetenschappen	Doctor of Engineering Sciences
27	Doctor in de industriële ingenieurswetenschappen	Doctor of Engineering Technology
28	Doctor in de medische wetenschappen	Doctor of Medical Sciences
29	Doctor in de biomedische wetenschappen	Doctor of Biomedical Sciences
30	Doctor in de sociale gezondheidswetenschappen	Doctor of Social Health Sciences
31	Doctor in de verpleeg- en vroedkunde	Doctor of Nursing and Obstetrics
32	Doctor in de tandheelkunde	Doctor of Dentistry
33	Doctor in de farmaceutische wetenschappen	Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences
34	Doctor in de gerontologie	Doctor of Gerontology
35	Doctor in de menselijke ecologie	Doctor of Human Ecology
36	Doctor in de kunsten	Doctor of Arts

APPENDIX II The Charter for Researchers

BACKGROUND

In December 2005, the VUB adopted the recommendations of the European Commission of 11 March 2005 on the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers.

In 2011, the VUB was awarded the HR Excellence in Research label following further internal implementation of the European Charter and Code of Conduct. The European Charter forms the framework for the VUB's human resources policy for research. The general principles and requirements laid down in the European Charter are also used as the basis for the VUB's good scientific practice and culture.

The VUB's research policy seeks to ensure that the preservation and promotion of good scientific practice is at the forefront at all times. The research policy focuses on awareness raising and prevention, but also incorporates a procedure for handling complaints relating to scientific misconduct.

Another key pillar of the research policy is raising the awareness of researchers through the (PhD) training programme.

The Charter has also been drawn up in accordance with the criteria laid down in Collective Labour Agreement IV for the higher education sector and in particular with a view to:

- ongoing awareness raising, training and increasing the accountability of researchers with respect to the correct application of scientific practices.
- The expectations that PhD candidates, supervisors and other stakeholders have of each other in terms of scientific practices in general and with respect to PhDs in particular.

This Charter describes what is meant by "scientific misconduct".

In addition, a detailed description is given of what constitutes "good scientific practice".

- Profile of a good researcher
- Profile of a good scientific author
- Profile of a good peer reviewer
- Profile of a good supervisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES	30
European Charter for Researchers	30
VUB staff regulations	32
Research policy	33
II. INFRINGEMENT OF SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY	33
III. GOOD SCIENTIFIC PRACTICES	34
IV. THE GOOD RESEARCHER	35
Publication, a moral obligation	35
International screening and visibility	36
Patent literature	36
V. PROFILE OF A GOOD RESEARCHER	37
VI. THE GOOD SCIENTIFIC AUTHOR	38
VII. PROFILE OF A GOOD SCIENTIFIC AUTHOR	38
VIII. PROFILE OF A GOOD PEER REVIEWER	39
IX. PROFILE OF A GOOD SUPERVISOR	40

I. General principles

European Charter for Researchers

The European Charter for Researchers enshrines the following principles.

Excerpt from 'The European Charter for Researchers – The Code of Conduct for Recruitment of Researchers' (ISBN 92-894-9311-9):

General Principles and Requirements applicable to Researchers:

Research Freedom

Researchers should focus their research for the good of mankind and for expanding the frontiers of scientific knowledge, while enjoying the freedom of thought and expression, and the freedom to identify methods by which problems are solved, according to recognised ethical principles and practices.

Researchers should, however, recognise the limitations to this freedom that could arise as a result of particular research circumstances (including supervision/guidance/management) or operational constraints, e.g. for budgetary or infrastructural reasons or, especially in the industrial sector, for reasons of intellectual property protection. Such limitations should not, however, contravene recognised ethical principles and practices, to which researchers have to adhere.

Ethical principles

Researchers should adhere to the recognised ethical practices and fundamental ethical principles appropriate to their discipline(s) as well as to ethical standards as documented in the different national, sectoral or institutional Codes of Ethics.

