

## **Recommendation of the University Doctoral Committee:**

The complex exam, pre-defense, and public defense could be taken online or using other electronic connection that ensures the followings:

- detailed presentation of the results of the Candidate,
- the opportunity for the workplace and other external professionals to express themselves and ask questions, the possibility for answers and recording,
- as well as the anonymous vote.

The complex exam, pre-defense, and public defense may take place in person – with attention to hygiene rules - and may be attended online by those who, for any reason, are unable to attend the event in person.

Whatever solution is chosen by the institutes, please, do it with the agreement of

- the chairmen,
- the chairman of the reviewer boards
- the discipline' doctoral council

Based on the above, the Antal Kerpely Doctoral School of Materials Sciences and Technologies will be introduced the following

### **PROCEDURE RULES**

from 26 October, 2020 until revoke  
for organization of complex exams, workshop discussions (pre-defense), and doctoral  
defense (public defense)  
complementing previous practice

#### **I. COMPLEX EXAM**

1. The normal complex examination period is expected at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of the 2020/21 academic year.

#### **II. PRE-DEFENSE**

1. The dissertation must be debated by a scientific workshop discussion (pre-defense) organized by the professionally competent organizational unit (Institute) at least one month before its submission. The minutes of this dispute have to be attached when submitting the dissertation.
2. The chair of the workshop discussion is the head of the relevant organizational unit, if he/she is not the supervisor of the applicant. In the latter case, an appropriate level of chair is provided by the head of the department.
3. The PhD candidate sends the electronic version of the dissertation prepared for the pre-defense (in PDF) - with the consent of the supervisor - to the Dean Office' responsible person for doctoral matters (Judit Roneczné Ambrus-Tóth; 'roneczne.judit@uni-miskolc.hu'), indicating when the pre-defense is planned.

4. Simultaneously with the submission of the dissertation, the PhD candidate and the supervisor announce to the head of the Doctoral School in which form they intend to organize the workshop discussion. The declaration (Annex 1) must be signed by the chair of the workshop discussion (normally the head of the concerned educational department).
5. The Dean Office' responsible person for doctoral matters sends the electronic version of the dissertation to the pre-reviewers for review. At the same time the head of the Doctoral School asks electronically for the agreement of the Doctoral Council on the form of the pre-defense.
6. A pre-defense can be organized after arriving of the two positive pre-reviews to the Dean Office' responsible person for doctoral matters. The earliest date may be the 14th day after receiving of the second positive review.
7. The head of the educational organizational unit appoints the secretary in advance and entrusts him/her with organization of pre-defense.  
The chair is responsible for the regularity of the workshop discussion.
8. The educational unit prepares the invitation. The invitation must state that:
  - in what form will be organized the workshop discussion,
  - how could join to the public pre-defense electronically
9. Participants on the pre-defense will cast their open vote by filling the attached voting paper (Annex 2) and returning it electronically, or directly on the online platform.
10. The invitation and the electronic version of the doctoral candidate's dissertation for the pre-defense must be published at least two weeks before the set date on the website of the educational organizational unit or on the website of the Doctoral School.
11. The minutes of the workshop discussion shall be prepared in three original copies, two copies shall remain with the candidate for the initiation of the subsequent doctoral degree procedure, and one copy shall be handed over to the Dean Office's responsible person for doctoral matters after the workshop discussion. Attached to the minutes are the list of participants, the screenshot containing the data of the participants, and the document certifying the authenticity of the votes.

### **III. DEFENCE OF DISSERTATION**

1. The dissertation and the request for the initiation of the degree acquisition procedure must be submitted to the General Vice-Rector's Secretariat in accordance with the provisions of the University Doctoral Regulations paragraph 17. (The form and its appendices must be submitted in 2 complete copies, the dissertation in 5 copies). The General Vice-Rector's Secretariat (GVRs) keeps a register of the received requests and after its formal examination forwards them to the Head of the Discipline' Doctoral School.
2. The Head of the Discipline' Doctoral School submits the request for initiate the procedure to the next meeting of the Doctoral Educational Committee (DEC).
3. The Dean Office' responsible person for doctoral matters checks the documents received from the GVRs and then, after the approving decision of the DEC sends the dissertation both in printed form and electronically, too, to the two designated and invited reviewers.

4. Within two months from the request of the Doctoral School the two official reviewers prepare a written review of the dissertation and state whether they propose to set it up for public defense.
5. The dissertation can be submitted for public defense only in case of two supporting proposals. If one of the proposals is negative, the Discipline' Doctoral School ask a third reviewer. In case of two negative reviews a new procedure may be initiated after two years, at most once on the same topic.
6. In case of two supporting reviews the dissertation must be submitted for public defense within two months in the education period.
7. After receiving the two positive reviews to the Dean Office' responsible person for doctoral matters, the Doctoral Education Committee examines at its next meeting whether the PhD candidate has fulfilled all the required conditions for admission to the defense. The PhD candidate and his/her supervisor have to announce in which way they intend to arrange the defense from the two options recommended by the University Doctoral Committee. The declaration (Annex 1) must be signed by the chairman of the reviewer board. Then the Committee proposes to the Discipline' Doctoral Council to submit the dissertation for public defense on the chosen way.
8. The administrator forwards the reviews to the PhD candidate and his/her supervisor. The candidate has to answer them in writing before the public defense and orally during the public defense.
9. The Discipline' Doctoral School at its next meeting decides on the submitting of the dissertation and the way of the public defense organization.
10. The Head of the Doctoral School informs the PhD candidate and his/her supervisor about the decision of the Council within 5 working days after the Committee decision has been made.
11. After receiving the decision, the PhD candidate and the supervisor inform the administrator about the date and place of the defense which is agreed with the reviewer board.
12. The appointed secretary of the public defense ensures the organization of the defense, the choice of the online platform, and informs the administrator how to join the doctoral defense electronically.
13. The electronic platform of the public defense must be chosen in such a way that the reviewer board has the opportunity to hold a closed meeting on a separate platform before the defense and after the public part.
14. One copy of the dissertation and the thesis booklet and their electronic version must be submitted to the Dean Office of the Faculty at least one month before the public defense where it is made available for those who are interested. It has to be mentioned on the invitation to the public defense sent at least 15 days before the event.  
The chairman of the public defense is responsible for the regularity.
15. The Dean Office' responsible person for doctoral matters prepares the invitation in which it shall be indicated, that: Szeritnem a titkár küldi ki
  - the public defense is organized in what form
  - how to connect electronically to the public defense
16. According to the doctoral regulations, the acceptance of the dissertation is decided by a anonye vote. The dissertation and the thesis are scored by the members of the reviewer board individually in a 0-1-2-3-4-5 system. They cast their votes either by filling in and drop the attached anonye paper or directly on the online platform.

