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A very warm welcome to ICPD-3 in Florence. Since establishing the ICPD series in London in 2009, we have been most encouraged by the positive response from colleagues involved in Professional and Practice-based Doctorates throughout the world. ICPD-3 follows on from the second Conference held in Edinburgh at Easter in 2011, responding to the continuing interest in current developments in the Professional Doctorate expressed particularly by academic colleagues, employers, potential graduate students who are often engaged in full-time work and a wide range of other stakeholders, especially in Europe, North America, Australia and the UK.

Building on the achievements of earlier events, the Florence Conference will cover many facets of the Professional and Practice-based Doctorate – the scope includes accreditation and standards, community practice and employer-led developments, philosophical and educational aspects – and will explore international perspectives on the contribution made by Professional Doctorates in the workplace. There will be a particular focus on the contribution to high-level training and research experience in partnership with employers of all kinds, as a key factor in strengthening and extending debates about the knowledge economy.

The conference addresses the distinct and overlapping purposes of Professional Doctorates, which often require significant immersion in professional activity, reflecting the networked society and engagement with employers and other stakeholders. They produce new kinds of doctoral level practitioners who engage with practice-oriented knowledge, creating valued purposes and products relating to professional work. The issues for Professional Doctorates are of concern because of their application to professional creativity and purposes that are not manifest in the more conventional approaches to doctorates. Much of the debate about the value of different doctoral models centres on the value of the knowledge produced – and in particular the function of doctorates in licensing graduates as researchers. ICPD-3 also addresses the implications for universities in terms of the need for change in structures and in assumptions that better meet the needs of innovative doctoral programmes.
The ICPD series is a collaborative venture between Middlesex University and the UK Council for Graduate Education, with active contributions by the Special Interest Group (SIG) for Professional and Practice-focused Doctoral Research. SIG was founded during the first ICPD and enjoys an expanding international membership of active practitioners. The Florence programme is based around presentation and discussion of short papers on topics covering the scope noted above, supported by Workshops giving an in-depth review of specific areas for extended discussion and creative responses. Round-Table Discussions, an innovation introduced in Edinburgh to facilitate discussion in small, mixed groups, have been extended to offer two sessions for every topic – giving delegates as much choice of topics as possible for engaging in small-group discussion. The Poster Sessions will include short presentations by Authors to groups around their poster, to stimulate discussion with participants in a relaxed, informal atmosphere. The broad spread of experience and perspectives represented by delegates at the Florence Conference should form an excellent basis for information exchange and networking across the traditional disciplinary and professional boundaries.

Delegates will have an opportunity to visit il Castello del Trebbio in the hills of Tuscany, a short drive from Florence, where a tour of the wine cellars and the historical rooms of the medieval Castle (1184) concludes with an opportunity to taste the local wines. This will be followed by the Conference Dinner with a traditional Florentine menu in the prize-winning Castello restaurant – with more local wines. As winner of several awards for the “Great Wine Capitals of Italy”, il Castello del Trebbio offers all delegates a real Florentine experience.

We trust that your visit to Florence will be rewarding and truly enjoyable – and that you will find ICPD-3 to be stimulating, informative and a great networking opportunity with colleagues from throughout the world.

Professor Carol Costley, Chair, ICPD Organising Committee
Professor Tony Fell, Deputy Chair, ICPD Organising Committee
### Conference Programme

#### Pre-Conference Drinks Reception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.30pm</td>
<td>Bus collects from Florence Centre to EUI *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00pm</td>
<td>Pre-Conference Drinks Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30pm</td>
<td>Bus Returns to Florence *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Conference Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30am</td>
<td>Bus collects from Florence Centre *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00am</td>
<td>Registration with Refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.40am</td>
<td>Welcome &amp; Introduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.00am | Plenary 1  
The impact of international trends in doctoral education – page 20  
Dr Thomas Jørgensen, European University Association, Brussels, Belgium |
| 10.40am | Refreshments                                                          |
| 11.00am | Paper Presentations  
Session 1 (See page 6)                                               |
| 12.40pm | Lunch  
Including at 1:30pm Presented Posters – Session i (See page 12)     |
| 2.00pm  | Workshops & Round Table Discussions  
Workshops – Session A (See page 9)  
Round Table Discussions – Session X (See page 10) |
| 3.00pm  | Refreshments                                                          |
| 3.20pm  | Workshops & Round Table Discussions  
Workshops – Session B (See page 9)  
Round Table Discussions – Session Y (See page 10) |
| 4.40pm  | Close - Bus Returns to Florence *                                    |

#### Conference Dinner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.10pm</td>
<td>Bus collects from Florence Centre to Castello del Trebbio *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00pm</td>
<td>Tours of Castello del Trebbio &amp; wine tasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30pm</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15pm</td>
<td>Bus Returns to Florence *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note that Bus timings are provisional.  
For the most up-to-date schedule please refer to the timetable in your delegate packs.
# Conference Day 2

**Tuesday 3rd April**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30am</td>
<td>Bus collects from Florence Centre *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00am</td>
<td>Day 2 Registration with Refreshments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09.15am | Plenary 2 Doctoral pathways to developing researchers for industry and the professions – page 21  
*Professor Terry Evans & Professor Chris Hickey, Deakin University, Australia*  
*Professor Peter Macauley & Dr Robyn Barnacle, RMIT University, Australia*  
*Presented by Terry Evans and Pater Macauley* |
| 09.55am | Paper Presentations Session 2 (See page 7)                            |
| 10.00am | Refreshments                                                           |
| 11.20am | Paper Presentations Session 3 (See page 8)                            |
| 12.25pm | Lunch Including at 1:15pm Presented Posters – Session ii (See page 12) |
| 1.45pm  | Workshops & Round Table Discussions  
*Workshops – Session C (See page 9)*  
*Round Table Discussions – Session Z (See page 11)* |
| 2.45pm  | Plenary 3 Review of ICPD-3 Outcomes  
*Pauline Armsby, Westminster University, UK*  
*Carol Costley, Middlesex University, UK*  
*Tony Fell, University of Bradford, UK* |
| 3.30pm  | Closing Remarks – Introducing ICPD-4                                 |
| 3.35pm  | Close & Refreshments                                                  |
| 3.45pm  | Bus Returns to Florence *                                             |

* Please note that Bus timings are provisional.  
For the most up-to-date schedule please refer to the timetable in your delegate packs.
**Session 1**

**Monday 2nd April – 11.00am – 12.40pm**

## Paper Presentations

### 11.00am – 11.30am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The accreditation of prior learning in professional doctorate curricula</td>
<td>Pauline Armsby, <em>Westminster Exchange, University of Westminster, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Working on the boundary between professions and the academy: The future of professional doctorates</td>
<td>Robert Ashford &amp; Steven McCabe, <em>Birmingham City University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Carson &amp; Nicola J Lloyd-Jones, <em>Glyndwr University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Reflecting on Reflexivity; a complexity inspired approach to research</td>
<td>Janet Kirkham, Yassaman Imani &amp; Moira Calveley, <em>University of Hertfordshire, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>In assessing professional doctorates should what is deemed useful also be morally and ethically 'good'?</td>
<td>Simon du Ploc, <em>Metanoia Institute, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The Internationalisation of the Professional Doctorate: Global Solutions to Local Problems?</td>
<td>Christopher Hill, <em>University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11.35am – 12.05pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>To what extent do postgraduate students understand the principles of mixed methods in educational research?</td>
<td>David Plowright, <em>University of Hull, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The EngD – Perspectives on 20 Years’ Experience at Warwick and Manchester</td>
<td>Tina Barnes, <em>University of Warwick, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Stanley, <em>University of Manchester, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Group supervision within an alternative path for qualifying university teachers at a doctoral level</td>
<td>Gerd Bjerke, <em>Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geir Sverre Braut, <em>Stord/Haugesund University College, Norway</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Professional doctorates: the Presentation of Educational Self</td>
<td>Sue Dyson, <em>De Montfort University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Maitland, <em>University of Westminster, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick Pratt, <em>Plymouth University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Negotiating 'Doctorateness' in Practice-Related Design Disciplines Some Notes from a Scandinavian Perspective of Research Education</td>
<td>Fredrik Nilsson, <em>Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Halina Dunin-Woyseth, *Oslo School of Architecture and Design / Telemark University College, Norway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12.10pm – 12.40pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Quality Assurance of International online Professional Doctorates: Case Study of on-line DBA and EdD</td>
<td>Pascale Hardy, <em>Laureate Online Education, Switzerland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clare Pickles, <em>Laureate Online Education &amp; University of Liverpool, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Doctoral research training and university-industry collaborative relationship</td>
<td>Fumi Kitagawa, <em>University of Manchester, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Charting Future Pathways to the Psychiatric Mental Health DNP in the United States</td>
<td>Bobbie Posmontier, <em>Drexel University, USA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>A doctorate for a professional triadic knowledge nexus?</td>
<td>Harald Jarning, <em>Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus, Norway</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Assurance of doctoral learning through interim and end goal assessments: implementing AACSB International guidelines within the professional doctorate</td>
<td>Sandra Corlett, <em>Northumbria University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Paper Presentations

**Tuesday 3rd April – 09.55am – 11.00am**

## 09.55am – 10.25am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors and Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Integrating Theory and Practice in a Fine Art Doctorate</td>
<td>Karen Raney, University of East London, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>A Heidegger/Wittgenstein Perspective on Work Based Practice</td>
<td>Dr Kevin Flint, Nottingham Trent University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The Professional Doctorate and Business Intelligence: How Academic Thinking can open up new business opportunities</td>
<td>Dr Peter Critten, Middlesex University, UK, Dr Philip Squire, Consalia Ltd, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 10.30am – 11.00am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors and Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Leadership Commitment to Change: Development and Research for Alignment With the Carnegie Initiative on the Education Doctorate (CPED) Principles</td>
<td>Dr Rosemarye Taylor, University of Central Florida, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Professional doctorates and knowledge transfer skills; from stony ground to influencing organisation change</td>
<td>Professor Hilary Burgess, University of Leicester, UK, Dr Gordon Weller, Middlesex University, UK, Professor Jerry Wellington, University of Sheffield, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Practice as we-agency, skills as I-agency. The importance for doctorate studies</td>
<td>Professor Paul Gibbs, Middlesex University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Becoming a practitioner-researcher: negotiating identities and practices</td>
<td>Lois Meyer &amp; Jan Ritchie, University of New South Wales, Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session 3

**Tuesday 3rd April – 11.20am – 12.25pm**

**11.20am – 11.50am**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td><strong>Ensuring Quality: The Key to successful Doctoral completion</strong></td>
<td>Francia Kinchington</td>
<td>University of Greenwich, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td><strong>Transdisciplinarity and professional doctorates: facilitating metanoia between candidates and advisers</strong></td>
<td>Dr Kate Maguire</td>
<td>Middlesex University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td><strong>Writing for Professional Doctorates</strong></td>
<td>Dr Daniel Soule</td>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td><strong>The promises and challenges of an “extended epistemology” in Doctoral Research for organisational practitioners</strong></td>
<td>Dr Kathleen King &amp; Gill Coleman</td>
<td>Ashridge Consulting, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11.55am – 12.25pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td><strong>A comparison of partnership models – maintaining quality as professional doctorate candidates are prepared for independent research</strong></td>
<td>Dr Amanda Maddocks</td>
<td>Concordia University Chicago, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td><strong>The practice research imagination</strong></td>
<td>Dr Kathleen Stoddart &amp; Dr Carol Bugge</td>
<td>University of Stirling, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td><strong>Supervising and supporting doctoral candidates in art universities</strong></td>
<td>Kirsi Rinne</td>
<td>Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Finland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session A

**Monday 2nd April – 2.00pm – 3.00pm**

See also Round Table Discussion Session X – page 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>A Framework Toward Global Standards for the Professional Doctorate in Nursing: A Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr H. Michael Dreher, <em>Drexel University, USA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Kathleen M. Stoddart, <em>University of Stirling, Scotland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Gerard Fealy, <em>University College Dublin, Ireland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Martin McNamara, <em>University College Dublin, Ireland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Carol Bugge, <em>University of Stirling, Scotland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Regina M. Cusson, <em>University of Connecticut, USA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Design and delivery of research supervisor training for Professional Doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Tony Fell, <em>University of Bradford, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Annette Fillery-Travis, <em>Middlesex University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gill Clarke, <em>University of Oxford, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Hidden Voices: Exploring personal and professional transformation through video narratives of Professional Doctorate candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Gail Sanders, Judith Kuit, Peter Smith &amp; John Fulton, <em>University of Sunderland, UK</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session B

**Monday 2nd April – 3.20pm – 4.20pm**

See also Round Table Discussion Session Y – page 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Implementing strategies for the convergence of professional and doctoral projects through immediate international brainstorming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwladys Jean-Joseph, <em>EuroDoc'Agro Platform, France</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Nadia Haddad, <em>ENVA, France</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Muriel Mambrini-Doudet, <em>INRA, France</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice François, <em>AgroParisTech, France</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Developing and sustaining effective doctoral programme leadership: building a doctoral learning culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Val Poultney, <em>University of Derby, UK</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session C

**Tuesday 3rd April – 1.45pm – 2.45pm**

See also Round Table Discussion Session Z – page 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>How art and design practitioners frame their research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Tom Fisher, Professor Judith Mottram &amp; Dr Kevin Flint, <em>Nottingham Trent University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>A Non-modular Approach to Stage 1 of a Professional Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian Frame, <em>Anglia Ruskin University, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reflections on recognition and accreditation of learning towards a professional doctorate programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Acknowledging the academic status of leaders of business who have been awarded a professional doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Embodied Cognition – the developing of Professional Doctorates as a way of knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Doctoral Graduates in Professional and Workplace Fields – Publication Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>The harvesting of professional knowledge: methodological perspectives on the legitimization of tacit and mode 2 knowledge in the professional doctorate thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Action Inquiry &amp; Research: The DBA Learning Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>A double helix: the Postgraduate Research Skills Agenda and the doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Criticality in Professional Doctorates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Curriculum Considerations for International Students on Professional Doctorate Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>The Role of the Doctoral-Level Prepared Clinical Expert in the Education of Nurses: A Doctoral Student Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>'It rocks my world' Pedagogical questions for the Professional Doctorate in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>The Adoption of the Clinical Practice Dissertation Among U.S. Doctor of Nursing Practice Programs: Revolution or Evolution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>A 5-Year intermediate Audit of the Impact of a Professional Doctorate Programme in Health &amp; Social Care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session Z

Tuesday 3rd April – 1.45pm – 2.45pm

See also Workshop Session B – page 9
1.45pm – 2.15pm and repeated 2.15pm – 2.45pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Developing partnerships in the pursuit of doctoral excellence</td>
<td>Dr Thomas Vitale</td>
<td>University of Central Florida, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>The Professional Doctorate in Academia: A Disruptive Innovation?</td>
<td>Dr Mary Ellen Glasgow</td>
<td>Drexel University, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>What counts as knowledge in a Professional Doctorate? Where is it</td>
<td>Dr Jon Talbot</td>
<td>University of Chester, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate to use more formal and less formal theoretical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frameworks in practice enquiry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Developing professional doctorates within a university-wide</td>
<td>Professor Neil Forbes &amp; Dr Christine Broughan</td>
<td>Coventry University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Breaking the boundaries of professional territories through</td>
<td>Dr Gail Sanders, Judith Kuit, Peter Smith,</td>
<td>University of Sunderland, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inter-professional dialogues</td>
<td>John Fulton &amp; Helen Curtis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>What are the options for a doctorate after completing my Coursework</td>
<td>Dr Margaret Kiley</td>
<td>The Australian National University, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session i
**Monday 2nd April – 1.30pm – 2.00pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Professional Clinicians on Faculty in the Academic Setting: Bridging the Knowledge-Practice Gap</td>
<td>Dr Sandra Bellini, <em>University of Connecticut, USA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>The Mouse that Roared, Phronetically Speaking: Doctoral Student Development in the Professional Doctorate in Education</td>
<td>Dr Jill Jameson, <em>University of Greenwich, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Pedagogy of Interprofessional Education: The Development of Multidisciplinary Approach to Evidence Based Teaching</td>
<td>G. Jean Logan, <em>Drexel University, USA</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session ii
**Tuesday 3rd April - 1.15pm – 1.45pm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>DProf Muslim Cultures, A step forward</td>
<td>Dr Mohammad Mesbahi, <em>The Islamic College, UK</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>The Introduction of Clinical Practice Doctorates to the Saudi Higher Education System</td>
<td>Professor M. Gary Sayed, <em>Afaisal University, Saudi Arabia</em> Mohammad Y. Al-Shehri, <em>King Saud University, Saudi Arabia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Creating the Best Evidence-based Practice in Cardiology: A Contrasting of European Society of Cardiology with American College of Cardiology for Acute Coronary Syndrome</td>
<td>Theresa Eiser-Brown &amp; Barbara Holdren, Drexel University USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Using simulation to teach Professionalism to Medical Students: A Model</td>
<td>Dr Eron Manusov, Duke SR-AHEC Family Medicine Residency, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Quality frameworks for Accreditation</td>
<td>Jean O'Neill, Middlesex University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Descriptions and Predictive Factors of Strong Community Research Partnerships: What Makes a Community Organization Value a Walden Researcher as a Partner?</td>
<td>Jenny Sherer &amp; Dr Leilani Endicott, Walden University, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session Venues

All Conference sessions will take place in one of five different rooms:

- Refettorio
- Emeroteca
- Sala del Capitolo
- Sala Seminario 2
- Sala Seminario 4

All plenary sessions will take place in the Refettorio. Specific room allocations for all other sessions will be indicated on the separate copy of the Conference programme found in your delegate’s pack.

All of the rooms are within close vicinity of each other and each room will be clearly signposted. There will also be an individual room timetable, posted on the door of each room, to aid you in locating the right session.

Session Sign-Up Sheets

Sign-Up sheets for the break-out discussions (Paper Presentations, Workshops and Round-Table-Discussions) will be available on notice-boards in Chiostro Inferiore (the cloisters surrounding the central courtyard).

Please note that sign-up sheets contain one line per delegate, if all lines have been completed then the session is full and you are kindly asked to select an alternative session.

If you have pre-selected your sessions prior to the Conference via email, then you may check your sessions on these boards.
Round-Table-Discussions (RTD)

RTDs will take place in Sala Seminario 2 & Sala Seminario 4.

Each RTD will be allocated a specific table. The room and table number for each RTD will be indicated on the separate copy of the Conference programme found in your delegate’s pack.

It is not possible to sign-up for specific RTDs in advance; places are available on a first-come-first-served basis. Please note though that each RTD is repeated once, therefore if your preferred RTD is full when you arrive, there will be a second opportunity to attend.

Session Handouts

Where available copies of plenary presentations are included in your delegate’s pack.

Copies of other presentations, and any related handouts, will be circulated at the start of the relevant session. Please note that not all sessions will have related handout materials.

Lunch

Lunch will be served in the Sala Colonna, which is on the basement level. A lift is available should you require one.

Conference Dinner

The Conference Dinner will take place at Castello del Trebbio, which is situated approximately 30 minutes from Florence. Buses have been arranged to take you to and from the venue. Please see the bus timetable for details.

The dinner will be preceded by a tour of Castello del Trebbio’s wine cellars and an opportunity to taste some of the wines.

Dietary Requirements

If you have any dietary requirements please advise the serving staff.

Disclaimer

Any opinions expressed – including, but not limited to, those given during oral presentations, or those written in paper abstracts – are those of the presenters and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the ICPD Organising Committee, Middlesex University or the UK Council for Graduate Education.
At Middlesex we are proud of our many achievements and our international reputation as an innovator in higher education. We are grateful to those who have recognised and rewarded academic and organisational endeavour and expertise. For example, since 1996 Middlesex University has been proud to receive three Queen’s Anniversary Prizes and a Queen’s Award for Enterprise.

Middlesex University aims to be a global University. Based in North London, Middlesex recruits widely across the world and works in partnership to deliver outstanding higher education in many countries. Our internationalism is key to our future ambition as North London’s university of choice.

In 2006 the University announced that the majority of its London activities would gradually be based at its Hendon Campus. An ambitious programme of development of the Hendon campus continues.

As well as a successful PhD programme, Middlesex offers an Ed. D. an Arts D. and a highly successful Doctorate in Professional Studies that has a large generic programme plus pathways in different subject areas both within the university and with partners.

The Institute for Work Based Learning at Middlesex University developed the unique pan-institutional Doctoral framework in which a wide range of pathways for people from all professional backgrounds can be followed. The Doctorate in Professional Studies (DProf), and the Masters in Professional Studies (MProf), allows individuals and groups from the private, public and voluntary sectors to negotiate high level customised programmes which focus on their professional and organisational needs.

The Doctorate in Professional Studies by Public Works (DProf PW) and Masters (MProf PW) enable established professionals with substantial evidence of already having contributed significantly to organisational and/or professional development to draw together a focussed account of their achievements. The pan-university remit of the Institute for Work based Learning means that the generic programmes run directly from the Institute take a transdisciplinary approach to research and curriculum. The focus is upon learning that takes place in the context of work and which meets the aims of individuals in paid and unpaid work, their organisations, communities and professional fields. The need for the application of existing epistemological approaches to contextualised learning and to reveal and clarify other issues form the intellectual and research basis for the Institute. The Institute for Work Based Learning at Middlesex University; http://www.mdx.ac.uk/wbl sponsors this conference.'
The UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) was established for the public benefit to advance graduate education in all academic disciplines throughout the UK. The Council aims to achieve its mission through a variety of activities such as the organisation of conferences, workshops and discussion forums debating and reflecting on topical postgraduate issues, and the publication of reports and newsletters. UKCGE also promotes and conducts research surveys and investigations into postgraduate education, as well as providing postgraduate data and information to both members and other interested parties.