Professional responsibility

Researchers should make every effort to ensure that their research is relevant to society and does not duplicate research previously carried out elsewhere.

They must avoid plagiarism of any kind and abide by the principle of intellectual property and joint data ownership in the case of research carried out in collaboration with a supervisor(s) and/or other researchers. The need to validate new observations by showing that experiments are reproducible should not be interpreted as plagiarism, provided that the data to be confirmed are explicitly quoted.

Researchers should ensure, if any aspect of their work is delegated, that the person to whom it is delegated has the competence to carry it out.

Professional attitude

Researchers should be familiar with the strategic goals governing their research environment and funding mechanisms, and should seek all necessary approvals before starting their research or accessing the resources provided.

They should inform their employers, funders or supervisor when their research project is delayed, redefined or completed, or give notice if it is to be terminated earlier or suspended for whatever reason.

Contractual and legal obligations

Researchers at all levels must be familiar with the national, sectoral or institutional regulations governing training and/or working conditions. This includes Intellectual Property Rights regulations, and the requirements and conditions of any sponsor or funders, independently of the nature of their contract. Researchers should adhere to such regulations by delivering the required results (e.g. thesis, publications, patents, reports, new products development, etc) as set out in the terms and conditions of the contract or equivalent document.

Accountability

Researchers need to be aware that they are accountable towards their employers, funders or other related public or private bodies as well as, on more ethical grounds, towards society as a whole. In particular, researchers funded by public funds are also accountable for the efficient use of taxpayers' money. Consequently, they should adhere to the principles of sound, transparent and efficient financial management and cooperate with any authorised audits of their research, whether undertaken by their employers/funders or by ethics committees.

Methods of collection and analysis, the outputs and, where applicable, details of the data should be open to internal and external scrutiny, whenever necessary and as requested by the appropriate authorities.

Good practice in research

Researchers should at all times adopt safe working practices, in line with national legislation, including taking the necessary precautions for health and safety and for recovery from information technology disasters, e.g. by preparing proper back-up strategies. They should also be familiar with the current national legal requirements regarding data protection and confidentiality protection requirements, and undertake the necessary steps to fulfil them at all times.

Dissemination, exploitation of results

All researchers should ensure, in compliance with their contractual arrangements, that the results of their research are disseminated and exploited, e.g. communicated, transferred into other research settings or, if appropriate, commercialised. Senior researchers, in particular, are expected to take a lead in ensuring that research is fruitful and that results are either exploited commercially or made accessible to the public (or both) whenever the opportunity arises.

Public engagement

Researchers should ensure that their research activities are made known to society at large in such a way that they can be understood by non-specialists, thereby improving the public's understanding of science. Direct engagement with the public will help researchers to better understand public interest in priorities for science and technology and also the public's concerns.

Relation with supervisors

Researchers in their training phase should establish a structured and regular relationship with their supervisor(s) and faculty/departmental representative(s) so as to take full advantage of their relationship with them.

This includes keeping records of all work progress and research findings, obtaining feedback by means of reports and seminars, applying such feedback and working in accordance with agreed schedules, milestones, deliverables and/or research outputs.

Supervision and managerial duties

Senior researchers should devote particular attention to their multi-faceted role as supervisors, mentors, career advisors, leaders, project coordinators, managers or science communicators. They should perform these tasks to the highest professional standards.

With regard to their role as supervisors or mentors of researchers, senior researchers should build up a constructive and positive relationship with the early-stage researchers, in order to set the conditions for efficient transfer of knowledge and for the further successful development of the researchers' careers.

Continuing Professional Development

Researchers at all career stages should seek to continually improve themselves by regularly updating and expanding their skills and competencies. This may be achieved by a variety of means including, but not restricted to, formal training, workshops, conferences and e-learning.

