**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A DOCTORAL POSITION   
- ADMISSION COMMITTEE CHECKLIST**

Admission of doctoral students occurs in a four-step process, the first of which is establishment of a doctoral position. Decision on establishment of a new doctoral position is taken by the head of department in each case after peer-review of an application made by the intended principal supervisor. The application includes a “Green Light” application, which is evaluated and decided on by the director of doctoral studies and head of department together. The financial plan is agreed by the head of division, who must sign the application form, and by the head of administration (AC). At LabMed the remainder of the application is evaluated by an Admission Committee that also takes part in the ISP seminar, the last step in the admission process. The Admission committee typically consists of the director of doctoral studies as well as two staff members and one doctoral student selected from the Doctoral Board at LabMed.

This checklist contains aspects to be checked by the Admission Committee in order to promote consistent, relevant and complete evaluations based on KI’s criteria[[1]](#footnote-1). The checklist should be regarded as a minimum list of aspects to be considered and does not exclude the inclusion of other aspects deemed to be relevant by the committee. The checklist is also intended to help principal supervisors hen writing applications for establishment of a doctoral position.

|  |
| --- |
| Name principal supervisor: **Click here to enter text.**  Project title: **Click here to enter text.** |

**1. Viability and suitability of the doctoral project**

Is the project within the area of medical science?

Does the plan clearly define the background to the area of the study and the knowledge that is lacking (ie. the area to be studied)?

Does the plan clearly explain why it is important to acquire the lacking knowledge?

Do specific aims formulate research questions that are answerable and for which the answers will contribute to acquisition of the lacking knowledge?

Does the plan describe the methodology that is appropriate for addressing the research questions?

Does the plan explain the type of results that will be generated as well as how they can be interpreted in order to answer the stated research questions?

Does the plan identify the main challenge(s) or risk(s) associated with each part of the study?

Are the identified challenges/ risks at an appropriate level for a doctoral (licentiate) project?

Does the plan discuss how problems with fulfilling the plan could be dealt with when blocks to progress arise?

Overall, is the level, extent, stringency and feasibility of the proposed project appropriate for a doctoral (licentiate) project?

**2. Existence or planning for necessary ethical permits**

Does the plan identify relevant ethical considerations associated with the proposed project?

Does appropriate ethical permission exist? If not, is it reasonable to believe that ethical permission will be granted and are plans for obtaining the necessary permission described?

**3. Relevance and suitability of the supervisory team**

Does the proposed principal supervisor have a good track record as main supervisor?

Does the proposed supervision team provide necessary support for an inexperienced principal supervisor?

Does the supervision team have the necessary competence to advise a student working on the proposed project?

Is the division of tasks between the supervisors and their physical availability appropriate and is the supervision strategy well planned?

Does the principal supervisor have time to provide the planned supervision?

Does the supervision plan provide for stable supervision throughout the study period?

**4. Suitability of the proposed study environment**

Are the physical resources, such as localities and equipment, adequate for the proposed project?

Are the competence resources, such colleagues and collaborators with appropriate knowledge and skills, appropriate for successful performance of the project and to promote scientific development of the doctoral student?

Are the academic resources, such as opportunities for contacts with other doctoral students, seminar series, journal clubs, group meetings and opportunities for international exchange/contacts adequate to promote the scientific development of a doctoral student?

1. See Rules for doctoral education at Karolinska Institutet (Reg.no. 1-920/2021), section 2.1. https://medarbetare.ki.se/media/1742/download. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)