

# International evaluation of the Graduate School of Health Sciences, Aarhus University, Denmark

## 1. Introduction

According to the ministerial PhD Order, graduate schools should be evaluated at regular intervals. Accordingly, Aarhus University is evaluating its five graduate schools in 2021, of which this is the evaluation of the Graduate School of Health Sciences (GSHS).

The main basis of the evaluation was a self-evaluation report with appendices (section 5) and a site-visit to Aarhus University on September 27-28, 2021. At the site-visit the international panel interviewed five groups of stakeholders in the PhD educational programme: Graduate School management team, principal supervisors, PhD committee, PhD students and department's management team.

Members of the international evaluations panel and authors of the report:

**Janet Carton**, Dr, Graduate Education Development Manager, Graduate Studies, University College Dublin, Ireland.

**Matti Nikkola**, Head of Education and Director of Doctoral Studies in Cell and Molecular Biology, Department of Cell and Molecular Biology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.

**John Creemers**, Professor, Director of the Doctoral School Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, KU Leuven, Belgium.

**Hans Bräuner-Osborne**, Professor, Head of Graduate School, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Denmark (chair).

### Content and educational goals of the Danish PhD programme:

The PhD education in Denmark is regulated by a ministerial PhD Order and a national Qualification Framework for Danish Higher Education.

According to the PhD Order, a PhD degree in Denmark is a structured research education scheduled to take three years (FTE) with the following components of the PhD programme:

1. Conduct independent research under supervision.
2. Complete PhD courses or similar subject elements totalling approx. 30 ECTS credits.
3. Participation in research environments, including stay at other, preferably foreign, research institutions.
4. Gain experience of teaching activities and/or other forms of knowledge dissemination related to the student's PhD project.
5. Complete a PhD thesis based on the PhD project.

According to the Qualifications Framework for Danish Higher Education, students obtaining the PhD degree must:

- possess knowledge at the highest international level within the research field.

- have made a significant contribution to the development of new knowledge and understanding within the research field based on scientific studies.
- master the scientific methodologies and tools as well as master other skills related to research and development tasks within the field.
- be able to analyse, evaluate and develop new ideas, including design and develop new techniques and skills within the subject area.
- be able to participate in international discussions within the subject area, disseminate scientific findings, and progress to a wide audience.
- be able to plan and carry out research and development tasks in complex and unpredictable contexts.
- be able to independently initiate and participate in national and international collaboration on research and development with scientific integrity.
- be able to independently initiate research and development projects and, through these, generate new knowledge and new skills, which develop the research field

## **2. Recommendations**

Overall, the educational programme of the GSHS is excellent and no major gaps were identified during the evaluation. The GSHS is well organized and generally strike a good balance between the level of quality control and administrative burden from enrolment to the PhD defence. All stakeholders are engaged and highly qualified. Overall, there are good onboarding programs for both PhD students and new supervisors, and communication is well organized via a range of channels. There are also good support systems both in terms of financial support to e.g. external stays and PhD courses and 'soft' support for e.g. career planning and wellbeing.

Our recommendations below should thus be seen as advice to further improve an already excellent graduate school.

### **Organization:**

It is evident that the ClinFo Graduate Programme (GP) is markedly larger than the two other GP's which raises two concerns:

- The two smaller programs might be 'squeezed' in some matters.
- The Head of ClinFo is a full-time employee, which might challenge the scientific competences and respect from peers in a longer perspective.

It might thus be considered to either split the ClinFo programme or support the GSHS/GP leaders to be able to maintain research competencies.

The PhD counsellor was well recognized and respected throughout the organization, but it was seen as fragile that it all relies on *one* person who in addition is at the end of the career. To safeguard continuity and know-how it is thus recommended to increase the number of PhD counsellors and spread them geographically across the Region.

### **Internationalization:**

The GSHS has a strong focus on increased internationalization. In general, there is good support for outgoing PhD students (exchange, course, conferences) while international recruitment is at a relatively low level.

To get all onboard the common mission it is recommended to communicate *why* international recruitment is beneficial and *what* is meant by internationalization at all levels in the organization.

While international PhD students were generally happy with the GSHS they noted that communication was often only in Danish which does not foster an international environment. This was also noted by the panel where e.g. several reports were only available in Danish. It is thus recommended to always communicate in English or simultaneous English & Danish at all levels of the organization. It is also recommended to make an onboarding programme for international PhD students and supervisors focused on integration in the Danish / Academic culture.