VUB staff regulations

All Academic Staff members must refrain from all behaviour that compromises the dignity of persons, or prevents the University from fulfilling its mission as laid down in the Organic Statute. In particular, a position as a member of the academic staff is not compatible with activities that compromise intellectual integrity or disregard scientific or academic ethical principles.

Research policy

Scientific integrity and a concern for (the inculcation of) an ethically sound research culture are key issues in the 2013-2017 Strategic Policy Plan for Research.

In providing researchers with training and career guidance, particular attention is focused on teaching them about the principles of good publication culture and the importance of scientific integrity.

Ethical publication practices merit special consideration given that it has been established that misconduct frequently involves abuse of copyright and data manipulation.

One priority is raising the awareness of young researchers through training, and the PhD programme therefore includes instruction on the different aspects of ethical research. The VUB validation regulations lay down the requirements for the ownership of research results.

Finally, reference should be made to the policies of the Ethics Committee for the Humanities, the Committee on the Ethical Use of Laboratory Animals and the Brussels University Hospital's Medical Ethics Committee.

II. Infringement of scientific integrity

§1. An infringement of scientific integrity is defined as any act that wrongly appropriates intellectual property or the contributions of others, including intentionally impeding the progress of research or corrupts scientific reporting or undermines the integrity of the scientific activities. There are three main types of infringement of scientific integrity:

1° Invention of observations or results (fabrication)

Inventing observations that are not based on the methods set or reporting entirely imaginary results that are not based on actual observations;

2° Misrepresentation or falsification of results, by design or by carelessness (falsification):

- a. report or propose false information;
- b. omit a fact so that with the proposed whole provides incorrect information;
- c. falsify observations or results, that is to say, alter observations or proposals in a way that affects the end result, or change or select research results in a scientifically unsound manner. Falsification therefore also includes leaving out results that are essential for the research findings;
- d. use statistical methods wrongly to reach conclusions that differ from those proven by the data;
- e. wrongly interpret results or conclusions;

- f. incorrectly report the findings of others.
- 3° Incorrect appropriation, by design or by carelessness (plagiarism):
- a. take over the original research idea or proposal or an original observation of other researchers without their approval or cooperation;
 - b. put forward as one's own substantiate claims or ideas of others — in the form of a research plan, manuscript, article, or other text drawn up by another researcher - be it full or in part, without the acknowledgement that is customary for the medium concerned (plagiarism). This includes is unjustified claims of (co-)authorship;
 - c. the use of information in breach of a duty of confidentiality, e.g. For the purposes of the evaluation of a manuscript or a grant application. This also included any violation of a pledge of anonymity;

§2. The following may also be deemed to be infringements of scientific integrity:

- 1° Carelessness in conducting research or having it conducted;
- 2° More subtle doubtful research practices, such as the inclusion of authors who have contributed little or nothing, publishing parts of research project more than once (Note: data from a doctoral manuscript can still be presented for publication), failure to report a conflict of interest, leaving out unwanted outcomes and other practices that differ from the generally accepted standards of scientific standards;
- 3° Deliberately removing, seizing or materially damaging the research-related property of others without permission, including (but without limitation) equipment, reagents, biological materials, writings, data, hardware, software, or other substances or devices used or produced in the course of the research.

III. Good scientific practices

Responsibility for the use of good scientific practices and the prevention of misconduct lies with the:

- researchers themselves, firstly;
- research managers;
- research institutions;
- research organisations and professional associations;
- scientific community.

Researchers must be informed of the institution's guidelines on good scientific practices and must be fully aware of the unacceptability of infringement of scientific integrity and to act accordingly.

In addition to the researchers themselves, scientific associations and research institutions have significant responsibility for maintaining and promoting good scientific practices. Promoting good scientific practices is therefore of major importance in all scientific

organisations. Scientific integrity is best maintained by developing and disseminating clear behavioural expectations in science, for example, through training and by presenting examples at all stages in scientific development.