**UKCGE Promotes:**
- The interests of graduate education across all disciplines
- A distinct identity for graduate education research in Higher Education
- Quality measures for graduate education & research conducted in HEIs
- The effective leadership & management of postgraduate students
- The effective provision & funding of graduate education
- The status, education and training of postgraduate students
- Effective infrastructural provisions for graduate education (including appropriate funding)
- Equal opportunities for students in graduate education
- The professional development and status of staff and supervisors in HEIs

**UKCGE Provides:**
- Annual programme of Conferences and Workshops debating and reflecting on topics such as Research Ethics, Recruitment & Marketing, Immigration Regulations, Audit & Best Practice, Professional Doctorates
- Sponsors of the ICPD series of international conferences
- Working groups investigating and reporting on a range of postgraduate topics
- An informative Website including downloadable UKCGE literature, postgraduate data and information to other organisations
- UKCGE offers three types of Membership: Full, Associate and Individual – for further information please contact: ukcge@ukcge.ac.uk
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We are witnessing a convergence in trends concerning doctoral education at the global level in these years. Through European processes such as the Bologna Process and the European Union’s Lisbon Strategy/EU2020 universities in Europe have engaged in a wide ranging and sustained process of reform during the last decade. These institutional reforms have been accompanied by a growth in the number of doctoral holders and an increased attention to doctoral education as a factor for ‘smart and sustainable growth’.

The emphasis on knowledge as a driver for growth is a global phenomenon that encompasses developed knowledge economies, emerging countries as well as developing countries looking for knowledge as a means for economic and social progress. A globally expanding university sector contributes considerably to this trend.

The expansion in doctoral education and the increased attention to its application outside academia has led to discussions about employability of doctorate holders and the possible gap between university training and careers in more ‘practical’ sectors. Several European countries have long traditions for PhD programmes involving the private sector, but the political pressure on providers to assure exposure to other sectors than the universities is growing – a trend that is visible also in East Asia. Universities have responded by setting up programmes on collaboration with industry and being generally more aware of the wide spectrum of careers open for doctorate holders. Until now, though, the particularity of professional doctorates has largely been a phenomenon of the English-speaking countries, but the question remains whether they will remain so, or whether the increasing focus on the relation between doctoral research and practice will see a proliferation of the model.
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Doctoral pathways to developing researchers for industry and the professions
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Terry Evans is a Professor of Education at Deakin University where his research focuses on both doctoral education, and open and distance education. He has published widely on doctoral education, in particular, he has edited recently (with Carey Denholm) Doctorates Downunder: Keys to successful doctoral study in Australia and New Zealand Second Edition (Melbourne, ACER Press, 2012), Supervising doctorates downunder: Keys to effective supervision in Australia and New Zealand (Melbourne, ACER Press, 2007) and Beyond Doctorates Downunder: maximising the impact of your Australian or New Zealand doctorate (Melbourne, ACER Press, 2009).
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Peter Macauley is an Associate Professor in the School of Business IT and Logistics at RMIT University, Melbourne. His research focuses on doctoral pedagogy, knowledge production, information literacy, scholarly communication, and library and information management. He is the recipient of three Australian Research Council grants and former chair of the Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) Research Committee.
For over twenty years, two major independent and unrelated approaches have been used in Australia to produce doctoral graduates with research skills, knowledge and capacities useful for industry and professional contexts. One approach is the Australian Postgraduate Awards—Industry (APAI) involving predominantly full-time APAI scholarship PhD candidates working on ARC Linkage projects planned and developed between universities and industry; the other is professional doctorate programmes that predominantly involve part-time candidates employed in professional/workplace contexts. Although there are differences of emphasis, the purposes and discourses about these two approaches to doctoral ‘research training’ are remarkably congruent. Arguably, these purposes and discourses resonate strongly for the contemporary world as it adjusts to the social and economic upheaval of the global financial crisis, the demands of climate change, and enduring needs for sustainable educational, health and social welfare provisions. Accordingly, the needs for ‘industry ready’ and ‘professional’ doctoral graduates are apparently never greater. This paper discusses APAIs and professional doctorates as being different responses to similar government and institutional imperatives for doctoral education geared to socio-economic benefits. This suggests comparative analyses are warranted of the outcomes and consequences (publications, career achievements, impacts) of the graduates from these different programs and forms of enrolment, in terms of university and workplace support and the associated broad costs.
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Pauline Armsby
Westminster Exchange, University of Westminster, UK
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Pauline is Director of Research at Westminster Exchange, an academic department at the University of Westminster that leads innovation in learning, teaching and pedagogic research. Research interests are in work-based learning and professional doctorates, and their epistemologies and methodologies. Much used pedagogic devices in work-based learning programmes such as the Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL), learning agreements and research and development projects are also interests, as is the use of elearning to facilitate work-based learners, and coaching and mentoring in the process of facilitating high level learning. Pauline has managed and developed a range of different professional doctorate programmes for distance provision, internationally and with collaborative partners. Recent research projects managed focus on developing and evaluating doctoral level provision.

Introduction

Professional Doctorates (PD) vary in the kinds of knowledge that they aim to produce and in the amount of 'taught' and 'research' elements in the whole programme (Scott et al, 2004). This paper sets out to explore how these and other theoretical, policy and pedagogical perspectives might influence the provision and uptake of the Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) in PDs.

Lester (2011) finds from the analysis of more than 30 PD research projects that practice can be situated in four different ways. It is argued that if practice takes centre stage as the focus of education and learning in the PD, then APL is a fitting foundation for study. This is because it concentrates on reflection on practice (Schon, 1989) and is a student-centred approach, which enables the candidate to benchmark and have recognised their current knowledge, skills and experience in areas relevant to their practice and planned future study. This is particularly suitable where the curriculum situates the candidate's practice and its development as central to the research project/programme.

In addition, where a PD contains taught, subject based elements, APL may also be appropriate to acknowledge the candidates existing certificated or experiential subject
based learning. A more contentious area for discussion is whether or not APL should be granted towards the research project element(s) of the curriculum. In an environment where the PD is still not widely accepted as different in nature, but equal in level to the PhD, the extent of the researcher development element which is so important in the PhD, has become a hot topic for those working in PDs.

Methodology

This paper reports on the preliminary findings from a short survey conducted in late 2011 and early 2012 on the prevalence of APL in PD. Brown and Cooke (2010) report data collected in January 2009 for the UKCGE. A request was sent to its 125 member institutions for information concerning the provision of PDs. The results showed that the number of awards had almost tripled from 109 in 1998 to 308 in 2009. The number of programmes in each area is shown below in Table 1. The APL questionnaire for this study used the six most prevalent (top) subject/practice areas and an ‘other’ category for the remaining areas. Table 1 also shows the number of responses achieved in each category. In total 81 responses from a potential 308 programmes have been made to date which provides a 26.3% response rate. The categories with higher response rates reflect the places that have been circulated to date which include:

- UK EdD network
- UKCGE Professional and Practice Based Special Interest Group and general membership
- Profdocs JISC network
- British Psychological Society

Results

The regulations at more than half (43 or 53.1%) of the Universities responding enabled the APL as part of their PD. Six respondents (7.4%) did not know, indicating that they had no intention of using such a regulation that might exist. The following responses relate only to those 43 programmes whose regulations did allow APL.

APCertificatedL was enabled by 32 (64%) of the sample, but only 22 (43%) permitted APExperientialL. There could be a number of reasons for this, for example, that universities wished to respect comparable learning from other universities, perhaps to encourage admission, and/or they perceived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/Practice Area</th>
<th>No of Programmes</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health, Social and Health Science</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Counselling</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Finance, Management and Tourism</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling/Psychotherapy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Architecture and the Built Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology and Ministry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>1 Sub tot 41</td>
<td>Other 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Institutions</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately one third of the respondents were from ‘old’ universities and two thirds from ‘new’ universities.
experiential learning to not be as credible as, or to be more difficult to assess than certificated learning.

Some PDs are not credit rated and those that are can include different amounts of level 7 and 8 credit, provided they meet the QAA (2008) requirement to have at least 360 credits at level 8 and the remaining 180 credits at level 7. Thus the questions on the number of credits that could be achieved through APL may not have been relevant to all respondents. The following table outlines the number of non-zero responses and the range of credits enabled at each level.

Table 2: APL Credits enabled at Level 7 and 8: Number of Non-Zero Responses, Range and Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No of Responses</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20-180</td>
<td>104.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50-240</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While 43 programmes said they enabled APL only 26 added the number of level 7 credits permitted and 10, the number who enabled level 8 credit. The ranges are large at both levels but the means show that where APL is enabled it often reasonably substantial. This may point to some programmes focusing on a more experiential perspective that builds on current learning and practice and may reflect the current social science bias in the sample. I will be interesting to compare responses from the different subject/practice areas when a fuller data set is achieved.

Turning to whether ‘taught’ modules and ‘research’ modules could be claimed, the responses showed that of the 38 respondents, 84% (32) enabled APL for the taught elements, whereas only 10.5% (4) enabled APL for the research component. This is not surprising given the low number of programmes that enabled level 8 APL, which is perhaps more likely to be research oriented. However, it does suggest that a small number of programmes have level 8 taught modules which are not research related and can be claimed through APL. The results also suggest that university programmes prefer to keep the research element of their programmes under their control.

The questionnaire included one open question, which was directed to the entire sample of 81 respondents; ‘Please outline any views you would like to give about enabling APL in PDs’. A staggering 54 or two thirds of the respondents made comments, many of which were interesting and informative for helping to understand the various both positive and negative views on this topic. The presentation and possible subsequent publication of these findings will provide an analysis of these comments, especially in relation to the implications for candidates, employers, practice, the university and teaching and learning.
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Introduction

The need to engage the professional in learning through exploration of practice is seen to be critical to development of the professional doctorate programme (Raelin and Coghlan 2006). This work, based on textual analysis of two professional doctorate programmes at two different institutions exploring what is meant by professional and, in particular, the key features that unify this type of study. As part of a two stage study, this preliminary analysis of documentation sought to explore how professional learning is engendered in each programme. We offer some tentative conclusions which will be developed in subsequent journal papers. It is contended that this research will have important implications for future policy direction at local, national and international level.

An overview of method

The initial analysis was based on each institution carrying out analysis of the other’s documentation. Using, textual analysis of the documents claim of offer, exploration was to ‘see it from the perspective’ of the potential learner; the student. Importantly, when a professional manager comes to a doctoral programme for the first time, the aim of this analysis...
was to consider, what are they really looking for? Our objective was to develop insight into and articulate an understanding of expectations of each programme as conveyed from the literature.

The second phase of this project is to use focus groups and interviews to elicit the views of current students in each institution to evaluate their experiences of being part of a doctoral programme.

Getting to work – the development of criteria

Two research teams were established at each participating university. University A is an English city university and University B is a Welsh university. A number of documents from a doctorate in Business Administration (DBA) offered by university A were analysed by the research team from university B. These documents included the current programme, a reflective evaluation of the previous DBA and the current student handbook. Similarly university B, who offer a suite of doctoral programmes, had their documentation analysed by the team from university A. These documents included: Code of Practice for the Professional Doctorate; Regulations for the degree of Professional Doctorate; Professional Doctoral Programmes.

The analytic method used was ‘the constant comparative method’ an iterative process of identifying common themes (Guba and Lincoln 1989). Following the initial ‘read through’, categories were identified by both teams. Through conversation between the researchers additional categories were generated. These were agreed and will now form the basis of a research interview schedule in the second phase of the project. Accordingly, the categories identified were:

- Mode 2 knowledge
- Expectations regarding supervisory relationship
- Relevance of course structure
- Student/Academic learning
- Progression
- Critical reflection
- Development of research philosophy and writing

Discussion

The analysis and data presented demonstrates that a surprising level of consistency exists between the two programmes. The fact that each are explicitly dedicated to the development of ‘practical knowledge’ would suggest that creating a student-centred community of learners would go some way to achieving this. However, achieving this objective is not without potential problems. That each programme presents a course structure of modules (in the case of establishment A because there were no credits they were ‘elements’), may provide comfort, however, it is how each sought to engage the professional with meaningful learning in a professional programme is clearly of significance.

What was very obvious during the course of the review that both programmes see the relationship between students and tutors as co-learners. Indeed, as we recognised, great value was placed on sharing contemporary problems of ‘professional practice’. Consistent with what Raelin and Coghlan (2006) propose, the vision for both programmes was to develop confidence in the professional’s ability to surface real-life problems, this was with a view to engage with their supervisor, to critically appraise personal and professional values in view of ‘established theory’. Both documentations appeared to bestow expertise on their supervisors as an inevitable expectation, however, how this expertise will enhance the professional’s practice was not clear.

Finally, the issue of professional recognition and accreditation was raised as an integral part of the advertising for doctoral programmes. Given that the doctoral qualification is primarily academic it was generally accepted that this is not an entirely relevant consideration. However, there was a view that it would be highly desirable if such programmes were more closely aligned with the needs and expectations of professional bodies. All course tutors were cognisant of the potential difficulties that are inevitable when designing a professional doctorate programme that is seen to adequately prepare students for the main element (the thesis) which will be examined using academic judgement not dissimilar to that used to assess PhDs (see UKCGE 2002).

Some tentative conclusions

From this preliminary review of the documentation there were a number of issues raised that warrant further exploration. It may be suggested that in appealing to a conventional structured approach as depicted in these documents the potential candidate cannot see possibilities for how such a programme could be relevant to them in their practice. As noted, the current assessment is not dissimilar to that of a PhD therefore it is hardly surprising that such a programme places emphasis on teaching academic knowledge and research methodologies as preparation for the thesis. While this is one way to develop
professionals for practice accredited for academic achievement, it is our contention that this quite rightly leads to the accusation that this form of professional is being ‘created in our own image’.

It is clear the relationships formed within a doctoral programme are essential for creating a student-centred community of learners. However, this community comprises academics as well as doctoral candidates. As such, this community has the potential for engaging in meaningful critical conversations to explore and challenge our understanding of theory and practice as professionals in our own context. It is our view that by gathering and challenging perspectives on what constitutes the ‘professional’ in a professional doctorate programme that we are more likely to understand and articulate a way to work the boundaries between professional and academic. Not only will this make our new form of educational opportunity attractive to professionals in practice, it will endure the scrutiny and resist the imposition of the professional bodies’ criteria for unifying doctorate programmes.
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For the professional practitioner, reflexive approaches can be valuable in developing professional understanding and improving professional practice. When allied with complexity inspired research, in which people and the interactions between them are placed at the centre of the research focus, it provides rich insights into the understanding of organizational and professional life.

This paper draws on experiences of professional practitioners in management who are engaged in programmes of research. It features the complexity inspired auto-ethnographic reflexive research methodology with which students have been working and the academic and practical challenges posed by research of this nature.

The paper

- aims to highlight the research difficulties encountered by professional practitioners when trying to make sense of their practice
- explores the use of auto-ethnographic reflexive research methodologies
- seeks to inform the debate that rigorous ways can be developed to enable complexity inspired reflexive research to take place usefully by professional practitioners.
Starkey & Madan (2001) argue that a key goal of management research is the development of forms of knowledge that help managers become better reflective practitioners (2001: S4). Whilst the notion of reflective practitioner is widely advocated, there are few accounts of such development submitted for professional doctorates. Although arguably the complexity approach to studying organizations developed as a consequence of the adoption of systems thinking during the later part of the last century (Stacey 2007), we are aware of only a handful of doctoral theses in management that are influenced by this approach (mainly submissions for the DMan at University of Hertfordshire).

Stacey has provided an interesting and illuminating view of organising (see for instance Stacey 2001) by rejecting the spatial concept of organisations as systems, and their subsequent reification, and arguing instead for conceptualising organisations as complex responsive processes. The focus of attention is that of human relating; actions/gestures provoke responses, which create further responses, and consequently lead to the co-creation of the emergent and unpredictable nature of organisations. It is by reflection on the detail of the local interactions experienced by the researcher that understanding does not take place in a vacuum; the researcher must also locate their ways of making sense of their experience into the wider traditions of thought in society, as well as making clear how their a priori is shaping their way of interpreting experience, whilst reflecting on experience is changing their practice (Stacey and Griffin 2005:22).

The raw material of the research generally takes the form of experience communicated as narrative account(s). Rhodes and Brown (2005) describe narratives as structures through which events are made sense of rather than just being representations which convey meaning, and propose narratives as methodological positions which allow the researcher to engage with the complex nuances of the ‘lived’ world. Auto-ethnography provides a way to document personal experiences that peers would find useful and to contribute to one’s own and one’s organisation’s development, as ‘a self narrative that critiques the situatedness of self with others in social contexts’ (Spry, 2001:710). In doing so, the auto-ethnographer is encouraged to conduct a study within a study, through reflection, that involves depth of self-disclosure and analysis (Ellis, 2001). As it values ordinary language over scientific language, and the use of metaphor, satire and irony to engage more fully with descriptions of life, (Foley 2002), it may be argued that it lends itself as a methodology to professional doctoral researchers. More controversially, it encourages a breaking away from formal academic writing in an effort to narrate and interpret events with a style that makes knowledge more accessible, and it is this that makes its use problematic in professional doctoral theses, which still do not have universal approbation.

Much of this problem lies in the differing styles in which auto-ethnographic research is written. Chang (2008) identifies four different ways of writing auto-ethnographies that he terms; descriptive realistic, confessional emotive, analytical interpretive and imaginative-creative. To achieve legitimacy, it seems that researchers need to write in an analytical interpretive style. This is not without problems. Our researchers found that moving from description to analysis, topics to themes difficult as the problem of objectivity/subjectivity needed to be dealt with. Stacey and Griffin refer to this way of doing research as "detached involvement" (2005: 9). Other problems encountered were that the approach generates a very broad range of topics – what to include and what to leave out has to be decided. The researcher is in complete control of selecting the content – there are very few guidelines/restrictions. Where to start – how far back to go, and where to end pose other dilemmas that need to be dealt with. Reiteration becomes a problem; as time goes on, continued reflection leads to amendments and further reflection/reflexivity, with Petersen (2008) noting how, on reflection, our use of the backspace key often represents a removal of that which appears illegitimate or inappropriate in academic work.

Given the problems above complexity inspired auto-ethnographic research can be perceived as difficult and time consuming, and offering vague or conflicting outputs. Nevertheless, the outcomes of such research offer an insight into behaviours and motivations not often articulated or recognised in the professional world.
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Candidates on the Doctorate in Psychotherapy by Public Works are explicitly expected to demonstrate their authorship of work based projects which have made a significant impact in the public domain. The implementation of this requirement raises a number of significant issues for the tutor team which are quite distinct from those normally embraced by academics when assessing in the context of psychotherapy training programmes. Since Public Works candidates are assessed on the basis of existing projects, rather than on the basis of fulfilment of a training programme, tutors have been required to radically re-vision their criteria for success to include notions of change agency and professional entrepreneurialism (du Plock and Barber, 2008).

The notion of professional entrepreneurialism, in particular, has challenged tutors in their thinking about assessment since entrepreneurialism per se is not a concept normally associated with therapy. In its most frequent usage it tends to denote profit-driven individualism – a far cry from attending to the psychological needs of our fellow human beings. Notions of ‘social entrepreneurship’ which have emerged recently in the UK and US appear less individualistic:

Entrepreneurship is the process of doing something new for the purpose of creating wealth for the individual and adding value to society
(Kao, 2006, p. 69)

Kelly (1993) has used the term social entrepreneurship to describe ‘conventional’ businesses that incorporate ‘social’ or ‘ethical’ aims into their mission and objectives. Roper & Cheney (2005) provide a useful critical perspective on the term.
Leadbeater (1997), perhaps the most influential UK contributor to this literature, provides a conceptualisation which has been adopted by tutors since it precisely describes the qualities which distinguish successful Doctorate in Psychotherapy by Public Works candidates: namely,

**Entrepreneurial**: they take under-utilized, discarded resources and identify ways of using them to satisfy unmet needs

**Innovative**: they create new services and products, new ways of dealing with problems, often by bringing together approaches that have traditionally been kept separate

**Transformatory**: they transform the institutions they are in charge of... Most importantly, they can transform the neighbourhoods and communities they serve by opening up possibilities for self-development

While social entrepreneurship reflects key characteristics of our candidates, there exist also two significant differences between therapy entrepreneurs and those in business: they have duel identification as both professional therapists and organizational leaders; and they are more concerned about social change than personal wealth. It seems to us that this group could accurately be described as 'professional entrepreneurs' since, essentially, they are acting as entrepreneurs within the therapy professions.

It will be appreciated that the assessment of professional entrepreneurship within the context of a rigorous doctoral programme raises issues which are not generally encountered on either traditional PhD programmes, or on Professional Doctorates where assessment criteria are generally set in accordance with academic requirements and/or the requirements of validating professional organisations. Assessment of 'professional entrepreneurs', instead, leads us 'back to basics' to reflect upon, in particular, what we mean by 'Transformatory' in relation to Public Works, since it is a this stage that the public value of the works becomes clear.

This exercise has led us to some interesting conclusions regarding how such candidates can be assessed. We have been led to re-visit what we mean by 'impact'; how it can be evidenced and measured; and what constitutes the 'public domain' for our purposes. With regard to 'significant impact': on what basis can we determine the 'usefulness' of public works, and should what is deemed useful also be morally and ethically 'good'? A number of successful submissions will be presented to illustrate how such assessment has been utilized. We will particularly focus on the work of Prof Yair Maman, the first graduate of the programme, as an illustration of the way in which a reflexive audit can enable a candidate to: integrate the academic and the entrepreneurial, and, complete a self- and peer-assessment of their achievements and the contribution they have made to the world of therapy. The presenter and Prof Maman have since collaborated on an account of developing a unique programme to train students to work with historically marginalized populations across the New York metropolitan area, and this will be drawn on to show its value-driven nature.

Our embracing of the concept of professional entrepreneurialism has led us to develop a supervisory model for our work with candidates in which these questions become the organising principle for their claims to doctoral status. Our conclusions for HE assessment of therapy professionals will be presented in this paper.
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With aims to dramatically increase the number of international students studying at universities in Malaysia and the increase in the postgraduate population of late, both in terms of pure numbers but also government drive and support, there is a need to reexamine provision and opportunity for further study within Malaysia.