A large number of PhD students are recruited via the fully/co-financed Faculty scholarship model based on applications from the PhD candidate. While this model has several

advantages it is a major hurdle for increased international recruitment as it requires prior connection between the PhD candidate and the supervisor team. The system was generally well liked throughout the organization and there was no desire to change the model. In order to increase international recruitment within this model we thus recommend the following:

- promote recruitment of international master (thesis) students
- foster international network and international supervisors
- advertise all vacancies on <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu> to enhance international visibility
- increase administrative assistance and promote joint/double degrees
- provide timely recruitment assistance in particular concerning enrolment criteria and provide feedback to supervisors when candidates are administratively rejected

### **PhD students**

Generally, the PhD students are very satisfied with the PhD programme. There is excellent onboarding, communication (website & newsletter) and PhD network, but more could be done to onboard international PhD students (see above) and to cultivate Aarhus University / GSHS affiliation in particular among externally employed PhD students and supervisors.

PhD students found it confusing at times to find the right information, but were overall happy with the personal service provided by the PhD administration. While the website is excellent it could be considered to collect the Rules and Regulations in *one* regularly updated PDF documents and communicate this as a "first stop" place of information to the PhD students and supervisors. It is also recommended to align information from all levels of the organization to avoid conflicting information from e.g. GSHS and Departments.

In general, the PhD students like to teach but often found it difficult and stressful to find teaching related to their PhD project to fulfil the 150 hours requirement. At the same time some PhD students were teaching more than required and Department were often lacking teachers for specific courses. It is thus recommended to make an effective matchmaking system. It is also recommended to relieve the stress from the PhD student to make it the responsibility of the Department to offer relevant teaching to the PhD student and accept less than 150 hours teaching if this can not be achieved.

In general, the PhD students were often not sufficiently prepared for the teaching. It is thus recommended to increase the focus on pedagogic courses for PhD students and to make a script for course directors and/or faculty teaching teams to onboard PhD students and prepare them for the teaching before the course start.

### **Supervision**

The mandatory PhD supervisor course for new/inexperienced principal supervisors is well liked and the content is according to international best practices. However, there is a lack of continuous supervision education which would be welcomed by both supervisors and PhD students.

It is positive that good supervision practice is recognized via the 'supervisor of the year' award. However, it is recommended to clarify supervisor roles (e.g. increase awareness of criteria for the supervisor prize) and increase support and GSHS awareness not least for

externally employed supervisors. There is also a need to clarify how poor supervision is recognized and appropriately dealt with, and create a more transparent and user-friendly structure for conflict resolution beyond the role of the PhD counsellor.

It is common practice to have supervisors from different groups. However, this is not required, and it is allowed to have a PI and postdoc from the same group as the only supervisors, which is fragile in terms of ensuring broad and independent feedback. It is thus recommended to either make it a requirement to have supervisors from different groups or have at least two supervisors at Associate Professor level or above.

Tools for career development plans and expectation alignment are in place but not always used. It is thus recommended to clarify the role and content of the annual MUS/PDR and to increase awareness that career planning should also be discussed at the midway evaluation and that expectation alignment should be performed at the start of the PhD.

### **Quality system**

PhD courses are evaluated via a centralized model and used by the PhD committee to make recommendations on future courses and generally by the course directors/teachers to improve individual courses. Overall, there was satisfaction with the courses offered through the GSHS but given short planning horizon it was not possible to make a meaningful course portfolio for the duration of the PhD study at the time of enrolment, which was thus seen as a waste of time. It is thus recommended to abandon this requirement.

There was strong support of the 2. regular assessment model (the midway examination) whereas the 1. and 3. regular assessment was seen as administrative 'ticking boxes' with limited value for the PhD student beyond ensuring they are on track with the obligatory components of the PhD programme. While many PhD students do get structured/formative feedback on their scientific progress by other means during the PhD programme, it could be considered to make it mandatory to write a progress report and get feedback from the supervisors at the 1. and 3. regular assessment to ensure this happens for all PhD students. It could be done in a flexible way so other forms of structured/formative feedback already happening is acknowledged as such scientific assessments.

The 'ticking boxes' in the 1. and 3. regular assessment is in part to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Danish Qualification Framework, but awareness of this is low and the model does not ensure that all learning goals have been obtained. It is thus recommended to make a more systematic approach and align the quality assessment systems with the Danish Qualification Framework requirements. Moreover, it is recommended to increase awareness of the Danish Qualification Framework requirements, which should be used in planning and follow-up at all levels of the organization.