A key element is putting quality control systems in place. Peer-review systems - whether in relation to scientific publications, assessment of funding requests or in relation to broader evaluations of research - also always play a role in the prevention of infringement of scientific integrity and fraud as an important instrument for quality assurance in general. Quite apart from its own systematic evaluations, an institution may encourage researchers to submit their research to international experts for assessment insofar as possible. In practice, this may mean publishing the research in international newspapers with a referee system or making maximum use of the possibilities of presenting research at international conferences. (Provided due account is taken of the protection of exploitable research, as defined in the VUB validation regulations.)

Training on good scientific practices and ethical research should, in principle, already be included in the academic programmes.

The Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) contains six key principles of ethically responsible research:

- Research must be designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure integrity, quality and transparency;

- Research staff and participants must normally be informed fully about the purpose, methods and intended possible uses of the research, what their participation in the research entails and what risks, if any, are involved;

- The confidentiality of information supplied by research participants and the anonymity of respondents must be respected;

- Research participants must take part voluntarily, without any form of coercion;

- Harm to research participants and researchers must be avoided in all instances;

- The independence of research must be clear, and any conflicts of interest or partiality must be explicit;

The different aspects of 'a good researcher' are clarified below: for researchers, authors, peer reviewers and supervisors.

IV. The good researcher

Publication, a moral obligation

Publication of the results is an essential part of research activities. A scientific publication should normally be the mechanism by which new findings are first made known to the public.

Before proceeding with publication, it must first be examined whether the exploitable research can be protected (see the VUB Regulation). With regard to research that is covered by contracts with sponsors or financiers, the rules on intellectual property rights must be respected.

Scientific publication as the end point of a given piece of research also marks the start of a process of evaluation, possible correction and further development by the scientific community. Researchers have a moral obligation to allow this process to be played out in full.

International screening and visibility

Researchers are recommended to publish their work in international publication media with peer review systems so that:

- putting research to scrutiny by international referee systems can only enhance its quality;
- it is in the interests of the first researcher and of research in general for the research results to be known as widely as possible and international newspapers are the ideal instrument for this;
- publications in international newspapers will not only be read by more colleagues but will also be read more rapidly than other publications.

Researchers are recommended to consult publication databases such as Thomson Reuters 'Web of Science', to which all VUB researchers have access, and to:

- check that their publication data have been entered correctly;
- to check whether newspapers in which they publish their research but which have not yet been entered comply with the requirements for indexation and, if appropriate, suggest to the publisher that a request be submitted to this end.

Patent literature

Researchers are encouraged to also consult patent literature in addition to the more traditional publication media so that they:

- have a full picture of any earlier research;
- avoid identical research;
 - Check whether the research results obtained can be protected;
 - Check the extent to which they have a free hand as far as social or economic exploitation of the research results is concerned.

V. Profile of a good researcher

The good researcher:

- conducts his research conscientiously and accurately.
- ensures the data are retained in full.
- ensures timely scientific publication of new and significant results, thereby contributing to scientific progress.
- ideally publishes in the leading publication media the content of which is as close as possible to that of the research concerned.
- undertakes scientific publications that make a significant contribution to the content of the area concerned.
- takes part in the peer-review process and thereby makes an important contribution to science.
- bears in mind the ethical aspects linked to the research concerned.
- ensures that a report is published in non-specialist publication media that presents an accurate picture of the research undertaken and discusses its meaning objectively, albeit in less scientific wording to make it more readily understandable by laymen..
- should not be drawn into serious or more minor forms of infringement of scientific integrity, including that arising from a lack of due care; this means:
- ensures that the results of scientific research are not published piecemeal but in publications that each give a full picture of a specific aspect of the general study.
- ensures that the same or similar data are not published in different publications.
- as a general rule, does not issue a report on specific research in media targeting the general public before the work undergoes peer review and is published in full, in order to prevent the dissemination of inaccurate or premature conclusions. In any event, no finding may be presented to the public before its experimental, statistical or theoretical foundation is sufficiently strong to ensure its publication in the relevant scientific literature. Where this is the case, the work concerned will be submitted for scientific publication as quickly as possible.
- does not take up proposals to act as a 'ghost author' and indicates this in the appropriate manner.
- does not unlawfully appropriate the intellectual property or contributions of others.
- does not breach any duties of confidentiality, guarantees of anonymity of other agreements on the use of the material.
- does not impede the research of others.
- weighs up and discusses possible protection and registration of the research results by applying for the relevant intellectual property rights prior to publication for the purposes of any social or economic validation of the research results.

