



UNIVERSITY OF  
LIVERPOOL

## **PGR SUPERVISOR DEVELOPMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL: A REVIEW AND THE NEXT STEPS**

Report to the University of Liverpool prepared by the University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development, Dr Martin Gough (September 2019)

Receipt of this report, by selected staff listed below, is also an invitation for you to send a response. It is likely that certain sections are more of interest and others less of interest to you, variously, so you are welcome to focus on the former, or, indeed, to treat this report primarily as information. The recommendations listed are not meant to be all or nothing and, variously, each can be treated separately from others to a large extent. Please send any response by 18<sup>th</sup> October by email to: [m.gough@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:m.gough@liverpool.ac.uk)

Sent to:

Senior Management Team: PVCs for Education and for Research & Impact

Human Resources: Director, Director of the Academy, Academic Development

Centre for Innovation in Education: Director

Liverpool Doctoral College: Manager, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research

Environment and Postgraduate Research, Directors of Postgraduate Research

Academic Quality & Standards Division: PGR Quality Officer

XJTLU: Graduate School Director and admin staff, ILEAD education developer for research

PGR Supervisor Development workshop presenters, facilitators and advisors

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. A credit-bearing module is created as an option in the academic staff development accredited programmes suite [actioned already, as module EDEV406].**
- 2. The successful PGCert/Dip/MA in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education programme module EDEV406 is made available to new academic staff via the PGCAP programme.**
- 3. The final 20 credits of the PGCAP would for each participant comprise one of a choice between optional modules; EDEV406, or a version of it suitably re-fashioned to align with the aims of the programme, is one of those options.**
- 4. The mandatory workshop 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework' is also a half-day session in the series of workshops for the core PGCAP module ADEV700 (and its equivalent).**
- 5. A distance learning version of the mandatory workshop 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework' is created to cater for supervisors who are remote or otherwise not able to attend the main campus in Liverpool for the F2F workshop.**
- 6. Iterations of the mandatory workshop 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework' can be developed tailored to discipline-specific and remote site working environments, as induction into the role in the context of those particular environments.**
- 7. There should be a facility for bespoke advanced consultation discussions/workshops/enquiries for troubleshooting localised problems in discipline-specific and remote site environments.**
- 8. A distance learning version of the mandatory workshop 'Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)' is created to cater for prospective examiners who are remote or otherwise not able to attend the main campus in Liverpool for the F2F workshop [actioned already].**
- 9. The distance learning package for the mandatory workshop 'Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)' is modified to produce a version dedicated to prospective examiners at XJTLU [actioned already].**
- 10. All versions of the mandatory workshop 'Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)' are modified to represent the new possible examination outcome of 'major modifications' and accompanying alterations.**
- 11. Experienced Examiners who are new to the University and all who need to refresh their practice may engage with the distance learning version of 'Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)' as an alternative to attending the F2F workshop [offered already].**

**12. Experienced supervisors should remain in good standing professionally, as the University currently expects. As an alternative to being required to attend the very introductory workshop 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework' again to this end, they should instead review the PGR Code of Practice and participate in one of the other, currently optional, workshops or scholarly seminars, as available [offered already].**

**13. To the end of maintaining good professional practice, there should be a functioning scholarly community of enquiry comprising supervisors in the University.**

**14. There should be a VLE class (or similar site) running to accommodate much of the above facilities and resources [actioned already].**

**15. The University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development should be funded to attend relevant UKCGE (and other) events as part of staying informed in the right networks for supervisor development.**

**16. The University should consider accepting the deal offered by Jon Wakeford on behalf of Epigeum to be involved with its course development, with the University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development joining the Development Team.**

**17. The University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development should be afforded at least a third of FTE to maintain and develop this work.**

The rest of this report comprises:

p5 Background

p7 Explanation of Recommendations

Appendices

p15 Appendix A: Module Guide for EDEV406: Developing Your Role as a Research Degree Supervisor

p25 Appendix B: Course evaluations by participants of the opt-in provision, three iterations over three years - summary

B(i) The EDEV406 module

B(ii) Workshop: Disciplinary Perspectives on Supervisory Approaches: Experienced PGR Supervisor Showcase

B(iii) Workshop: Cross-disciplinary and Personal Perspectives on the PGR Supervisory Relationship

B(iv) Workshop: Motivating your PGR Student and What They Want of You

B(v) Workshop: The Supervisory Relationship: fostering independence in your PGR student

B(vi) Workshop: PGR Careers and Professional Development: The Supervisor's Role

B(vii) Workshop: Supervisory Approaches for a Diverse PGR Student Body

B(viii) Workshop: PGR Student Wellbeing: The Academic Environment and the Supervisor's Role

p34 Appendix C: Course evaluations of the mandatory workshop: Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)

p36 Appendix D: Course evaluations of the mandatory workshop: Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework

p39 Appendix E: Additional themes to discuss or learn about in another workshop or resource

p40 Appendix F: Epigeum Business Case

## BACKGROUND

When Martin Gough started as a supervisor of PhD students at UCL in 2005, he participated in the not-for-credit PGR supervisor programme there. As someone already researching into research pedagogy and other postgraduate-related topics, and as attender of the Society for Research into Higher Education Postgraduate Issues Network seminars and workshops since 1997, he was also at this point invited to join the team of Convenors of that Network, planning and choosing the seminar and workshop series. He used this expertise to re-write the optional module on PGR supervision for the University of Kent PGCert/Dip/MA in Higher Education, aimed at new academic staff, and ran the module successfully 2008-2013. On joining the University of Liverpool Centre for Lifelong Learning in 2015, also as a supervisor and examiner on the EdD in Higher Education programme, Martin Gough responded to the call for suggestions to develop the Educational Development PGT curriculum, in the wake of the CLL IPR in 2014, with a plan to adapt the Kent programme module for CLL's programmes. This Review of PGR Supervisor Development began with discussion around this idea in Autumn 2015.

Martin Gough started working on this with the then University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development, Richard Hinchcliffe, and with the blessing of Liverpool Doctoral College. The only workshop provision Dr Hinchcliffe was running up to this point were the two mandatory ones. 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs' and 'Duties of Internal Examiners'. Martin Gough was already involved facilitating the mandatory workshop 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs' and attending UK Council for Graduate Education events, as deputy to Dr Hinchcliffe when he was otherwise engaged. The two of them booked Martin Gough's SRHE Postgraduate Issues Network Co-Convenor, and internationally celebrated expert, Pam Denicolo (Professor Emerita at University of Reading) in April 2016 to run an enhanced version of the mandatory workshops at the Liverpool campus (Martin Gough was able to book her again, approved by LOSADA, to lead on the more general introductory one in May 2018).

The specification of the new module EDEV406: *Developing Your Role as a Research Degree Supervisor* was approved by the University at the end of the 2015-16 academic year as an optional module in the PGCert/Dip/MA in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education programme. Dr Hinchcliffe and Martin Gough ran an information event for it on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016, attracting 25 staff to register for this (19 attended), and Martin Gough ran the actual dedicated workshop classes for the first time on the Liverpool campus in the summer term 2017 (the classes were dedicated to the module but each one has been open to any supervisor to book on as standalone CPD). Before this point, Martin Gough took over from Dr Hinchcliffe as University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development based in CLL, when the latter left the University in March 2017. Martin Gough facilitated the re-titled mandatory workshop 'Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)' for the first time in April 2017, accompanied by the Director of the LDC at that point.

Martin Gough has continued since then, from August 2017 as a function of Academic Development in LOSADA, to facilitate on his own the two mandatory workshops and to facilitate the other, optional workshops, some led by himself, some led by guest presenters (he also led the dedicated introductory session on supervising PGRs as part of the final iteration of the 'Teaching for Researchers' credit-bearing programme in 2017-18). Both the optional workshops each in themselves and the EDEV406 module as a whole have received good feedback in participant evaluation exercises (see Appendix B). PGR

supervision pedagogy is an important distinct area of academic practice which across the sector often does not otherwise receive adequate attention in academic development programmes designed to cover primarily taught programme pedagogy. The module especially has allowed the selected participants to develop personally and professionally in this area in suitable ways, which they would not have done otherwise.

Review of PGR supervisor development at the University, with the EDEV406 module ultimately in its repertoire, has been ongoing since Autumn 2015. A report could have been expected before now but staffing issues and consequent prioritising of other academic development work have slowed down progress. Four years on, rather than later, is certainly the point to take stock and make recommendations regarding the next steps for its provision.

## EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### **1. A credit-bearing module is created as an option in the academic staff development accredited programmes suite.**

This was the first action resulting from the review, in place to run for 2016-17 Semester 2, noted here for the historical record. EDEV406: *Developing Your Role as a Research Degree Supervisor* (see Appendix A) was housed in the PGCert/Dip/MA in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education, as the only programme for academic staff development offering optional modules. Ideally EDEV406 should have been created as an option in the Certificate in Professional Studies in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education (CPS) programme. The Level 6 status of this programme, as well as exclusion of options, meant that the module had to reside in the PGCert.

### **2. The successful PGCert/Dip/MA in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education programme module EDEV406 is made available to new academic staff via the PGCAP programme.**

The Level 7 PGCert in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education programme and the Level 6 CPS programme no longer run, since the new Level 7 PGCAP programme is designed to cater for probationary academic staff. The CPS programme has always been the probationary requirement for new lecturers, a significant proportion of which being research career track. The PGCert L+T was invented originally in response to cater for those who are more teaching career track and for those more interested in pedagogic enquiry, and offered a choice of optional modules to suit different interests.