The 'PhD planner' is used as the main quality control system, but was generally seen as being outdated and more an e-portfolio tool than a planning tool as the name infer. It is thus more a list of conducted activities than articulation of skills the PhD students have obtained (in accordance with the Qualifications Framework). Alternative programs were used for actual time/milestone planning. It is thus recommended to develop a new IT system where planning, reporting and self reflections can be conducted on one platform.

### **3. Background**

#### Key facts about the Graduate School and its organization

The GSHS is lead by the Head of Graduate School and is organised into three Graduate Programmes:

1. Biomedicine
2. Clinical Medicine, Forensic Medicine and Dentistry and Oral Health ("ClinFO")
3. Public Health

The *Graduate Programmes* are headed by a Head of Graduate Programme (HGP) which is either a full time (ClinFo) or 50% FTE position (Biomedicine and Public Health). In addition, ClinFo has a 80% FTE coordinator assisting the HGP.

The Faculty of Health is divided into five *Departments*:

- Department of Clinical Medicine
- Department of Biomedicine
- Department of Public Health
- Department of Dentistry and Oral Health
- Department of Forensic Medicine

Upon enrolment in the GSHS, the PhD student is affiliated with one of the Graduate Programmes and one of the departments.

A *PhD committee* with elected PhD students and academic staff members is an advisory committee to the GSHS.

An experienced PhD supervisor serve as *PhD counsellor* providing confidential advice to PhD students and supervisors.

All PhD students become members of the *PhD Association*, which is an independent organization with the purpose of improving the conditions for the PhD students.

The GSHS receives administrative support from the *PhD Administration at Health* unit embedded in the PhD Administration at Health, Natural Sciences and Technical Sciences serving three Faculty graduate schools.

In 2020 the GSHS had 591 enrolled PhD students affiliated as follows:

- Biomedicine: 77
- ClinFo 443
- Public Health 71

In the period 2015-2020 the enrolled PhD students were 64% female and 36% male with 16% international PhD's (64% from Europe, 36% the rest of the World). Almost half the enrolled PhD students have MD degree (47% in 2020).

Recruitment is typically either through a centralized biannual Faculty funded scheme where the PhD student is the applicant (with research project and supervisor team) or via continuously advertised positions based on external funding obtained by the supervisors.

PhD students are mainly employed at Departments at Aarhus University or the hospitals in the Central Denmark Region. It follows that the PhD students and supervisors are spread over a relatively large geographical area across the Region, in particular for the ClinFo programme.

There is no formal requirement for publications embedded in the PhD thesis, but the vast majority of PhD students compose their thesis as a synopsis/review with embedded submission-ready manuscripts and published papers. A survey found that GSHS PhD graduates from 2019 had published an average of 3 peer reviewed contributions to journals.

The assessment of the PhD thesis and format of the oral PhD defence is highly regulated by the ministerial PhD Order. From the description in the self-evaluation report it is evident that the GSHS follows these requirements and e.g. have at least one international assessor on 98,8% of PhD defences (31,2% have two international assessors). About  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the assessors are female. The main criteria used to assess the PhD thesis corresponds to the criteria stipulated in the PhD Order: the PhD thesis "must document the PhD student's/author's ability to apply relevant research methods and to conduct research work meeting the international standards for PhD degrees within the field in question".

PhD graduates have very high employments rates (97% one year after graduation in 2020) and are mainly employed in the public sector (85% in 2020). Average completion time for regular PhD students is only slightly above the 3-year programme (3.3 years in 2020) and dropout rate is very low (17 PhD students in 2020).

#### Key recommendation from international evaluation in 2015

The GSHS was previously evaluated by an international panel in 2015. The main recommendations in that report were as follows:

- provide better evidence for the bibliometric statistics and scientific quality of the PhD theses' content
- continue emphasizing the 'dual purpose' nature of PhD studies: publications and the graduates' contributions to the health care system's general quality and to the promoting of evidence-based medicine
- establish a project proposal review process that includes the use of external peer reviewers to further strengthen an already strong evaluation process
- enhance the transparency of the assessment processes and especially of the stipend allocation distribution process
- initiate a survey of how current international PhD students managed to identify a supervisor and to compose the PhD project proposal that is a requirement for applying for PhD enrolment
- provide the skills needed in work outside of university in addition to expertise in research work
- continue the good work with progress evaluations, but enhance information provided to both supervisors and PhD students

- enhance mobility by better advertisement of the ample funding possibilities and publicising some of the good examples
- encourage research units to set up exchange agreements with likeminded research units abroad
- support good supervisors by giving proper credit for their work
- limit the number of PhD students per supervisor and/or limit the number of faculty stipends allocated per supervisor
- promote interdisciplinary research
- add courses in career planning and in writing grants proposals to the course programme
- allocate more resources to the enhancement of information to supervisors, applicants and other stakeholders about processes and initiatives in the GSHS
- further improve collaboration with other graduate schools, locally, nationally, and internationally

From the self-evaluation report and site-visit it is evident that many of these recommendations have been followed in the interim period, while some issues such as recruitment of international PhD students still remain.