VI. The good scientific author

With regard to copyright, good scientific practice can be described as follows:

- In terms of public accountability for the appropriate parts, all the authors have adequately taken part in the work by making significant contributions to the design and organisation, the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of data, the drawing up or critical review of the publication.
- All the authors were involved in the final approval of the version to be published, indicating their willingness to support the overall conclusions of the study and to take responsibility for the study.
- The acquisition of funding, collection of data, the general supervision of the research group or provision of administrative assistance do not, *per se*, constitute authorship.
- All persons cited as being an author must comply with the above criteria.
- All persons satisfying the above criteria must be given as an author.
- The order in which authors are cited must be agreed between the authors and may be confirmed by them.
- Persons who are not authors but have contributed to the work must be cited in the acknowledgements section.

VII. Profile of a good scientific author

A good scientific author:

- reports accurately the research conducted and discusses its meaning in objective terms;
- identifies the methods, equipment and procedures in sufficient detail to enable other researchers to reproduce the results (the key method for scientific validation of the results);
- describes the statistical methods in sufficient detail for a well informed reader with access to the original data is able to check the accuracy of the results cited;
- provides sufficient substantiation of the claims made;
- makes sufficient reference to the original publications of previous results obtain and ensures that they are correctly interpreted;
- gives due recognition to the work of others and reports it correctly;
- uses or mentions personal data provided (in a conversation, correspondence or discussion with third parties) or confidential information (e.g. As part of peer review procedures) only after obtaining the explicit consent of the researcher concerned;
- pinpoints financial and other conflicts of interest that may affect the work and makes them known;

- appropriately cites the institutions to which he is linked and the school in which the research is (jointly) conducted;
- indicates all financial support for the work as well as other financial and personal interests linked to the work;
- is not drawn into serious or more minor forms of infringement of scientific integrity, including that arising from a lack of due care; this means that he:
 - omits no fact that would compromise the accuracy of the work as a whole;
 - formulates no observations that do not follow from the proposed methods and does not report results that are entirely imaginary and are not based on actual observational evidence;
 - makes no changes to data or observations that would affect the end result;
 - does not manipulate the experimental set-up in an unscientific manner;
 - does not change or select the research results in an unscientific manner;
 - does not apply statistical methods incorrectly to achieve conclusions differing from those supported by the data;
- restricts to a minimum quotations from works to which no reference is made in the research reported on (except in the case of a review article).

VIII. Profile of a good peer reviewer

The good peer reviewer:

- only agrees to act as a peer reviewer - whether for a scientific treatise (e.g. an article submitted for publication, an application for a research grant, a clinical research protocol), or a research programme (e.g. during a site visit) - when he is an expert in the field concerned;
- provides his assessment in good time; If this is not possible due to the circumstances, the manuscript is returned immediately to those responsible for the review process or the likely delay is reported and the proposed deadline is reviewed.
- opts not to take part in the review process and returns the material unread if he considers that there is a conflict of interests;
- always reports to those in charge of the review process any real or perceived conflict of interest that could arise as a result of a directly competing, cooperative or other closely related relationship to one or more of the authors of the material to be assessed and that might affect his judgement. Whether or not his judgement would actually be affected is of no importance. Those in charge of the review process will, if necessary, interpret the assessment and decide for themselves whether it should be withheld;
- reaches an objective opinion, based solely on scientific evaluation of the material presented that is in the public domain and not based on scientific information that is not publicly available;
- issues and supports that opinion appropriately;

- treats the material presented as confidential information: does not use it for his own benefit unless it was already in the public domain, provides no access to that information unless it is required as part of the review process and, where this the case, reports this to those in charge of the review process, does not copy or save the information unless it is explicitly permitted by those in charge of the review process and the authors.

