

Chapter 9. Award of the Doctorate

9.1 The Doctoral (Ph.D.) Thesis

The doctoral dissertation, or thesis, should be a work of independent research. It should reveal the ability to formulate a problem or research question, analyse and interpret information, demonstrate knowledge of the literature relating to the subject, describe the methods and procedures used, report the results, and display the researcher's ability to discuss fully and coherently the meaning of the outcome of his/her research.

In order to allow for disciplinary diversity, each department is invited to formulate standards and requirements as to how the scholarly work is to be conducted in their discipline, and how this should be reflected in the dissertation and format, with a maximum limit for the number of words. These requirements shall be published by each department and communicated to each new researcher and staff member of the department.

9.2 The work mentioned under 9.1 shall consist of a thesis which will contain the researcher's own account of her/his investigations. This must not previously have been published in full.

Should part of the thesis be based on work already published by the researcher (or jointly with others) before defence, this fact shall be referred to in the thesis manuscript. In this case, the work may be included only if it forms an integral part of the thesis and so makes a relevant contribution to its main theme and is in the same format as the rest of the thesis. The part played by the candidate in any work done jointly with the supervisor(s) and/or fellow researchers must be clearly stated by the researcher and certified by the supervisor.

Alternatively, a series of papers, with an introduction, critical discussion and conclusion, may be submitted instead of a conventional thesis provided that such a format is permitted by the guidelines issued by the researcher's department and that the thesis conforms to those guidelines. A thesis that contains only joint papers is not acceptable. Also, the linking material must be solely the work of the researcher. The part played by the candidate in any work done jointly with the supervisor(s) and/or fellow researchers must be clearly stated by the researcher and certified by the supervisor.

At all stages of its production, the thesis shall remain the intellectual property of the researcher, without prejudice to the provisions of point 9.13.

9.3. Conferral of the Doctorate

In accordance with Convention Article 14 (1), the Doctorate of the European University Institute may be conferred on researchers who have completed a minimum of two years' study at the Institute and have submitted a work of independent research as mentioned under 9.1 which is the result of research they have pursued at the Institute and has been approved by the Institute.

It shall be awarded in the following forms:

- Doctor of History and Civilization of the European University Institute;
- Doctor of Economics of the European University Institute;
- Doctor of Laws of the European University Institute;
- Doctor of Political and Social Science of the European University Institute.

For use in Member States, the title of Doctor of the European University Institute shall be abbreviated in accordance with the usage in the country concerned for the discipline in question.

9.4. Submission of Thesis

The researcher shall submit the thesis (including a 300-word summary) by depositing it with the departmental assistant.

The submitted thesis shall be submitted together with an originality report produced by an anti-plagiarism software application. The supervisor (and co-supervisor if there is any) shall receive an originality report on the whole text of the thesis and shall take this report into account in the evaluation on the submission. An originality report is not to be considered as sufficient proof that the submitted thesis does not contain plagiarised text. Avoiding plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct in the authorship of the thesis remains the sole responsibility of the researcher. If the supervisor (or co-supervisor) suspects plagiarism, he or she may ask for an investigation. Academic misconduct, procedures for investigation and sanctions are described in sections II and III of the [Code of Ethics in Academic Research](#).

9.5. Examination Board Reports and Scheduling of Defence

When the thesis supervisor concludes that the doctoral work and thesis progress justifies the establishment of an Examining Board, he/she shall, after consulting the researcher and any co-supervisor, propose the composition of the Examining Board to the Department. The researcher may bring observations on the composition of the Examining Board to the attention of the supervisor and Department. The Executive Committee decides on establishing the Examining Board on recommendation by the Department.

When a researcher submits a full draft of the thesis, the supervisor and any co-supervisor shall inform the researcher within a month whether they accept it as ready for defence.

If the supervisor and any co-supervisor conclude that the thesis needs further revisions before it can be sent to the Examining Board, they shall agree on a date for resubmission with the researcher. If major revisions are requested, this date shall not be later than six months after the initial submission to the supervisor, except when serious personal circumstances impede carrying out this work – in this case a reasoned request for extension of the six-month limit for revisions shall be submitted to the supervisor and department and be decided by the Dean of Graduate Studies. The date when the supervisor and any co-supervisor have accepted the thesis as ready for defence shall count as the thesis submission date.

After the submission date, the Department shall send the manuscript without further delay to the other members of the Examining Board. Each member of the Examining Board, including supervisor and any co-supervisor shall independently draft a report and send it to the Department within no more than two months after receiving the manuscript. These reports shall state whether the thesis is considered defensible as submitted, or which changes would be needed to make it suitable for defence. The members of the Examining Board and the researcher will not receive each other's reports before all reports have been submitted. When all reports have been submitted, the Department shall forward them to the researcher. If all members of the Examining Board conclude that the thesis can be defended as submitted, the Department shall prepare the final printed version of the dissertation in collaboration with the researcher and schedule the defence as soon as possible. Before the defence, the printed thesis shall be displayed in the EUI library for two weeks.