The postgraduate market is expanding in Malaysia and there is increasing interest in the doctorate as a means to upscale academic staff, develop connections and research capability from within industry and as a central KPI for the government in terms of educational value and prestige. In 2008 there were 8000 PhD holders in Malaysia and under the government’s MyBrain15 initiative the target has been set at 60,000 by the year 2020. (This target is down from the original 100,000 mark and was reduced due to unreasonable expectations).

Malaysia’s desire to achieve international recognition for its education sector must be viewed in light of the current developments in Asia, such as the continued emergence of transnational education, the influx of international providers and the development of international partnerships offering study abroad schemes. The national desire and the changes in student demographics with its implications upon recruitment, create avenues for further discussion regarding doctoral education, in terms of introduction, partnership, expansion and funding.

Funding mechanisms are closely related to the research element of degrees and the ability of institutions to respond to national
demands provides real opportunities for growth in this field. The decrease in government funding for study abroad creates an increase in the necessity for local alternatives. Malaysia has a strong tradition, dating back to the 1950s, of sponsoring students to pursue their PhDs abroad but in light of the increasing concern over brain drain and the natural desire to further strengthen internal capacity, there has been a considerable focus upon the nation’s ability to develop and support doctoral education. Funding at public universities, as a result of the New Economic Policy in 1971, existed historically to support the admission of the bumiputera population and so alternative options and methods may become necessary in order to reach the aims listed above. These alternatives could well be provided by the private sector through the sponsorship of research driven professional doctorates.

With the growth of this area of provision must come reflection and analysis. The value of a PhD, the manner of delivery and the role of the supervisors, be they from academia or industry, are all issues that will need to be further explored in order to ensure that the introduction and development of professional doctorates responds appropriately to an identifiable need without damaging the inherent value and reputation of the qualification. The current number of PhD holders naturally impacts upon any possible increase in recruitment, as there is a direct correlation between the availability of suitable and qualified supervisors and the new students that can be recruited. The introduction of professional doctorates offers an opportunity to relieve some of the strain in this area by diversifying the supervisory role.

Students undertaking a professional doctorate are, according to the ESRC, expected to make a ‘contribution to both theory and practice in their field, and to develop professional practice by making a contribution to (professional) knowledge’. While the qualification of the professional doctorate is equivalent to that of a research doctorate in status, it is naturally more suited for a career in the professional world as opposed to the academic one. There is an area of tension here to explore in the Malaysian case, as, while it will fully support the absolute and pure number gain, it will not necessarily promote academic growth.

Malaysia has a rich history and culture of corporate, leadership and professional training and as such a further development of this area would be supported by existing practice. The Human Resource Development Fund, a national initiative to fund training across the higher education sector, demonstrates the degree to which this level of continued professional development is encouraged.

As Malaysia continues on its journey from developing nation to developed knowledge economy, there is an increase in focus and emphasis on R&D and commercialisation. Initiatives are in place to ensure that ‘homegrown’ research is protected and properly exploited. In 2012 Universiti Teknologi Malaysia launched its Industrial PhD programme, supported by the National Higher Education Fund Cooperation, and there is every reason to believe that more will follow. The key area for Malaysia will be to ensure that the system is robust and transparent.

This session will examine the current climate and discuss issues central to the successful development of the professional doctorate in Malaysia and to its sustainability and international recognition. Malaysia is an ideal location for this discussion given its success in the higher education sector, its close links with the international community, its desire for further improvement and its position as a developed nation within the South East Asian context. Geographically Malaysia may well reside within Asia but ideologically it firmly bridges the gap between East and West and as such is an ideal breeding ground for higher education development of this nature.
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This paper reports the initial findings of a study investigating postgraduate students’ understandings of the theoretical principles underlying the use of ‘mixed methods’ as a research strategy.

Making appropriate and well-justified decisions about which strategies to employ when undertaking empirical research is a challenging task for PG students. In addition, using a mixed methods approach is becoming more wide-spread but often it is seen as an easy option, its rationale simply involving reference to the mixed methods literature arguing for a combination of data collection strategies. This also applies to candidates registered on professional doctorate programmes of study. The occupational experience of applicants’ to such programmes is usually based in practice, where day-to-day activities are about getting things done and addressing operational issues. Not surprisingly, therefore, applicants tend to be attracted to a professional doctorate because they are interested in contributing to the development of practice in a particular subject located in a specific context. Surfacing the scholarly and strategic issues associated with conceptualising, and thus intellectually framing, that practice is a low priority, if a priority at all. It is demanding and challenging, therefore, for practitioners to make the shift from being practice-oriented to considering how to theorise the development of professional practice. In addition, candidates are expected to become proficient in the practicalities and theoretical principles of carrying out research at doctoral level.

However, despite (probably) having undertaken a masters degree which (might) have included time spent on research methodologies, many are ill-prepared for undertaking educational research that goes beyond the basic approaches and strategies outlined in introductory research methodology modules. Because of the practice-based focus of professional doctorates, the research undertaken is often about evaluating practice using relatively
basic strategies that are uncontested and are not seen
as being epistemologically problematised.

One major issue that has yet to be addressed in the
literature, is that most methodology publications still
tend to reinforce a polarised view of the research
process with a continuing use of qualitative and
quantitative distinctions. Even the increasing number of
text books about ‘mixed methods’ continues to draw on
a traditional paradigmatic explanation, claiming that it is
legitimate to use methods drawn from both approaches
and to ‘mix’ paradigms in the same project. This has
reached relatively sophisticated levels of articulation,
with for example, Creswell et al’s (2003) six design
types of sequential explanatory, sequential exploratory,
sequential transformative, concurrent triangulation,
concurrent nested and concurrent transformative
approaches to carrying out mixed methods research.
However, each of these continues to draw on
qualitative/quantitative approaches. There is no
attempt to challenge and consequently re-conceptualise
the research process in order to bring the different
traditional methodologies together into one coherent,
integrated strategy. Indeed, there is a confusion over
what exactly is being referred to in the phrase ‘mixed
methods’: in particular, what is being mixed and what
are the methods that are being used together? This
inevitably leads to the concern, and the accusation, that
there is a lack of coherence overall in the subject and
with mixed methods in particular. If this is true, then
this will have an unhelpful impact on post-graduate
researchers’ developing understandings and views about
the research process and what is expected of them as
they undertake an extended, summatively assessed
empirical research project. The research reported here,
therefore, attempts to discover what post-graduate
students’ understandings are of the issues associated
with using a mixed methods approach to educational
research. This was achieved through asking the
following questions:

1 What are post-graduate students’ experiences of
   using mixed methods in their own research?

2 To what extent are postgraduate students familiar
   with the philosophical, ideological and theoretical
   principles of ‘mixed methods’ in educational research?

A strategy using an integrated methodology
(Plowright, 2011) was employed, including an on-line
questionnaire survey and face-to-face small-group
discussions with postgraduates registered on
programmes of study in, currently, three UK
universities. The research strategy included:

- asking clear research questions within identified
  contexts;
- drawing on an effective data source management
  strategy;
- implementing appropriate sampling procedures;
- using methods of data collection that generated
  both numerical and narrative data;
- selecting evidence to support provisional,
  warrantable inferences aimed at addressing the
  initial research questions;
- employing a participant-centred ethicality;
- embedding the research within an holistic,
  integrated philosophical perspective based on a
  pragmatic approach.

Findings explore post-graduate researchers’
contrasting views and understandings of research
methodologies in general and mixed methods in
particular. The outcomes provide an opportunity to
consider the nature of paradigmatic explanations of
research methodologies; the epistemological
conceptualisation of issues associated with the
research process and the implications for supporting
professional doctorate candidates. The paper
concludes by suggesting that Plowright’s (2011) FraIM
(Frameworks for an Integrated Methodology) offers an
alternative strategy for integrating different
depthes. The FraIM eschews the use of the ‘Q’
words, takes a pragmatic approach to carrying out
research and rejects the habitual way of looking at the
‘validity’ of the research process. It is further argued
that the FraIM is appropriate for post-graduate
research that is aimed at evaluating and contributing
to the development of professional practice.

It is intended to extend the research reported in this
paper to a wider sample of both masters and doctoral
researchers. The potential for collaborative,
international research is highlighted, raising possibilities
of investigating and subsequently addressing the
contrasting needs of international students studying
for professional doctorates in education.
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Established in 1992, the Engineering Doctorate (EngD) was conceived as a high quality, broad-based doctoral research degree which would enable ambitious early-career individuals and recent graduates to achieve a “fast-track” progression to senior management positions in industry. The scheme was initiated by the Science and Engineering Research Council (SERC), the predecessor to today’s Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), to address concerns by engineering/manufacturing businesses that PhD graduates lacked business awareness and key transferable skills.

Through its funding criteria, EPSRC has been instrumental in establishing a common
framework across programmes, establishing the EngD as a research degree of equivalent standing to the PhD, whilst also ensuring high value for its stakeholders, not least the Research Engineers (REs) themselves (as EngD students are commonly known). But the EngD owes its success also to the manner in which the various Centres (22 prior to the 2007 EPSRC review) have interpreted EPSRC’s vision; within the basic common framework, there is sufficient flexibility for Centres to achieve EPSRC’s intent in a manner that best suits the institution(s), the Centre’s research focus, the sponsor companies and the nature of researcher each Centre attracts. This paper demonstrates the success and the challenges of the EngD model, with respect to the standards of quality and value that have been achieved, through two quite different examples – the longstanding programmes of University of Warwick and University of Manchester.

The Warwick and Manchester EngD Programmes

Both the Warwick and Manchester programmes have been in operation since the EngD’s inception. To date, +100 REs have graduated from Warwick, and +140 from Manchester, with the support of major UK-based engineering/manufacturing companies like BAE Systems, Rolls-Royce, Jaguar Land Rover, GlaxoSmithKline and Arup, as well as SMEs. The Warwick programme has diversified from its original focus on manufacturing to incorporate construction, medical engineering, low carbon manufacturing and digital technology. Manchester has two programmes – Manufacturing and Nuclear Engineering.

Operationalising EPSRC’s Vision

A key stipulation by EPSRC is that an RE must spend approximately 75% of their time on a project with the sponsor company. The research must be industrially relevant and involve either one, large project or a number of smaller projects connected by a particular theme. The taught component accounts for the remaining 25% and focuses on developing the technical skills and knowledge needed for the research, formal training in research methods, and transferable skills development, e.g., project management, financial awareness and leadership. This paper highlights specific areas in which Warwick and Manchester have established equally successful, but quite different approaches to the structure and operation of our programmes:

The Research Engineer

A feature of the Warwick programme is that REs can either be predominantly campus-based whilst performing research for the sponsor company, or an employee of the sponsor company incorporating research into their company role. At Manchester, by contrast, only a few REs are company employees, though many spend a large proportion of their time conducting research at the company. The benefit of the employee-RE is that they often enjoy a higher degree of visibility and influence, and greater access to company resources. The challenges are the inevitable distractions from the research and the inherent isolation from other REs. The distractions are however, not limited to employee-REs. Campus-based REs too are sometimes used as a “cheap resource” – an occurrence observed at both Warwick and Manchester. However, not all such distractions are negative. Indeed most REs have reported benefiting from the experience and the enhanced interaction with company counterparts.

Cohort-based Training

Manchester operates a cohort-based approach to the taught element, such that REs take courses together at set times in the year. The programme allows some flexibility with respect to the technical elements (based on research need), but the business courses are essentially fixed. This approach is operationally efficient and the researchers benefit from the support network that forms within their group. The downside is a lack of opportunities to mix with REs in other years, and a wider student body. At Warwick, REs select courses from the existing part-time MSc programme and thus benefit from mixing with a wider student body, many of whom are experienced engineers/managers in UK-based manufacturing companies. They also enjoy considerable flexibility in which courses they take and when – an important feature for employee-REs. This approach is cost effective in avoiding the need for dedicated courses, but the REs have less contact with each other, and those based predominantly off-campus can become isolated.

Portfolio versus Thesis

A key area in which EngD programmes differ is in how the research is presented for examination. Warwick operates a portfolio approach, whereby the research is conveyed through a series of documents, each relating to an important aspect of the research or a key outcome/deliverable. Manchester, by contrast, maintains the traditional thesis approach, though an alternative format (not unlike a portfolio) can be adopted on request. The portfolio approach predominantly benefits the employee-RE – enabling them to write up and submit “as they go” is often critical (given competing pressures on their time) to
ensuring completion. For some, the sense of achievement in submitting a new document is also a considerable motivator. The disadvantages of the portfolio reflect the strengths of the thesis approach – the thesis is familiar to examiners, and submission only at the end of the RE’s programme encourages rationalisation of the work, leading to more concise, efficient presentation. An important benefit of the portfolio however, is that only a summative document enters the public domain, thus making commercially sensitive information accessible only to the examiners.

The Benefits and Challenges of the EngD

A key feature of the EngD is the range of its impact: from technological innovations (in products and processes), cost and efficiency savings, creating new business models/strategies and practical frameworks/tools for industry, to the influence REs themselves have on colleagues and subordinates. High standards are maintained by a traditional examination process - external and internal academic examiners apply the same standards of rigour as for a PhD, whilst an industrial examiner assesses the efficacy of the findings from the business perspective. The EngD model for doctoral training addresses the needs of a modern, knowledge-based economy, relevant beyond the UK. Indeed, similar initiatives are gaining currency in Europe.

The challenges for the EngD are principally, finding efficient and cost effective ways to sustain the programme in the future, and capturing the value and impact potential of the research. Sponsor companies struggling to keep pace with shifting markets and competitive pressures are sometimes unable to capitalise on research findings. EPSRC, whilst continuing to support the EngD, must constantly balance the needs of REs and stakeholders against the limited funds available. Solutions to these challenges may reach beyond the programme management detail – fundamental structural and philosophical differences may prove more pertinent. For example, the contrasting advantages of the inter-departmental Centre, run by a dedicated administrative team, versus the essentially department-based Centre operated by a team of academics and administrators (for whom the Centre forms but one part of their departmental role), collaborating with other departments on a case by case basis. What is clear is that the flexibility afforded by EPSRC allows Centres to evolve these differing approaches, and to find their own innovative solutions to the new challenges presented to doctoral training.
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Aim
This paper presents a semi-structured supervision programme for teachers at a school of nursing at university college level. The aim is to qualify for posts as senior university lecturers (associate professors) according to the requirements in the Norwegian legislation.

Message
The legislation related to universities outlines two paths for qualifying as academic teachers on advanced level. One of them is a traditional path going through a combination of teaching and research, including a dissertation on the basis of a doctoral thesis. The other one goes through a combination of teaching and documentation of participation in educational developmental projects. This path has some similarities with professional doctorates in other European countries. In Norway it does not end up with a doctoral examination, but with a bureaucratic evaluation from a professional committee.

The alternative path is quite new in its present form. Thus there is no solid tradition to lean upon. Many potential candidates probably try to avoid this path because they are afraid to become stuck in their career. To ensure the quality of the alternative path, and to make it more predictable for the candidates, Stord/Haugesund University College has established a semi-structured supervision programme. At present the group of candidates consists of six teachers. The group is lead by two supervisors. The group meets six times per year. At each meeting the candidates present and defend their ongoing developmental projects, and they get comments from their peers and the supervisors.

The paper discusses the experiences of group supervision as a tool for stimulating an individual learning process on an academic level.

Conclusions (lessons learned)
Building a new way for qualification of academic teachers requires a systematic approach for establishing a predictable path for the candidates. The success depends on the support and supervision the candidates are offered.
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Introduction

Professional doctorates have been available in the UK for some time. In spite of this there endures a debate as to whether professional doctorates should sit alongside the more traditional PhD, as a valid mode of study for the highest award a university can confer. In addition to questions around the status of the professional doctorate or in other words it’s legitimacy, questions remain about the title, structure, and assessment and quality assurance mechanisms appropriate to these types of doctoral programmes, which are invariably part taught and part independent research. These debates have been well documented and to a certain extent closure achieved as professional doctorates proliferate and gain popularity among the professions, namely education, engineering, business administration, and more recently the health professions including nursing and midwifery (Becher 1999; Scott, Brown, Lunt, and Thorne 2004, Ellis 2009). Yet to be resolved is how students undertaking professional doctorates think about these programmes and why they choose this mode of doctoral study as opposed to the PhD. One would like to think professional doctorate students have made informed decisions regarding the choice of doctoral programme. However, anecdotal evidence suggests this is not the case, with students often referring to themselves as PhD students. This begs the question do professional doctorate students prefer to think of themselves as PhD students, and by implication think the PhD preferable to the professional doctorate, and as such do they lack understanding of the difference between the two routes to doctoral study. It is important to gain understanding of this phenomenon in order to ensure marketing, recruitment, application and interview procedures are fully informed and the “right” candidates are admitted to the programme in similar ways to the assessment of candidates wishing to study a PhD. Not to do so devalues the professional doctorate and serves to undermine the continued development of the professional doctorate.

This study does not revisit the debate around quality, assessment, or mode of delivery of professional doctorates; focusing instead on the characteristics of students undertaking a professional doctorate as opposed to a PhD, and whether their reasons for doing so are educationally sound. The study draws on accounts from students enrolled on professional doctorates across three HEIs and from a range of disciplines, including nursing, midwifery, education, biomedical science, and health visiting. The study raises important questions around the motivations of professional doctorate students and argues that for some students at least, the decision to study a professional doctorate is not necessarily fully informed. Students often appear unclear, even well into the programme, as to exactly what a professional doctorate is, how it differs in fundamental ways to a PhD, not simply in the approach to course delivery, but at a
philosophical and pedagogical level. The implications of this are far reaching. If students are considered ambassadors for higher education programmes it is imperative that they understand why they are enrolled on a particular programme and whether or not their expectations have been met. In other words the future of the professional doctorate is in the hands of the student. If professional doctorate students themselves do not understand the nature, purpose and point of a professional doctorate then the programmes will not survive, especially at a time of financial constraint and efficiency savings.

Goffman’s (1959) concept of presentation of self in everyday life (Goffman 1959) has informed the notion of presentation of educational self in everyday life. This concept is used to frame the data analysis.

Presentation of Educational Self

Goffman (1959) in his seminal work ‘The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life’ suggested that when an individual plays a part he implicitly requests his observers take seriously the impression that is fostered before them. They are asked to believe that the character they see actually possesses the attributes he appears to possess, that the task he performs will have the consequences that are implicitly claimed for it, and that in general, matters are what they appear to be. Goffman offers two possible explanations for this behaviour. At one extreme, the individual, or in Goffman’s words, ‘the performer’ can be fully taken in by his own act; he can be fully convinced that the impression of reality he stages is the real reality. At the other extreme ‘the performer’ may not be taken in at all by his own routine.

These opposing positions allow for an interesting examination of the professional doctorate students’ ‘performance’ so to speak, once enrolled on the programme. Taking Goffman’s first position whereby the individual believes in their own performance, it could be argued that the professional doctorate student who refers to their programme as a PhD believes this to be the case and by implication does not know the difference between the PhD and the professional doctorate. The implications of this are such that one could argue against different routes for doctoral study as students at least, are not making a distinction between programmes. This begs the question of the clarity of marketing of and recruitment to the professional doctorate programme.

Goffman’s alternative position, whereby the professional doctorate student is not taken in by his own performance, is perhaps more onerous as this suggests that the student does understand the distinction between the professional doctorate and the PhD but for some reason prefers to think of themselves and indeed to articulate the view, that they are a PhD student. This begs the question of the value the student places on one programme, as opposed to the other. Both positions require thorough investigation if assumptions are to be avoided, valid conclusions reached, and informed recommendations made to relevant stakeholders.

To understand students motivation to study a professional doctorate, what students understand about the programme, and how this is squared with programme aims we undertook qualitative in depth semi structured interviews with 20 professional doctorate students from a range of professional disciplines across three HEIs. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Themes were developed around why students choose professional doctorates as opposed to the conventional PhD, what students understand about their programme of study, experiences of studying the professional doctorate programme, and whether or not the programme of study has met their expectations. Goffman’s (1959) presentation of self in everyday life was utilised as a unique approach to uncovering the motivations of professional doctorate students.
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There are continually higher expectations with regard to quality of research in the ADA fields (Architecture, Design and Arts). In organised research education academic standards of designerly research are being taught, discussed and negotiated. During the years of doctoral ‘apprenticeship’ the PhD students learn to master the research craft. The final trial is the assessment of the doctoral thesis, where a committee decides whether an expected level of “doctorateness” has been achieved.

Already in 1997 UK Council for Graduate Education published a report on quality of doctoral work in the ADA fields, in which the term “doctorateness” appeared in the following context: “The essence of ‘doctorateness’ is about an informed peer consensus on mastery of the subject; mastery of analytical breadth (where methods, techniques, contexts and data are concerned) and mastery of depth (the contribution itself, judged to be competent and original and of high quality)” (Frayling et al. 1997, 11).

In 2005 the European Ministers adopted the Framework for Qualifications from the so called “Dublin descriptors” (EHEA 2005), which on doctoral level can be summarised as: a systematic understanding of a field of study including mastery of the skills and methods of research; the ability to conceive and pursue a substantial process of research with scholarly integrity; a contribution through original research; capacity of critical analysis and evaluation; and an ability to communicate with peers, the larger scholarly community and with society in general.

We regard these two definitions, coming from different time periods, as important contributions to the development of the third level of higher education in Europe. The two sets of criteria for research competence have inspired the authors to contribute to further define these criteria of research competence in their own ADA fields.

The concept of “doctorateness” has been central in doctoral courses the authors during several years have offered in Belgium, Norway and Sweden. In 2011 the authors have, together with a group of international doctoral candidates, studied the “doctorateness” of several recent Scandinavian practice-related doctoral theses in architecture and design as a research project itself.

