

## Joint PhD between Ghent University (UGent) and an institution outside the Flemish Community

Situation in which UGent is not the home institution (i.e. when the public defence does not take place at UGent)

### Communication with the joint examination board

When UGent is not the home institution (i.e. when the public defence, *mutatis mutandis*, does not take place at UGent), all administration is carried out by the foreign home institution. This means that the foreign home institution

- provides the manuscript to all members of the joint examination board (i.e. also the members of the jury who are affiliated with UGent);
- informs all jury members of the joint examination board (i.e. also the jury members affiliated with UGent) about the course of the joint doctoral examination, invites them for this joint doctoral examination, etc.

### Communication with the 'commission of three'

By definition, setting up a 'commission of three' means that UGent is not the home institution.

The 'commission of three' - which has to perform a quality check - consists of:

- the UGent promoter belonging to the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences;
- an UGent professor, belonging to the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences (chairperson of the 'commission of 3');
- an UGent professor, yes or no belonging to the faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences (expert in the subject matter).

Based on the written evaluation forms of all joint examination board jury members (and where necessary, also based on the manuscript), the 'commission of 3' performs a quality check. The 'commission of 3' does not repeat the evaluation of the PhD, but checks the evaluation by the joint examination board against our quality standards.

It is the UGent-FFW promoter

- who activates the 'commission of 3' and makes the bundled written evaluations of all the members of the joint examination board available to this 'commission of 3'. The dean's office is not involved in the administration of the quality check by the 'commission of 3', since the dean's office is in no way involved in (and therefore has no knowledge of) the functioning of the joint examination board, nor the administration of the PhD (timelines, deadlines, ...) by the home institution. Only the (UGent) promoter has this information;
- who, after the quality check by the 'commission of 3' has taken place, gives feedback/advice to the chairman of the joint examination board regarding a 'go' for the public defence.

The quality check consists of all the joint examination board jury members drawing up a written evaluation of the PhD thesis and each member submitting his/her evaluation (via the UGent promoter) to the 'commission of 3' at the latest 3 weeks before the public defence (or the preceding internal defence, if organised); the chairman of the 'commission of 3' sees to it that he/she effectively receives all the information and organises a consultation with a view to formulating feedback/advice.

At the latest 2 weeks before the admission by the joint examining board to the public defence (or the preceding internal defence, if organised), the 'commission of 3', has to give feedback/advice to the joint examining board through the UGent promoter, concerning a 'go' for the public defence. If the 'commission of 3' notices major problems, it has to consult with the joint examination board to discuss desired adjustments in function of the possibility to proceed with the public defence.

#### Attention, the dean's office

- must be informed of the date of the public defence;
- must be informed as soon as the PhD student has been given the green light (by both the joint examination board and the 'commission of 3') to publicly defend his/her dissertation;
- will request a number of data from the PhD student for the benefit of the faculty student administration and to announce the PhD on the UGent website;
- must be informed of the successful public defence, in order to make it possible for UGent to make up 'our' part of the joint PhD degree.