The Department shall schedule the defence no later than nine months after the delivery of the jury reports, except where an extension for resubmission has been granted to the researcher or where unforeseen delays have occurred due to the late delivery of the reports or the unavailability of members of the Examining Board. The Department shall in such cases make a reasoned request for extension of the nine-month limit for scheduling the defence to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

9.6. Revisions of the Thesis

9.6.1. Revisions of a Full Draft before Submission

If the supervisor or any co-supervisor request major revisions before submission, the researcher can express in writing her or his desire to defend the thesis against the judgment of the supervisor or co-supervisor. The date when the researcher sends this statement will count as the submission date and the thesis will be sent to the Examining Board. The members of the Examining Board will be notified that the supervisor or any co-supervisor have not accepted the present version as ready for defence but will not be informed about the content of the report/s.

If the researcher has accepted to carry out major revisions but the supervisor or any co-supervisor conclude that the thesis is not ready for defence and no extenuating personal or professional circumstances that might have prevented the researcher from carrying out the revisions have been approved and the researcher still wants to defend, the thesis will be sent to the Examining Board as resubmitted. The members of the Examining Board will be notified that the supervisor or any co-supervisor have not accepted the present version as ready for defence but will not be informed about the content of the report/s.

If the supervisor or any co-supervisor conclude that a full draft of a thesis submitted to them needs major revisions that cannot be completed before the end of the fifth year of registration and the researcher still wants to defend, the thesis will be sent to the Examining Board at the end of the fifth year of registration as then submitted by the researcher. The members of the Examining Board will be notified that the supervisor or any co-supervisor have not accepted the present version as ready for defence but will not be informed about the content of the report/s.

9.6.2. Revisions after Submission

If the report of any of the members of the Examining Board concludes that the thesis needs to be further revised before defence, the researcher shall carry out such revisions as soon as possible after receiving the reports and shall explain in a letter to the Examining Board in detail which changes have been made.

If major revisions are requested by one or several members of the Examining Board, the researcher shall carry these out and report on the changes made within no more than six months after receiving the reports except when serious extenuating personal or professional circumstances impede carrying out this work – in this case a reasoned request for extension of the six-month limit for revisions shall be submitted to supervisor and Department and be decided by the Dean of Graduate Studies.

The six-month limit for major revisions does not affect the nine months limit for scheduling the defence. If an extension of the six-month limit has been granted, the department may request an equivalent extension of the nine-month limit for scheduling the defence in accordance with the fifth paragraph of Art. 9.5.

If major revisions had been requested, the members of the Examining Board shall be asked after resubmission whether the defence can go forward. If the majority of the voting members of the Examining Board (not counting the supervisor and, where applicable, co-supervisor) agree that the resubmitted thesis can be defended, the further schedule for the defence shall apply as laid out in art. 9.5 above. If the majority of the voting members express in writing the view that the thesis cannot be defended as resubmitted, the researcher will no longer be able to defend his/her thesis at the EUI.

9.7. Examining Board

The thesis shall be defended before the Examining Board. The candidate's thesis supervisor shall be a member with voice but no vote. The co-supervisor, if any, may also be appointed as a member of the Examining Board.

In addition to the supervisor, the Examining Board shall include one current full-time Institute professor and two academics from outside the Institute.

Hence, the Board is normally made up of two internal members and two external members. The four members should not all be nationals of the same state or be currently employed in the same state.

Internal Members

Internal members are deemed to include (i) current full-time professors of the EUI, (ii) former full-time professors of the EUI, provided their permanent contract has overlapped with the period in which the candidate was in receipt of grant to the extent of at least six months (iii) current or former part-time professors of the EUI, provided that their period of contract (which need not be consecutive) has overlapped with the period in which the candidate was in receipt of grant to the extent of at least six months.

External members

External members cannot include persons who are eligible to act as internal members as set out above. Former full-time or part-time professors are eligible as external members provided (i) they are not eligible as internal members, and (ii) their most recent contract ended at least three years prior to the date on which the jury is scheduled to meet. If appointed to the Examining Board, an external co-supervisor shall be treated as an external member. At least one of the external members must be a current University professor. No more than one external member may be appointed from the same institution. All external members must be of high academic standing in the area with which the thesis is concerned.

No more than two internal members may be appointed to the Examining Board, In exceptional circumstances, three external members and only one internal member, namely the supervisor, may be appointed. This is permissible only where the spread of expertise necessary for the satisfactory examination of a thesis cannot otherwise be provided.