The project builds upon a series of doctoral courses which we have implemented in research education for architects and designers in Belgium, Norway and Sweden in the years 2008-2011 (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson 2010; Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson 2011), in which we attempt to train the doctoral students towards the above mentioned research competences. The courses included the study and evaluation of already accepted doctoral thesis in the design fields, and the PhD students were guided by a set of criteria formulated by the teachers. With regard to these guidelines, which include our interpretation of how the competences are embedded in the final product of doctoral work, the students were asked to discuss and evaluate: the research problem of the thesis; the knowledge status in the field; the “research design” of the doctoral project (the relations between the object of study, the theoretical frameworks used, the traditional or the “by design” approach to the research); the description and self-evaluation of the “route mapping”, i.e. the research method applied and the arguments for the chosen approach; the scholarly craftsmanship materialised in the thesis (“akrib”); the communicability of the thesis; the importance of the project to the knowledge building in the field, and if it has brought about new original knowledge; the potential for further development of the results of the thesis; and the value of the thesis outside the scholarly and designer community.

The project consists of several steps. The first is an analysis of the three assessment assignments carried out by doctoral students at universities in the three different countries. All of them studied the same set of doctoral theses. The next step is to analyse the written assessments by the adjudication committees for the doctoral theses at the universities where they were defended. While we can regard the first group of informants as novices in research practice, the other group are the experts in the practice of assessing research at the doctoral level. The third step consists of comparing the kind of results of assessments by the different groups of assessors. The thesis assessments are analysed using an approach of integrative research review (Cooper 1984). This methodology conceptualizes the integrative research review as a form of scientific inquiry similar to the primary research process.

While studying the assessments of the doctoral theses, the authors follow the ethical rules of conduct as formulated in various European guidelines (for instance Code of Good Practice in Academic Research (European University Institute 2011). Our approach is especially careful while addressing the partly confidential experts’ assessments.

The paper will report on the analyses and findings from these studies. We assume that the outcome of the
project will be a more operative definition of 
“doctorateness” which we hope to become a 
pedagogical tool to be used in research education in 
the ADA fields.
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The University of Liverpool offers two online Professional Doctorates. They are each delivered by Laureate Online Education through a collaborative agreement. The partnership necessarily addresses the following factors: accreditation, academic standards, quality assurance and quality enhancement. This particular partnership makes a good case study through which to explore best practice.

In this paper we review the regulatory environment in the context of UK and European frameworks. We identify key aspects of collaborative partnerships necessary for the delivery of professional doctorates. The discussion considers each of the following aspects of successful collaboration: accreditation, academic standards, quality assurance and quality enhancement. Through carefully chosen examples of practice on the DBA and EdD, the paper identifies threshold standards and examples of good practice which characterise these on-line professional doctorates. In particular, the paper addresses the following themes through the two case studies of the DBA and the EdD:

- Accreditation: options available through collaborative partnerships including validation and franchise agreements;
- Academic Standards: the role of the University and the Partner in assuring the academic standards of the degree;
- Quality Assurance and Enhancement: key processes which assure and enhance the quality of the student learning experience including the importance of effective staff and educational development. Also some precepts from the Code of practice from the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in the UK will be examined.

The University has a long standing (since 2000), mature relationship with Laureate Online Education for the delivery of a suite of postgraduate, distance learning programmes beginning with a MSc in Information Technology. Since then, the number of programmes and number of students has grown considerably and now totals 23 programmes including two taught research degree programmes at doctoral level and a total of approximately 8,000 students.

Programmes delivered through the Liverpool – Laureate partnership are only one set of a suite of UK and International Partnerships which the University operates. All are managed with reference to the UK Academic Framework and in particular, Section 2 of the Code of Practice. Whilst most Universities characterise their Collaborative Provision, the type has now become less important than the outcome and the overriding factor is that the University remains ultimately responsible for the academic standards and the quality of the students' learning experience. However, it is difficult not to group partnerships into different relationships and the usual topology provides a useful tool. Different but relevant types of partnership will be examined in order to reflect upon that which currently applies to the Laureate delivered programmes.

The two professional doctorates, the DBA and EdD which are the focus of this paper are Liverpool degrees, for which the University takes full responsibility but delegates day-to-day operations to Laureate. The University has in place processes to ensure that the rules and guidelines that apply to these off-campus programmes, in relation to quality assurance, enhancement and standards, mirror as far as possible those that apply to on campus delivery. The curriculum is specified by the University department and approved through the normal University procedures. At departmental level, the Laureate programmes are managed in the same way as on-campus provision with a Board of Studies and a Director of Studies whose role is complemented in Laureate by a Director of Online Studies. The two Directors work in partnership on academic issues with final decisions, where necessary, being made by the (University) Director of Studies. While the tutors are appointed, and trained, by Laureate, and have no direct contractual relationship with the University, the Director of Studies is responsible for their approval, and re-approval, as recognised teachers of the University. Details of module assessments are contained in the module descriptors and are operated by the module tutor working to University of Liverpool University prescribed criteria. A monitor, appointed from the relevant University school is responsible for sampling a proportion of the assessed work to check that these criteria are being appropriately applied and standards maintained. Particular processes that apply to the Doctoral thesis stage of the degree will be explored.

The paper will also discuss the day to day assurance and enhancement processes operated by both Laureate and the University of Liverpool which assure the quality of the students’ learning experiences. We thus review the academic framework which informs the doctoral programmes, identify key aspects of quality systems and share best practice.
Research training at doctoral level is an important and strategic issue for the future of the university and also for wider workforce development. The significance of collaborative research between academia and industry during doctoral education are noted by Mangematin (2000); Zucker et al (1997); Stephan and Levin (1997); Harman (2002). Nevertheless, empirical evidence with regards to the impact of such relationships and implications for firm strategies and skill development is still few. Based on the literature of S&T human capital, Boardman and Corley (2008, p. 903) propose that “university research centres are strategic exercises in S&T human capital enhancement” where collaborative networks are fostered to create “cross-disciplinary and cross-sector synergies” to further a field of research and development. In this light, the nature and organisations of doctoral education programmes, incentives for creating multi-disciplinary science teams between university and industry, and interactive experiences of doctoral students need to be investigated. This paper reports empirical findings from Industrial doctorate programmes in the UK, particularly focusing on the motivation of firms that participate in collaborative relationships with doctoral programmes and how that influences knowledge creation processes within the organisations, and knowledge flows across sectoral and organisational boundaries. The paper will draw on the empirical data based on semi-structured interviews with firm managers that participated in industrial doctorate programmes in engineering. The paper identifies firm strategies, perceived impacts for both firms and individuals under such programmes. The paper argues that knowledge transfer between university and industry through doctoral research training has direct and indirect implications not only for doctoral students and their research experiences, but also for organisational strategies of the firms with regard to their research and human resource development.
Charting Future Pathways to the Psychiatric Mental Health DNP in the United States
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In 2004, the American Association of the Colleges of Nursing (AACN) developed a position statement which mandated that the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) become the entry level into advanced nursing practice by 2015. In response, members of the International Society of Psychiatric Nurses DNP Task Force convened over several months to examine the current issues surrounding the AACN mandate. In particular, we examined its potential impact on safe and cost effective primary and preventive care for the public, development of didactic and clinical expertise vs. leadership skills and translational science, recent contextual changes impacting on the current healthcare workforce, the effects of a volatile economy on costs for the public, students and educational programs, and the DNP as a terminal vs. entry level degree. In addition, we examined its alignment with the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine (IOM) Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health report which addresses barriers to nursing practice and patient access to care, promotion of patient centered care, the role of primary care nurses in patient care, the shortage of nursing faculty, the need to reduce healthcare hierarchies, mechanisms to promote nursing leadership, and mechanisms to reduce the nurse provider shortage. Based on this work, the purpose of this presentation is to share how this group has begun to articulate the future of the DNP in psychiatric mental health nursing in the United States while considering the current landscape of post-baccalaureate education. We examined several issues involved in charting a future course for the DNP as the entry level/terminal clinical degree as well as the validation of competency for advanced practice. We recommended that curricula, certification processes, and licensure processes require incremental modification over time for the profession as a whole to achieve this goal and propose 2025 as the implementation date.
A doctorate for a professional triadic knowledge nexus?

In Norway, as elsewhere in Europe, mass HE and inclusion of new institutions was based on a classification of the task structure of new institutions into the knowledge architecture of established universities. Gradually extended missions of non-university institutions and new universities cover areas beyond the core of older universities. All HEI in Norway have from 1995 a common framework including the mandate to base its educational programs, teaching and learning “on the best from research, professional and artistic development work”. With this triadic knowledge nexus research and qualification drift in new institutions (Kyvik 2010), then, do not necessary imply academic drift.

In the Norwegian case a major source of academic drift has, however, been a rapidly expanding university based doctoral education, remodeled in the 1980s and 1990s to the PhD format. From 1997 a supplementary channel for recognition of merits on a doctoral level, but with a broader profile, have been a national scheme supporting the award of position as førstelektor (senior lectureship). In the HEI faculty with merits as førstelektor represent about a fourth of total staff with PhD or equivalent. In the UCs in 2010 541 of 1526 with intermediate level qualifications were senior lecturers. Many UCs have small programs supporting this supplementary qualification, with OUC as pioneer since 2003.

In the paper the HIOA program and a two other supplementary programs will be analysed as examples not covered by the established PhD model. At the moment a national working group go through existing regulations and evaluate needs for supplementary doctoral degrees to support needs for qualifications at the highest EQF level in all parts of the Norwegian HE and research system. The examples of ongoing alternative programs and the proposals from the national working group will be compared with the NQF as a background.

The presentation will build on earlier research and references, including:
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Sandra Corlett
Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, UK
Email: sandra.corlett@northumbria.ac.uk

Within the business school context, a premier and the largest (Rubin and Martell, 2009) international accrediting body is the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International (AACSB). Its Assurance of Learning (AoL) standards require schools to provide “hard evidence” (Rubin and Martell, 2009) of educational achievement against programme learning goals including, where appropriate to the institution’s accreditation plan, at doctoral level. This “very distinct change” in the 2003 standards, as noted by Milton Blood, the former Director for Accreditation at AACSB International (Thompson, 2004, cited by Rubin and Martell, 2009, p.368), presented a challenge generally to schools, because of a lack of systems of direct learning measures.

Although clearly defined and specific in their purpose, the AoL standards give schools discretion in designing and implementing AoL processes (Zocco, 2011). Whilst there are exemplar AoL processes for Undergraduate and Masters programmes (see, for instance, Bisoux, 2008, Hayes and Lu, 2010), there are none for doctoral programmes. The doctoral AoL process presented in this paper was implemented in 2010-11 within a UK University Business School, offering professional doctorates (Doctor in Business Administration, and Doctor in Business Leadership) and a PhD programme. The paper illustrates the AoL process implemented and considers how the interim assessment of professional doctorate (and PhD) students’ learning may enhance student achievement of end-of-programme learning goals.

The AoL process

AACSB (2007) guidance suggests the following five AoL-process steps:

1. Define learning goals and objectives
2. Align curriculum with goals
3. Identify instruments and measures to assess learning
4. Collect, analyze, and disseminate assessment information
5. Use assessment information for continuous improvement

As Fenton-O’Creevy notes (cited in Bisoux, 2008), AACSB’s suggested AoL process aligns well with UK Higher Education Institutions’ assessment systems,
established to meet the UK’s Quality Assurance Agency’s (QAA) requirements, for instance of publishing module learning outcomes and of aligning assessment measures with them. However, AACSB’s emphasis on defining programme level Learning Goals (LGs) and Learning Objectives (LO) encourages systematic continuous improvement, at both module and programme levels.

AACSB’s Standard 21 represents the ‘normal’ learning goals for Business and Management doctoral programmes (AACSB, 2007). The AACSB’s (2007) broad aims of ‘educating students for highly specialized careers in academe or practice ... and [developing] sufficient understanding to participate in knowledge creation in their fields of study’ fits well with the QAA (2011) doctoral descriptors. We used these descriptors to define the “measurable attributes of the overall learning goal” (AACSB, 2007), i.e. the Learning Objectives (Table 1).

Whilst the AoL standards reinforce the use of direct measures of learning achievement, they allow choice of assessment instruments. The three suggested assessment instruments – selection based upon knowledge or skill acquired through previous educational experience (such as pre-entry qualifications), module/course-embedded measures (such as assignments) and stand-alone testing or performance (such as end-of-programme thesis) – all apply to professional doctoral programmes. As “the doctoral examination is...where all the candidate’s achievements and research relevant attributes are tested” (QAA, 2011, p.22), it might be argued that assurance of learning should be measured through the thesis submission and viva. However, additionally, institutions providing doctoral education are required to “put in place...clearly defined mechanisms for formal reviews of student progress” (QAA, 2004, p.18). In this paper, we analyzed assessment data on student attainment of learning goals and objectives at the mid-point formal review and at the doctoral examination.

Research Methods

The data presented in this paper represent all doctoral students submitting for doctoral examination during the academic year 2010-11. Of the 15 doctoral students, eight were completing a DBA and seven a PhD programme. We analyzed the assessment data for these students from two ‘stand-alone performance tests’ (AACSB, 2007), at the mid-point progression (MPP) and thesis/viva stages. The data included examiners’ responses to checklist questions (taking a Yes/No form) and to open comment sections. The latter included examiners’ comments on the reason(s) for the examination outcome and on any required corrections.

The checklist question and open comment responses were coded, using content analysis (Holsti, 1969), against the programme learning objectives. The frequency of coding ‘counts’ and examiners’ comments were analyzed to inform curriculum development.

Analysis of assessment data

AoL aims to determine whether students are achieving programme learning goals. The typical outcome of doctoral examinations within this study’s institution is ‘pass the research component subject to corrections’. From this, a three-point scale of student performance was set: to pass/proceed without corrections is to exceed expectations; to pass subject to corrections is to meet expectations; and to not be permitted to proceed (at MPP stage) or to require a resubmission/fail/be awarded a lower degree (at viva stage) is to fall below expectations. For this first ‘periodic review’ (Hayes and Lu, 2010), the programme ‘standard’ was that 70% of students would meet or exceed expectations at MPP stage, and 80% at viva stage.

Table 2 shows student performance against the programme standard. At MPP, 100% of students met or exceeded expectations. At viva, 86.6% of students met or exceeded expectations. However, the programme breakdown shows achievement by 100% of DBA students and 71% of PhD students.

Closing the loop

Zocco (2011) argues that the five-step AoL procedure should be recursive in nature, with assessment data collected during the previous assessment cycle being used to ‘close the loop’ (Bisoux, 2008, p.22) by informing curriculum improvement. Even when students attain the programme learning goals, analysis of individual and collective student performance against the learning objectives helps to identify areas for curriculum improvement. At the MPP stage, the highest frequencies of correction comments (for both DBA and PhD) related to Learning Goal 2 (Table 3). For both programmes, the next highest frequency comment relates to Learning Objective 5.1. At the viva stage, issues relating to communicating and disseminating complex ideas (5.2) predominate, for both programmes. Learning Goal 2 issues remain at the viva stage for the PhD. Although issues relating to learning objective 2.2 were ranked third on the PhD programme, only one correction related to this on the DBA. Based on further analysis of narrative comments
mapped against these learning objectives, suggestions for improvement include:

**Learning Goal 2:**
- Throughout the programme, keep title, aims, objectives, research question and boundaries under review and ensure they reflect the work undertaken
- At mid-point, provide details of data analysis technique(s) and show link between initial data analysis and preliminary findings

**Learning Goal 5:**
- Provide clarity regarding the originality of contribution to practice (DBA) and to knowledge (PhD)
- Ensure the abstract summarises the entirety of the work
- Correct typographical and grammatical errors

**Conclusion**

The study has illustrated the assurance of learning process for the professional doctorate (and PhD), within a UK University Business School. Although the results represent a small sample size, the paper has illustrated how assessment data have been systematically collected and analyzed to determine the extent of Learning Goal achievement and to identify areas for curriculum improvement. Ongoing implementation of the AoL process, and future analysis of assessment data, will evaluate the impact of curriculum development improvements on student attainment of doctoral goals.
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**Table 1: Example of Doctoral Learning Goals and Learning Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Have acquired advanced knowledge in areas of specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Create and interpret new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Demonstrate systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Have developed advanced theoretical or practical research skills for the areas of specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Demonstrate the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Demonstrate a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Have given attention to the role of the specialization areas within managerial and organizational contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Demonstrate an ability to continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Be prepared for responsibilities in higher education or professional practice (for those students who expect to enter teaching careers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Demonstrate an awareness of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require both the ability to make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields and an innovative approach to tackling and solving problems in higher education, professional or equivalent environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Have demonstrated personal integration of, and original intellectual contribution to, a field of knowledge (for PhD) or to professional practice (for Professional Doctorates) through a written and oral defence of a dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Create and/or interpret knowledge which extends the forefront of a discipline (for PhD) or an aspect of professional practice (for Professional Doctorates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Communicate and disseminate complex ideas to fellow academics and/or professionals to stimulate developments of a field of knowledge or of professional practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from AACSBS (2007) and QAA (2011)

**Table 2: Examination outcomes for candidates submitting thesis/having viva in academic year 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proceed/Pass</th>
<th>Corrections minor</th>
<th>Corrections major</th>
<th>Resubmission (viva only)</th>
<th>Lower award</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA (n=8)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD (n=7)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (n=15)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viva</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA (n=8)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD (n=7)</td>
<td>4 (57%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (n=15)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At MPP, 100% of students met (Minor/Major corrections) or exceeded (Proceed) programme learning goals. At viva, 86.6% of students met (Minor/Major corrections) or exceeded (Pass) programme learning goals (100% DBA, 71% PhD).
Table 3: Frequency of corrections mapped against Learning Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viva</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viva</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrating Theory and Practice in a Fine Art Doctorate

Karen Raney
Senior Lecturer in Art and Art Theory
University East London, UK
Email: k.j.raney@uel.ac.uk

Karen Raney is Senior lecturer in Art and Art Theory at the University East London, and joint course organiser of the Professional Doctorate in Fine Art. Since 2000 she has been editor of Engage journal, of the international association for museum and gallery education. Previously she was research fellow at Middlesex University, and visual arts officer at Arts Council England. Her book Art in Question is a selection of interviews with leading international artists, art historians, theorists and curators. She has lectured and published widely on art and art education.

Art is by nature two-faced. It is amenable to rational analysis and it is irrational and resistant to analysis. Art is bound up with ideas, and it has imaginative autonomy from ideas. Because of this paradox, Fine Art is a field in which the relationship between theory and practice is particularly vexed. It is never a matter of ‘applying’ theory, but rather developing the framework of ideas which will best feed the imagination and push the work forward. This will be different for every artist, and every student of art.

Over the last six years at University of East London, our Professional Doctorate in Fine Art has become a unique programme for young and mid-career artists, the only one of its kind in the UK. Undertaken over three years full-time, or five years part-time, the DFA has been granted PhD equivalence by the university, which has been important for its status, particularly amongst overseas students. We currently have students from Greece, Malaysia, Korea, Taiwan, Japan, Brazil, Canada and Lebanon as well the UK. Some have recently completed an MA; some are returning to education after years working as artists or lecturers. Our graduates have gone on to become gallery directors, deans, professors and teachers of art, as well as exhibiting artists. One graduate has set up a Fine Art Professional Doctorate at Lahore University in Pakistan. Doctoral programmes are becoming an important avenue for pedagogic development, and at UEL we are developing doctorates in other subject areas, such as design and fashion, based on the DFA model.

The structure of the Doctorate in Fine Art

Students spend the first six months of the programme writing their proposal in the context of group seminars and supervisory tutorials. The aim during this period is for students to locate their work in relation to current debates and practices and to develop critical habits. The proposal is
written in stages. Presentations are made to the student group at each stage, in order to test, consolidate and share their research.

Initially, students review their past creative and professional practice. They scrutinise the content and subject matter of their work, their creative strategies, and the contemporary context, reflecting on the artists and theorists that have been important to them. Students invariably find it illuminating to reflect on what they may have taken for granted in the past, and this prepares them to locate their conceptual position for the doctorate. At this stage we are able to identify any weaknesses in writing or critical thinking, and put supportive measures in place. This is particularly important for overseas students who have not been educated in the UK, and may need help in adjusting to London’s academic and artistic environment.

In the next stage of writing the proposal, theory is arrived at through researching art practice. Students identify three relevant contemporary artists and explore the critical debate surrounding their work. This emphasises the primacy of practice and ensures that the theory they choose is relevant and ‘owned.’ Over the same period, students are developing a new piece of artwork, and in the final stage they present the work to the group. The aim is to make explicit the methodologies they already use, and to open up new ones that will allow theory to inform but not prescribe creative practice.

Following the completion of the proposal and registration, students continue working more independently on the three fronts: creative practice, professional practice and theoretical research. At the end of each year they write a critical review, summarising developments in each area. The reviews create a reflective record of the journey of the doctorate. In the final year, theoretical research is presented to the group as a rehearsal for the viva, and to model the integration of theory for first year students.

When students come to the viva examination, the ‘thesis’ is their final exhibition of work. This may take any of the forms of contemporary art, from paintings, prints or sculptures to installation, video or performance. Their proposal and their annual reviews form the basis of the final report, a contextual document which supports the exhibition-thesis.

Private autonomy and public scrutiny

Although artworks may be created in private, to exist as ‘art’ they need a public life and exposure to the responses of others. For this reason, two elements crucial to the doctorate are the group dynamic and the exhibition culture. Throughout the programme, work in progress is aired to the group through regular seminars which supplement one-to-one tutorials with supervisors. Students exhibit each year at UEL interim shows, and they are encouraged to seek out and curate their own external exhibitions. Each year critics, curators and artists contribute to a doctoral forum, which is an opportunity for student work to be seen and discussed in a professional context.

Between theory and imagination

We have designed our programme to follow as closely as possible the organic nature of the creative process. This distinguishes it from the more academic Fine Art PhDs, where candidates arrive with a research project which they carry out. For our students, the proposal is not a project outline but a starting point, from which their work could develop in many different directions.

This comes back to my opening reflections on the two-faced nature of art. We invite students to analyse their work, and the way they work, not to stamp out intuition, ambiguity, accidents, chance or the fertile state of ‘not knowing’, but rather to situate these less controllable processes within a strategy which is set in place by, and is continually reappraised through, critical reflection.