The Academic Development review of CPS in the 2017-18 academic year found three main weaknesses: its Level 6 status; its lack of cohort progression structure; the lack of different module options for completing the curriculum. As a result, a few research career track lecturers chose the PGCert, either instead of CPS or in addition (completing the 60-credit CPS would translate into 20 credits APCL in the 60-credit PGCert), when they did not have to for probationary requirements. So, appropriately, the new 60-credit PGCAP has displaced CPS as being aimed at the research career track probationers (amongst others), thereby acquiring the advantages of the PGCert L+T in setting itself at Level 7 and also in supporting cohorts. But, currently, the PGCAP does not offer optional modules.

A condition of successful completion of work-based programmes such as these is that participants are doing relevant work. So, for instance, they have to be HE teachers (or, perhaps, in a related learning support role) to engage with and complete PGCAP. By the same token, to engage properly and demonstrate competence in the pedagogic role of PGR supervisor, they need to be supervisors (whether formally recognised or just doing this work). The EDEV406 module, serving the PGCert L+T, could only attract a small number of participants, since most registered on this programme have been teaching career track, and a few, but only a few, of those are PGR supervisors. Most of those probationers starting PGR supervision in their work are research career track and, as explained above, they were on (and happy to settle for just) the CPS programme. So the

old programmes structure did not facilitate getting at the right people very well.

It would be possible to introduce via the PGCAP more on PGR supervision pedagogy to these staff, who are at the head of the queue to join this programme, but the module definitions do not give explicit room to do so at present. The curriculum of the core module is designed to cover adequately the core elements of being a taught degree programme teacher in higher education and is as full of content as ought to be expected. The learning outcomes of the programme and, in turn, its modules certainly do not afford explicit demonstration of competence specifically in research degree programme pedagogy.

In the first year of the PGCAP running, 2018-19, the workshops dedicated to EDEV406 (see Appendix A) were available (as they had been in the previous two years) for new supervisors as individuals to book on to and participate in voluntarily as CPD not-for-credit. They have been appreciated by the self-chosen few but not well attended because opt-in. As not in any way part of the probationary programme they would amount to extra work not required by anyone: as entirely voluntary, their apparent importance in the eyes of new staff aiming primarily to achieve probation would be low. In so far as the PGCAP is now serving this function of channelling especially probationary research career track academics through an initial development programme, it is, even more than CPS was, structurally excluding those staff from focusing on their development needs as supervisors.

**3. The final 20 credits of the PGCAP would for each participant comprise one of a choice between optional modules; EDEV406, or a version of it suitably re-fashioned to align with the aims of the programme, is one of those options.**

The only solution which serves adequately the new academic staff, all relevant departments of the University and the institution as a whole is to introduce an optional module structure into the PGCAP programme definition. Those who are starting to supervise PGRs would (as they could in principle through module EDEV406 but not by means of the right institutional structure), be able to choose a 20-credit module on PGR supervising to complete the programme. On the work-based learning principle of academic development, only those who are supervising already can do this successfully. So a substantial section of a programme designed for participants to show competence in this area of work is not suitable for just any PGCAP participant (i.e. those not supervising) and the fine existing ADEV701 module serves their needs happily. Those who are supervising may choose the ADEV701 option if their personal professional interests are better served thus, but at least the option would be available to them to develop their role as a PGR supervisor by means of this additional dedicated module.

The question could be posed, for however many options are made available, whether there would be sufficient demand to populate a class deserving of resourcing. In a cohort of 60 (and there are two cohorts, Autumn and Spring, per annum on the PGCAP), many of whom will be supervising PGRs (informally if not necessarily in a formal supervisor role), the clientele will be present. EDEV406 has had three annual iterations and managed to build momentum in recruitment, with 10 participants registering in 2018-19 out of a much smaller PGCert L+T cohort the majority of whom would be on teaching career track lectureships. The pre-cursor optional module for PGR supervisors which Martin Gough led in the University of Kent PGCert programme, where two optional modules were chosen from a suite of eight, attracted over 15 participants on average. This alone shows how importantly new academic staff who are supervisors view such an opportunity in their



accreditation journey (a summary record of participant evaluations for EDEV406 and dedicated workshops are in Appendix B).

A further bonus, for proceeding with an optional module for those on the PGCAP who are PGR supervisors, is that such a module does not need creating because it is on the books already. The 'wheel', tried and tested, does not need re-inventing for the PGCAP (the curriculum can of course be modified).

**4. The mandatory workshop 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework' is also a half-day session in the series of workshops for the core PGCAP module ADEV700 (and its equivalent).**

Two scheduled workshops serve also as required (by the University) of new supervisors and new internal examiners respectively, so they are well attended but popular only through conscription. The 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework' workshop is suitable for participation by any staff, since it is very introductory and so helpful for those just considering whether they want to get into this line of work, for instance. It was designed also to serve as a CPS advertised workshop, informing completion of one of the assessed assignments which supervisors could approach by responding to a problem case study and reflect to some extent on the features of PGR pedagogy.

The PGCAP programme in 2018-19 has not made room for it in the workshops schedule. As mandatory for actual supervisors, no further incentive would be needed to generate participation in an additional event. Attended as a separate commitment in its own right, however, the current system places that extra burden on probationary staff who are supervisors. As suitable for those not (yet) supervisors but who could benefit from being educated about the important distinct pedagogy for PGR supervision, this workshop would be a fitting complement as part of the scheduled workshop classes for PGCAP's core module ADEV700. It is repeated throughout the year and will run still as standalone and available to supervisors not enrolled on PGCAP.

**5. A distance learning version of the mandatory workshop 'Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework' is created to cater for supervisors who are remote or otherwise not able to attend the main campus in Liverpool for the F2F workshop.**

There a number of remote campuses with PGR supervisors and different staff have different working patterns. Participation in the F2F half-day workshop is the better learning experience: a distance/online version would be resource-intensive and not to be favoured as a replacement for the F2F workshops, where staff can develop their thoughts effectively through sharing experiences and ideas with peer group discussion. But some supervisors simply will not be able to make it to one of these. Specific groups which have identified themselves as in need are based in the HLS Faculty and at the Singapore campus (Martin Gough did offer to visit to run the workshop there as part of an itinerary in October 2018 but the hosts were reluctant in the event to organise a local schedule).

**6. Iterations of the mandatory workshop ‘Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework’ can be developed tailored to discipline-specific and remote site working environments, as induction into the role in the context of those particular environments.**

Any such iteration will involve significant input from staff based in those environments for both content and delivery, working with the University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development. Martin Gough visited the XJTLU campus, as part of the visit organised by LDC, and on 17<sup>th</sup> Oct.2018 delivered a reduced version of the workshop to approaching 100 supervisors, tailored to fit in as part of a half-day induction session started off by the Director of the Graduate School there and contributed to by other staff, such as Liverpool based PGR Student Admin visiting. The local context for induction was an important dimension to this and we may have confidence that XJTLU can run this when needed themselves, using the materials the Liverpool visitors have supplied (including the continually updated generic distance learning package version to be, as in 5 above). The Department of Earth, Ocean and Ecological Sciences have tried organising their own induction for ECRs as assistant supervisors, which could be developed. The Management School have been given the opportunity to determine what it is that they might need beyond the more generic F2F provision but came to the conclusion in the short term that the structure and content of the generic workshop works well for them.

**7. There should be a facility for bespoke advanced consultation discussions/workshops/enquiries for troubleshooting localised problems in discipline-specific and remote site environments.**

This will already involve significant input from staff based in those environments to start to articulate the problem and to translate contributions from outside, at the very least. Pedagogical expertise would be provided by the University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development, who is (and should be) an experienced supervisor as well as researcher into this area of academic practice. But, with other aspects surfacing within problematic situations, such as matters of procedure, staff from, variously, AQSD and LDC should be on-hand. The School of Chemistry made a specific request for involvement at a time when central resources were absent. The Management School have started considering explicitly what it is that they might need above and beyond the more introductory provision.

**8. A distance learning version of the mandatory workshop ‘Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)’ is created to cater for prospective examiners who are remote or otherwise not able to attend the main campus in Liverpool for the F2F workshop.**

Martin Gough, as University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development, visited the XJTLU campus, as part of the visit organised by LDC, and on 18<sup>th</sup> Oct.2018 delivered the standard version of the workshop (with a tweak to represent the variation on administrative structure and paperwork processes there). Research Degrees at XJTLU are University of Liverpool awards and so there are no local differences regarding the core process of examining. The UK doctorate is a defined entity which applies to any HEI operating within

the UK system, and the concept of doctorateness in general terms can be considered usefully by all groups within it.

All this means that (apart from the XJTLU-specific tweak) there cannot be, for instance, bespoke versions of this induction course for different disciplinary groups. Different disciplinary groups are certainly welcome to follow up the standard induction workshop and develop their new (and more experienced) examiners with organisation of activity considering actual theses and examiner reports in their disciplinary area, for instance. At least one generic induction workshop participant has expressed disappointment that we were not doing that there and then. But that would be impractical both in terms of expectations on participants regarding preparation and in terms of trying to make particular judgements of standard and quality with a multidisciplinary group.

Martin Gough's meetings in XJTLU that week, on 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup>, and 19<sup>th</sup> Oct., with staff variously of the Graduate School, ILEAD and subject-based Graduate Studies Officers, established the value of making resources for supervisors available online, and particularly this workshop as a priority, so that new Internal Examiners based at XJTLU may be deemed fit by the University to operate. Again, although the F2F workshop offers the better learning experience, certain individual University staff based in other parts of the institution may find that they are unable to attend one, at least not until well after completing an examination, and so would be legitimate candidates to engage with the distance learning version.

Martin Gough created a distance learning individual study package (Beta version, at least) out of the F2F workshop materials in the Summer term 2019 and since then six staff have completed the course successfully by this means. It requires the University Lead on Supervisor Development to check over and give feedback on a worksheet completed by the participant, analogous to marking an academic development programme module assignment. Three of these six staff are main campus based, one is employed by Laureate Online Education, two are XJTLU based (with whom on their request the feedback process continued through a Skype call). The distance/online version is resource-intensive and not to be favoured as a replacement for the F2F workshops, where staff can develop their thoughts effectively through sharing experiences and ideas with peer group discussion.