IX. Profile of a good supervisor

A good supervisor:

A good researcher will only undertake to act as supervisor of a doctoral thesis if he or she is in a position to offer the PhD candidate the necessary expertise, infrastructure and guidance.

expertise, infrastructure and guidance — The supervisor:

- has established a reputation in a field of study which is at least closely related to the field in which the PhD candidate is to conduct his or her research.
- is responsible for the material and intellectual climate in which the PhD candidate develops his or her research project. He/she ensures that the basic facilities are in place for the PhD candidate, such as easy access to computer infrastructure, including internet access, and office space.
- ensures that the number of PhD candidates is proportionate to the number of places available in order that adequate supervision may be guaranteed (partly by post-doctoral researchers).
- vouches for the quality of the PhD candidate's research plan.
- provides the funds to support his or her PhD candidates in their work, by applying for external or internal research funds and by using the allocated grant funds for researchers. The supervisor notifies the PhD candidate of any grants that were made available for the PhD research project. The supervisor's role is one of encouragement, co-ordination and assessment for the duration of the PhD process:

co-ordination — The supervisor:

- allows sufficient time to have regular contact with the PhD candidate and to monitor his or her research project closely.
- assists in developing and – if necessary – adjusting the research project.
- helps the PhD candidate place his or her research in a broader context.

schedule of planned activities — The supervisor:

- works in conjunction with the PhD candidate to draw up a thorough h schedule of planned activities for the PhD research and training programme.
- ensures that the PhD candidate's obligations, such as the teaching assignment, are organised in such a way as not to jeopardise completion of the PhD project within the set time.
- is responsible for the progress made during the PhD process, preferably leading to completion within the set time.

Encouragement — The supervisor:

- launches the PhD candidate in the world of science by introducing him or her to researchers who may be able to provide assistance, by encouraging him or her to take part in conferences and in the Doctoral Training Programme, by offering advice on the development of his or her scientific research project, by providing general encouragement and fostering enthusiasm.

assessment — The supervisor:

- arranges to be present on a regular basis when the PhD candidate introduces his or her work to fellow scientists and provides the PhD candidate with feedback after the event.
- in conjunction with the PhD candidate regularly assesses the progress that is being made and makes adjustments if necessary in order to keep the project on track
- is obliged to inform the PhD candidate of the recommendations that he or she has made in the progress report.

publication — The supervisor:

- alerts the PhD candidate to opportunities for publication and helps him or her prepare publications.
- carries significant joint responsibility not only for the PhD candidate's thesis, but also for the articles and abstracts arising from the PhD research project.
- gives the PhD candidate who is the first author of a publication maximal opportunities to submit the results of his or her research for technology transfer procedures.
- ensures that mention is made, as required, of the funding source, as well as the PhD candidate's VUB-affiliation in accordance with internal guide-lines.
- deals with any protection of the research results prior to publication

APPENDIX III Declaration - Right to use the PhD thesis

I, the undersigned, (first name and last name),

have written a PhD thesis with the title of

.....

.....
..... (Title)

Within the faculty of

.....

.....(faculty) of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, under the guidance of

.....
.....

.....
..... (Names of the supervisors).

I am filing my thesis for public defense in (number) paper copies and in
electronic form in format (format).

In accordance with Article 28 of the Central PhD Regulations, I retain the copyright to my
thesis, but I grant the VUB irrevocably non-exclusive permission to reproduce and/or
publish the thesis, in the version in which it is filed for public defense, in accordance with
Article 27 of the PhD Regulations, in its entirety and unchanged, in the following ways:

In paper form

The thesis may be made available on paper in the premises of the VUB university library so
that researchers can consult it on site under the same conditions that apply to the electronic
form.