As supervisors, one of the challenges we face is to ensure rigour and coherence in the students’ work, whilst allowing for and building upon the unpredictable fruits of the imagination. Tuition has to be tailor-made to each person. Not only is there great variation in content, medium, and theoretical concerns, but different students, or the same student at different times, will have to be nudged toward or away from theory. Some students need to read, analyse and research more widely and deeply in order to open up the possibilities in their practice. Others may use theory to justify, illustrate, or avoid creative practice; they need to put theorising aside and learn to take leaps in the dark, to surrender a measure of control so that their work can have an imaginative life of its own.

If they are to develop as artists, everyone has to find their own particular way of to-ing and fro-ing between seemingly opposed states - private and public, reason and un-reason, theory and imagination - honouring the claims of both.
Every branch of activity at the workplace would seem to have its own particular forms of practice. In such an environment a wide range of practices would seem obvious to those professionals implicated, for example, those involved in the media, management, marketing, HR, accountancy, medicine, law, engineering, education and so on. All such domains of activity have their own training regimes in which new recruits are inducted and guided in developing a range of concepts that shape and in some ways define particular forms of practice. Within such regimes, practice itself is more often viewed as some kind of transparent medium through which people work. But, what exactly do we mean when we variously make reference to practice and why should we be bothered to examine such an issue anyway?

In response to this question there are associated concerns about how what are represented as practices might be distinguished from activities and actions or the just plain doing of something. Questions concerning practice are therefore centred upon not only what lies behind the doings of such activities, but also the language in which practices are located. In their own different ways Ludwig Wittgenstein and Martin Heidegger have already opened just such questioning and thinking about what unfolds behind our everyday representations of professional practices.

In this study the particular reading of Wittgenstein and the significance of his writings for making sense of practice has been strongly influenced by the work of Thomas Schatzki. Wittgenstein is famous for turning the tradition of philosophy running from Plato to Husserl on its head. Wittgenstein’s celebrated argument holds that a concept identified by a practitioner is
not an instance of concepts introduced into usage in and through professional training, for example. According to his argument we are located as practitioners in various ‘language games’. The regularity and non-regularity of such games, like the metaphor ‘game’, itself, does not amount to the repetition of the same, but alerts all involved to a ‘family of resemblances among activities’. In looking behind the unfolding of practices with Wittgenstein this study illuminates on the one hand the basis upon which practices are constituted and maintain their integrity as forms of social order at the workplace.

From this approach to the issue of practice, it is apparent how those involved in particular forms of professional practice can readily identify and characterise the ways in which their own practices resemble and differ in particular ways from other known practices. In any given durée, such as the case example, featured in this study, of the director of a company that coordinates social housing in the West Midlands, behind the more obvious bundles of doings and sayings that characterise the practice of directing (or any other form of workplace practice), there is, as Shatzki (1996) argues, a ‘teleoaffective structure’. This structuring of a temporally evolving open-ended set of doings and sayings, characterising in this case the practice of one director, and linked for him to his practical understandings of the rules of his workplace culture and more general understandings of his role. This study provides a characterisation of such a teleoaffective structure, which gathers together the layer of doings and sayings of those involved in a ‘hierarchical’ order within one company organisation with other layers of their specific ‘tasks’ and much wider ‘projects’ in accord with particular moods and emotions. Certainly, from a Heideggerian (1962) perspective such moods and emotions may not only be the product of workplace activity, but the very basis for shaping it in the first place. In providing a characterisation of the teleoaffective structuring of the director in question, the study will also serve to illuminate the normative powers inscribed in such structuring through the sanctions of others that dispose individuals and groups with particular forms of ‘oughtness’. What ought to be done that is inscribed in the teleoaffective structures in such practice is here shown to provide grounds for the performativity that is found in the contemporary workplace, which in turn makes demands upon such teleoaffective structures in practice.

This foregoing approach to questioning and thinking about the practice of the director of one company opens insights into what is at work in maintaining the integrity of the social order in what Shatzki (1996) calls an ‘integrative practice’. From a Heideggerian perspective as an approach it remains ontically structured, and so concerned primarily with the possibilities unfolding in particular beings. The concluding aspect of this study examines the workplace from a contrasting ontological viewpoint concerned with our unfolding relationship with the horizon of being at the workplace.

At least two further issues emerge from an ontological viewpoint regarding the director’s practice. First, the study illuminates the ‘ready-to-hand’ aspects of the director’s world that help him to make sense of and to shape his everyday practice. Finally, the study will also open further questions about higher order teleoaffective structures of being found in Western cultures, that Heidegger (1977) in his more mature work finally identified as technological enframing, or simply the enframing. In his original work the enframing was linked to more obvious technologies such as roads, bridges, airplanes, hydroelectricity schemes and so on. More recently Flint and Peim (2012) have shown how such enframing is also at work in the practices of modern formal systems of education. The enframing constitutes for human beings always the possible danger of reducing us to only one way of revealing our world, recognised in this study on the basis of the ‘principle of reason’ or its more recent offspring, the ‘principle of assessment’.

In this particular case it is the principle of assessment that is shown to constitute grounds for intelligibility in the world of the director. The study provides a characterisation of the ways in which the world of the company director is made intelligible on grounds of quantitative assessment of what is done in practice. The study concludes with a brief reflection on other forms of disclosure open to human beings and the dangers of individuals and groups at the workplace being caught up in particular ways of practising at the workplace that is ultimately, but unconsciously driven by the enframing; that is, our relationship with being.
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The Professional Doctorate and Business Intelligence: How Academic Thinking can open up new business opportunities

Tuesday 3rd April
Session 2 – 09.55am – 10.25am

Why should a CEO of a growing international business take time out to complete a professional doctorate? Three years ago Philip Squire, CEO of Consalia (a growing international company specialising in sales consultancy) completed a professional doctorate with Middlesex University’s Institute for Work Based Learning. In this paper Dr Philip Squire explains how his undertaking the Doctorate in Professional Studies has opened up not just new ways of thinking for himself but also business opportunities which have meant his business has grown by almost
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Dr Philip Squire is the CEO of Consalia Ltd...... Having worked in the banking sector with Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Group he took a sales role then a sales management role in the Financial Services industry. In 1985 he set up an independent sales training and service consultancy practice that now has offices in London and Singapore. Since 2003/4 Philip led a doctoral research project on sales effectiveness for B2B and B2C market orientated companies. The research suggests a new paradigm is required for sales and service teams based on key values. In particular Philip has explored the link between values and value creation.
80%. The link between the two he describes as an increased awareness of ‘business intelligence’ which he draws upon to leverage a wider range of opportunities for his clients.

Dr Peter Critten supervised Philip’s DProf and has collaborated with him on a number of conference papers (Critten P, Squire P & Leppenwell G (2010) ; Critten P, & Squire P (2011) that focus on the same argument: high level learning and knowledge is not and should not be confined within academia. It is now 18 years since Gibbons et al first proposed the notion of ‘Mode 2’ (that privileges knowledge emerging from practice) as opposed to Mode 1 knowledge (which is the domain of ‘academic’ expertise). But this means engaging more with ‘the real’ world and encouraging professional practitioners to challenge existing Mode 1 knowledge which in turn leads to ‘new’ knowledge domains to be ‘mapped’ out (Wyatt 1994) As Barnett observes this requires ‘Collective self-scrutiny’ which is not a ‘natural condition of the academic’ (Barnett 2000). What this paper explores is what can be achieved if business and academia collaborate not just to generate Mode 2 knowledge but also Mode 1 knowledge but this may be a bridge too far for much of academia.

‘Mode 2 knowledge production poses particular problems for the traditional kind of university-based researcher. The authority of Mode 1 research in this environment means that the dominant mode of dissemination is the academic book, the scholarly refereed paper and the conference presentation. Mode 2 knowledge is disseminated much more informally, if at all, through such means as the summary report and, increasingly, through on-line postings and other forms of electronically mediated communication’ (Usher and Edwards 2000: 263)

In this paper Dr Squire illustrates how since acquiring his professional doctorate he has gone on to contribute not just to Mode 2 knowledge but through international conferences he has hosted to disseminate his research findings he argues he is also generating knowledge and theory that meets Mode 1 criteria (of which, of course, his professional doctorate, was a prime example). In particular he is currently going through the process of translating outcomes of his research into a series of modules which will be accredited by Middlesex University and lead to an MA I Sales Transformation. He acknowledges that he has been helped to do this by his association and collaboration with Middlesex University. And in particular he focuses on the contribution of academia in changing his way of thinking while completing his doctorate and how changing one’s way of thinking leads to the opening up of business opportunities as well as new knowledge. He observes that

‘Businesses have very little time to think about how to reflect, let alone reflect, as they chase the quarter’s performance goals - the value of reflective practice is less tangible than hitting the latest sales figures or meeting the current cost reduction exercises. Academia has much to offer on reflective practice,... Business needs a robust thought leadership process, but they also need relevancy. Academia can provide more robust processes to thought leadership.

My suggestion is that businesses should lead the thought leadership agenda as this ensures relevancy but that academia underpin the thought leadership process with sound research methods often lacking in business.’ (Critten, Squire and Leppenwell 2010)

The conclusion of this paper is that the professional doctorate should promote more the link between raising the level of thinking to the highest ‘academic’ level and the capability that provides for innovative thinking in the market place (Mode 2 knowledge) which in turn can and should inform ‘academia’ (Mode 1).

Dr Peter Critten develops this theme and explores what a new kind of partnership between business and academia might look like if it was driven by business seeking help from academics to sharpen their thinking and business intelligence in the way it has worked for Philip Squire. He shares a model which has at the heart of it ‘professional practice’ and shows how academia can help business ‘theorise’ their practice. In effect, the ‘theorisation’ of practice is what work based learning is all about. Theorisation of practice that leads to recognition at a doctorate level is the ultimate academic prize. Critten argues that in the same way as someone graduating with a PhD might expect to become a professional researcher and take up an academic career, a CEO like Philip Squire with a professional doctorate behind him should also expect to follow up his original research but where would the outcome of that research be disseminated?

Critten proposes that academia pays more attention to how they could better support and encourage former Professional Doctoral students to continue their research and provide a forum for its dissemination.
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When developing the professional practice doctorate and conducting pilot research related to the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) working principles, committed leadership to both was evident. This paper will explore leadership for change and the role of CPED critical friends in achieving alignment with principles or quality standards.

Background

Established in 2007, CPED sought to distinguish the Ed.D. (professional practice doctorate) from the Ph.D. From the Council for Academic Deans of Research Education Institutions (CADREI) 24 teams were selected to participate in CPED and the deans made these commitments:

- To envision new ways of preparing professional practitioners for schools and colleges,
- To design new programs that will enable professional practitioners to function effectively,
- To examine recent advances in the learning sciences and human cognition, statistics and technology, leadership and discipline-based knowledge, and alternative pedagogies.

A professional academic community committed to the development, implementation, and monitoring of progress and quality of the initiative among partner institutions was developed (Perry & Imig, 2008; Storey & Hartwick, 2010). Pilot research related to leadership and fidelity to agreed upon standards will be discussed.
CPED Critical Friends as Researchers

Members participated as critical friends (Storey & Hartwick, 2010) by agreeing upon six principles to be contextualized to each institution. Organizational structures differ among these US institutions just as they differ among institutions internationally. These institutional variations do not preclude commitment to leadership for change and participation as critical friends in CPED (Storey & Hartwick, 2010).

CPED critical friends represent characteristics noted by Swaffield (2005): useful knowledge and experience, reflective listening and communication, facilitation of critical thought, and support for confidence building with respect. According to Storey & Hartwick (2010), the critical friends networks value increases over time as understanding of the professional contexts, issues, and people deepens. Value of these critical friends has been noted by CPED continuing participants (Storey & Taylor, 2012).

Curry (2008) suggested that teams (such as critical friends) who are driven by inquiry hold each other collectively accountable leading to positive outcomes, reflecting high performance. As a reform in higher education, the professional practice doctorate may benefit from critical friends as part of a success strategy (Bambino, 2003).

Methodology

The author and a second researcher in the role of critical friends visited University A March 30- April 1, 2011, during which structured interviews with three administrators, four faculty, and six students were recorded and transcribed. Transcriptions were coded and findings quantified to create a case study. “To what extent has each institution implemented the CPED principles?” is one of the research questions investigated by the researchers and is the focus of this paper.

Leadership for Change

Transformational leadership, that is, empowering faculty through capacity building to align the doctoral program with CPED was provided by the Dean (Bass, 1997; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Consistent with Astin and Astin (2000) the Dean identified leadership to collaborate with faculty to design and implement the professional practice doctorate. Such collaboration among faculty, who are rewarded for their individual work, can be in conflict with the institution’s cultural norms unless leadership develops a culture of shared values and alignment of individual and institutional goals among both administrators and faculty (Astin & Astin, 2000; Davis, Hides, & Casey, 2001).

Prior to developing the professional practice doctorate, University A had a large Ph. D. program (90-100 students), but faculty perceived that the school practitioners “were flooding courses that were designed for scholars and, if you like, were diluting the focus of courses that had been designed to prepare people for the academy” (Faculty 3). According to the Department Chair, “The then Dean and Assistant Dean were instrumental in participation in CPED and in attending to the President’s wishes for developing a new program.” Reflecting both the concepts of critical friends and leadership the Dean voiced that CPED participation helped conversations about change, “…has informed the culture... and made us more thoughtful, and willing to tilt windmills. It has legitimzed doing something very, very differently.”

With change in mind, a new Department Chair was recruited to provide leadership for the Ed. D.’s development. A Principal Investigator, described by the Dean as a “colleague leader”, was also recruited.

Alignment with CPED Working Principles

(cpeditiative.org/working-principles-professional-practice-doctorate-education)

Administrators, faculty, and the students were aware of the CPED design principles. Specifically, during the interviews the principles were mentioned 18 times when describing the Ed. D. design and related CPED concepts were mentioned 17 times as integrated into the new program. When Faculty 2 was given the list of principles to review, he exclaimed, “This looks like our program!” Evidence related to alignment with each principle follow.

Principle: Are framed around the questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.

“We really build on the idea of equity/ethics/social justice” (Principal Investigator). She was clear that the purpose was to move students beyond awareness of the need for social justice and to act on the need through field experiences.

Principle: Prepare leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.

The words of the Department Chair reflected the value of constructing and applying knowledge, “The Ed. D. is focused on how can you become or how can you become more of a leader, so there is more focus on doing.” On the other hand, Student 1 said that making a difference with individuals and families was not emphasized.

Principle: Provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and
communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.

Students worked in teams, but there was resentment among students whose team members were not perceived as doing their share of the work and yet, who received the same grade and degree.

Principle: Provide field-based opportunities to analyze complex problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.

Department Chair, “We’ve done [sic] a lot of problems of practice every semester, and every course is built around problems of practice.”

Principle: Are grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.

The program integrated inquiry into the content of courses, which frequently meant that the content became the focus and not the research methodology and statistics. When students began their capstone the Principal Investigator intervened with seminars to compensate for the lack of direct instruction.

Principle: Emphasize the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice.

“Emphasizing generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge in practice is really important,” (Principal Investigator). In contrast, Student 1 indicated that students did not generate new knowledge, but used knowledge.

Final Thoughts

Commitment to change by leadership enhances success in implementing and improving the professional doctorate. The critical friends’ research findings on alignment with the principles provided insight not only for leadership and revisions at University A, but also for the researchers’ programs. A key conclusion is that emphasis on scholarly practitioner, in contrast to a practitioner, is important as they are skillful in use of research, creating new knowledge, and reflect Ed. D. programs perceived to be rigorous and of high quality. Findings may encourage others to utilize the critical friends’ reform strategy to achieve alignment with agreed upon quality standards.
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Introduction

Knowledge transfer between educational institutions and industry has emerged as a priority for most universities in the UK. One recognised facilitator for such knowledge transfer is through researchers undertaking organisationally relevant research (Lee et al, 2000). However, our research indicates that there are a number of issues around the effective transfer of knowledge and skills learned at doctoral level when students complete their studies and ‘return’ to the workplace.

Earlier research and initial findings

This study builds upon earlier research on the tensions, impact and identity of practitioners as they emerge from professional doctorate study (Burgess & Wellington, 2010 and Burgess et al, 2011). The research extends this work to consider the strategy, skills and process in which professional doctorate practitioners effectively transfer research outcomes and contribute to their organisation practice. Data are drawn from online interview questionnaires, doctoral theses, face-to-face and telephone interviews and case studies.

The ‘re-entry’ gap

Our initial findings indicate that newly qualified professionals at doctoral level have developed a range of transferable skills, attitudes and abilities as a result of their professional doctorate (PD). These skills and attitudes are highly relevant to how the professional researcher ‘re-enters’, and is received into, the political and cultural context of their workplace. The focus of this paper is how that knowledge and skills is (or is not) transferred back or utilised in practice. What are the border issues between academy and profession that students face? These ‘border crossings’ (Enders 2005) may prove difficult for some students depending upon the organisation and content of their professional doctorate programme and whether the question of ‘what is this research training for?’ has been adequately addressed. The specific professional practice oriented doctorate undertaken by these students ought to ease knowledge transfer facilitated as it is by the ‘situated’ nature of their study. However, our research indicates that this is not always the case. The notion of the doctoral student as ‘enterprising self’ (Tennant 2004) promoted in the new knowledge economy of universities, argues for a closer examination of doctoral study as a whole (including the PhD) and the boundary crossings of students between academe and their workplace settings.

The potential change in identity of doctoral candidates as they progress through their learning journey may lead to great strides in personal skills development (for example written communication and verbal reasoning) and more general attitudes and aptitudes valued in academia such as ‘criticality’. For our doctoral students, the situated nature of their learning created many interesting workplace dynamics and brought varying responses to their hard
earned professional knowledge. For some it was about a reaffirmation of their professional values for others the management of a new ‘critical edge’ in their working relationships. There was some evidence of lack of acceptance among colleagues, which may lead to difficulty in influencing and convincing leaders within their organisation, and a potential fracturing of the employment relationship. A range of questions is considered on how to enhance the strategic fit and enable the doctoral researcher to integrate their academic and situated knowledge more effectively.

Creating the ecological conditions for growth and development

Eraut (2004) notes that informal and practice oriented learning in the workplace will need to be nurtured and supported in order to foster a pluralist learning culture, a point that is significant to our initial research findings. Organisations may benefit from guidance on how to best integrate and exploit an employee who has undergone professional doctoral development. Such guidance may indicate strategies and influences to the human resources mindset on how to create space for the professional doctorate member to utilise their (sometimes tacit) research and practice knowledge within the organisational culture.

Understanding organisational change

Hurst (1995) proposed a cyclical order of change within organisations, moving through conservation, creative destruction, renewal and exploitation and then back to conservation, achieved through strategic management. Stacey et al (2000) consider that organisations learn and grow through holding the paradox of stability and instability, seemingly on the edge of chaos. The sequential movement through the complex states of instability to stability, and the resulting change, in successful organisations, is attained through transformational leadership. The consequence of an employee undertaking doctoral research and such learning being integrated into the organisation may be understood as part of the instability that organisations need to experience in order to evolve strategically. However, this form of potential instability may require a different, perhaps more explicit and authentic approach from organisation leaders.

Pedagogical implications

This research is intended to contribute towards understanding the complexity of the learning organisation interface between its existing culture and how it may enable its members to influence change. Our findings to date suggest that there is room for a more emergent theory of practice in this context. The paper concludes by considering a need, towards the end of the doctorate, for a preparatory stage to enable development in using transferable skills within the cultural context of the organisation. A potential development framework for completing professional doctoral candidates will be outlined, including findings and recommendations from employers on potential strategy.

Suggestions for future research

This study is evolving to understand and recognise the needs of individuals, organisations and higher education institutions in a new more integrative way. The conference presentation will include debate around future approaches to collecting data from the relevant stakeholders and implications for employability, for example:

- Seeking the employers’ views on the right ecological conditions for a learning organisation to accept a new PD graduate, who is re-entering.
- Possible methods; interviews with employers, or perhaps two or three case studies / narratives exploring both perspectives i.e. the seeds and the stony (or more fertile ground…); what is fertile ground in a profession?
- Is a learning needs analysis required on the type of skills and abilities that the professional researcher and the organisation require?
- How do organisations perceive the university as validating the research that has been undertaken, what role do organisations feel that the university should have in providing ‘after care’?
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Practice as we-agency, skills as I-agency. The importance for doctorate studies.

Lee and Dunston situate the growing interest in higher levels of vocational or professional education in higher educational institutions as ‘an increasingly visible and important part of contemporary higher education, shaped increasingly in terms of human capital imperatives for employability and workforce supply’ (2011, p.483). In the shifting of universities towards a more clearly economic imperative rather than social good, the relationship between higher education teaching and professional practice has become more apparent in the courses offered by universities and their relationship with employment and employers. This paper envisions all high-level vocational education as professional and discusses how an understanding of the phenomenology of practice might help define how it might be structured and with whom.

The phenomenological analysis of practice in this paper leads to a proposed curriculum of self-understanding, for practice in the becoming of professional[1]: the practice associated with university-level vocational education. This approach is grounded upon the work of Heidegger (1962), Wittgenstein (2012), Merleau-Ponty(1962) and Bourdieu (1990), whose contributions to a perspective of being-in-the-world-with-others offer insights into different settings such as institutionalised education and other workplaces. Furthermore, this offer of a phenomenology of practice attempts to correct the technological and calculative modalities of contemporary life by opening up ‘possibilities for creating formative relations between being and acting between who we are and how we act’(van Manen, 2007, p. 13). It attempts a phenomenological understanding of the relationship between the dispositions of our Being’s being and how we act within social, cultural and political contexts that shape our material-economic condition. These situational ‘extra-individual’ features of practice (Kemmis and Smith, 2008) create
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the environment in which the architecture of practice (traditions, rituals and practices) limits individual interpretation of their practical agency.