**9. The distance learning package for the mandatory workshop 'Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)' is modified to produce a version dedicated to prospective examiners at XJTLU.**

The two XJTLU based staff who have completed received the modified version of the distance learning package already produced. It will need updating and otherwise developing alongside revising the main version to reflect changes in the University's process and to incorporate other worthwhile enhancements.

**10. All versions of the mandatory workshop 'Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)' are modified to represent the new possible examination outcome of 'major modifications' and accompanying alterations.**

The new University process in this respect applies to theses submitted from this month onwards.

**11. Experienced Examiners who are new to the University and all who need to refresh their practice may engage with the distance learning version of ‘Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)’ as an alternative to attending the F2F workshop.**

With the distance learning package available, any more experienced staff who would find it tedious sitting for half a day in a workshop covering mainly principles they are familiar with could organise their own refresher and check on the fine detail of the rules. It ought not to take them as long as a novice to engage with the individual study distance learning package, if they are so familiar. Participant evaluations of the F2F workshop are in Appendix C.

**12. Experienced supervisors should remain in good standing professionally, as the University currently expects. As an alternative to being required to attend the very introductory workshop ‘Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework’ again to this end, they should instead review the PGR Code of Practice and participate in one of the other, currently optional, workshops or scholarly seminars, as available.**

Even more acutely, experienced supervisors are finding that the introductory workshop, because introductory, does not serve their needs as it does for novices (this is clear from participant evaluations – see Appendix D). The above alternative option has been offered and endorsed already by such staff who have made enquiries recently. If no defined topic based optional workshop catches their interest then the workshop to attend would be *Disciplinary Perspectives on Supervisory Approaches: Experienced PGR Supervisor Showcase*. In this, an experienced supervisor from each general subject area in the University’s structure talks about their experience and lessons from it and how they aim to go about supervising, and they form a panel to answer questions participants may have about what they do, such questions being generated by participants’ own experience or through reviewing the PGR Code of Practice. This new facility would therefore be primarily for supervisors who have become experienced at the University following attending the Introduction workshop originally and are in need of refreshment of their practice. It could be offered also to those staff new to the University but who are experienced supervisors (at least within the UK sector), to ensure their more advanced needs are met more effectively.

**13. To the end of maintaining good professional practice, there should be a functioning scholarly community of enquiry comprising supervisors in the University.**

This exists already formally, through participants in F2F workshops becoming users on the site referred to in (14) below. It should develop more substantively. The UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) is encouraging the building of development oriented networks for supervisors and aims to provide a facility for extending this nationally.

**14. There should be a VLE class (or similar site) running to accommodate much of the above facilities and resources.**

Martin Gough in Spring 2018 set up the necessary site through VITAL: as a basic BlackBoard vehicle it is cumbersome, but in the absence of something better it suffices to maintain resources for supervisors and a site for engagement, whether to access the distance learning packages online or to generate and maintain a scholarly discussion on relevant issues in PGR pedagogy. Its resources do need permanent developing.

**15. The University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development should be funded to attend relevant UKCGE (and other) events as part of staying informed in the right networks for supervisor development.**

Details of 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019 event, "Supervisor Development - Reflection & Recognition" (2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019 – now fully booked up): <http://www.ukcge.ac.uk/events/supervisor-developers-19-144.aspx>

This is the latest key development in the world of supervisor development in the UK (which inevitably influences the international scene). The University of Liverpool needs to be involved in these sorts of developments, if it wants to shape them to suit, or risk falling out of kilter with the sector. At present, the University has plenty of valuable work to showcase, and just presence in these networks can only reflect well on how the sector views it. Due to recent resourcing issues (staffing and budgets), the last UKCGE event which the University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development has been able to attend was the July 2018 UKCGE annual conference (and only then through a combination of self-funding and a financial year remainder of HLC School funds assigned to the Centre for Higher Education Studies for research conferences). The LDC explicitly supports such involvement but has no budget at present.

**16. The University should consider accepting the deal offered by Epigeum to be involved with its course development, with the University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development joining the Development Team.**

What Epigeum may offer cannot do worse than inform curriculum development and broadening provision for the different needs of supervisors. Martin Gough has responded to (his long-time acquaintance) Jon Wakeford expressing interest in sharing his expertise in this forum, without, of course, any hint of accepting the offer as yet, remaining agnostic, since significant outlay is requested. The invitation letter copied here:

**From:** WAKEFORD, Jonathan <[jonathan.wakeford@oup.com](mailto:jonathan.wakeford@oup.com)> **To:** [m.gough@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:m.gough@liverpool.ac.uk)  
**Sent:** 22 August 2019 11:04 **Subject:** Supervising Doctoral Studies at the University of Liverpool

Dear Martin,

My name is Jonathan Wakeford, Senior Learning Consultant at Epigeum, a leading provider of online courseware at higher education institutions. In fact, the University of Liverpool already uses several Epigeum programmes, including *Consent Matters* (working with Julia Purvis and Paula Harrison Woods in Student Services) and *Research Ethics in Practice* (working with Matthew Billington in the Research Support Office).

Apologies for the unsolicited nature of this email but, in your role within the Academic Development team (particularly as coordinator of the *Developing Your Role as a Research Degree*

*Supervisor* module), I thought that you might be interested to know that Epigeum will be publishing a brand new edition of our **Supervising Doctoral Studies** programme. We are currently looking for (a maximum of 20) institutions that may be interested in collaborating with us as part of a Development Group.

Supervising Doctoral Studies 2.0 will be a comprehensive, flexible and interactive programme of training to equip both new and more experienced supervisors to support doctoral candidates' development into independent researchers. The programme recognises research supervision as a distinct academic practice, requiring supervisors to develop a specific set of skills, knowledge and understanding. It will guide supervisors in the most effective and up-to-date techniques in supervisory practice to ensure the best possible environment for doctoral candidates.

It will consist of 10 x 30-minute modules that address the core principles and practices of research supervision across the doctoral lifecycle (please see the attached flyer for more details on the provisional structure). Although modules can be used as stand-alone or complementary resources, our programmes are often most effective when used as part of a blended approach.

New or expanded content will be developed on a number of topics relating to key developments in doctoral studies and supervision, including:

- Respectful relationships
- Gender/power dynamics; exploitation and harassment; misconduct issues
- Mental health and wellbeing; pastoral care
- Diversity and inclusivity
- Distance and online supervision
- Different doctoral formats
- Engaging with industry
- Employability and careers, especially beyond academia
- Team supervision
- Giving feedback
- Balancing workload demands with time for quality supervision

For a one-off fee of **£29,950 + VAT**, your institution will be able to inform all aspects of the programme via a two-day collaborative workshop (to take place in London w/c 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2019) and rigorous review process – ensuring that it truly reflects the needs of your doctoral supervisors and candidates – before receiving unlimited access to the finished resource in perpetuity upon publication (due to be in December 2020). Joining a Development Group is normally much more cost effective than subscribing to the programme following publication. Places are limited and will be allocated on a first come, first served basis.

If you are interested in discussing this opportunity further, please let me know and we can arrange a call or visit at your earliest convenience. I can also send through a short business case document containing further details that could be useful with any internal discussions that you may have. Many thanks,

Jonathan

**Jonathan Wakeford**, Senior Learning Consultant, **Epigeum - part of Oxford University Press**

Tel: +44 (0) 7884 655666

5 Kensington Church Street | London | W8 4LD | UK

E-mail: [jonathan.wakeford@oup.com](mailto:jonathan.wakeford@oup.com) | [www.epigeum.com](http://www.epigeum.com)

## **17. The University Lead on PGR Supervisor Development should be afforded at least a third of FTE to maintain and develop this work.**

Progress over the last two years has been slow, since effectively only around 0.1FTE has in the event been available for this work outside running the credit-bearing modules. As this report shows, however, a well prioritised section of important work is already 'under the belt' and a central focus for development resources is in place.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Module Guide for EDEV406: Developing Your Role as a Research Degree Supervisor**



**Postgraduate Certificate / Diploma / Masters in  
Learning & Teaching in Higher Education**

**EDEV406: Developing Your Role as  
a Research Degree Supervisor**

**MODULE GUIDE**

**2018-2019**

**Welcome to the module:*****Developing Your Role as a Research Degree Supervisor***

This 20-credit 7(M)-level module is intended for lecturers, researchers and others teaching within the University who wish to develop their practice as a supervisor of research students. It is a requirement for starting the course that you are currently, or have prior experience of, undertaking research student supervision, or be actively involved in a supervisory team in your department. This may be at masters' as well as doctoral level but it is important to emphasise that the master's has to be a research and not a taught degree, so just being the supervisor of the 'research' element of a taught MA/MSc, i.e. the dissertation/project element, would not grant eligibility. Do check with the module convenor if you are not sure if you are eligible.

The module then offers you the opportunity to develop and enhance the essential skills required for the adequate training and support of research students and for allowing them to develop and reach doctoral standard in their work. It develops expertise and recognises the effort and contribution that the supervisor makes to the development and success of their research students. It also provides a forum for the recognition, discussion and resolution of problems encountered through supervisory work. Participants will be encouraged to review in context their current practice in preparation for submitting a piece of work reflecting critically upon their own and their School/department's practice. Indicative topics are: the supervisory relationship, student motivation, academic and pastoral support for a diverse student body, supervisory approaches, the regulatory framework, types of research degree, the training and skills agendas, academic and other careers, assessment and the examination process, the future of the doctorate, and variations across the sector in practice under these topics.