17. The chairman of the reviewer board is responsible for the regularity of the defense.
18. Information must be provided about the date of the public defense on the website of the Doctoral School 14 days in advance. At least 22 days before the public defense the dissertation must be placed in an electronic database in accordance with the regulations of the Hungarian Academic Science. Their availability must be indicated in the National Doctoral Database.
19. The invitation, the electronic version of the dissertation and the thesis booklets must be published on the website of the Doctoral School at least two weeks before the set date.
20. The defense is managed by the chairman of the reviewer board. At least one of the reviewers must be present in person or electronically to conduct the defense. The defense cannot be conducted without the presence of the reviewer who gave the negative review. During the discussion the opinions of the reviewers should be listened.
21. The defense is conducted on the basis of the general scenario (Appendix 3).
22. The minutes of the defense shall be drawn up in four originals, certified by the signature of the chairman and the secretary. Attached to the minutes are the list of participants and, separately, the list of the reviewer board, the screenshots and also the document certifying the authenticity of the votes.

Issues not detailed above are covered in the doctoral regulations.

Miskolc, October 26, 2020.

Prof. Zoltán Gácsi  
Head of the Doctoral School

Prof. Valéria Mertinger  
Head of the Doctoral Education Committee

Annex 1.

### Declaration

I, the undersigned ..... PhD candidate and ..... supervisor declare that in accordance with the recommendation of the University Doctoral Committee we choose the following form for the

complex exam                       pre-defense                       public defense

- creating and using online or other electronic connection which provides
  - detailed presentation of the results of the Candidate,
  - the opportunity for the workplace and other external professionals to express themselves and ask questions, the possibility for answers and recording, as well as
  - the anonyme vote ( in case of public defense).
  
- personal presence with attention to hygiene rules and may be attended online by those who, for any reason, are unable to attend the event in person

We ask for the approval of the Discipline' Doctoral Council.

Miskolc, .....

.....  
PhD candidate

.....  
supervisor

I agree with this request.

.....  
chairman of the pre-defense/  
chairman of the reviewer board

I agree with ..../....(...) the decision of the Doctoral Education Council.

.....  
chairman of the DEC

Annex 2.

**Vote for pre-defense**

As a result of the above, I concluded that:

- the results presented by the Candidate are clearly his/her own research and measurement results,
- the results heard were unanimously revealed to be new results based on real, realistic measurement results,
- the work presented meets the formal requirements.

**Vote PAPER for public defense**

I suggest the following points for ..... PhD candidate according to his/her public defense presentation took place on .....

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

### Scenario for PhD public defense

#### **Closed part**

Before the defense, the committee examines the documents related to the candidate's scientific activity.

They formulate the questions to be asked (2-3).

They examine whether the candidate has responded in writing to the reviewers. Did the reviewers accept it?

#### **Public section**

1. The chairman opens the defense and introduces the member of the reviewer board.  
Members of the reviewer board:  
Reviewers:
2. The chairman announces that the candidate has stated that he/she has no objections to the members of the board and that the reviewers recommend that a defense be issued.
3. The chairman invites the supervisor to make a brief evaluation of the candidate's work (research work, research routine, suitability).
4. The chairman asks the secretary to describe the candidate's professional work.
5. The chairman invites the candidate to present the dissertation.
6. The candidate presents his/her scientific results in 30 minutes.
7. The chairman invites the reviewers one by one to present their review.
8. The reviewers describe their review briefly and immediately the candidate responds to each question.
9. The chairman asks the reviewers if they want to ask further questions about the dissertation.
10. The candidate answers the subsequent questions. The chairman asks the reviewers if they accept the answers.
11. The secretary of the public defense reads out the questions of the reviewer board.
12. The candidate answers the questions asked.
13. The chairman asks the member of the reviewer board whether they accept the answers.
14. The chairman provides an opportunity for those present to comment and ask questions.
15. In case of a question the candidate answers.
16. The chairman suspends the public defense for the duration of creating the reviewer board's opinion.

#### **Closed part**

17. Creating an assessment (2-3 sentences) and read it out. A statement must be made as which theses are accepted with yes, which ones with modification and which ones are not.

Secret ballot of the reviewer board (0, 1, 2, 3 point). Percentage calculation after the vote (defense is successful if the results are at least 60%). The qualification of the defense of the

doctoral dissertation must be determined in the proportion of the achieved score in relation to the obtainable score:

- 90-100% "summa cum laude"
- 80-89,9% "cum laude"
- 60-79,9% "rite"

Signing of the minutes.

***Public section***

18. The chairman announces the result.

19. The chairman asks the secretary to explain which theses had been approved and how.

20. Congratulations