Such an approach draws attention to a tension between formal education’s concentration on the self-developing autonomous individual, attested through technologies of individual assessment and resting upon a technical rather than a dispositional way of being, and the challenges of the economic imperatives in education. It is in the workplace that the shared agencies of communities of practice determine success. What fails the professional in the workplace is the difficulty for higher education institutions to grasp this phenomenon, exasperated by cultures and ideologies of individual autonomy and reward.

The spine of individuality seems to run through educational and training regimes as a given; we teach, assess and reward individuals in our educational institutions and for the most part do the same in our corporations. We expect convention but when this is successfully ruptured by an individual understanding a context differently from others and then providing imaginative solutions to problems, we accept their difference. Those who do stand out and fail, however, risk becoming what Greene (1988) terms a ‘critical stranger’ to their communities and workplaces for in these everyday contexts the basis upon which reward is given is adherence to the collective, settled in the familiar. This familiarity becomes the ‘presupposed basis of any thoughts [which] are taken for granted and go unnoticed, and because in order to arouse them and bring them into view we have to suspend for a moment our recognition of them’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. xiii). It is this actuality that a phenomenological analysis of practice is intended to reveal. Following Bourdieu, the logic of this practical awareness is not distinct from, nor reducible to, formal logic. The logic of this practical approach is a ‘logic that is intelligible, coherent but only up to a certain point (beyond which it would no longer be “practical”), and oriented towards practical ends, that is, the actualization of wishes, or desire (of life or of death), etc’ (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 132). It can be understood only in immediacy of action and ‘excludes attention to itself’ (1998, p.92). This applies to all modes of knowledge that cannot be translated into conceptual and theoretical representations but are ‘corporeal, relational, temporal, situational and actionable knowledge’ (Van Manen, 2007, p.22). Also, for Bourdieu, ‘practice is inseparable from temporality, not only because it is played out in time but because it plays strategically with time and especially with tempo’ (1990, p.81).

The paper will propose ways of radically restructuring the barriers between work and educational institutions by exposing them to the phenomenological furnace of professional practice. This requires a special understanding of professional higher education and is an addition to the conceptual notion of university and the skills version of vocational education. An argument has been made for this to be progressed through a radical revision of the higher education professional and vocational curriculum along the phenomenological lines of a currere. This would be in accord with the growing number of practice based doctorate qualification that are emerging from the UK, Europe that have parity of rigour and intellectual engagement but based on professional practice and workplace achievement. In the vanguard of this engagement with the practice of professionals has been the UK where practice based masters and doctorates have been on offer for a considerable time. The paper draws a distinction between these and the professional doctorate based on the separation of practice and evidence in awards such as DBAs and EdDs.
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Introduction
Professional doctorates within the Australian context have been a highly dynamic and shifting arena with multiple configurations and developments. The release of the newly agreed national benchmark for the professional doctorate in Australia (AQF, 2011) suggests a new phase of greater clarity for the provision and undertaking of professional doctorates whatever the area of professional practice. However, in the liminal spaces of doctoral practice, professionals need to make sense of their journey in becoming practitioner-researchers and in negotiating the complexities of academic and workplace cultures.

This paper outlines a current research project focusing on the unfolding individual and collective learning trajectories of a group of multidisciplinary health practitioners.
undertaking a newly accredited three year professional doctorate in public health (DrPH). Our approach draws on that advocated by Lee and Boud (2009) who argue that it is important to move beyond studies of simply what is provided in doctoral education to one that focuses on ‘how it is perceived and taken up’ (Lee & Boud, 2009, p. 16). The study traces the practitioners’ shifting understandings and meaning-making activities as they seek to mediate the complex relationships and knowledge regimes of academia and the workplace in becoming senior public health practitioner-researchers.

Locating the DrPH program

The doctorate arose from a recent partnership between a state health department and an Australian university. In contrast to typical university-industry partnerships where the pedagogical approach and site of learning are principally with the higher education institution (Neumann, 2005) here the professional doctorate is strongly embedded in the workplace and derives many of its features from the well-established workforce development program provided by the state health department.

For twenty years the program has been a high-level career pathway for producing a cadre of senior public health professionals from diverse multidisciplinary health backgrounds who undertake a three-year traineeship in a series of health service placements. With the inception of the partnership in 2009 all new trainees have had the opportunity to concurrently be doctoral candidates and have their workplace projects in their health service placements contribute towards the DrPH.

With the reconfiguring of the program into a work-based professional doctorate has come a new set of expectations, requirements and possible contestation as provision is now a joint enterprise between the health department and the university. Participants are now both ‘candidates’ and ‘trainees’, as they learn in and across university and health service workplace contexts and knowledge cultures (Meyer, Ritchie, & Madden, 2011). Where formally the program sought to foster senior practitioners who could undertake ‘public health action’ within complex environments (Morey & Madden, 2003), the DrPH seeks to also nurture researching professionals (Bourner, Bowden, & Laing, 2000) who can generate practice-based scholarship for use at organisational and professional levels to enhance population health outcomes.

The research study

This research project seeks to understand the lived experience of doing this particular DrPH with its own expectations and affordances and how participants negotiate their learning and identities in what is potentially a demanding process of becoming a new kind of health professional. As a qualitative longitudinal study the research is tracing the changing perceptions and activities of the DrPH participants as they undertake the program.

Sixteen trainees from a range of initial clinically based disciplines and differing levels of public health experience have commenced the DrPH since 2009 and are currently at various stages of candidature. All were invited to participate in the research and all agreed. Data is being collected principally through in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted at twelve-month intervals with each of the trainee-candidates.

Drawing on biographical learning methods (West, Alheit, Andersen, & Merrill, 2007) and narrative analysis (Riessman, 2008) transcripts from the first two rounds of interviews have been inductively analysed and re-storied into provisional accounts of learning and change for each of the DrPH participants. These are temporal products of the participants’ experiences as they transition through the program providing a reflective trigger for the following interview and working accounts for interpreting the unfolding individual and collective stories of becoming public health practitioner-researchers.

Some preliminary findings and discussion

Analysis of the narratives suggests that collectively all of the DrPH participants are engaged in considerable identity work in negotiating their practices and products between workplace and university knowledge cultures. A strong theme across accounts is the challenge of constructing written products from their health service projects that can meet the differing expectations of academia and the workplace. This finding accords with Lee’s view (2011) that undertaking a professional doctorate can involve particular tensions and ambiguities in seeking to make sense of and negotiate the differences between academic disciplinary and workplace knowledge forms and cultures. Despite the labour involved the accounts also reveal a kind of wanting – a deep desire to struggle through to become practitioner-researchers and a valuing, even if at times perplexing, of the affordances that the university and workplace provide in shaping their professional capacities.

Our analysis also indicates that it is not only the challenge of negotiating in and across the spaces of the university and the workplace that are influencing the complexities of undertaking this professional doctorate and shaping identities and practices. For some, ties from their initial clinical disciplinary culture
and the loss of the therapeutic relationship are impacting on their learning and identity formation in becoming public health professionals. Moving from the bedside to the desk is another type of negotiation and transition requiring for some considerable identity work as they seek to shift to a population focus and find their location in the broad field of public health.

Negotiating to become a practitioner-researcher in public health through this DrPH appears to require an active process of seeking to reconcile shifting identities and practices across time and space. How this is undertaken is understood to be a complex and personally mediated process involving individual life histories, aspirations and connections to differing professional communities of practice intersecting with the broader history of the program and the field of public health. What is presented here is provisional and ongoing. The research study is still in process, as are the lives and engagement of all the participants in this specific professional doctorate.
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Quality assurance (QA) is a requirement of all university programmes. However, effective QA can only be claimed where there is synergy between QA and the programme of study. Professional doctorates, although sharing aspects such as QAA level 8 descriptors and a prolonged period of study, differ from PhD awards with regards to delivery, content and the length of the final thesis. Professional doctorates have unique characteristics comprising taught and independent research elements; and at the case study university, a student body formed of mid to late career professionals drawn from diverse disciplines ranging from education, health, business, architecture, computing, engineering through to public services. These individuals may comprise university staff, Headteachers, school inspectors, Chairs of governing bodies and senior managers, taught together as mixed discipline cohorts, sharing perspectives and learning together.

Experience over the past ten years within a UK university School of Education currently with 85 students on the professional doctorate, has shown that doctoral students have an ambivalent and complex emotional-intellectual relationship with their study. Unlike level 7 awards, the professional doctorate has not been found to be directly aligned to promotion rather it is more closely linked to self-actualisation and achievement of personal goals and fulfilment. Engagement in a professional doctorate carries personal meaning and a heavy investment in terms of cost, time, family relationships, professional identity and self esteem that on occasions impedes academic progression (Kinchington 2009). This group of students are engaged in what for them, is a high-risk venture that is played out in a public arena. Their very seniority; their having to combine part time study with a full time job that normally carries extensive responsibility; their being
accountable to an employer who may pay their fees, in addition to the awareness of their colleagues that they are engaging in doctoral study, place the student under increased pressure and have implications for QA in terms of academic progression and successful completion. Completion becomes the driving force; failure to complete is a humiliation that is psychologically difficult to rationalise and success a vindication of not only six years of their personal investment but that of their families and strained relationships.

It is proposed that a transparent QA process that is responsive to these factors is fundamental to students’ successful engagement and academic progression since it defines standards, practice and assessment and ultimately holds the university experience to account. Ensuring that students understand these QA processes is critical to their academic progression.

Common issues faced by students include: managing the conflict between a full time job, serious study and maintaining relationships; interruptions to study as a consequence of promotion, personal or family illness or change in domestic circumstances that come about in mid life; loss of confidence in themselves or their supervisors; and students lacking the confidence to ‘let go’ of their professional persona to allow them to learn different ways of thinking and understanding, and to learn from failure. Reasons such as these highlight the need for transparent academic QA processes that are integrated into the programme itself and which students know are in place to support them throughout their period of study. The view is taken that quality assurance processes provide the foundation to successful and timely doctoral completion.

This paper draws on data from national QAA and university validation documentation; internal QA documentation and reports; student and supervisor evaluations; completion data and reports from the doctoral programme External Examiner and programme leader responses to the External Examiner during the period 2009-20011. These data enable the examination and analysis of seven key areas which demonstrate how QA informs the professional doctorate, pre-empting progression issues, assuring standards and addressing quality enhancement:

- The validated document which articulates the doctoral level descriptors
- The role of Progression Boards
- External examiners
- The teaching and supervision team
- The stages which scaffold the student experience
- Review and evaluation and external examiner reports
- Timely completion of doctorates

Of particular importance are the 13 stages which scaffold the student experience which are embedded in the QA systems and the QAA doctoral level descriptors, and the induction and training of supervisors. These serve to translate theory into practice and assure programme quality. The student’s progression through these stages and the engagement with their supervisors is fundamental to bringing about the paradigm shift that occurs in the student’s conceptual engagement with their research demonstrating their readiness to progress to examination. The training of supervisors is essential. Having completed a doctorate does not automatically ensure that supervisors have an understanding or the experience needed to guide students through the process that leads through to successful and timely examination. Strategies such as pairing up an experienced supervisor with a novice supervisor, support the modelling of ‘good’ and responsible supervision to take place and an understanding of the role of QA; as does attending Research Degrees and Ethics committees as an observer, which allows novice supervisors to hear the discussions related to each submission and in so doing familiarise themselves with QA processes and procedures.
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In doctoral level professional studies and work based learning, we know what transdisciplinarity is in practice, we experience it, we work with it, we promote it. We are constantly seeking to articulate it more coherently so that we can continue to underpin it with a sound pedagogy as we believe it to be an appropriate response to an increasingly complex world where discipline/domain islands cannot remain isolated. Thus sophisticated bridges of knowledge transfer to produce new learnings and syntheses are required, of use to the widest number of stakeholders, as well as skilled translation between these different realms of knowledge, experience and practice. It is the properties and purpose of the translation that interests us in professional studies advising and is the subject of this paper.

The field of translational studies, like professional studies, has progressed rapidly in the last twenty years. Its current discourses have relevance to our own: it has refined debates on conceptual frameworks for responding to complexity using spatial metaphors to define relationships between the different discipline islands - interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, transdisciplinary; it contributes to our emerging pedagogy which underpins doctoral level study that goes beyond interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinarity into the co creation of new knowledge and concepts; and it offers us language in which
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to ‘translate’ what we do more efficiently and effectively (Duarte et al 2006). This paper will not concern itself with the differences between inter, multi and trans but rather concentrate on the emergent field of transdisciplinarity where professional studies is increasingly situated.

Transdisciplinarity can be said to be, like translation, an area of knowledge, as stated by Nouss cited in Duarte et al (2006:3),

‘After ‘consciousness’ in the nineteenth century and ‘language’ in the twentieth, ‘translation’ can be considered to define the contemporary ethos. As an area of knowledge, it calls for an innovative, transversal and metis [interweaving] epistemology.’ (2005:228)

An approach to knowledge and research which is participatory with the non academic as argued by Cronin (2008) in her support of the views of Hadorn et al:

‘Transdisciplinary research [TDR] is a new field of research emerging in the ‘knowledge society’, which links science and policy to address issues such as environmental degradation, new technologies public health and social change. Through transdisciplinary approaches researchers from a wide range of disciplines work with each other and external stakeholders to address real world issues (Hadorn et al, 2008).’

and the approach to knowledge creation for the future according to Russell et al involving three areas: problem focus (research originates from and is contextualized in ‘real-world’ problems), evolving methodology (the research involves iterative, reflective processes that are responsive to the particular questions, settings, and research groupings) and collaboration (including collaboration between transdisciplinarity researchers, disciplinary researchers and external actors with interests in the research) (2007:2).

Professional doctorates need to be engaged with all of these defining features of transdisciplinarity. To further differentiate it, it could be said that interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinarity are terms which usually imply a process of cooperation or collaboration between two or more disciplines which are either logical because they are linked in some way as in neuroscience and psychotherapy and may bring about changes in both, or because they come together to solve a problem which requires different inputs, for example, a multidisciplinary approach to mental health. This cooperation does not primarily seek to change the individual discipline’s epistemology, methodology or content. Transdisciplinarity, on the other hand, implies a qualitatively different relationship between disciplines and practices. It is not so much a process of cooperation or collaboration which defines it but rather an intentional approach to transcend boundaries of disciplines and practices to create a new knowledge synthesis within the individual or domain of practice and indeed in society. As Cronin (2008:2) and others would argue, its aim is to overcome the gap between knowledge production on the one hand and the demand for knowledge to contribute to the solution of social problems on the other. In professional studies doctorates this may be the medical devices inventor who, in order to ‘translate’ his/her invention from bench to the clinic to save lives, needs to visit and learn from the other domains such as regulation; public health policies; insurance; monopolies; media that facilitate or block progress to achieve a creative solution, or it may be the senior non academic practitioner whose intentional engagement with academia changes both domains. Such change agents act as pollinators between the different domains causing new thinking and practices to emerge.

Key components of transdisciplinarity include stakeholders’ views; real world problem solving; change agency; knowledge production; new synthesis; exchange between disciplines and practices with the intention of achieving action that influences the disciplines and practices themselves; mapping and remapping; academic and non academic participation and social responsibility. This author supports social responsibility as a key element but recognises that this aspect of transdisciplinarity, while considered by some as the core element that makes transdisciplinarity the most appropriate response to complexity, ‘problematising and political’ (Osborne 2011:16), it is thought of by others as the unnecessary inclusion of a moral dimension to an approach to knowledge.

These core elements of transdisciplinarity can lead to what can be called metanoia, another way of knowing; a knowing ‘beyond’ which is creative and transformative. This poses challenges for professional studies doctorates about the skills and attributes required of those who have the task of facilitating and negotiating this understanding between different realms of experience, thinking and cultures so that a metanoia can take place that supports the arriving at a change or response that is of benefit to the largest number of stakeholders. The author would suggest that enabling a transdisciplinary approach to research
and knowledge in an individual or group requires something different from the traditional role of supervisor whose expertise in the discipline is privileged over any relational, observational, enabling, coaching, interpretative, ‘trans’ skills that have come to be the attributes of the transdisciplinary adviser. I would also suggest that to be a successful transdisciplinary adviser is not predicated on mastering disciplines but mastering how to facilitate connections and communications in a way that results in creative and practical change agency transforming of the candidate, their professional environment and society.

Capacities and abilities of a transdisciplinary adviser might include:

1. to bring considerable experience in some form of professional practice and a sound knowledge of academia to the relationship
2. to articulate and externalise one’s own learnings and skills and how they were arrived at
3. to hold learning and edifying conversations with candidates
4. to be an ethnographer observing and listening in order to learn the cultural language of the candidate
5. to view the world as an archipelago of interlinking islands with their own cultures
6. to navigate, in partnership with the candidate, the different domains extracting what is necessary and useful to achieve the aims of the research minimising harm to participants and maximising benefits to the greatest number of stakeholders
7. to have ‘no final vocabulary’ (Rorty 1989:73) but to contribute to an emerging metanoic language that captures commonalities and introduces new terms or a new and appropriate application of existing ones. This could be in the style of the ethnologist who distills commonalities from each new cultural encounter (ethnography of each candidate) and disperses new language or new applications of existing concepts between them to enhance understanding. Examples would be Deleuze and Guattari’s (1980) use of ‘rhizome’ the botanical term for mass roots to denote multiplicity and interconnections in non hierarchical structures between all aspects of society, and ‘metissage’, the interweaving of connections, cultures, ideas (Laplantine and Nous 2008).
8. to facilitate going beyond cooperation and collaboration between domains into the development of new knowledge, thinking and attitudes
9. to contribute to the epistemological implications for our theories of pedagogic practices when universities are facing pressure to feed employability demands
10. to engage in discourses with the candidate on social responsibility, moral dilemmas and value driven agendas

Transdisciplinarity in professional studies doctorates aims to go beyond the ‘straitjacket’ (Osborne 2011) of mere problem solving into an era that does not negate disciplines and dilute them into some kind of epistemological soup but rather creates the conditions for more metanoic solutions to managing complexity.
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Writing a doctoral thesis is a demanding activity and full-time research students’ problems of writing up their research are well evidenced. Those undertaking a Professional Doctorate (DP) perhaps face even greater difficulties. They continue working in their professional setting, so demands on their time are significant and it is often difficult for them to find lengthy and sustained periods of free time. Many are also returning to higher education after a break and are new to the activity of research. Students are often high achievers in their work setting; they bring experience of producing workplace writing, but can find it difficult to translate those skills into the written practices of the university. In addition, staff contact is different to conventional doctoral programmes: with introductory, structured learning curricula; group based learning; and relatively short but intensive contact with a cohort of students. At least anecdotally, we can say that writing is an issue often raised by both PD candidates and the academic staff involved in supporting their learning. From the perspectives of doctoral students and the institutions supporting them, integrating appropriate support for the academic writing can be challenging.

There is a growing body of literature on the nature and impact of writing practices within universities, yet little has been applied to the burgeoning area of PDs; however, much of this work is applicable to PDs.

Writing should not be seen as either a skills deficit issue, a remedial intervention, nor as issues relating to students studying in a second language. Rather, it is an institutionally situated task, mediating the social structures, etiquette and, conterminously, epistemologies of thought, which make up universities and their various academic disciplines. In the sense of Bourdieuan discursive practices, it is ‘habitus’ and symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1991): a reflection of scholarly practice and practice itself.

Two main threads of research exploring writing from this perspective have been English for Academic Purposes (EAP), emanating from the linguistic work of John Swales (1990, 2004), and the Academic Literacies approach of Lea and Street (1998, 2004). The former, EAP, is strongly influenced by Swales’ concept ‘genre’, which he has explicated particularly in relation to academic texts:
A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. The purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of context and style. Communicative purpose is both a privileged criterion and one that operates to keep the scope of a genre as here conceived narrowly focuses on comparable rhetorical action. In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience. If all high probability expectations are realized, the exemplar will be viewed as prototypical by the parent discourse community. (Swales, 1990: 58)

Therefore, texts are purposeful objects, i.e. they ‘do’ things, and are produced for more or less specified and, in the academic context, specialised groups of readers. Those readers and writers constitute a ‘discourse community’ and their shared purposes and expectations figuratively and literally shape the structure and style of the texts they produce: its topics of interest, grammatical structures, vocabulary choices, the style and manner of intertextual referencing, and the length, layout and structure. These make up the often unexplicated rules of discourse and form an important criterion for assessment. As the rules are unexplicated they are therefore learned by habituation to the discourse practices of the discourse community (or ‘habitus’ as above), and there is a negative differential in knowledge between expert and novice. This inevitably has pedagogical implications because what we as academics study and teach is inextricably linked to the manner in which we conduct that discourse.

In a complementary vein, the Academic Literacies (AL) paradigm has illustrated the epistemological nature of academic discourse, with different disciplines valuing different discursive strategies in the articulation of their discipline (Lea and Street 1998). For example, an undergraduate who scores high grades in a Humanities subject when applying the same discursive practices to a Social Science essay may perform less well. The student’s variable performance is not to do with a mastery of ‘the facts’. Rather, Lea and Street have noted of academics’ assessment of written work that:

The twin concepts of ‘structure’ and ‘argument’ came to the fore in most interviews as being key elements in student writing... Even though staff generally had a clear belief in these concepts as crucial to their understanding of what constituted a successful piece of writing, there was less certainty when it came to describing what underlay a well-argued or well-structured piece of student work. More commonly, staff were able to identify when a student had been successful, but could not describe how a particular piece of writing ‘lacked’ structure. (1998: 162)

The conclusion being that student writers struggle less with surface level issues of a text (such as grammar, or a preferred referencing style) than they do with understanding the disciplinary assumptions which form the contexts in which their writing is assessed. Equally, staff can lack the descriptive tools to explicate their own disciplinary assumption.

The main problem is how to integrate what is known about enhancing writing within the curricula of PD programmes. Several potential impediments come to mind: prioritising time for writing development; availability of appropriate staff; and perhaps most importantly, dealing with writing not as an ‘add on’ but as an integral part of research and the epistemological perspective of an academic discipline.