**Formal pre-requisites**

- Participants will have experience of acting in a research degree supervisor role (which may include a junior role in a supervision team), prior to or during the year of study on this module.
- Completion of module EDEV401: Learning, teaching and assessment; or if the potential participant has not studied EDEV401 then, as an alternative, we shall regard as equivalent RPL attainment through formal instruction in HE pedagogy, e.g. through the CPS programme or an accredited programme from another institution, or HEA Fellowship.

**Course schedule**

From the Autumn you will be garnering more supervisory experience and finding out more about the wider context through consulting resources and observing what is going on around you, helping you to see how to develop your ideas and construct your assignment. You should be keeping a log of your experience for your future private reference (i.e. not something you have to share), for which the questions below may provide suitable structure.



**Reflecting on Supervision:**

Has anything interesting arisen in the course of your supervisory practice? - anything surprising, perplexing, frustrating; anything to commend or celebrate?

Who was involved, who did what?

What explanations can you give for what happened?

What recommendations would you offer?

Every class session provides an opportunity for you to air concerns and try out your ideas and views on the situation with mutually supportive peers in the context of the course. The sessions will be largely participatory throughout and there will be time for more informal chat on the issues and for individual queries. Supervisors who are not formally registered on the module are likely to be attending the workshops, according to their choice. As module convenor, I shall be available to discuss your progress on a one-to-one basis in private too, and a group tutorial for orientation purposes will be scheduled at the start of the module for those interested in choosing this option.

You would need to book yourself on to each session yourself, after which you will receive confirmation of the room:

<https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/eddev/book-an-event/>

**Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework**

12/12/2018 14.00-17.00;

repeated 06/03/2019 14.00-17.00 ; 25/06/2019 13.30-16.30

This introductory session, supported by Liverpool Doctoral College or AQSD colleagues, is required by University policy for those new to or about to start supervising and includes insight into the University's processes and regulatory framework (as set out in the Handbook for Postgraduate Research Students and Supervisors) and requirements for the training of research students and the monitoring of their progression. Employing case studies for discussion, it will provide an opportunity to explore the experience of supervision through the eyes of the student. It also serves to advertise further workshops, with opportunity for academic credit, available for more in-depth consideration of issues introduced.

**Cross-disciplinary and Personal Perspectives on the PGR Supervisory Relationship**

02/05/2019 12.15 – 13.45

The first part of the workshop leads participants to find out about their own preferred approaches to supervision, informed by the literature, and how they may be more flexible.

The second part, led by Dr Julie Regan of the Centre for Higher Education Studies EdD supervisory team, explores the factors which contribute to establishing trust in the supervisory relationship. Participants will be introduced to a model of trust which explains the decision making surrounding trustworthiness, and how trust impacts on behaviours in the supervisory relationship. By way of preparation, some advance reading:

Lee, Anne (2007), "Developing effective supervisors: Concepts of research supervision", *South African Journal of Higher Education* 21(4), pp680-693. also available at: <http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/492/>

### **Motivating your PGR Student and What They Want of You**

09/05/2019 12.15 – 13.45

Workshop on conceptualising the student's journey, through stages of study; consideration of particular research about student preferences for characteristics of supervisors, which reflects sensitivity to stages and the different motivational factors. By way of preparation, some advance reading (will be emailed to you):

Fraser, R. & Mathews, A. (1999), "An evaluation of the desirable characteristics of a supervisor", *Australian Universities Review* 1, pp5-7.

### **PGR Careers and Professional Development: The Supervisor's Role**

23/05/2019 12.15 – 13.45

Dr Shirley Cooper, Programme lead on the Liverpool Doctoral College Development programme, will lead this session with colleagues. The workshop will allow supervisors to consider their own good practice in this area and where they may need guidance regarding: the Researcher Development Framework; development needs analysis and assessing progress of students within programmes; looking beyond towards options for careers development. By way of preparation, some advance reading (will be emailed to you):

Whitnall, Davina (2016) 'Realising Researcher Potential – Introducing the CNA-Confidence Need Analysis!' [www.vitae.ac.uk](http://www.vitae.ac.uk)

### **Supervisory Approaches for a Diverse PGR Student Body**

30/05/2019 12.15 – 13.45

Discussion, co-led by Joanna Cheetham of the Centre for Innovation in Education, will focus on academic and pastoral support for a diverse research student body, general principles on this and meeting the needs of different sub-groups of students, e.g. international, disabled or part-time students. A further section, led by Dr Mark Johnson of HLS Centre for Educational Development & Support and the EdD supervisory team, will look at alternative ways to provide feedback to your PGR student's draft writing in cases where they are not responding well to your input.

### **The Supervisory Relationship: fostering independence in your PGR student**

06/06/2019 12.15 – 13.45

The purpose of the workshop is to allow participants to try out an active listening technique, using action learning set methodology. As well as being focused around the supervisory relationship, it demonstrates and gives some practice in simulating allowing your PGR to take the initiative. Your PGR will be coming to you with queries or problems and you will be seeking means to allow them to sort them out themselves rather than be overly directive. This will allow you to concentrate more on research study as *process* (as opposed to as *task*). This in turn would assist them ultimately in making their own contribution to knowledge. Workshop participants must be, or have been, in the role of research degree supervisor (being an assistant adviser in a supervisory team is eligible). By way of preparation, please recall a problematic or perplexing situation in your experience of research degree supervision or study that

you are prepared to talk about with a couple of colleagues not in your academic group. Chatham House rules apply to this session so that what you say will not be disseminated outside the room.

### **PGR Student Wellbeing: The Academic Environment and the Supervisor's Role**

13/06/2019 12.15 – 13.45

In the first part of the workshop, Dr Tom Price of the Institute for Integrative Biology gives his supervisory perspective on mental health matters in doctoral studies. He has a leading role in the Research England and the Office for Students (formerly HEFCE) funded 'Catalyst Project', "Studying towards a happy and healthy PhD":

<https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/integrative-biology/postgraduate-study/happy-and-healthy-phd/>

The conclusion of the workshop will be a chance to discuss the wider concept of wellbeing in relation to postgraduate research study and in determining what actions might be taken. A recent report to look at:

Metcalfe, Janet; Wilson, Sally; & Levecque, Katia (May 2018), [\*Exploring wellbeing and mental health and associated support services for postgraduate researchers\*](#) (Cambridge: Vitae, Careers Research and Advisory Centre (CRAC) Limited)

### **Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners)**

16/01/2019 14.00-17.00;

repeated 13/03/2019 14.00-17.00 ; 19/06/2019 13.30 – 16.30

This session, supported by Liverpool Doctoral College or AQSD colleagues, is required by University policy for those newly appointed to the role of Internal Examiner and includes details of the University's processes and regulatory framework around examining doctoral candidates and their theses and your duties as Internal Examiner. If imminently you are examining a thesis then we advise attending the first available session, otherwise it fits well at the end of the series of classes.

We shall also cover the duties and responsibilities of external examiners, the appointment of examiners, management of the viva itself and discussion, through case studies, on research degree examination practice, both at Liverpool and at different institutions. We will pick up on issues such as the 'original contribution to knowledge', the relationship between the dissertation and the viva with regard to the total assessment and the behaviour, expectations and standards of fellow examiners. The options permitted to examiners presented with a weak thesis will also be explored along with the principle as well as procedures regarding the overall judgement (such as 'minor modifications' vs 're-submission').

By way of preparation, some advance reading (and other materials will be emailed to you):

The primary document to be familiar with is the University PGR Code of Practice Appendix 8: 'Policy on Research Degree Examinations and Examiners'. You can find that on this page:

<https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/aqsd/academic-codes-of-practice/pgr-code-of-practice/>

Research papers which it would be useful for you to read in advance:

Tinkler, P. and Jackson, C. (2000) "Examining the doctorate: Institutional policy and the PhD examination process in the UK", *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(2), pp167-180

Mullins, G. and Kiley, M. (2002) " 'It's a PhD, not a Nobel Prize': how experienced examiners assess research theses", *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(4), pp369-386

Other useful resources:

Tinkler, Penny & Jackson, Carolyn (2004). *The Doctoral Examination Process: A Handbook for Students, Examiners and Supervisors*, Maidenhead: Open University Press/SRHE.

Jackson, Carolyn & Tinkler, Penny (2007). *A Guide for Internal and External Doctoral Examiners*. London: SRHE

Murray, Rowena & Pearce, Lynn (2004). *How to Examine a Thesis*. Buckingham: Open University Press

### **Disciplinary Perspectives on Supervisory Approaches: Experienced PGR Supervisor Showcase**

26/06/2019 14.00 – 16.30

An experienced supervisor from each general subject area in the University's structure will talk about their experience and lessons from it and how they aim to go about supervising, and will form a panel to answer questions you may have about what they do. They are:

Tim Veal (Science & Engineering)

Gundi Kiemle (Health & Life Sciences)

Peter Kahn (Humanities & Social Sciences)

### **Questions of Knowledge and Purpose: the future of doctoral study**

(to be conducted as a tutorial with attention to assignment preparation, scheduled for convenience but soon after the last workshop – e.g. 20 June lunchtime)

Recalling the workshop '**Assessing Doctoral Work**', this discussion raises the questions what constitutes 'original contribution to knowledge' and 'doctorateness?', the practical question being: when is your student ready to submit? Picking up on the end of the previous session, '**PGR Careers and Professional Development: The Supervisor's Role**', it considers, in relation to policy developments and proliferation of types of doctorate, the questions: what sort of knowledge should we be aiming to achieve, what are the doctorate and the research student ultimately for, where did the doctorate come from and where is it going? Useful reading:

Rowland, Stephen (2006) *The Enquiring University: compliance and contestation in higher education* (Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press), chapter 4, "The Skills Agenda", pp45-59

Reeves, Julie, "Getting Beyond Supervision", pp151-162, in Hinchcliffe, Richard, Bromley, Tony & Hutchinson, Steve (eds.) (2007) *Skills training in research degree programmes: Politics and practice*, Maidenhead: Open University Press

- Park, Chris, & Ramos, Marife (2002) "The Donkey in the Department? Insights into the Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) experience in the UK", *Journal of Graduate Education*, 3(2), pp47-53
- Park, Chris (2007) *Redefining the Doctorate*, <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/redefining-doctorate>
- Simpson, Renate (1983). *How the PhD came to Britain: a century of struggle for postgraduate education*. Guildford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education

## Module Assessment

Assessment for this module is by means of a 4,000–5,000 word written assignment, through which participants will reflect critically on their supervisory practice and professional development needs and will address topics in a broader context. This will be carried out in a scholarly manner engaging with the research literature and other resources, and demonstrating achievement of the module learning outcomes. More specifically, the piece will comprise the following components:

- A critically reflective account of their experience as a supervisor, through the current year or recent years, including problems that have arisen. Participants are encouraged to make comment using evidence, such as extracts from a personal log of their experiences.
- A critical discussion of at least one issue of policy or theory of research degree supervision: this may be pertinent to current practice in their department or it may be of a less local and of a more broad intellectual interest.
- An account of learning from both components above as regards how they will act in future, what steps they plan to take for their own ongoing professional development and how they might influence the development of the profession in which they are a participant.

