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## Introduction

This document contains a first draft of the working rules for the EURO-DOTS platform. It is intended to cover all matters except those explicitly covered in the Consortium Agreement and in the Grant Agreement. It is considered a first draft and working document, since Deliverable 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 are expected to be finalized at later dates. It is also expected that experience during the project will cause changes to the rules.

Contents of the document are: version history, working rules, rules for amendment of the rules, rules for scholarships, rules for academic committee and rules for course modules.

A Plan for Continuation will be presented later as Deliverable 4.6, but the rules have sections that are specific for the project period (May 1st 2010 – April 30th 2012) and for after completion of the project (from May 1st 2012).

## Planned versions

1. First version Nov. 1st 2010

Coming versions foreseen in DoW planning:

2. Second version Feb 1st 2011 adding Deliverable 4.2 and 4.3

3. Third version May 1st 2011 adding Deliverable 4.4

4. Fourth version May 1st 2012 after completion of project

## Working rules of the EURO-DOTS Platform

This section and the division into the following sections comprise Deliverable 4.1 in the project.

### 3.1. During the project (until April 30th 2012)

*Figure 1. Structure from EURO-DOTS Description of Work, Part B p. 20.*

The management structure of the EURO-DOTS support action is shown in Figure 1 above. The project steering committee will take all decisions during the project, except for the selection of course modules, see section 7 below. The Academic Committee will be installed consisting of ten Professors from European Universities consisting of three members of the consortium (Carl-Mikael, Michel, and Georges) complemented with seven colleagues from universities outside the consortium.

### 3.2. After completion of the project (from May 1st 2012)

*Figure 2. Proposed structure after completion of project (draft version)*

Once the project is completed, the Academic committee will continue the main work of the EURO-DOTS platform, which is selection and accreditation of course modules. The steering committee is no longer funded or necessary, and its remaining roles will be taken over by the Academic Committee.

If there is funding for continued scholarships, the final approval of scholarships will be taken by the Academic Committee. An office for accounting and book keeping will support the collection and payment of scholarships, similar to WP5 in the project, and website needs to be maintained.

The Scientific Committee can be maintained as a reference group for the Academic Committee.

## Amendment of the rules

### 4.1. During the project (until April 30th 2012)

During the project the working rules for the EURO-DOTS platform are planned to be updated, see section 2 above. Changes will occur as result of deliverables 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 or as result of requests from the steering committee. Major changes will be discussed at steering committee meetings. If needed, a vote will be held among the steering committee members, requiring a 2/3 majority for changes.

### 4.2. After completion of the project (from May 1st 2012)

In the continuation of the project, the Academic Committee will take over the management of working rules as well as all its other tasks. Amendment of the rules can take place at the management meetings of the Academic committee, or per capsulam. If needed, a vote will be held among the academic committee members, requiring a 2/3 majority rounded up for changes, for example 7 out of 10.

## Rules for the application and attribution of scholarships

Draft based on DoW, to be finalized in Deliverable 4.2 (M9).

*Figure 3. Proposed flow of scholarship applications*

### 5.1. Eligibility for scholarships

In order to be eligible for a scholarship, a PhD student must fulfill a set of requirements that will be edited. These requirements may include some of the following criteria:

* Proof of registration as a PhD student in a European university;
* At least one year of PhD work completed with final acceptance in the doctoral program of their university of origin;
* Certificate from the PhD advisor that the acquired ECTS credits by the PhD student will be accepted by the home university;
* The course should fit with the PhD topic of the student (short justification required);
* The student takes the engagement to take the exam;
* Scholarships are restricted to one per student (to be revised during the course of the project);
* Students can not apply for scholarships for courses organized by their home university;

### 5.2. Application procedure

See Figure 3 above.

1. T-X months Courses are posted on the website.

2. T-Y months PhD students apply for a scholarship (online?)

3. T-Y+5 days Eligibility criteria are applied, ineligible students are notified.

4. T-Y+10 days Applicants are ranked (see 5.3) and a final decision is taken

by the steering committee (per capsulam?)

5. T-1 month Students are notified of decision for scholarship.

6. T Course takes place

7. T+1 month Students complete course, and submit course certificate and receipts.

8. T+2 months Coverage rules are applied (see 5.4) and scholarship is paid (see 5.5).

Notes:

Courses are posted on the EURO-DOTS website along with a last date for application for scholarships that is set so that the decision can be taken well before the course starts. These time frames will have to be discussed and decided. On one hand we would want to allow students ample time to plan their trip. On the other hand we want to make it possible for courses to be accredited in a late stage and still be eligible for scholarships. This will make a complex interaction with section 7 below.

### 5.3. Selection procedure

After eligibility criteria have been applied, there may still be more applicants than budgeted scholarships. In these cases the students need to be ranked. Since some universities do not grade courses other than pass/fail, grade point average would be unfair. Time in PhD studies could be used, with the reasoning that students that are in the beginning of their program have more chances to get the scholarship; however in some programs students are expected to finish their course requirement in their first year or years. If we decide to give more than one scholarship per student, students without prior scholarship should be prioritized. Do we want to have distribution rules among countries/nationalities?

### 5.4. Coverage and size of scholarship

The Steering committee has decide that the student can get:

either 50% of all the expenses (course fee, travel, hotel, etc.)

or 100% of the registration fee

In any case, a cap of 1,000 Euro shall not be exceeded.

A list of criteria for accepted expenses needs to be defined.