In electronic form

The thesis may be used:

A. for saving in the electronic archives of the VUB university library;

B. for consultation through special terminals in the premises of the VUB university library. The VUB shall use all necessary and reasonable efforts to provide adequate technical protection for the thesis against any downloading, printing and/or transmission to third parties.

The thesis may also be reproduced for the purposes of indexing the full text and making it searchable, even if the full text has not been made available. The biographical content will be entered immediately in the VUB university library catalogue that can be accessed on line.

C. for publication on line under the following terms:
(Tick as appropriate and supplement as necessary)

The VUB may publish my entire thesis on a network accessible to the public (Internet) from *(date)*.

The VUB may publish parts of my thesis through a network accessible to the public (Internet), and more specifically the following parts *(fill in)*:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

from *(date)*

My thesis may not be made available over a network accessible to the public.

The decision on whether to allow or reject limited or full on-line publication of the thesis immediately applies for the full term of the copyright.

I shall have two years from the date of its public defense to exploit the thesis commercially or otherwise, and to reproduce (or allow it to be reproduced) in an edited or reworked form and publish it (or allow it to be published). I may apply to the VUB for this deadline to be extended on due grounds (for example, by submitting a signed publication contract in which, in accordance with the customary industry practices, a reasonable period of time is set for the agreed number of copies of the thesis to be produced and distributed, even if publication has not yet taken place).

During this (extended) period, the decision on whether to allow or reject limited or full publication of the thesis immediately shall apply, subject to the following:

A. I have granted the VUB permission to publish the thesis in its entirety on an open network;

If the thesis is exploited (commercially) during this (extended) two-year period, I can revoke the permission granted to the VUB by notifying it of the exploitation. The revocation shall come into effect on the date on which the notification is received or the first day on which the (commercially) exploited results are published if this takes place after the notification has been issued. Written notification of the revocation is deemed to be received within 48 hours of its dispatch. The VUB will terminate immediately access to the thesis on a open network.

B. I have refused permission for the VUB to make the thesis available through an open network:

If the thesis is not exploited (commercially) within the (extended) two-year period, the VUB has the right to reproduce it in its entirety and publish it through an open network (such as the Internet) without financial gain.

C. I have granted limited permission for the VUB to make the thesis available through an open network:

If the thesis is exploited (commercially) within the (extended) two-year period, I can revoke the permission granted and the rules under point 1 shall apply *mutatis mutandis*.

If the thesis is not exploited (commercially) during the (extended) two-year period, the rules under point 2 shall apply *mutatis mutandis*.

The use of the thesis in electronic form means that it can be reproduced on all possible digital media so that it can be used in accordance with the industry's best practices. Depending on technological developments, the thesis may be reproduced in any way and reworked technically to ensure that the techniques used for the permitted use are the most appropriate.

This non-exclusive licence applies worldwide and for the entire period of the copyright protection and of all other intellectual and commercial property rights applying to the thesis.

I shall receive no consideration for any of the aforementioned usage rights granted to the VUB.

I warrant that I have not granted, nor shall I grant, any operating rights to third parties that are incompatible with the usage rights I am granting to the VUB.

I warrant that I am the author of the thesis and that I have received any permission that may be required for including in the copyrighted thesis materials belonging to third parties (for example, texts, charts, pictures, recordings, etc.) and am granting to the VUB the aforementioned usage rights.

I shall hold the VUB harmless without limitation against all possible claims by third parties (for example, for breach of intellectual property rights, personal rights, etc.).

Done at (*place*), on
..... (*date*),

In duplicate, with one (1) signed original being retained by the PhD candidate.

.....
.....

(Handwritten name of the PhD candidate, followed by the signature)

.....
.....

(Name and signature of the VUB representative)