## **4. Summary of key points and reflections from meeting with stakeholders**

### **Summary of key points and reflections from meeting with GSHS management**

The Panel initially praised the self-evaluation report, which was found to be comprehensive, well documented, and ambitious. Overall, processes were well described and gave an impression of a well-functioning GSHS with high level of services and no major gaps.

The Head of Graduate School presented key content of the self-evaluation report as well as extra materials answering written questions raised by the panel before the site visit, which confirmed the abovementioned impressions of a well functioning and well organized GSHS with a high engaged management team.

#### **Organization:**

The key points noted by the panel was the highly uneven size of the GPs and the fragile organization of the PhD counsellor function, which the GSHS could thus consider strengthening or re-organize. The Head of GPs found that they had the resources needed to conduct their duties, but the full-time position of the Head of ClinFo might pose challenges with peer recognition over time, and/or the large ClinFo might 'squeeze' the smaller GPs.

The large administration covering multiple graduate schools was also not seen as being a problem as it was compartmentalized towards the individual graduate schools (HEALTH, NAT, TECH) giving 'personalized' service while allowing for sharing best practices across the compartments. Overall, the panel got the impression of a well functioning administration, which was well liked by the different stakeholders, with the notable exception of the PhD Planner administrative platform, which was generally seen as archaic and not user friendly.

#### **Internationalization:**

Increased internationalization is a key point of attention of the GSHS as they would like to increase recruitment of international PhD students. Several obstacles such as the Faculty/Department financing model and the requirement to speak Danish for MDs seeing patients during the PhD studies were identified. The management team and other stakeholders did not want to change the financing model as it was seen to have many advantages, so the focus was on strengthening international recruitment by other means.

#### **Supervision:**

Overall, the management team was very satisfied with the introductory PhD supervisor course, but found it problematic that some supervisors did not want to participate in the course despite it being mandatory for them. It was evident that there was a large lack of continued professional development activities for PhD supervisors beyond the introductory course. It was thus recommended to develop such activities as they could both support already engaged supervisors and serve as an alternative for the 'resistant' supervisors if tailored to their needs.

#### **Employment:**

Overall, the management team was very satisfied with the very high employment rates of their PhD graduates. However, the panel noted a relatively low employment rate in the private sector compared to the Regions (mainly hospitals) and State (mainly universities). This

was in part explained by the lack of large pharmaceutical companies in the region and low mobility of the PhD graduates towards other regions in Denmark. The panel recommends to focus more on employment opportunities in the private sector during the PhD programme e.g. via strategic collaborations with private companies or foundations (e.g. exchange programmes or industry co-funded PhD scholarships) to increase awareness of private sector employment opportunities.

### **Summary of key points and reflections from meeting with supervisors**

This summary is based on the key points raised at stakeholder meetings and four pillars for consideration which arose from these discussions. These include; Organisational Support, Professional Development, Recognition and Reward and Building a Sustainable Community of Practice. **Considering the question, why would a supervisor want to work in Aarhus University? is helpful when examining areas for improvement.**

#### Organisational Support:

- **Access to clear, dedicated supports via website.** There is currently a section on the website for staff. The panel would suggest developing a section which specifically supports research supervisors. They can use this part of the website for guidance on regulations, available training and workshops. This would be especially important for clinical supervisors who spend the majority of their time in hospitals and out of the university environment.
- **Clarification on roles and responsibilities** of research students and supervisors (main supervisors and co-supervisors). Even if this information is available on the website, some workshops on these topics could be provided to both students and staff for example.
- **Clarity on conflict management/ resolution process** 'What to do if things go wrong' in support of the PhD Counsellor role, which is in itself vulnerable. This point came up from different stakeholders. The process to follow when things go wrong should be transparent and easy to locate.
- Infusion of **Danish Qualifications framework** in backbone of all supports - the targets for PhD qualification need to be crystal clear. What the doctoral outcomes are should be evident to all stakeholders.
- **Incentives** for Danish supervisors to work with international students and supervisors should be considered. For example, internationalisation can be supported through PI collaborations across different universities, which will naturally draw international students to study.
- **Clear signposting** for supervisors to university supports, particularly around career development, would assist them in career conversations with students, which many find challenging.