At Glasgow Caledonian University’s (GCU) our approach has been to embedded academic writing sessions within the taught modules of our PD, delivered by a permanent, full-time lecturer specialising in academic writing. These sessions are stage specific and aimed at research tasks relevant to different phases of doctoral study. In the first year of study students receive an introduction to academic style and workshops on writing literature reviews, developing research hypotheses and methodologies and using writing as a project management tool. The process research of writing also is discussed – how to start and edit but also what strategies to take, what tasks to priorities in the early stages and what thinking underpins them.

Second year workshops deal with the structures of texts and editing, and we revisit style and process. The final phase covers how to manage the structure of a large written thesis, editing and preparing for a viva and understanding the institutional context of the submission (its forms, process, participants and potential results) and how it relates to the thesis. To supplement this, GCU also developed, along with the universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, an academic writing website (www.ewriting.org.uk) for Master’s and Doctoral students. The overarching approach to writing is not prescriptive but aims to give students a set of descriptive and generative tools to apply to their own
discipline. Writing is also dealt with as a process, not an end product, which enables style, structure and content to be situated within an ongoing and changing process of research, in which texts are drafted and rewritten many times and elements of writing improve overtime.
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In our paper we argue that the current prevalent thinking about doctoral level research and the ‘generation of knowledge’ are a significant factor in the low completion rate of many programmes.

The requirement to “make a unique contribution to knowledge”, in our view, does not only not take into account the collaborative nature of knowledge generation, it generates a competitive spirit that prevents individual researchers as well as academic institutions from supporting one another. The battle for research funding only exacerbates this competitive atmosphere. This results in research often being a solitary endeavour that requires considerable stamina and perseverance on the part of the researcher. Part-time PhD or Doctoral students appear particularly prone to giving up, as life and work demand their attention in the course of the lengthy research process.

The shape of the Ashridge Doctorate in Organisational Change (ADOC) departs from more conventional PhD and Doctoral programmes, placing considerable emphasis on the group as a place of dialogue and a source of learning. Participants meet in a series of workshops during the first three modules and each becomes a member of a supervision group. These groups will meet during and between workshops, sometimes with and sometimes without the Supervisor being present. Participants are expected to write a paper in preparation for every meeting, as well as read and critique each-others’ work. Although demanding, this discipline generates lively debate, insights and often a profound sense of support and belonging. We have famous antecedents in this practice: Ernest Rutherford, the inspiring leader of the Cavendish Laboratories that produced numerous Nobel Prize laureates, used to gather his research team together weekly and encourage them to challenge their own and others’ knowledge and to collaborate on developing fresh ideas1. The feedback from ADOC participants is, without exception, that the relational quality of the programme sustains them in their research.

A second important feature of the programme is the intermediate assessment points. Rather than hurdles participants have to take, we have constructed those as an opportunity for taking stock, in conversation with academic and practitioner peers, as well as the examiners, for being challenged and supported. Not only are those assessments a shared target to work towards, they often represent a moment of significant development in a candidate’s research.

Feedback from current and passed participants tells us that the combination of group based nature of the programme, as well as the interim assessment, are the key contributors to the high completion rate on the programme. Of the first group, six out of the seven people who continued on the programme, completed their thesis successfully within the allocated time (two participants suspending their studies due to employment and family circumstances). The programme goes from strength to strength.

It is time to rethink our approach to PhD and doctoral research, from an individualistic, competitive endeavour, to a collaborative engagement. Professor Rutherford set an example, as early as the nineteen thirties!

1. From Nobel Lectures, Chemistry 1901-1921, Elsevier Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1966
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This paper reports the results of a 3-year study to evaluate two partnership models used to develop, market, and deliver professional doctorate programs at a private university in the United States. Specifically, this paper will assess the preparedness of doctoral candidates for independent research, comparing candidates from two different partnership models (A and B) involved in educational leadership doctor of education (EdD) programs. The author will first discuss the structure of the two partnership models, and then data will be shared related to candidate, faculty, and partner experiences and successes, with a focus on the preparedness of candidates for independent research.

The relationship between universities and industries (the profession) is often just at the surface level (U.S. Council of Graduate Schools, 2007). As a result of this university’s strategic planning, a focus was placed on deepening these connections to make them more clinical, engaged, and applied (Maxwell, 2003). Recognizing that our students capture and construct knowledge in their course work, in their workplaces, and in their own independent research (Maxwell, 2003; Scott, Brown, Lunt, & Thorne, 2009), these partnerships and the evaluation of their success are critical.

Partnership Model A involves the use of a state school administrator’s organization. The partner maintains relationships with students during their time at the university. Members of this organization serve as adjunct instructors in the doctoral program, supervise student internships, and oversee candidate dissertation research in collaboration with full-time university faculty. Currently 66 students are actively
enrolled in course work or in the dissertation phase of the program using Model A.

Partnership Model B involves the use of a regional teacher and school administrator professional development organization. Membership in this group provides students access to a specific professional doctorate program in educational leadership at the university. The partner organization is not involved in the delivery of course work or in supervision of candidate research. Members of the organization do provide student support services, such as registration assistance, during the degree program. Currently 169 students are actively enrolled in course work or in the dissertation phase of the program using Model B.

Both of the new partnership models were initiated along with a shift to instruction via a distance delivery model. In Model A, delivery is both face-to-face and online. In Model B, delivery is almost exclusively online, with students gathering for face-to-face meetings just four times per year.

Because Partnership Model B involves a much larger number of students, interviews and focus groups were held with these students first. Between the fall semester of 2009 and the fall semester of 2011, 103 students from Partnership Model B who were in the course work phase of the program were interviewed or involved in focus groups. Data collected from these students related to program quality and their individual experiences with all aspects of their doctoral program. Six major themes emerged from the analysis of these data: faculty/instruction, collegial circles, program format, course mechanics, communication, and services. Students reported both positive and negative reactions to all the themes but only negative reactions to issues around services. The collegial circles are the face-to-face meetings held for Partnership Model B students. In general, students were satisfied with their research course work and felt it would prepare them well for their dissertation research. When students reported not feeling satisfied, issues related to course mechanics, technology difficulties, or problems with individual instructors.

During the fall semester of 2011, surveys were administered to both dissertation supervisors and doctoral candidates (those in the dissertation phase of the program) from both partnership models. Twenty-four supervisors (an 86% response rate) and 65 candidates (a 42% response rate) completed surveys online. The majority of the candidate respondents (36 of 65, 55%) were from Partnership Model B. Although this may skew the results, it does accurately reflect the proportion of students enrolled overall in the university’s programs.

Survey results indicate that 96.9% of those candidates responding believed they have the technical skills needed to complete their research. In contrast, only 45.8% of supervisors felt that candidates have the required skills for independent research. Also of interest was the finding that supervisors with less experience working with students were more likely to have negative feelings on this issue, $\chi^2(9, N = 24) = 20.99, p = .013$.

A large source of the supervisor dissatisfaction is linked to their evaluation of their candidates’ writing ability. Half of the supervisors responding did not feel that students have the writing skills needed to complete their dissertations.

These initial findings have sparked conversation and changes in how the programs are constructed and delivered to include more emphasis on the pedagogy of supervision (Pearson & Brew, 2002) and the examination of how faculty and workplace cosupervisors need to be differently prepared to deal with the needs of candidates involved in these partnership models (Maxwell, 2003; Pearson & Brew, 2002).

Further research will focus on the disconnect between candidates’ self-perceived ability/competence levels and their abilities as assessed by supervisors. It is hoped that as supervisors are prepared for this work with candidates, they will begin to feel that they have the skills to assist students they feel are less than fully prepared.

In addition to these findings, the role of an internal quality assurance committee and doctoral advisory committee will also be discussed, and connections will be made between this research and the university’s ongoing accreditation processes.
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Research imagination is a concept that we may all be familiar with. However, ‘practice research imagination’ as a concept seems to be lacking in the health care and related literature. The absence of imagination as applied to practice research is a disparity in methodological thinking and makes practitioners’ research toolbox incomplete. This paper is about the role that exercising the practice research imagination should play in creating new understanding and knowledge.

Contemporary health care and related academia is moving towards enhanced clinical academic working. Clinical academic working can be understood to be centred upon the notion of co-production of knowledge emergent from and related to
the practice setting. Co-production of knowledge from this standpoint means that ideas should originate in the clinical setting and be developed and pursued there in partnership with clinical and academic colleagues and, with patients and the public. There will always be a role for research that relates to external agendas, as examples, intervention protocols and policy evaluations. However, clinical academic supported research is likely (but not exclusively) to originate in ideas developed where care is delivered. Doctorate students and Graduates exemplify those who are tasked to look and think about the world in a different and purposeful way. And for those of us tasked with guiding them, practice research imagination could be a useful vehicle.

‘The sociological imagination’ expounded first by Mills in 1959 (2000) has contributed much to the development of social research, including health research. The sociological imagination Mills calls for is about vision, a way of looking at the world that can see links between the problems of the individual and important social issues. Social research has progressed since Mills first published and today his ‘vision’ can be translated into looking at patient centred ‘problems’ and the importance of improving research based practice.

The contemporary literature that is available that cites imagination mostly focuses on conceptualising caring. Scott (1997) mentions informed imagination in the context of caring and considers it to be a missing dimension in constructive caring ‘at the bedside’ with patient focus. May (1997) relates the professional imagination to how doctors and nurses conceptualise their role difference in patient centred practice. He draws heavily on sociological frameworks, especially in relation to power and patient involvement, to do so. Walsh (2007) relates imagination to ethics. His position is that imagination is essential not only to humanity but also to testing out new ideas. He suggests that imagination assists the nurse to see possibilities for patient care. Walsh also makes the suggestion that ‘practice development is an exercise in imagination’ and mentions creativity as part of that exercise (1997:206). Other authors such as Gularatnam (2007) and Foster (2007) relate imagination to research methodology and to sharing of findings in particular. All of this literature is interesting in its positioning of imagination as valuable, but doesn’t venture upon its application in practice.

Terms of definition of imagination seems to vary according to academic discipline. A point of interest is that imagination is recognised as a means through which we explore possibilities and constraints. Most of us think of it as ‘picturing in our mind’s eye’, entertaining a thought, or forming ideas. We have taken a pragmatic and constructivist perspective and thus are not hostages to philosophical, psychological or sociological theories. However, Beaney’s discussion of Hume’s notion of the ‘empire of the imagination’ includes emphasis upon imagination having authority over ideas and powering them (2010: 70). The notion of ‘empire’ leads to thoughts of collectives and collation. If creativity is added to that, a range of possibilities emerge. For example, is imagination a novel combination (or re-combination) of existing ideas, or about abstract ideas? This leads to a further question: is imagination the source of creative activity, or is it the vehicle - or both? We suggest that all of these possibilities have potential for those researching in healthcare practice. The role of context, personal characteristics and experience is, in our view, what crafts the authority and power over ideas of the individual practice researcher. Over and above, we include the notion that imagination may be stimulated by memories in and of the practice context.

Memories and what we make of them is part of our personal and professional modus operandi and the concept of practice wisdom is sometimes applied to that process. Practice wisdom is sourced from the accumulated knowledge and personal and professional experience that practitioners bring to individual patient cases and to their practice. Practitioners transfer practice wisdom to problem solving and to applying generalisations (Klein 1995, O’Sullivan 2005, Sheppard 1995). In that transference process practitioners test their wisdom out and reconstitute it. Following on from our point about clinical academic working, and if the conditions are right for creativity, the potential is there to invoke naturalistic enquiry powered by imagination. Benner et al (2011) are scholars in the area of clinical wisdom in evidence-based practice. They include clinical grasp, inquiry and forethought in their arguments and relate those perspectives to the practitioner as a clinically wise expert. However, they build their position towards the expert practitioner using evidence, with less emphasis upon creating it – inquiry for them seems to reach towards the quest to find best evidence and use it wisely.

We propose to explore the potential of practice research imagination to power conceptualising and constructing context specific inquiry by clinical academic practitioners. That potential can serve quality improvement and knowledge advancement. We accept that research needs to shed light upon current practice and practice development. However, rapidly evolving practice demands new or reconstructed ideas to create new knowledge and explanations to inform
contemporary practice – for improved quality of care for patients.

We propose that in the context of expert practice and research, imagination is a catalyst for change. Those claiming to be, or affirmed as, ‘expert’ have expectations placed upon them, including contributing new knowledge to their field of practice. In those terms, practitioners need to be both practice and research focused. Overall, the notion of practice research imagination is an idea about ideas that moves us beyond practice wisdom and towards purposeful naturalistic inquiry. We suggest that practice research imagination is quite simply a way of practitioners inspiring themselves to realise their ambitions to make a difference to patients, carers and colleagues by marshalling memories to ideas and so to research proposal.

With all of that in mind, a central theme of this paper is about constituting memories purposefully. Our aim is to draw attention to the value of memories that lie in practice experience and expertise. Those memories include learned information and knowledge gained from experience and, what we make of that experience. Imagination is a means to add value to memories – in this instance we mean informed imagination that is active, productive and for the future, applied. To explore our theme we intend to use examples from the areas of enhancing self care and clinical leadership.

References

Beaney M 2010 Imagination and Creativity (2nd edition) Open University Press, Milton Keynes


Foster V 2007 Ways of knowing and showing: imagination and representation in feminist participatory social research. Journal of Social Work Practice 21, (3) 361 - 376

Gunaratnam Y 2007 Where is the love? Art, aesthetics and research Journal of Social Work Practice 21, (3) 271 287

Klein G 1995 Practice wisdom Social work 40, (6) 799 - 807

May C 1997 The professional imagination: narrative and the symbolic boundaries between medicine and nursing Journal of Advanced Nursing 25, 1094 - 1100


Scott P A 1997 Care, attention and imaginative identification in nursing practice Journal of Advanced Nursing 21, 1196 – 1200


Supervising and supporting doctoral candidates in art universities

Kirsti Rinne
Aalto University School of Art, Design and Architecture, Finland
Email: kirsi.rinne@aalto.fi

Kirsti Rinne is working as a research coordinator of film and scenography at the Aalto University School of Art, Design and Architecture. She takes care of doctoral studies and research activities. School of Art, Design and Architecture (former University of Art and Design Helsinki) is one of the leading universities in practice-led research. Before entering the university, Kirsti worked several years at the Finnish Film Archive and in different positions in the Finnish film culture. She is preparing a dissertation on the supervision of practice-based doctorates in film, scenography and performing arts. Kirsti has graduated from the University of Helsinki (majoring in sociology) in 1989.

Objective

The study aims to gain an understanding of the processes of artists undertaking practice-based doctoral degrees. It focuses on the issues of support, especially supervision, and the challenges of hybrid theses, which combine theoretical thinking with the creation of art works, in this case, films and performances.

Background

Doctoral education for practicing artists has been available in Finland since the beginning of the 1980s when a decree reform process was conducted. Although the decree permits differences and each of the four art universities (music, fine arts, theatre and art and design) has applied it from their own starting points, a common feature of the doctorate is the interaction between artistic work and research (Buchanan et al. 2009, 19).

The combination of art and research has not been easy, and the beginning of doctoral education in particular can be described as controversial. The role of the artistic project in a dissertation and its contribution to the production of knowledge has been widely debated (Rust 2007). This reflects the difficulty of integrating artistic activity within scientific discourse because of their divergent meanings, working methods and criteria. Artistic research is affected by the values, conventions and activities of the art world on the one hand, and by academia, on the other. This creates a double bind to be solved. The challenge for the emerging discipline is to overcome the claimed dualism of subjective art and objective science. The interconnectedness of art and research should be considered a beneficial process that affects, changes and informs each other (MacLeod & Holdridge 2004).
Earlier Studies

Only few studies have been conducted on the doctoral experience in practice-based research in creative disciplines. Hockey and Allen-Collinson (2002) found that tensions and contradictions arise when artists skilled in visual language face academic requirements, mostly those connected to writing. The unfamiliar situation is often a reality shock. There is also concern that research might harm or freeze researchers’ practice by breaking the flow or momentum of creativity. Those discovering research as a creative activity have managed to reinterpret the analysis of their practice as innovative, thus making them feel empowered when new skills and competencies evolve.

Mode of Inquiry

Ethnomethodologically-informed and semi-structured interviews have been conducted in 2010 to 2011. The perspective adopted is that of a doctoral candidate. The interview agenda was based both on earlier literature and the author’s experience gained while working with doctoral students. A total of 11 doctoral candidates from two art universities have been interviewed.

The issues examined contain reasons for embarking on the doctoral journey, the practical implementation of supervision, experiences of supervisory situations and the importance of peer support. In addition, the interview data covered subjects related to the written documentation of artistic productions and reflection. The interviewees were also asked to list desirable characteristics of a good supervisor.

Preliminary Analysis

The interviews started by asking respondents their reasons for embarking on the doctoral journey. Many had reached a point in their career where they wished to explore more in depth the numerous open-ended questions emerging from the professional artistic practice. These recurrent questions called for deeper analysis. Some were already theoretically oriented, which guided the idea to complete a doctorate and acted as a starting point for the development of artistic projects. Some also expressed a desire to increase their professional status by making the tacit knowledge of their artistic processes visible.

Almost all respondents acknowledged difficulties in how to define practice-based research, believing that this wording is ambiguous. The unstability, incoherence and lack of prior experience with the methodology were challenging.

Building the connections between art and theory and reflecting on the art project afterwards was described as weird and difficult, even irritating, which the students were not used to in their earlier work as artists. Students were unaccustomed to looking at art through the theory lens, to contemplate conceptually possible failures or successes or to explain how arbitrary or associative thoughts interfered with the process. Usually the reflection resulted in more questions than answers, especially how to tie all of the evolving ideas into a coherent whole.

The usual method for reflection, which was frequently acknowledged as an essential part of the research, is writing. In earlier studies, writing has been argued to be quite a problem for doctoral students in creative disciplines. The shifting from a creative to conceptual mindset is described as confusing and distressing (Hockey & Allen-Collinson 2002). In this study, the interviewed students had no apparent difficulties in writing and did not find writing troublesome. On the contrary, they seem to have found a balance between writing and art-making.

The interviewees seemed to have adopted a seesaw working method, which means forming a productive relationship between writing and art making. In other words, writing is instrumental to the conception of an art project. However, art work also needs to be rethought against the written text. This process reshapess and revises both the text and the art works, both of which are integral to the whole (MacLeod 2000; MacLeod & Holdridge 2004, 157).

Consequently, there seems to be some evidence towards "the maturity of arts research", which means to import the practice of writing into a productive relationship with arts practice (Newbury 2010, 368).

Usually artist-researchers have two supervisors, one holding a PhD and the other possessing sufficient artistic competence. Quite often in practice-based research, the process is unpredictable, and perspectives, viewpoints, emphasis and even the topic of research evolve as the study progresses. Therefore, it is possible to change supervisors and include new experts on the team.

One of the general preconceptions is that an experienced or professional artist does not need as much supervision with arts as with the research question, in the combination of theory and practice. The artistic productions are presented to supervisors, and a written report usually follows. The majority of interviewees stated that during the productions they do not even think about supervision.
Supervisors must be familiar with and have personal experience with “hybrid theses” (Kroll 2009) and possess the ability to advise students how to integrate art and science. Supervisors are expected to be interested in the topic of research and give well-argumented criticism. Encouraging and motivating a positive attitude and effective communication were listed as characteristics of a good supervisor. Asking the right questions and requiring students to explain and clarify their choices were considered the best ways to advance the doctoral project.

The interviewed doctoral students depend on fellow artists and students when they seek advice regarding either theoretical or artistic questions. Collegial support seems to be more emotional and immediate than supervisor’s support. In addition, students require many technical facilities for the time-consuming productions. Fulfilling the expressed desire to make more use of artistic projects and develop a conscious and structured methodology for research via and through art requires better facilities and serious investments in the research support personnel.
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Dr. H. Michael Dreher, Associate Professor of Nursing, College of Nursing and Health Professions, Drexel University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania is a graduate of the University of South Carolina and Widener University (PhD in Nursing Science, 2000). In 2003 he completed a two year postdoc in sleep and respiratory neurobiology at the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Dreher held the position of founding Chair of Drexel’s Doctoral Nursing Department from 2004 - 2010. He currently serves as Associate Editor for the peer-reviewed journal Clinical Scholars Review: The Journal of Doctoral Nursing Practice and is the column editor for “Practice Evidence.”

Dr. Dreher has published extensively and is currently the co-author of 3 books, Philosophy of Science for Nursing Practice (with Dr. Michael Dahnke as first author) (Springer, 2010) and Role Development for Doctoral Advanced Nursing Practice (with Dr. Mary Ellen Smith Glasgow as second author) (Springer, 2010) which won the prestigious 2011 AJN Book of the Year in the Advanced Practice category. His third book Legal Issues Confronting Today’s Nursing Faculty: A Case Study Approach with Dr. Mary Ellen Smith Glasgow (first author) and Carl “Tobey” Oxholm, Ill, JD, President of Arcadia University (third author), was published January 2012 by FA Davis.

Dr. Dreher’s primary research areas are sleep in women, practice knowledge development, and in the development of the professional/practice nursing doctorate, particularly at the international level. He served on the Review Panel for the United Kingdom Council for Graduate Education 2011 Report on Professional Doctorates and co-authored the concluding paper in the report (with Dr. Pauline Armsby, University of Westminster) “Towards a Metric for Measuring the Value of Professional Doctorates.”
Dr Kathleen M. Stoddart

University of Stirling, UK
Email: k.m.stoddart@stir.ac.uk

Dr. Stoddart is the Doctor of Nursing/Midwifery/Professional Health Studies Programme Director, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health, University of Stirling. Dr. Stoddart has worked in the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health at Stirling University for some years, prior to that she was a senior and experienced Registered Nurse. As Director, she concentrates on supporting and developing the Doctorate Programme, plus research activity. Current research is related to clinical leadership and practice-focused development. Dr. Stoddart is also a Clinical Academic Consultant (Honorary) with NHS Forth Valley, Scotland.