9.8 Presence of Members of the Examining Board

Under normal circumstances, the candidate and all four members of the Examining Board are required to be present at the public thesis defence at the EUI. The absence of members is not condoned except in cases of force majeure. In such cases, the minimum required presence is one external and one internal member.

9.9. Public Defence

The thesis defence shall be public. It shall be given appropriate publicity at least two weeks before the date set. The candidate's thesis manuscript, deposited in two copies in the Institute's Library, may be freely consulted during this period by any member of the Institute.

9.10. Procedures of the Examining Board

Before the defence, the Examining Board shall choose its own chair by consensus. The thesis supervisor or co-supervisor (where applicable) is precluded from being chair and has no vote.

It shall take its decisions by majority of voting members participating. The Chair has a casting vote.

The defence shall last a maximum of two hours, and include:

- presentation of the thesis by the candidate lasting approximately 20 minutes;
- comments and questions by members of the Examining Board, which must be confined to the candidate's research topic;
- a general discussion, in which all those attending the defence may participate unless otherwise decided by the chair.

9.11. Deliberation

Following the defence, the Examining Board shall deliberate *in camera*. It shall decide on the basis of the thesis submitted to it and the way the candidate has defended it.

The chair of the Examining Board shall compile a reasoned report on the thesis and its defence. The chair may delegate this task to another member of the Examining Board. If the report is not drafted and agreed during the deliberation, it shall be adopted within no more than three months after the defence.

Where the reports by the members of the Examining Board are favourable, the Examining Board shall take one of the following decisions:

- immediate unconditional acceptance

- postponed conditional acceptance

Where in accordance with the regulations of Art. 9.6 the thesis has not been accepted as ready for defence by the supervisor and any co-supervisor or where one or more Examining Board members have expressed a negative opinion in their reports, the Examining Board shall take one of the following decisions:

- immediate unconditional acceptance
- postponed conditional acceptance
- rejection.

In the case of postponed conditional acceptance, the Examining Board shall indicate to the candidate the points where changes should be made. The revised thesis should be resubmitted within 6 months of the date of receiving the reasoned report. The Examining Board shall appoint one of their own to whom the changes will be submitted for approval. This member shall attest in writing that the changes have met with his or her approval. The date of conferment of the Doctorate shall be the date of this attestation.

9.12. Grading

The Doctorate of the European University Institute is ungraded, and this fact shall be clearly stated on the degree certificate issued to the person concerned.

9.13. Publication of Thesis

In accordance with Convention Article 14 (1), theses approved by an Examining Board must be published.

Theses can be published on paper or in electronic format with an external publisher or in the open access electronic EUI repository. In the latter case, the copyright remains with the author. If the author decides not to agree to publication of the thesis in the EUI repository but fails to publish it with an external publisher within four years after the defence or has no firm indication of proximate publication, the

EUI will automatically acquire the right to publish thesis in the EUI repository. These conditions shall be accepted by the author of the thesis in a signed agreement.

The version of the Thesis published in the EUI repository shall be the final accepted version. If minor corrections are requested by the Examining Board, the author shall carry these out immediately and shall submit the final corrected version to the department in which the thesis was supervised, together with a report on the corrections, within one month after the defence. In case of postponed conditional acceptance of the thesis and approval of revisions after the defence according to Art. 9.11, the author shall submit the final approved version of the dissertation to the department within one month after approval.

9.14. Co-operation with other Institutions

The Doctorate of the European University Institute may be prepared in cooperation with another university institution. In such cases, one member of that institution shall be appointed external co-supervisor. The cooperation shall be mentioned on the degree certificate issued to the candidate.

At the start of the third year the researcher shall sign a statement committing herself / himself to defend the thesis at the EUI. Allocation of the 3rd and 4th year of funding is conditional upon the signing of the above statement.

The defence shall take place at the EUI, unless a derogation is granted by the President with the consent of the Executive Committee.

9.15. Revoking the Doctorate.

9.15.1. When, after the award of the doctorate, allegations of academic misconduct are brought forward, the Academic Council shall be empowered, after a process of due investigation, of the framework which is outlined below, to revoke the Doctorate of the European University Institute.

9.15.2. **Academic misconduct.** Academic misconduct is defined extensively in the EUI Code of Ethics in Academic Research that regulates also sanctions for academic misconduct in work carried out or submitted by doctoral researchers before the defence of their thesis. Academic misconduct in dissertations defended at the EUI includes in particular, but is not limited to, the following offences:

Plagiarism: The deliberate copying of ideas, text, data or other work (or any combination thereof) without due permission and acknowledgement.