#### Professional Development:

- The **training programme is excellent** and has been received very positively. This good will should be built upon and developed to relate to the supervisors' career stage/level of experience. **Ongoing continued professional development** such as induction and mandatory refresher courses/programmes for more experienced supervisors should be considered. Content should reflect needs of those in clinical practice as well.

- Demonstration of **International best practice** including familiarity with the Danish Qualifications Framework via supervisor training programme and website would be valuable.
- **Supervisor of the Year** recipients should feed back into training initiatives, crucial at induction and to more experienced academics (who need advice just as much).
- The implementation of a **process for non-engagement with mandatory training** should be carried out. This could be done by carrot (perhaps inclusion in funding initiatives if training is engaged with) and stick (withholding research student assignment for 6 months or until training is finished, whichever comes first for example).
- The **PhD Counsellor** should feed into the training programme at induction and more experienced supervisor engagement points.
- The introduction of a regular **survey for research supervisors**, will identify key bottlenecks and training needs and also facilitates stakeholder consultation and investment.

#### Recognition and Reward:

- Supervisors are aware of the *Supervisor of the Year Award*, but do not know the criteria being measured in this competition. The **Danish Qualifications Framework** should be a key pillar in the quality assurance approach to supervision. Clarity around requirements for award will change culture around quality assurance
- Showcasing of recipients of **supervisor of the year award** should be prevalent on the website.
- **Financial incentives** should be considered for new supervisors as well as experienced supervisors and those who are well published.
- Consideration should be given to an approach to deal with **poor supervisory practice**, this is a challenge for many universities.

#### Building a Community of Practice:

- Research supervisors should feel **valued by the university, a sense of belonging** and clarity around the university's expectations of supervisors, professional development and recognition, all contribute to the university's ethos of support and development.
- **Recognition of different cohorts of supervisors**, those who have heavy research loads and those who have clinical practice. Identify and meet specific needs, but maintain an inclusive approach i.e. all are supervisors at the University of Aarhus
- Some **data analysis of existing supervisor population** is required. A clear identification of total numbers of supervisors, how many are main supervisors, how many are co-supervisors, how many engage in training, what is the level of experience of each supervisor, completion rates etc. This data will enable the graduate school to identify needs and supports more effectively for this community.

#### **Summary of key points and reflections from meeting with PhD committee**

- The PhD committee consists of elected faculty members and doctoral students from all of the scientific fields and the departments in the Graduate School.
- The PhD committee is a well-functioning element in the operations of the Graduate School. Besides the defined advisory role, the committee and its subcommittees have

defined allocated tasks, such as the approval of courses, credit transfers and exemptions, and guidelines for PhD supervision.

- The members of the committee are a combination of veterans and newly elected members. The committee members state they have gotten involved in the committee work through their interest in developing doctoral education. The mix of participants ensures both continuity and a steady inflow of new ideas and visions for the development of the Graduate School.
- The doctoral student representation in the PhD committee ensures that doctoral students can take an active role in the operations and the development of the Graduate School.
- The committee members including the doctoral student participants feel that they have a strong platform in the form of the PhD committee, and that they can have their voice heard in the matters concerning doctoral education in the Graduate School.
- The committee is well-supported by the Graduate School administration, and the communication with the leadership of the Graduate School is efficient.
- The PhD committee with its doctoral student representatives has an important role in initiatives aimed at support for stress and mental health issues of doctoral students
- In the context of the pronounced aims of the Graduate School in internationalization, it is important that the PhD committee has representation that includes international doctoral students to ensure that the challenges of providing adequate support to all doctoral students are properly identified and addressed.

### **Summary of key points and reflections from meeting with PhD students**

The representatives, both Danish and international PhD students, were unanimously very positive in their over-all judgement of the Graduate School. In particular, the university's flexibility and financial support regarding delays caused by the covid-19 crisis were appreciated.