You may order the three components above as three discrete sections or as one integrated piece of essay style prose. It is important that your work as a whole should demonstrate how you **meet each of the module learning outcomes**:

On successful completion of the module, participants will be able to:

- evaluate critically approaches to teaching and supervision at research degree level for underpinning the educational attainment and the professional development of PGRs, in the context of the higher education environment;
- evaluate critically their own practice, and that of their academic community, in providing appropriate support to individual PGRs on academic and pastoral issues, integrated with use of an appropriate range of methods to monitor progress through the research degree programme;
- reflect critically on their own approach, and that of their academic community, to the formal examination of research degree study.

You will need to consult and cite (with full bibliographic details) various sources and literature on the issues which arise. You may supplement this writing if appropriate by additional documentary evidence in appendices, indeed this is encouraged.

You should try to make your submitted work as anonymous as possible but that is not easy for this topic! Your work submitted will not be made available to anyone outside the programme's examiners. You should submit the work via the Turnitin link in the class for this module in VITAL. In order to be returned to the Autumn Board of Examiners, which is the last opportunity, the absolute submission date is 31<sup>st</sup> July 2019 - no extensions are possible, nor re-submission after this date, due to the change in status of the programme. Therefore, please note **the formal submission date for the assignment of this module is 14<sup>th</sup> July 2019**.

## Resources

Introductory and Practical Readings:

The series of Guides in the Society for Research into Higher Education series, *Issues in Postgraduate Education: Management, Teaching and Supervision* is a good place to begin: [http://www.srhe.ac.uk/publications/guides\\_on\\_postgraduate\\_issues.asp](http://www.srhe.ac.uk/publications/guides_on_postgraduate_issues.asp)

Bromley, T. (2009). *Evaluating Training and Development Programmes for Postgraduate and Newer Researchers*. London: SRHE.

Clegg, S. & Alexander, M. (2001). *Delivering Core Training for Research Students over the Web*. London: SRHE

Coe, E. & Keeling, C. (2000). *Setting up Peer-mentoring with Postgraduate Research Students*. London: SRHE

Cryer, Pat (ed.) (1998). *Developing Postgraduates' Key Skills*. London: SRHE

Farrar, Val & Young, Richard (2007). *Supervising Disabled Research Students*. London: SRHE

Fell, Tony & Haines, Ian. (2009). *The Bologna process and beyond: implications for postgraduate education*. London: SRHE

Gough, M. & Denicolo, P. (2007). *Research Supervisors and the Skills Agenda: Learning Needs Analysis and Personal Development Profiling*. London: SRHE.

Jackson, Carolyn & Tinkler, Penny (2007). *A Guide for Internal and External Doctoral Examiners*. London: SRHE

Lee, Anne (2008). *Supervision Teams: Making Them Work*, London: SRHE

Loughlin, Eleanor, Martin, Elena, McComb, Lowry & Taylor, Stan (2010). *Induction for postgraduate research students*. London: SRHE

McCulloch, A. & Stokes, P. (2008). *The Silent Majority: Meeting the Needs of Part-time Research Students*. London: SRHE.

Okorochoa, E. (2007). *Supervising International Research Students* (2nd Ed.). London: SRHE.

Rousseau, Alan & Eley, Adrian (2010). *Capturing Best Practice in Postgraduate Supervision – Taking a Fresh Look*. London: SRHE

Smith, A. & Gilby, J. (1999). *Supervising Students on Industrial-based Projects*. London: SRHE

More substantial books:

- Delamont, S., Atkinson, P., and Parry, O. (2004). *Supervising the PhD: A Guide to Success*. 2nd Ed. Buckingham: Open University Press and Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Eley, A. and Murray, R. (2009). *How to be an Effective Supervisor*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Hinchcliffe, R., Bromley, T. and Hutchinson, S. (eds.) *Skills Training in Research Degree Programmes: Politics and Practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Lee, Anne (2012). *Successful Research Supervision*. London: Routledge.
- Simpson, Renate (1983). *How the PhD came to Britain: a century of struggle for postgraduate education*. Guildford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education
- Simpson, Renate (2009). *The development of the PhD degree in Britain, 1917-1959 and since: an evolutionary and statistical history in higher education*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press
- Taylor, Stan, Kiley, Margaret & Humphrey, Robin (2017). *A Handbook for Doctoral Supervisor* (2nd Ed.). London, Routledge.
- Walker, M. and Thomson, P. (eds.) (2010). *The Routledge Doctoral Supervisor's Companion*. London: Routledge.
- Wisker. G. (2012). *The Good Supervisor* (2nd Ed.). London: Macmillan-Palgrave.

## Further Support

The module convenor is here to support you through the taught sessions and the completion of the assessed assignment and can answer queries you may have. In addition, time will be made available after taught sessions for individual consultations. This will necessarily be informal and on a 'first come – first served' basis. However, should you prefer to arrange a more formal tutorial to deal with any issues relating to the module or the assessment then please do not hesitate to make an appointment.

**In addition, we strongly urge all participants to send an electronic draft of their assignment to the module convenor for feedback prior to final submission** (by the end of June).

This guide should provide most of the information and material you need to complete this part of your programme. If you have any questions about the content of this module, please contact the module convenor, **Martin Gough**: [m.gough@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:m.gough@liverpool.ac.uk), x41486.

Martin is a supervisor on the EdD in Higher Education as well as academic developer at Liverpool specialising in PGR supervisor development. He was a researcher on Education projects at Leeds Metropolitan University, Warwick University, and Birkbeck, Institute of Education and University College London, following a term of office as General Secretary of the National Postgraduate Committee. He was teaching on the equivalent of the PGCert at the University of Kent and at UCL, as well as supervising PhD students on HE topics, and running accredited courses on professional development and on research for applied science postgraduates there.

Before that he taught Philosophy for Leeds, Manchester, Nottingham and the Open University, attaining his PhD in the process. He convenes the Postgraduate Issues Network of the Society for Research into Higher Education, and has directed research projects, including one on supervisor characteristics and one on researcher development (the latter funded by the Centre for Excellence in Preparing for Academic Practice).

Any queries about the wider taught course programme, such as about other modules, and general and non-academic queries, should be directed to **Megan Forbes**, the programme administrator: [theacademy@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:theacademy@liverpool.ac.uk)

Informal enquiries to the PGCert Programme leader, **Dr Sue Bolt**: [suebolt@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:suebolt@liverpool.ac.uk)

Informal enquiries to the PGDip/MA Programme leader, **Dr Charles Buckley**: [charlesb@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:charlesb@liverpool.ac.uk)



## Appendix B: Course evaluations by participants of the opt-in provision, three iterations over three years - summary

### B(i) The EDEV406 module

15 participants have sat the module, as part of the PGCert or PGDip in Learning & Teaching in Higher Education programmes, and 13 successfully completed it by passing the assignment (4 Distinction and 8 Merit grades awarded); a further staff member received credit for the module through RPL.

Participant evaluation questions and responses:

1) How useful for your development has it been to study in concentrated manner the topic of PGR supervision through a dedicated module (as opposed to more general introduction-to-teaching topics) as part of a PGCert programme for new academic staff?

- clearly useful x7

- PGR supervision guidance for new academics is sorely lacking (at least in Physics): overreliance on drawing from your own experience rather than best practice.

- not so useful x1

- I'd rather have chosen a different optional module (I really wanted to do the 'Policy Issues in Higher Education' module) [the preference was not available]

2) How important for your development is it that you engaged in academic assignment writing on top of participating in the workshops?

- important x3

- It helped me engage with and reflect upon the topic in a way I don't think I would if I just had the workshops

- not sure x2

- Caveat to this would be it is useful in that it makes you read the literature more widely, but reading the literature was the useful part rather than the writing.

- not important x3

- I know there has to be some form of assessment, but I am unconvinced that the written assessment added to my development. The workshops were excellent though, if under attended.
- I personally would have preferred focussed discussions based on pre-reading or other activities for all EDEV modules. It was an interesting experience writing extended essays, as it's very different from my day-to-day discipline, but very time consuming for a novice!

On tutor feedback given on the writing, responses volunteered without prompting:

- Thank you for your email and detailed feedback on my coursework. Thanks again for all your help on EDEV 406.
- Many thanks Martin that is by some distance the best email I've had all day!
- Thank you for the speedy feedback, it is both very helpful and gives me some time to make adjustments
- Thanks ever so much for that, that is really useful feedback. I'll definitely use it in editing for the summative deadline.
- Thank you ever so much for the feedback. It must have taken you considerable time to do that and so I am very grateful. I will give it some more thought when I return from fieldwork next week and work on a final version.
- I really appreciate the time you have taken to go through the assignment, and for coming back to me so quickly

3) Which workshop topics did you find most relevant and which less so? What other topics could usefully be presented? Please add any further comments you wish to.

