**ADMISSION COMMITTEE CHECK LIST**

**FROM CREATION OF A DOCTORAL POSITION TO ISP**

Admission of doctoral students occurs in a four-step process and three of the steps involve collegial evaluations. The evaluated steps are creation of a position for a graduate student, recruitment of a candidate for the position and adoption of the individual study plan for newly admitted doctoral students. For each new doctoral position at LabMed an Admission Committee is appointed to conduct the collegial evaluations throughout the admission process. The Admission committee consists of the director of doctoral studies as well as at least two staff members and one doctoral student member of the Doctoral Education Council. Additional experts may be added to the Admission Committee if necessary. This document is a checklist containing aspects to be checked by the Admission Committee in order to promote consistent, relevant and complete evaluations of admission processes at the department. 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 and newly admitted students when they prepare documentation for the different admission steps.
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**1. CREATION OF A DOCTORAL POSITION**

The role of the Admission Committee is to assess the appropriateness of the supervision team, the project plan and the study environment for studies of a doctoral student.

 **Supervision 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 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?

**Project plan**

[ ]  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 contain methodology that is appropriate for addressing the research questions?

[ ]  Does the plan explains 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 will be dealt with when blocks to progress arise?

[ ]  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?

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

**Study environment**

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

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

[ ]  Are the academic resources, such as seminar series, journal clubs and group meetings adequate to promote the scientific development of a doctoral student?

**2. SELECTION OF A CANDIDATE**

During a meeting with the principal supervisor the Admission Committee should ensure that an appropriate recruitment/ selection process has been conducted and that the process is adequately documented in writing. The Admission Committee should determine whether the suitability and ability of the candidate in relation to the project and the general requirements for doctoral education has been adequately assessed and documented in writing (Also applies for cases where the position is exempt from the advertising requirement). The finalised written document will be signed by the principal supervisor and head of division and is an obligatory attachment to the admission application from the selected candidate.

[ ]  Is the proposed list of ranked eligible candidates in agreement with an unbiased evaluation of applicants’ qualifications in relation to the evaluation criteria published in the advertisement (advertised positions only)?

[ ]  Is the selection process in relation to the advertised evaluation criteria sufficiently well documented in writing?

[ ]  Do the ranked candidates (or candidate in cases exempt from advertising) have suitable characteristics and abilities in relation to the requirements of the specific doctoral position?

**3. INDIVIDUAL STUDY PLAN (ISP)**

After admission, the student prepares an ISP, which is the document that together with the general syllabus regulates their studies at KI. The student presents their ISP at a seminar before it is finally adopted by the department. The role of the Admission committee is to evaluate the ISP and the knowledge of the student in relation to their ISP.

[ ]  Is the ISP complete and correct in relation to documentation provided when the doctoral position was created and when the student was admitted?

[ ]  Are the learning activities for the different learning outcomes reasonable in general and appropriate for the needs of the individual student?

[ ]  Are the suggested courses in accordance with the general syllabus for doctoral studies and are they appropriate in relation to the requirements of the doctoral project and the needs of the individual student?

[ ]  Does the student understand the aims of the project, the methods that will be used and how interpretation of obtained results will answer the specific research questions in the project plan?

[ ]  Does the student understand ethical aspects associated with the project as well as actions that are needed to obtain ethical permission, if that does not already exist for all parts of the study?

[ ]  Is the student familiar with the rules and regulations that apply to doctoral studies at KI?