Supervision was mostly sufficient both in quality and quantity, although it was noted that this could be challenging in case of supervisors with substantial clinical duties. The midterm evaluation was considered to be most useful as a formative feedback moment. To safeguard a uniform quality of the midterm evaluation, we suggest to provide evaluators with a standard form to address all relevant topics like progress, critical thinking, background knowledge, communication skills, statistics, and career development. The first- and third-year evaluations were not deemed useful but rather an administrative burden without the face-to-face meeting. The absence of a requirement for one or more publications at the time of defence was supported by the PhD students. It reduced stress, yet the peer pressure and personal ambition has kept publication output at 2-3.

Critical comments were made about the functionality of the 'PhD planner', which was not only considered archaic but was also more like a portfolio than a planner. The IPTO plan was suggested as a user-friendly alternative. The offer and capacity of skills courses was considered sufficient, especially with the additional possibility to follow courses at other universities or through NorDoc.

The students were overwhelmingly positive about teaching and considered it an opportunity rather than a duty. A more formalized structure to indicate responsibility for initiation in the

specific course and the feedback on their performance, as well as a broader announcement of the teacher training course would be useful.

The students felt that the administrative and financial support to obtain international experience was sufficient. All agreed that international experience was an asset for PhD researchers although parenthood could limit the options.

Altogether, the PhD-student representatives felt that an acceptable work-life balance could be achieved in combination with the research and additional requirements for the doctoral training.

### **Summary of key points and reflections from meeting with department's management team**

#### Organization:

Overall, the department's expressed that they had a well functioning collaboration with the GPs and GSHS. However, some concern was expressed that the large size of the clinical programme might 'squeeze' some areas such as qualitative research.

#### Internationalization:

The departments do get strategic resources that they *could* use to promote international recruitment. However, they were generally used so support other strategic focus areas. Some areas already had significant international recruitment, so the issue was not universal. It was thus stressed that it was important to define what 'internationalization' means and explain why it is important to target the mission efficiently and get all onboard. Several good reasons for raising international recruitment was mentioned so it is evident that the awareness it present but needs to be better and more uniformly communicated across the organization.

#### Content of PhD programme:

Some concerns were raised about the obligations during the PhD (e.g. to teach and do an international stay) and the relatively short 3-year programme with regards to meeting the international standards at the end of the PhD. In general, it was seen as a waste of time to make a plan for PhD courses and teaching at enrolment as they rarely unfold as planned due to the short horizon of teaching and course offers. The first and third assessment was also seen as unfruitful in its current form as it was mainly bureaucratic

#### Teaching:

Overall, the Departments found that they provided adequate support to the supervisors for their supervision duties and teaching on PhD courses. Departments sometimes found it challenging to match their teaching needs with the PhD students teaching obligations and area of expertise. It was the obligation of the Course Directors and main supervisors to instruct the PhD students prior to the teaching but this was not always done. Despite this, the PhD students generally did fine as they did not want to fail, but they could then end up using too much time on preparation compared to the norm. It should thus be considered to increase focus on formal pedagogic training and better introduction to the courses e.g. by the Course Directors or experienced teachers.

## **5. List of materials**

The following documents were provided before the site-visit:

- Self-evaluation report (2021)
  - Appendix 1. Quality Framework for Doctoral Education. 2013
  - Appendix 2. Basic principles of PhD education at Aarhus University. 2019
  - Appendix 3. Quality in the PhD Process. 2021 A survey among PhD students at Aarhus University. (In Danish: Kvalitet i ph.d.-uddannelsen KIP)
  - Appendix 4. The employment survey 2020. (In Danish only: Beskæftigelseundersøgelse 2020. Rapport for ph.d-dimittender)
  - Appendix 5. Annual report for talent development, Aarhus University, Appendix Health report. (In Danish only: Årsrapport talentområdet på Aarhus Universitet 2020. Appendix Health rapport)
  - Appendix 6. Annual report 2020. Enrolment at GSHS 2015-2020. (In Danish: Årsrapport vedr. Appendix 7. Overview of application procedure 2020-indskrivninger på Healths ph.d.-skole i 2020)
  - Appendix 8. Final Course plan Spring and Autumn 2020
  - Appendix 9. The GSHS action plan for internationalization of PhD education 2020-2022. (in Danish: Ph.d.-skolens handlingsplan for internationalisering af ph.d.-uddannelsen 2020-2022)
  - Appendix 10. NorDoc summer school and conference 2021
  
- 4 representative PhD theses

The following documents were provided after the site-visit:

- Minutes from the stakeholder meetings by Lene Bøgh Sørensen
- PowerPoint presentations from meeting with Graduate School management team
- Evaluation report from 2016