- Most relevant: PGR student wellbeing, Supervisory approaches for a diverse student body, Assessing doctoral work
- I also found the introduction to the module session very useful and Martin Gough a tremendous support. It may have been useful to hear a little more from a clinical academic about the struggles students face in balancing demands of NHS training with a doctorate. The one to one conversation I had with Martin was helpful in this respect though.

[a clinical academic running a different on-campus professional doctorate did present at the 'Experienced Supervisor Showcase' event in Summer 2019]

- The course was very interesting and I enjoyed the sessions and speaking about different people's experiences of doctoral supervision and the strategies they employ to deal with different issues. Compared to other PGCert modules the lack of a peer group doing the same module was unfortunate as from the experience with EDEV402, having that group would have been highly useful and valuable (however, I do realise that was not in our hands) [this was the first iteration, with a sole module registrant]. In terms of the materials covered, it was all very interesting. I would have personally found some quantitative numbers around PhD supervision interesting (numbers of students who start, finish, how long, supervisor numbers etc.), but I like numbers for context and not everyone might find this aspect as interesting.
- Considering the immediate usefulness to practice I found the following ones particularly important:
  - PGR Student Wellbeing: The Academic Environment and the Supervisor's Role - useful (although not necessarily the exact contents and delivery, but the topic certainly was).
  - The Supervisory Relationship: fostering independence in your PGR student – very useful
  - Cross-disciplinary and Personal Perspectives on the PGR Supervisory Relationship – excellent
  - Motivating your PGR Student and What They Want of You – important!

- Regulatory framework introduction was particularly useful as was the one on supervisory approaches/styles.
- The workshops where we directly shared experience and expertise were superb. Sometimes the atmosphere was a little awkward when attendance was really low, but this is a necessary evil I expect. My favourite two were the panel workshop with experienced supervisors, and the 'sharing experience' workshop with group work in 3s [the 'Fostering Independence' workshop]. Both of these were really great, and much more useful/memorable than the educational theory or the doctoral college workshops at the start of the course. Overall, the module ran very well, and I am very pleased to have completed it.
- I felt all of the topics were relevant and well presented. I think there was some repetition between the supervisor intro sessions and 406, do people on 406 have to attend the intro session? Overall it was an interesting and enjoyable experience and I am using some of the things I picked up.

[The 'Introduction' session is the mandatory workshop for all new supervisors: as introductory it introduces topics and themes which, amongst others, are then explored in more appropriate depth in the opt-in workshops, which they cannot be in the broad-ranging general introduction session]

- All of the workshops were relevant to some degree. The one on conflict resolution and active listening was perhaps the least helpful in that while the topic was useful and worthy of coverage, the topic of active listening is a complex one and (with respect, Martin) might have benefitted more from instruction from an outside expert, rather than a member of academic staff who is 'one of us'. The material on mental health was very valuable. Overall I really enjoyed the module and doing the assignment was particularly important as it enabled me to dig deep and really think about my practice. Thanks so much.

[used in the 'Fostering Independence' workshop, the active listening method, according to guidance literature, really needs a longer period of time than was available to fit in to the 90-minute lunchtime workshop schedule, which could then only offer a 'taster']

- I found the showcase of good practice with experienced supervisors very useful. It would have been nice to extend this to discuss the optimal use of the DNA for PGR student training with experienced supervisors in each discipline along with some theory behind the process.
- I enjoyed them all. I think it would have been more productive to be longer sessions which included more topics (so one four-hour session with a break, rather than two two-hour sessions). With the shorter sessions it feels like as soon as you've warmed up it's the end!
- Completely just a personal preference, but it was much easier to schedule one or two full days/mornings for the EDEV401 & 402, rather than multiple lunchtime workshops. I realise, however, that most participants are very busy and there will no doubt be equal numbers of people for whom this makes scheduling far harder!

[the better scheduling principle would be met through integration into a PGCAP module, with proper half-day sessions as a matter of course]

- Thanks again for everything on this module so far. It has been really interesting and also been great to meet some colleagues who I wouldn't otherwise have come across.

### **B(ii) Two-Hour Workshop: Disciplinary Perspectives on Supervisory Approaches: Experienced PGR Supervisor Showcase**

Apart from the 15 module participants, 10 staff have registered for this as a standalone workshop of which 8 attended to participate.

Usefulness of the workshop: 7.50 / 10

Valuable aspects:

Speaker experience, quality, candidness, chance to meet and discuss with them  
diversity of presentations, perspectives and cases considered, incl. OK to allow students to walk away

aid to reflection on practice, identifying common issues and utility of admin processes

Enhancing the workshop:

Could be shorter [but at expense then of less opportunity to ask questions and discuss with experienced colleagues]

More participants should attend [which would mean more discussion time]

More structured discussion [if numbers higher, could invite submissions of questions in writing in advance]

Better gender balance [the 2018 iteration was just male speakers; with just three speakers, and relying on volunteers who are available at the same right time, we cannot guarantee this; but the 2019 iteration did enjoy a male and female mix]

As a result of participating:

There should be a forum for supervisors to share experiences across the University, continuing support for us [the University wide network and scholarly community of enquiry is recommendation 13 of this report].

[as integrated into the PGCert module at the University of Kent run by Martin Gough, participants declared the equivalent of this session to be especially valuable for them]

### **B(iii) 90 minute Workshop: Cross-disciplinary and Personal Perspectives on the PGR Supervisory Relationship**

Apart from the 15 module participants, 18 staff have registered for this as a standalone workshop of which 13 attended to participate. Martin Gough also delivered a version at the XJTLU campus during his Oct.2018 visit (7 registered, 4 attended).

Usefulness of the workshop: 7.47 / 10

Valuable aspects:

The content, of two topics, on different supervisory approaches (which are not just culturally defined) and on trust & agency

Viewing the supervisory relationship in a new light

Theoretical flavour and breadth of analysis

Reading material

Recognising effects of own behaviours on students, the mismatch of respective expectations

Multidisciplinary group of new supervisor participants to discuss with

Workshopping the scenarios

Enhancing the workshop:

More reading material

More workshop activity and discussion time, tighter schedule [this workshop has comprised two separate topics and speakers, so two smaller workshops effectively, squeezing time for each topic; evaluation returns reveal that some liked one half more than the other and vice-versa so they would work better as separate and each longer, particularly as the presenters' thoughts have been developing]

Opportunity to explore in discussion how external factors bear upon trust in the relationship

The gender dimension [Anne Lee's reading does touch on this already]

More on institutional expectations on supervisors [other workshops look at this]

Relationship with co-supervisor(s)

More by way of practical strategies to take away and constructive strategies in response to the scenarios; conflict management with breakdown of trust

More real stories

Handouts to write notes on in the workshop [normal practice has been to circulate documents like slide shows, if not circulated in advance as preparation material, then after the event, but it does and can vary]

As a result of participating:

Think about how I can re-balance my supervisory approach and build/maintain trust

Apart from the certification, what does the student hope to achieve?

Organise and attend a follow-up workshop for these participants to assess how our styles may have altered [a job for the University wide supervisor network]

Aim to incorporate these topics in to PGR student induction

#### **B(iv) 90 minute Workshop: Motivating your PGR Student and What They Want of You**

Apart from the 15 module participants, 28 staff have registered for this as a standalone workshop of which 18 attended to participate. Martin Gough also delivered a version at the XJTLU campus during his Oct.2018 visit (7 registered, 4 attended).

Usefulness of the workshop: 7.45 / 10

Valuable aspects:

Reading material and theory

Research on students' view of supervisor characteristics, variety of their expectations, aspirations and experiences

Nuances on motivation  
 Cross-disciplinary perspective  
 Sharing experiences, purposive discussion with colleagues, including on practicalities  
 Reflection on my roles and responsibilities as supervisor  
 Hints and tips  
 Importance of induction and University resources  
 Students should not be rushed through their PhD  
 The presenter is approachable

Volunteered by email from XJTLU, on B(iii) and B(iv) combined:

“Thanks a lot for sending the slides to us. And thank you very much for the useful workshops you delivered while in Suzhou. I really learned a lot.”

“Thanks!”

Enhancing the workshop:

more fine-grained research results

More follow-up research on this topic [it is hard to maintain research momentum without a job contract which provides resources for research, but it should happen more]

More reading

Case studies (...at this University)

How to manage different types of student

Survey at this University [PRES?]

Strategies and techniques to assist students losing motivation [the discussion of research exhausted the time available, additional practical dimension would round this session out more]

Clearer learning objective and ‘take-home messages’

Would Arts/Soc.Sci and Science issues be better considered separately?

As a result of participating:

Seek out support (e.g. ‘soft’ skills) available for students

Reflect on practice in more informed way, review my methods and relationship with students, re-evaluate my level and nature of support

Idea for input into my assignment

### **B(v) 90 minute Workshop: The Supervisory Relationship: fostering independence in your PGR student**

Apart from the 15 module participants, 25 staff have registered for this as a standalone workshop of which 16 attended to participate.

Usefulness of the workshop: 8.28 / 10

Valuable aspects:

Discussion with colleagues

Reflection on my approach to enhance it

Chance to explain my real issue, and listen to others’ problems better, learning from their situation

Chance to practice being supportive colleague

Getting support on my issue, generated action points  
 Practical character of the workshop, process consultancy  
 Not lecture-like  
 Multidisciplinary structure, facilitating good teamwork  
 Action learning as methodology  
 Volunteered by email:

“Thank you Martin, the session was really useful today.”

