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4. adresselinie, tryk derefter F9

INFORMATION REGARDING ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE REQUIREMENTS

 As a rule the below mentioned standards must be met by the members of the assessment committee:

* Minimum educational level equaling Danish associate professor cf. the Ministerial Order no 1039 of August 27, 2013 about the PhD education at the universities and certain higher artistic educational institutions.
* Actively publishing within the research area of the dissertation, documented through publications in internationally acknowledged journals and conference proceedings with peer-review (within the last five years), this can be documented with an updated list of publications, patents, technical reports, product development and the like.
* At least one external member must have experience with PhD supervision and must have been main supervisor on a PhD project with a positive outcome.
* Diversity in the composition of external members is desirable, so that one main supervisor does not repeatedly use the same external member.
* When relevant for the PhD project it is possible to include a member of the assessment company from the industry.

APPROVAL OF AN ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

The following documents must be enclosed in one pdf file in searchable format when an assessment committee is forwarded to the PhD Board for approval:

1.CV incl. an updated list of publications for all three members. The CV must reflect the above mentioned standards. The publication list must be exhaustive for the last five years. CV and publication list must be in Scandinavian or English.

2.For Industrial PhD students, a confirmation must be enclosed from the Department stating that § 26 of the Ministerial Order has been met (at least one of the members shall have company-relevant research experience within the relevant field).

3.The name of the PhD student's supervisor (and co-supervisor(s), if any) must be noted on the recommendation from the department.

4.The supervisor/co-supervisor and the members of the assessment committee must not have any joint publications during the last five years. In case of co-authorships within the last five years the department must submit a statement explaining why this does not constitute a conflict of interests. Furthermore it is not possible to be a member of the assessment committee if there are any co-authorships with the PhD student.

Concerning competence to act the regular competence to act regulations apply cf. The Act on Public Administration §3-6. Special attention must be given to the following:

* Members of the assessment committee cannot be in an up-downwards management layer compared to the main supervisor (example 1: The Head of Department cannot be a member of an assessment committee for a PhD student in his or her own department. Example 2: A section leader cannot be a member of an assessment committee for a PhD student in his or her own section.) NOTE: If it is not possible to find other academically competent persons to replace a disqualified members, a permission to serve in the assessment committee can be given by following special argumentation.
* It is not possible to be a member of an assessment committee if there are joint publications with the PhD student, or if any are in preparation.
* As a rule, it is not possible to serve as, member of an assessment committee if there is a significant amount of joint publications with the supervisor or co-supervisor(s), if any.
* If the PhD student or the main supervisor is fully or partly financed or has a sideline occupation at an external company, then assessors from that company cannot be used. This also includes subsidiary companies and branches in other locations.

MODERATOR

The Department is responsible for appointing a moderator. The PhD Study Director is responsible for approving the moderator. The following requirements must be met by the moderator:

* Minimum educational level equaling Danish associate professor
* Not associated with the research project in question
* Not a member of the assessment committee

# Tjekliste i forbindelse med nedsættelse af bedømmelsesudvalg

Det anbefales at påbegynde processen med nedsættelse af bedømmelsesudvalg i god tid før planlagt forsvar. Instituttets indstilling bør tilgå ph.d.-skolen senest fire måneder før planlagt forsvar. Denne tidsramme sikrer, at forsvaret kan finde sted til planlagt tid, selv i sådanne tilfælde, hvor medlemmer af det oprindeligt indstillede bedømmelsesudvalg ikke kan godkendes.

Dokumenterne fremsendes i én samlet pdf-fil i søgbart format.

Afkryds og udfyld nedenstående for at sikre, at alle nødvendige dokumenter fremsendes. Tjeklisten vedlægges det fremsendte materiale. Husk at vedlægge redegørelse, hvis der f.eks. er publikationssammenfald eller andre afvigelser.

[ ]  Indstilling om nedsættelse af bedømmelsesudvalg inkl.

 [ ]  Navn(e) på hovedvejleder:

 [ ]  Navn(e) på evt. bivejleder(e): Indtast navn(e)

 [ ]  Navn på den studerende: Indtast navn

 [ ]  Institut: Institutnavn

 [ ]  Afhandlingens titel: Indtast titel

[ ] CV (skandinavisk/engelsk) for *alle tre*medlemmer af bedømmelsesudvalget inkl.

 [ ]  Navn på den interne formand: Indtast navn

 [ ]  Navne, affiliations og e-mailadresser på de to eksterne bedømmere:

1. Indtast navn m.v.
2. Indtast navn m.v.

[ ]  Opdateret komplet publikationsliste for de seneste fem år for alle **tre** medlemmer (inkl. Den interne formand) af bedømmelsesudvalget.

[ ]  Erfaring med ph.d.-bedømmelse hos mindst 1 af de eksterne medlemmer.

[ ]  Er på mindst lektorniveau.

[ ]  Intet publikationssammenfald mellem vejleder(e) og medlemmer af bedømmelsesudvalget inden for de sidste fem år. NB. Dette gælder også den interne formand.

[ ]  Intet publikationssammenfald mellem den ph.d.-studerende og medlemmer af bedømmelsesudvalget.

[ ]  Mindst ét medlem er fra udlandet.

[ ]  Erhvervs-PhD – ét medlem af bedømmelsesudvalget skal have virksomhedsrelevant forskningserfaring inden for det pågældende fagområde.

[ ]  Har ét eller begge eksterne medlemmer bedømt afhandlinger ved samme hovedvejleder inden for de seneste frem år?

 hvis ja: Angiv navn på den/de ph.d.-studerende: Angiv navn(e)

[ ]  Redegørelse såfremt et medlem afviger fra ph.d.-skolens retningslinjer.

[ ]  Indstilling om og navn på den interne ordstyrer: Indtast navn

[ ]  Forsvarsdato og sted. Hvis forsvaret ønskes afholdt uden for AAU skal det angives og samtidig hvad grunden er til dette: angiv dato.