Piracy: The deliberate exploitation of ideas from others without proper acknowledgement

Abuse of Intellectual Property Rights: Failure to observe legal norms regarding copyright and the moral rights of authors.

Academic Rules and Regulations for the Doctoral and Master's Programmes

Abuse of Research Resources: Failure to observe the terms and conditions of institutionally licensed research resources.

Defamation: Failure to observe relevant legal norms governing libel and slander.

Misinterpretation: The deliberate attempt to represent falsely or unfairly the ideas or work of others, whether or not for personal gain or enhancement.

Personation: The situation where someone other than the person who has submitted any academic work has prepared (parts of) the work;

Fabrication and Fraud: The falsification or invention of qualifications, data, information or citations in any formal academic exercise.

- 9.15.3. **Allegations.** Allegations of academic misconduct concerning a doctorate awarded by the EUI should be presented to the Principal who may delegate the task of preliminary investigation to the Dean of Graduate Studies. The EUI is committed to ensuring that any allegation is investigated fully, thoroughly and quickly. The EUI also recognises that it has to protect its doctors from mischievous, frivolous and malicious allegations, and from allegations which are without substance. Before any allegation is formally investigated, it will therefore be subject to preliminary screening by the Dean of Graduate Studies.
- 9.15.4. **Investigation.** In cases where a preliminary screening leads to the conclusion that a full investigation is needed, the Principal shall appoint -- after consulting of the Department where the doctorate has been supervised -- two external expert academic scholars to conduct the investigation. Those asked to undertake such an investigation are under the obligation to ensure that their enquiries are sufficiently full as to allow them to reach well-founded conclusions on the matters they are considering, and that they pursue the investigation disinterestedly.
- 9.15.5. **Natural Justice.** The investigation shall be carried out in accordance with the principle of natural justice, which shall be taken to mean that any person against whom an allegation of misconduct in obtaining the doctorate is investigated, as described under 9.15.3, shall be given full details of the allegation, in writing, and shall be afforded every reasonable opportunity to respond to the allegation(s) and to produce evidence in his or her defence.
- 9.15.6. **Confidentiality.** So far as is reasonably practicable, the investigation under 9.15.3. shall be carried out in accordance with the principle of confidentiality so as to protect the interests of all parties involved.
- 9.15.7. **Reporting.** The results of the investigation shall be reported to the Ethics Committee of the EUI. The Ethics Committee will ask the members of the Examining Board that awarded the doctorate for their comments, either

individually and/or collectively and will set up a hearing of the doctor involved.

9.15.8. **Hearing.** At this hearing the Ethics Committee has the opportunity to interview the doctor involved and others whose views the Committee wishes to hear. The doctor involved has the opportunity to defend his or her case and in doing so may seek advice and assistance from any person of her or his choosing, and may be accompanied by that person at the hearing. Legal representation is permitted.

9.15.9. **Recommendation.** Upon conclusion of the hearing, the Ethics Committee shall decide whether to recommend to Academic Council that the doctorate should be revoked. Such a decision shall be taken either unanimously or by majority. In case of a deviating minority view and vote, a full account of the differences between the majority and minority will be given to Academic Council.

9.15.10. **Decision.** The Academic Council shall discuss the recommendation of the Ethics Committee in restricted session. The decision to revoke the doctorate requires the support of a two-thirds majority of the Academic Council members of the Institute that are present and entitled to vote.

9.16. Attendance Certificate

In accordance with Article 14 of the EUI Convention, each researcher who has been registered at the EUI on one of the degree programmes is entitled to receive an Attendance Certificate. The certificate shall attest to the work carried out by the researcher whilst at the Institute, specifying seminars attended, work submitted and, where appropriate, other relevant research activities. The certificate shall be issued by the Academic Service at the researcher's request.

9.17. Conferring Ceremony

The distinctive garments that Institute doctors shall be entitled to wear at academic ceremonies shall consist of a gown and shoulder piece.

The gown, with closed, centrally slashed sleeves, shall be black.

The shoulder piece shall be worn on the left. It shall consist of a large two-coloured ribbon in the Institute's colours (dark blue and turquoise), consisting of a front part and a back part. The front part shall bear the Institute's emblem, in golden thread.

9.18. Honorary Doctorate

The Honorary Doctorate of the European University Institute may be conferred by the Academic Council on eminent persons, particularly those whose actions have been important in an area of particular interest to the development of Europe, especially its culture, history, law, economics and institutions.

It shall be conferred in the forms provided for in point 9.3.

The Academic Council shall take its decision, on a reasoned proposal from the Executive Committee, by two-thirds majority of votes.

Honorary doctors of the Institute shall enjoy the same rights and prerogatives as regular Institute Doctors.