“these sessions are incredibly helpful”

“Many thanks for this and a very useful session this lunchtime.”

Enhancing the workshop:

Emphasis away from Action learning Set methodology, more on supervisory experience  
 More instruction what to do, feedback from workshop facilitator, not just from others in the AL set [N.B. if more than one set operating, facilitator cannot pay attention to discussions in full]

More consideration of solutions to our problems as well, techniques to tackle them [N.B. no prior knowledge of what the participants' problems would be]

More leadership by facilitator [this may be about keeping the sets to time, but time-keeping is one of the set member roles]

More theory discussion, more readings on this

A longer duration for the workshop

As a result of participating:

Can reflect more on my problematic issue

Be more flexible in my supervision

Be more student-led, hold back from quickly offering advice such as solutions to research problems, allow student time to explore

Come to more of Martin's workshops, participating in a proper course is a good idea

Encourage support group for supervisors [c.f. recommendation 13 of this report]

Return at a later date to find out if have made progress with own problem [facilitated in the University network?]

### **B(vi) 90 minute Workshop: PGR Careers and Professional Development: The Supervisor's Role**

Apart from the 15 module participants, 19 staff have registered for this as a standalone workshop of which 12 attended to participate.

Usefulness of the workshop: 8.43 / 10

Valuable aspects:

The practicality and relevance

introduction to LDC PGR Development resources

introduction to VITAE resources, RDF

latest on giving careers advice to PGRs, e.g. placements

Sharing perspectives with colleagues

Enhancing the workshop:

More supervisors should attend  
 More on engaging with DNA

I still don't think that either many supervisors or indeed most PGR students see the importance of this 'extra' training. Many see it as an inconvenience or a sideshow to the main project and the pressures of delivering their thesis, publications etc. I am not sure how to do this other than better embedding the TNA from both sides, which again at the moment I suspect is often seen as a bit of a box-ticking exercise.

As a result of participating:

A conversation (encouraging) with student, how best to engage with LDC resource, their career

Will look closely at RDF

Better local information network and comms for students and supervisors

### **B(vii) 90 minute Workshop: Supervisory Approaches for a Diverse PGR Student Body**

Apart from the 15 module participants, 16 staff have registered for this as a standalone workshop of which 8 attended to participate.

Usefulness of the workshop: 8.89 / 10

Valuable aspects:

account of legal dimension and general understanding of the issue, institution's depts' purposes

Specific strategies, different ways, for acting, e.g. reasonable adjustments, being flexible to accommodate diversity of student needs, different ways to communicate with student

Consideration of international students

Practical experience of using video for feedback

The suggested further reading

A space to aid reflection on issues

Group discussion, sharing stories and ideas

Quality of facilitation of the workshop, and different facilitators

Enhancing the workshop:

Longer, to consider case studies of tricky situations

More University of Liverpool examples and resources

As a result of participating:

Interact with student on a more 'social' level

Re-think approach to being inclusive

Consider how to incorporate into induction

Get feedback on my next approach

### **B(viii) 90 minute Workshop: PGR Student Wellbeing: The Academic Environment and the Supervisor's Role**



Apart from the 15 module participants, 19 staff have registered for this as a standalone workshop of which 11 attended to participate.

Usefulness of the workshop: 8.92 / 10

Valuable aspects:

Really interesting topic, research-informed, how aspects of doctoral research link to mental health issues

Informative and thought-provoking talk

Introduced to 'impostor syndrome' and stats on mental health issue, along with honesty about unknowns

Reminder of importance of checking on student's health, raising discussion with them, consider what I do already

Overview of resources, for students and staff, where to go, how to spot problems as well as tackling them practically

Further reading

Excellent speaker (informal style) and slides

Discussion with colleagues

Enhancing the workshop:

Concrete courses of action in specific (e.g. serious) circumstances

Someone (student or staff) to stand up and tell their own relevant story

More on legal responsibility dimension

More research on this to review

More preparatory reading for workshop

As a result of participating:

Check on my students

Get on to Mental Health First Aid training

Collate my own store of resources, nudge my own DPR, review what available in my Dept Research this issue myself

There should be a more definite locus for resources within University, what do other Depts provide? - greater institution-wide consideration of issue [Supervisor community of scholarly practice as vehicle?]

There should be action on this issue on a wider scale

[Note: Dr Tom Price of the Institute for Integrative Biology will be chuffed that this workshop gets a mean average usefulness score from participants higher than any other workshop, since he has led this one throughout on all three occasions! He has a leading role in the Research England and the Office for Students (formerly HEFCE) funded 'Catalyst Project', "Studying towards a happy and healthy PhD":

<https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/integrative-biology/postgraduate-study/happy-and-healthy-phd/>

(which Martin Gough, and also Matt Davis from LOSADA, have contributed to in an advisory capacity). With Martin Gough's separate workshop prepared for the UKCGE conference, "Supporting the Mental Health and Wellbeing of PG Students" (Foresight Centre, University of Liverpool, 6th March 2017), too, there will be plenty of additional resources available to expand this topic in future development provision. The 'Mental Health First Aid training' should, however, be treated as separate.

## Appendix C: Course evaluations of the mandatory workshop: Assessing Doctoral Work (induction for Internal Examiners) (since April 2017)

10/04/2017

13 staff registered for this workshop of which 9 attended to participate

21/06/2017

31 staff registered for this workshop of which 29 attended to participate

25/10/2017

30 staff registered for this workshop of which 28 attended to participate

17/01/2018

27 staff registered for this workshop of which 22 attended to participate

20/06/2018

53 staff registered for this workshop of which 38 attended to participate

18/10/2018, at XJTLU campus

62 staff registered for this workshop of which 38 attended to participate

24/10/2018

25 staff registered for this workshop of which 20 attended to participate

16/01/2019

26 staff registered for this workshop of which 20 attended to participate

13/03/2019

21 staff registered for this workshop of which 18 attended to participate

19/06/2019

24 staff registered for this workshop of which 18 attended to participate

11/09/2019

24 staff registered for this workshop of which 21 attended to participate

Feedback score on usefulness of the workshop: 7.89 / 10

Valuable aspects:

Practical dimension, purposes of aspects in the process

Code of Practice referred to

Examiner roles and responsibilities

Introduction and explanation of rules for PhD assessment, explanation of where these rules come from and why they are (or aren't!) effective

Viva questions

Case studies

Discussion of how to handle differences of opinion between internal and external examiner

Discussion on The Judgement, originality, standards, including the philosophical dimensions; good guidance on what filters into 'significant contribution', 'quality', etc.

Highlighting differences between countries and institutions  
 Useful tangential topics that will help with PGR supervision and guidance  
 Recommended reading and other resources  
 Good approach by facilitator, fostering understanding with engagement and discussion,  
 just right, good slides  
 Refreshed my understanding well  
 Enjoyable

Volunteered by email:

"thank you very much for yesterday's workshop. Very helpful and loads of things to consider when examining."

"I found the workshop very useful."

"Thank you for the very useful workshop and the uploaded support material."

"Thanks Martin. Enjoyed the session and appreciate the support."

"Thanks Martin for the workshop. It was very informative."

"Session yesterday afternoon was really helpful and very informative. Also, thanks for all the reading material."

"Thanks for the workshop. It was indeed quite useful. Thanks for the slides and reading materials."

"Thanks for these attachments and for running the workshop yesterday which was very useful."

For the distance learning version:

"Thank you very much for the very informative feedback."

"Many thanks for the feedback."

Enhancing the workshop:

More interactive group discussion

More cases of examiner conflict and controversy [since this is not all that common in reality, there is probably enough of this in the workshop, to alert prospective examiners of the possibility]

More Viva questions

More on policy and best practice

Need to make clearer whether issue was policy at UoL or a more general matter.

More on the proformas, more on the mechanics of the viva overall, who to talk to in my dept

Incorporate video resources

Prefer slightly shorter workshop

As a result of participating:

Learn more about others' experiences examining

More workshop activity looking at theses themselves, what are the 'right' qualities?

## Appendix D: Course evaluations of the mandatory workshop: Introduction to Supervising PGRs and the regulatory framework (since April 2017)

03/05/2017

19 staff registered for this workshop of which 16 attended to participate

27/06/2017

26 staff registered for this workshop of which 20 attended to participate

13/12/2017

33 staff registered for this workshop of which 27 attended to participate

14/02/2018

27 staff registered for this workshop of which 25 attended to participate

10/05/2018 (also a Masterclass, led by Prof. Pam Denicolo)

12 staff registered for this workshop of which 11 attended to participate

26/06/2018

49 staff registered for this workshop of which 40 attended to participate

12/12/2018

29 staff registered for this workshop of which 23 attended to participate

06/03/2019

36 staff registered for this workshop of which 29 attended to participate

25/06/2019

27 staff registered for this workshop of which 20 attended to participate

11/09/2019

22 staff registered for this workshop of which 17 attended to participate

Feedback score on usefulness of the workshop: 6.73 / 10

On the evaluation form returns:

Some found the case studies engaging, others did not like the small group discussion format to engage them.

A number stated they wanted to concentrate on the procedures and rules, while some regarded the workshop as 'dry' already, and there is a suggestion of completing this by 'online' means: certainly getting supervisors just to read the Code of Practice can be done over the web on their own (and they are asked to do that after the workshop); those interested in learning the salient aspects of the pedagogy are best served by the F2F group discussion environment, which is not the best place for just trawling through rule after rule.

A common comment (especially from those who declared they were experienced, many of whom also gave a low usefulness score) was that the workshop is very general and they would like to focus on some things (and not other things) in greater depth. This introductory workshop is the general introduction, and was too introductory for these

experienced supervisors. But by the same token this is, according to the feedback overall, serving the needs of the majority of participants, who are presumed to be relative novices, and the opt-in workshops are available to serve the other demands.