The student should submit a budget and requested funding at the time of application.

### 5.5. Payment of scholarship

Scholarships are paid after the issue of a certificate of completion (was attendance). Depending on the coverage rules, receipts for air fare, hotel, course fee etc may have to be submitted. In many cases it is the home institution of the student that pays for courses and travel, and in these cases the scholarship is paid to the university (which has paid the expenses in advance) rather than to the student.

## Constitution, tasks and working rules of an Academic Committee (AC)

Draft based on DoW, to be finalized in Deliverable 4.3 (M9).

### 6.1. Composition of academic committee

The Academic Committee will be installed consisting of ten Professors from European Universities consisting of three members of the consortium complemented with seven colleagues from universities outside the consortium. The chair of the AC is selected among the ten members, initially one of the members of the consortium is chair. In cases when the vote is tied, the chair decides.

### 6.2. Rotation of members, acquiring new members

It is suggested that a rotation schedule of two years is adapted, and approximately half of the members are replaced every two years. The maximum time for membership in the AC is four years, except for the initial EURO-DOTS project members that can stay for six years to get this started. New members can be suggested by AC, steering committee (for the first two years) and the Scientific Committee. A simple majority vote is suggested for accepting new members. If AC members decide to quit in between biannual renewal, a new member may be selected with duration other than the standard two or four years. A list of potential members for the future should always be maintained for these kinds of situations.

### 6.3. Tasks of academic committee

Initial tasks are selection of course modules and changes to the selection rules and working rules. After completion of the project, it is suggested that the AC also takes over some of the roles of the steering committee: invitation letters, final decision of scholarships and interaction with Scientific Committee.

### 6.4. Meetings

It is suggested that management meetings are held twice yearly at large European conferences relevant in the area, to save travel time and money for AC members. Although some travel funds are available initially during the project, for the continuation we need to develop meeting structures that needs less funding. Possible conferences for these meetings are ESSDERC/ESSCIRC (fall) and ULIS (spring). It is the task of the AC chair to arrange these meetings and find a time slot where most can attend. Breakfast meetings or lunch meetings are suggested. The main agenda for the management meetings are discussions of the course module selection procedure, course module quality, and how to recruit new course modules. Every two years, or if an AC member quits, new members should be discussed. Course modules need to be handled in between meetings.

### 6.5. Decisions between meetings

In order to be able to accept interesting high quality course modules on a short notice, the AC should have preparation for handling course module selection and accreditation between meetings. A procedure is suggested below in section 7. Decisions can be taken per capsulam (via email or electronically if the website supports this). Teleconferencing or phone conferences could also be a possibility.

## Selection and accreditation of course modules

Draft based on DoW, to be finalized in Deliverable 4.4 (M12).

*Figure 4 Proposed flow for selection and accreditation of course modules.*

### 7.1. Search / call procedure

See Figure 4 above. A call for applications for course modules is published on the web. Depending on the results of a gap analysis, the calls can be targeted to certain course topics. Examples of excellent course modules should be posted on the website.

Teaching and learning activities can be suggested, for instance:

* Advance reading + Homework
* Compulsory lectures and labs
* Homework corrected and discussed
* Lab reports submitted afterwards
* Course survey to all students

An open question is how we can find incentives for organizing course modules. Is the web announcement enough, if there are no scholarships?

### 7.2. Application procedure

Course applications are submitted (electronically) on the website according to a template to be decided. One requirement is the use of Intended Learning Outcomes. The suggestion is reviewed by the academic committee and voted upon. After the course is finished, the course responsible must submit a course analysis which includes a course survey among the participating students. If the quality is deemed high enough, the course can be listed for rerun without re-review.

### 7.3. Review and accreditation process

In the interest of reaching fast decisions, so that course modules can be posted for inclusion in the scholarship section and attract many students, the following is suggested:

* An all-electronic handling is suggested, similar to the review of manuscripts/abstracts
* All members of the AC read the applications and vote within one week
* Vote can be Accept / Reject / Abstain
* As soon as a course module has a majority Acceptance the module is accepted, even if not all members have voted
* The course module with syllabus and application information is posted on website

### 7.4. Eligibility criteria for selection of course modules

Preliminary version from Deliverable 3.2. \* indicates sections to be detailed.

* Modular, intensive course (by preference of one week duration)
* Timely announcement of the course w. all details on program and organization.
* Quality and scientific level: content, expertise of the organizing group in the field,

lecture notes, infrastructure and organization, etc

* Degree of response to the industrial E&T needs (D1.2)

and the recommendation for new specific course modules (D2.4),

* Accessibility to both PhD students and professionals.
* Registration fee of PhD students within an imposed limit (\*)
* Course fitting the rules for the proposed number of ECTS credits (hours, level)
* Course accredited by the Doctoral School of at least one major European university,

to be progressively extended to three major European universities. (\*)

* Exam/evaluation organized at the completion of the course (\*)
* Certificate of course attendance & related credits (\*)
* Mandatory evaluation of each course by all participants (\*)

### 7.5. Course analysis and improvement

After the course is finished, the course responsible must submit a course analysis which includes a course survey among the participating students. A template for course analysis and suggested survey questions will be made available on the website. If the quality is deemed high enough, the course can be listed for rerun without re-review.

All course syllabi and course analyses should be made available on the website after course modules finish in the interest of public relations, specifically

* Attracting students
* Attracting new course modules
* Attracting funding for new scholarships
* Scientific review of EURO-DOTS program