Volunteered by email:

“Many thanks Martin. I enjoyed the session.”

“Many thanks for the seminar yesterday - The below materials most welcome”

“That is really helpful, many thanks Martin!”

“I attended your excellent PGR supervision training in December 2017.”

“Thank you for your workshop, I found it useful and enjoyable.”

“Great session Martin. Really useful topics for us to consider. Will try to sign up for a few more.”

“thanks a lot for a great session today. Very informative and lively.”

The first time Martin Gough led this workshop (28 Oct.2015), he was peer observed, feedback:

The workshop was introduced very well with a clear plan, relevancy, content, resources and scope outlined.

Very clear who the session was for, range of participants, which set a strong context for the rest of the workshop.

The introductory case study appeared to be a very effective approach to engaging the room very quickly in discussions around the key topics and issues. Participants on each table all seemed to be clear about the requirements and purpose of the task – the presenter was accessible and quickly dealt with queries and questions to enable quick participation in the task. One observation from this initial task was concerning the specific appropriateness of the scenario used as this could be perceived as negative and extreme at first inspection, but as the workshop progressed it did lead to more detailed subsequent issues and debates.

Participants engaged quickly with workshop activities and discussion topics. No participants seemed to dominate the open whole group discussions, and there was a lot of input from a range of participants at different points.

The workshop was well paced – good balance between table discussions and activities, open discussions and content input from the presenter.

The workshop is built around a series of case study/ scenarios that seemed a very effective teaching strategy.

The discursive and case example structure to the workshop, enhanced with experiences from the participants and David as a director of research study, created a rich learning experience that supports participants to self-assess and reflect on their learning throughout the workshop.

Small issue of images as a background behind presentation slides – this can be difficult to read the text particularly for dyslexic participants. Some slides seemed text heavy – this could have been given out in some form of supporting document. Resources available on PGR teams’ website could have been demonstrated earlier in the workshop.

Overall I had the sense that this was a well-run and well-thought out workshop developed from the experiences of the presenters.

What was particularly effective about the workshop was the inclusion of David Joss from Physics as he was able to add, at appropriate points in the workshop, his experiences as director of research study and as a research supervisor – added a strong authentic component to the workshop is a good practice that could be developed more in other workshops potentially.

Facilitator response - Strengths:

Sufficient number of students engaged to generate the right sort of discussion, even if some were relatively reticent in plenary – but most got involved in the sub-group activity discussions.

Structure explicit with topic headings; also indicated where more active participation required vs sections more of information to convey to participants. The session does not try to present a singular answer to the question how to supervise and is meant to be a bit of list of (important) things.

Operating with the ‘side-kick’ model of team teaching is important: David Joss had the knowledge of supervisory experience in Sciences (mine being in Humanities & Social Sciences) and institutional knowledge of the bureaucracy behind supervision at Liverpool (so the no-show from the PGR Student Team was less important).

Success of session corroborated by informal feedback from some participants.

Facilitator response – Areas for further consideration/development:

- 1<sup>st</sup> case study: Is it a bit of heavy and also highly particular narrative to put to students so early in the session?

Well, it does relate to the eternal triangle, and research study notable for its problematic stories, Richard H’s view is that happy stories don’t have the right impact, don’t facilitate learning points so well

- images and text layout on slides, something to take care about?

Good observation for my own slides design – what I did do was make the slides background coloured, better for other dyslexic condition

We need to be more modest about what I / the presenter can effectively squeeze in to three hours: two-thirds of the slide show did not get shown and a number of slides sped through before the end (I take this as a sign that the earlier topics and activities captured points particularly worthy of more in-depth discussion). The amount of material would be better spread over two sessions (at least two hours each). At the same time, introducing these topics constitutes the ‘tip of the iceberg’ of wisdom of supervisory practice. This field of practice deserves more advanced instruction/guidance as a development pathway for participants, and Richard Hinchcliffe has developed some provision outside of the structure of the award-bearing programmes, but there may well be enough for a new module on the PGCert, which may have a need for more options (but, like this session, with classes open to others not registered on the credit-bearing programme). If that gets a go-ahead then the more esoteric more theoretical elements tabled for this session could be taken out and have a proper exploration elsewhere, leaving a manageable amount of purely introductory pedagogical and institutional processes material for this session. David Joss is in agreement with this general picture and plan. If I run this session again this year then I’ll consider showing less of the information oriented slides, focus attention on the pedagogical aspects, but can include the information slides in the file circulated afterwards.

From the programme director, on the shorter and adapted version of the workshop, for ‘Teaching for Researchers’: “Thank you for delivering an informative and interesting workshop yesterday. I know the students really appreciated the hands-on approach to the case studies.”

From one of the programme participants: “Thank you for the inspiring session. I found it very helpful. At the beginning, I felt it ‘challenging’ to start with the analysis of the case studies (as I was not sure how to address the task, and it was new), but by the time the lecture finished, I realised that it was a great approach to make us learning both the theory as well as helping us with our assessment task (the more I read Biggs... the more I understand!).”

**Appendix E: Additional themes to discuss or learn about in another workshop or resource**

Often participants providing feedback on a workshop on what else they would like to see entered a theme already covered in one of the other existing workshops. Additional suggestions were:

Team supervisory practice, Business Studies insights

Communication skills for supervisors

Proper training course on PGR student mental health, 'First Aid' and more

## Appendix F: Epigeum Business Case

### Joining an Epigeum Development Group *Supervising Doctoral Studies, Second Edition* Business Case for the **University of Liverpool**

Epigeum, part of Oxford University Press, is preparing to develop a new edition of its online training programme *Supervising Doctoral Studies*, which was originally published in 2014. Your institution has been invited to collaborate in the development of this new edition.

*Supervising Doctoral Studies* will be developed in collaboration with universities from around the world, as well as an international team of expert authors, reviewers, and advisors, with the support of our in-house production and editorial teams.

### Epigeum Collaborative Model

*Supervising Doctoral Studies* will be developed using Epigeum's unique collaborative model – drawing on the expertise and experience of partner institutions, reviewers, advisors, and authors to ensure the quality and relevance of the finished product.

By joining this collaboration, your institution will have the opportunity to share best practice with peers and experts in the field, and have significant input into the planning and development of the programme – through an ongoing review process and two-day workshop – to ensure that it truly reflects the needs of your doctoral supervisors and candidates, and meets your institutional requirements, upon publication (Dec 2020).

As a member of the development group, your institution will receive a campus-wide, unlimited subscription to the resource upon publication – giving you access to high-quality, interactive content at a speed and level of investment that would rarely be achievable when working alone. We will also provide ongoing technical and implementation support.

### Time Commitment:

We acknowledge that time is precious, so we ensure your input is kept manageable but valuable. We invite you to:

- Agree a detailed content outline
- Participate in a two-day development workshop (Dec 2019)
- Review programme materials as they are worked into modules
- Arrange for students and staff from your institution to appear in course videos



## ***Supervising Doctoral Studies, Second Edition***

The second edition of *Supervising Doctoral Studies* will provide flexible, comprehensive training to equip both new and more experienced research supervisors with the knowledge, skills, and understanding that are vital to effectively supporting doctoral candidates' development into independent researchers – using video interviews, case studies, and scenario-based activities to highlight best practice across all major disciplines.

The programme will address new and emerging developments in doctoral supervision, including the widespread adoption of structured training programmes, the increasing diversity of the student population, and the challenges relating to mental health and wellbeing that can be experienced by candidates, to ensure that supervisors are aware of the wider context and purpose of their work, and are able to navigate both academic and non-academic responsibilities with confidence.

### **Programme Audience:**

- New and aspiring doctoral supervisors
- Experienced doctoral supervisors requiring a refresher
- Doctoral Studies administrators

### **Advisory Board:**

The programme will be developed under the guidance of an expert Advisory Board:

- **Dr Douglas Halliday**, Director of the Multidisciplinary Centre for Doctoral Training in Energy at Durham University
- **Dr Margaret Kiley**, Adjunct in the Research School of Humanities and the Arts, Australian National University
- **Dr Stan Taylor**, Honorary Fellow of the School of Education at Durham University

### **Proposed Structure:**

The new edition of *Supervising Doctoral Studies* will adopt a modular structure – allowing learners to work through the programme in its entirety or select modules according to their unique development needs, using a self-diagnostic tool.

Modules include:

- Introduction: The Doctoral Context
- Attracting and Selecting Doctoral Applicants
- The Research Culture and Environment
- Managing Expectations, Responsibilities and Relationships
- Planning, Conducting and Communicating Research
- Developing the Researcher and Enabling Progress
- Academic Writing and Delivering Effective Feedback

- Supporting Your Candidate
- Preparing for Completion and Examination
- Developing Your Supervisory Practice

## Logistics

We plan to hold a 2-day development workshop in London on 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> December 2019. It is expected that one or more representatives from your institution are present at the workshop, to feed into discussion on the shape and scope of the programme, but it is not mandatory, and all travel, accommodation and meals will be at the expense of your university.

## Pricing

To join this collaboration and contribute to the development of a new edition of *Supervising Doctoral Studies*, the investment cost for the University of Liverpool is **£29,950 + VAT**. This entitles your institution to campus-wide, unlimited use of the programme once published, with full technical support for five years, including any updates in this period. The cost of a subscription for non-collaborating universities of your size would be approximately £14,614 + VAT per year\* – making this a considerable long-term saving.

\*Based on an approximate student FTE of 26,000 (data taken from [HESA](#) web site) and current subscription prices to existing version of *Supervising Doctoral Studies*. New edition prices may vary.

## Next Steps

For further details and to reserve a place in this development group, please contact:

Alan Stafford

Director of Academic Partnerships

[Alan.Stafford@oup.com](mailto:Alan.Stafford@oup.com)

07766246875