Dr Gerard Fealy

University College Dublin, Ireland
Email: gerard.fealy@ucd.ie

Dr. Fealy is Associate Professor and Associate Dean for Research & Innovation at the UCD School of Nursing, Midwifery & Health Systems. A former Dean and Head of School at UCD, he is a UCD graduate with a bachelor’s degree in nursing (BNS) and a master’s degree in education (MEd). In 2003 he obtained a PhD from UCD; his doctoral thesis was entitled ‘A history of apprenticeship nurse training in Ireland’. He is a past recipient of the NUI Dr Mary L Thornton Scholarship in Education. In 2010, he was appointed Honorary Associate Professor at the University of Queensland.

Dr Fealy is a researcher in the field of social gerontology and is Director of the National Centre for the Protection of Older People at UCD. A nursing historian, he is Director of the UCD Irish Centre for Nursing & Midwifery History and is the author of A History of Apprenticeship Nurse Training in Ireland (Routledge 2006) and The Adelaide Hospital School of Nursing, 1859-2009: A Commemorative History (Columba Press 2009). He teaches on the social history of healthcare. He is also a researcher and writer on professional and disciplinary issues in nursing and is a member of a several international committees, including the Editorial Board of the Journal of Clinical Nursing.
Dr. McNamara is currently Head of School and Dean at the UCD School of Nursing, Midwifery & Health Systems. He was appointed a Fellow in Teaching & Academic Development in May 2009 for a 2-year period. He is involved in funded research programmes and projects in the areas of protection of older persons, clinical leadership in nursing and midwifery and the history of nursing and midwifery in Ireland. Dr. McNamara graduated from the Open University in 1997 with a BSc (Hons) degree and from UCD in 2000 with an MSc (Nursing) (Education). Subsequently he undertook MEd and MA (SocSci) degrees with The Open University, graduating in 2002 and 2003, respectively. He also undertook doctoral work at The Open University Research School and completed a Doctor of Education degree in 2007. His doctoral thesis was a sociological investigation into the underlying principles structuring academic nursing in Ireland. He qualified as a Psychiatric Nurse in 1989, as a General Nurse in 1993 and as a Nurse Tutor in 2000. He has mainly worked in Acute Mental Healthcare, Addiction and Emergency Nursing. Before moving to the Nursing Careers Centre at An Bord Altranais in 1999, he was a Clinical Placement Co-ordinator at St James’s Hospital, Dublin.

Dr. Bugge is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health at Stirling University and a Registered Nurse. She leads the School’s Enhancing Self Care Research Group. She has been involved in Stirling’s Doctorate Programme since 2004, with a particular focus on teaching students about and supporting them to undertake their own research projects. Carol’s research focus is on various aspects of enhancing self-care with clinical focus on urogenital disorders.

Dr. Cusson is Professor and Interim Dean, University of Connecticut’s School of Nursing. Dr. Cusson earned her BS in Nursing from St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg, MD, her MS in Maternal-Child Care and PhD in Human Development from University of Maryland, and her post-graduate NNP certificate from University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Cusson’s first nursing assignment was as an intensive-care nurse in the University of Maryland’s Medical System. In 1979, she joined that University’s nursing faculty, where she later chaired its Department of Maternal-Child Nursing. She developed Maryland’s first NNP program, as well as a graduate major in pediatric trauma-critical care nursing. In 1998, she joined the faculty of UConn’s School of Nursing. Dr. Cusson coordinates the Faculty Special- Interest Group for the National Association of Neonatal Nurses. NIH and March of Dimes funded her research on preterm infant development. Her current research efforts explore role transitions in advanced-practice nursing and workforce issues for neonatal nurse practitioners. During the 2004 academic year, she was a Visiting Professor at the Florence Nightingale School of Nursing and Midwifery. She consults regularly on NNP programs throughout the U.S., and accepts frequent invitations to speak on her area of specialty at national meetings and conferences.
It is quite likely that the professional or practice doctorate in nursing is globally the largest of what are now termed “second generation professional doctorates” (Rolfe & Davies, 2009). However, even with the professional nursing doctorate flourishing globally, it predominates primarily in the US, the UK, Ireland, and Australasia. At the two previous ICPD conferences, many papers and posters have been presented that have focused on professional/practice nursing doctorate program, curriculum, and knowledge development and this trend is likely to continue at ICPD3. While the International Network for Doctoral Education in Nursing (INDEN) in 2004 published a white paper “Quality Criteria, Standards, and Indicators (QSCI) for Doctoral Programs in Nursing” this document focuses exclusively on research-focused doctoral nursing programs (the PhD). With the professional nursing doctorate growing faster than any other professional doctorate (Dreher & Smith Glasgow, 2011), it is time that the purposes and aims of the professional nursing doctorate be better explicated to the global workforce. Further, it is increasingly important that steps are taken to ensure some degree of uniform quality so the global migration of doctorally prepared nurses, who possess a professional or practice doctorate, have credentials and skills that are recognized and transferable across our borders. Indeed, the health of the global citizen is even more reliant on the knowledge and skill of today’s doctorally prepared nurses who are educated and specifically-oriented toward the improvement of nursing practice that enhances health and well-being. This proposed workshop, led by a panel of prof doc nursing educators from the US, Scotland, and Ireland, will be a “working workshop” where the presenters are merely the facilitators. The real work of this workshop will be carried out by the attendees and participants who will construct an initial framework toward international professional/practice doctorate nursing standards. The “working group” will appeal to or draw from any documents from any country addressing the quality and standards of professional nursing doctorate programs, regardless their degree title or initials. This workshop will not be the end of this process, but the beginning, and hopefully the output of this “working group” at this and subsequent ICPD conferences can continue to be refined.

As a blueprint from which to begin our workshop discussion, we are providing the following information below on the global state of the professional nursing doctorate. We ask that all attendees: review these documents thoroughly prior to attending, and bring 1) relevant nursing prof doc statistics, 2) any formal criteria for nursing prof doc program evaluation, and 3) information on new program development.

The National Qualifications Authority of Ireland conducted a review of professional doctorates in Europe in 2006 (NQAI 2006). At that time the NQAI concluded that ‘the professional doctorate is not generally known in Europe, outside of the UK and Ireland’ and found that ‘industrial PhDs’ (however, not specifically in nursing) were offered in Denmark and Sweden, which were ‘similar in objective and organisation to the professional doctorate but were a variant of the PhD’. A review of programs in Scotland, Wales and England indicates there are currently 9 programs (1 in Scotland/Stirling; 1 in Wales/Cardiff; and 7 in England/West London, Portsmouth, Northumbria, London South Bank, Kings College London, Huddersfield, and Brighton. The UK Council for Graduate Education published the second national report (Fell, Flint & Haines, 2011) on the professional doctorate in 2011 but there is no specific UK guideline for nursing prof doc programs. A paper by Armsby and Dreher (2011) in that report provides some initial exploratory metrics on how to evaluate prof doc programs that are applicable to nursing. In Australia there are 3 Doctor of Nursing (DNurs) programs (Sydney, Adelaide & LaTrobe) and 1 DNSc (James Cook), but only 2 of these are offering courses for 2012. The Australia Qualifications Framework (2011) lists guidelines for all doctoral research degrees, which the professional doctorate is also classified under. We are not aware of any prof doc nursing programs in New Zealand and the only one in Asia is at the University of Honk Kong (DNurs). The most globally prevalent critical mass of professional (or practice) nursing doctorate is in the United States (US). Currently, there are 153 schools accepting applications to Doctor of Nursing Practice programs (overwhelmingly DNP programs) in 37 states, with 160 more programs in development. In 2010 7,034 students were enrolled with 1,282 graduates. These numbers surpassed PhD nursing programs for the first time. One leading document The Essentials of Doctoral Education for Advanced Nursing Practice (AACN, 2006) provides the most guidance to DNP program development and evaluation. However, the major advanced practice nursing organizations in the U.S. have published new criteria outlining their vision for professional or practice doctorate education for nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, nurse anesthetists and clinical nurse specialists and other non-direct care roles including the nurse executive (and we note these organizations do not uniformly agree).

We anticipate working toward 4 goals at this conference and hopefully at subsequent ICPD conferences. The first goal in this workshop is to begin work on establishing a global definition of what is...
Many professional doctorate programs are now being offered worldwide. However, the role of knowledge development in the professional or practice nursing doctorate is not yet fully understood. The goal of this workshop is to better explicate the role of knowledge development in the professional or practice nursing doctorate in order to provide more clarity to the differing purposes of the nursing prof doc (no matter the degree title) and the PhD. This is not simply a struggle that confronts the nursing discipline but the larger professional doctorate community as well. A third goal is to identify quality metrics that are appropriate for the global nursing prof doc. We acknowledge that some metrics may be shared with the nursing PhD and others will be unique to this professional doctorate. Lastly, our working group would like to maintain a master list of global professional nursing doctorate programs that can be used to better connect this rapidly evolving community. We surmise that the global nursing prof doc has an opportunity to impact health in ways the PhD cannot, particularly in countries where resources to mount a PhD are far more unlikely than the nursing prof doc. A global mission to advance health by nurses with professional doctorates is perhaps more likely and indeed exciting.

Sources to Review


Gill Clarke has been involved in doctoral education and policy development for some 15 years at a research-intensive UK University. During her secondment to the Quality Assurance Agency’s development and enhancement group from 2003 – 2008 she chaired the working group responsible for revising section 1 of the ‘QAA Code of Practice: Research degree programmes’ (2004). This publication has set the scene for management of postgraduate education and its regulatory assessment throughout the sector. Gill subsequently became involved in the work of other sector-wide organisations, including Research-Councils UK, the UK Council for Graduate Education (as a member of the Executive Committee) and the Vitae ‘Impact and Evaluation Group’. She also contributes to European and Bologna-related doctoral (third cycle) events, including EUA and EuroDoc conferences and seminars.

Gill’s discussion paper for QAA in 2007 led to the revised ‘Doctoral qualification descriptor’ in the ‘QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland’ (2008). She subsequently contributed to a QAA project on ‘Doctoral degree characteristics’ (2011) and is the specialist author for the ‘QAA Quality Code on Research Degrees’ (section B11; 2012), the successor publication updating the ‘QAA Code of Practice’ (2004). Her other professional interests include the assessment of students and quality assurance in higher education. In parallel, Gill is a D.Phil candidate in the Department of Education at the University of Oxford.
Tony Fell has extensive experience of supervising doctoral candidates and has authored over 200 publications on computer-aided drug analysis and quality control. He is Founding Editor of the key Elsevier journal in his field: ‘Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis’. In 2000 he co-founded the Graduate School at Bradford, with responsibility for doctoral training, policy development and advising the University on all aspects of graduate education. For many years he chaired the Research Degrees Committee and the Committee on Ethics in Research.

As Head of Graduate School Tony designed and delivered a wide range of skills training for masters and doctoral candidates, including ‘Ethics in Research’, ‘Research Report Writing’, ‘The End-Game for Thesis Completion’ and ‘Strategies for Surviving the Viva’. Some 20 years ago he designed one of the first workshops on ‘Effective Research Supervision’ for developing academic supervisors/advisors, a generic programme now adopted by Universities in the UK, Ireland and Europe. He has recently developed and delivered (with Dr Annette Fillery-Travis) an innovative programme for training research supervisors of Professional Doctorate candidates.

As an elected member of the UK Council for Graduate Education Executive for ten years he has initiated and delivered many workshops for University colleagues. He contributed to the EUA series of Bologna meetings on ‘Doctoral Education in Europe’ in Salzburg, Brussels, and Nice. As chair (or deputy chair) he has actively developed international conferences on graduate education at the EUI, Florence, Italy (2006) and in Edinburgh (2008), together with the International Conference on Professional Doctorates in London (2009), Edinburgh (2011) and Florence, Italy (2012). Tony is co-author of “The Bologna Process and Beyond: Implications for Postgraduate Education” (OUP: 2009) and co-editor of “Professional Doctorates in the UK” (UKCGE: 2011). He is an enthusiastic European fluent in several languages and for relaxation loves classical music and jazz.
Annette is currently Director of Programmes responsible for the M/DProf at the Institute of Work Based Learning, Middlesex University, where she is a senior coach educator, researcher and author.

Annette started as a senior scientist in a Research Institute from 1993-2004, with a PhD in Physical Chemistry and over 60 publications. As a Fellow of the Royal Society of Chemistry she served as Chair of the RSC “Food Group” and was Visiting Professor in Colloid Science at the Sante Fe Institute, Argentina from 2000-4. Annette began a second career armed with a Masters in Professional Development and Science Management, as Programme Director and then CEO with the Professional Development Foundation, where she served as Programme Director for the Masters degree programme in leadership development and coaching, accredited by Middlesex University. In 2010 Annette moved full time to Middlesex University to assume her current responsibilities. Her private practice has a specific focus on senior leaders within the public sector at Head of Service level and above, utilising a coaching model encompassing both developmental and transformation coaching.

Annette has worked for many of the coaching professional associations, including the development team for the European Mentoring and Coaching Council’s training course in 2006, serving as Moderator for the Accreditation Process from 2006-2009. She has worked extensively with the World Wide Association of Business Coaching as special advisor to the CEO in 2009 and Chair of the Training Course Accreditation Panel since 2008. She was appointed to the International Steering Group in 2008 of the Global Coaching Convention, serving on the organising committee for the 2011 Global Coaching Convention Rainbow Conference in Cape Town, South Africa.

Annette’s research interests include the role of doctorate supervisor/advisor as coach. She has recently developed and delivered (with Prof Tony Fell) an innovative programme for training research supervisors of Professional Doctorate candidates.

This Workshop will offer a global opportunity for professionals from academia and the world of work to share and reflect on their different experiences in supervising Professional Doctorate (PD) candidates to successful completion. The fundamental principles underpinning effective supervision of PD candidates will be reviewed, and various models for supervision explored. Short case histories based on the real-life experiences of doctoral candidates will illustrate approaches to the development of supervisors (a.k.a. ‘advisors’) and the sharing of best practice in research supervision.

Professional Doctorates represent a major growth area in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Australia, Ireland, parts of mainland Europe, the UK and the USA. They offer new developmental opportunities for advanced practitioners to become doctoral research candidates in fields such as education, the health sciences, business administration, social sciences, arts, design and architecture. The PD has opened up access to postgraduate research for non-standard candidates – who often come from a wider demographic than many PhD students – and are equipped with a wealth of professional knowledge and resources.

This feature has stimulated changes in the nature of doctoral research itself and in the mode of examination, in addition to
innovative approaches to supervision. Significant challenges are involved in developing supervisors for PD candidates – especially since many research programmes focus on knowledge produced within the work role, where the candidate’s expertise may exceed that of the supervisor. Thus the supervisory relationship becomes one where the supervisor and the student work in partnership, each making a qualitatively different expert contribution. This needs to be acknowledged, accommodated and managed. If, as is often the case, the supervisory team includes external professionals, the broader network of complementary expertise available to the PD candidate redefines the role of the academic research supervisor.

In the UK, best practice in research supervision is supported by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Code of Practice (2004), which serves as a key reference point for policy and guidance. Precepts 11 – 14 recognise that internal and external PD supervisors should both have access to appropriate training to equip them for their role and ensure consistency of supervision. In the new UK Quality Code, where Section B11 replaces the QAA Code of Practice, these points are reflected in Indicators 9 – 11 (consultation version, 2012).

Thus it is clear from the formal policy framework, supported by academic experience (Scott, et al 2004; Lee, 2008) and sector-based workshops such as one held recently in Bristol (UKCGE, 2011), that while new strategies for doctoral supervision are emerging to reflect the diversity of doctoral routes, some fundamental, generic principles underpinning effective supervision remain and are common to all, including the PD.

The Workshop will focus on the generic requirements for developing doctoral supervisors, coupled with innovative approaches to coaching doctoral candidates (Fillery-Travis & Lane, 2006). It will review key stages in doctoral training – from induction, skills development, progress monitoring, thesis completion through to preparing the PD candidate for the Viva voce (Fell & Haines, 2011). The Workshop will conclude by exploring best practice in the critical process of selecting examiners and conducting the Viva voce.

Fillery-Travis, A. and Lane, D (2006) ‘Does Coaching Work or are we asking the wrong question?’ International Coaching Psychology Review 1 (1) April
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Hidden Voices: Exploring personal and professional transformation through video narratives of Professional Doctorate candidates

Gail Sanders
Principal Lecturer
University of Sunderland, UK
Email: Gail.sanders@sunderland.ac.uk

Gail Sanders is Principal Lecturer with responsibility for Learning Enhancement with the Faculty of Business & Law at the University of Sunderland. She has extensive experience in the development of part-time programmes for practising managers, most recently focusing on innovative developments in work-based learning at doctoral level. She is a member of the core team for the university’s Professional Doctorate programme, and programme leader for the Business School DBA. Gail’s main research interest is in the concept of professional identity and authentic leadership, particularly as it applies to health-care workers.

Judith Kuit
Principal Lecturer
University of Sunderland, UK
Email: judith.kuit@sunderland.ac.uk

Judith Kuit is a Principal Lecturer in the Department of Pharmacy, Health and Well-Being in Faculty of Applied Sciences at the University of Sunderland. She is a core team member of the University’s Professional Doctorate programme and for many years worked in academic staff development where she researched and published in the field of reflective practice. Currently she is the programme leader for BSc Clinical Physiology, a Strategic Health Authority commissioned programme, and its successor, BSc Healthcare Science. The changes in NHS workforce career structures have led her to undertaking research into the area of professional identity and interdisciplinary working in the NHS.
This workshop explores through video narratives the personal and professional journey of transformation of professional doctorate candidates at varying stages in their programme.

All of the individuals engaged in our Professional Doctorate programme are already well-established in their field and for the majority career progression is not the main driver for advanced study. A survey completed in 2010 (Smith et al), indicated that only 46% of respondents said they did so for career progression, but all recognised that studying on the programme had made a difference in the way that they approached their professional practice. They reported a change in perspective on their professional lives and an ability to think more critically and reflectively about their work. This professional transformation is actively encouraged through the structure of the programme, which uses reflective practice, interdisciplinary working, and an exploration of professional identity to underpin candidate development.

Many candidates, when starting off on their doctoral journey, tend to define themselves almost entirely through their job role. We believe that this can be restrictive in terms of what we are trying to achieve through the professional doctorate, presenting a barrier to the creation of new knowledge in different situations. There is a tendency for such individuals to be “territorialised” within their specific profession (Baumard, 1999). That is, their knowledge and therefore their strategic approach to their professional practice is bounded by the cognitive map that they have created within that context; they may find it difficult to adapt to very different cultures and approaches. Furthermore, this
The traditional system of education leaves little opportunity at pre-qualifying level for aspiring professionals to explore how their personal beliefs and values inform their practice nor to interact with others to identify and solve problems at a high level and creates an environment for innovation and development. Barr et al (2005) describe how exposure to other professions often can be seen to be a distraction or ‘contamination’ at this level, and that pressure to increase profession-specific studies leaves no time for interprofessional studies. However, at doctoral level the relatively new ‘second generation’ Professional Doctorates (Maxwell 2008) are starting to address these issues. The model adopted at the University of Sunderland follows this second generation approach. It is a ‘generic’ doctorate which draws candidates from a range of different disciplines and background, and integral to the learning experience is the interaction and sharing of knowledge between candidates. Studies start with a module on reflective practice, where models of reflection are introduced through the vehicle of professional identity. This takes a two-sided approach: candidates are asked to explore the identity of their profession and then their own personal professional identity, where identity is defined as:

‘The relatively stable and enduring constellation of attributes, beliefs, values, motives and experiences in terms of which people define themselves in a professional role’ (Schein 1978)

Critical incident technique, exercises in use of metaphor, and community of enquiry are used to break some of the barriers to this type of reflection. The value of their exploration and clarification of their professional identity is explained in terms of their research paradigms, authentic leadership (Gardner et al), and interprofessional working.

Although many candidates struggle with this approach initially, we have found that reflective accounts produced at the end of their studies evidence of some quite remarkable transformations that have changed the way these candidates view themselves as professionals. For example, one recently-examined candidate commented at the end of her viva that she wouldn’t really have cared if she didn’t pass as she knew anyway that she had completely transformed as a persona and as a manager (though that was, of course, said in the knowledge that she had passed!). The following extract from our most recently examined candidate is testament to the impact that the approach can have on professional practice:

At the start of my doctorate process I thought I knew why I was doing what I was doing, comfortable in my skin and prepared to take on the world. However, my real journey of discovery started when I wrote the personal reflection of my life and career, identifying some of the significant events that form my personal jigsaw. Accustomed to the practice of reflection as a nurse, I understood its value to practice, but not its value to me as a person. When I look back at the role of reflection as a clinical practitioner and as a process of understanding me, the two processes are poles apart in terms of depth and wider meaning. In reality, the reflection I undertook as a nurse offered a ‘here and now’ picture of what had happened, what the consequences were, and what I should do next. I did not examine the personal impact, look at relationships, or the impact that events had on me. It has only been through the doctorate process I have taken the time to examine the situations, events, and developments I have led in more detail, adding strength to my outlook on life. In practice, I feel it is important to know who you are and what drives you, and yet it has only been over the last three years that I have achieved such clarity. ………Blinded by my passion at times, access to critical friends (both inside and outside of work and the university) has been vital in ‘extracting’ me from my world of improvement, in order to bring objectivity and meaning.

Our workshop will consider video narratives of the professional life histories of individuals explored through reflective practice, and examine the processes of reflection and the effect that this has had on professional practice.
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Gwladys Jean-Joseph, since the creation of the EuroDoc’Agro platform (end of 2009), has managed its activities, mainly:

1) Incubation of European projects (Initial Training Network and Erasmus Mundus) in Life and Environmental Sciences and Technologies (community of six Research Centres and Higher Education Institutions)
2) Best practices and support of strategies on research, training and European partnerships questions (quality of doctoral paths, public-private partnerships, etc.)
3) Communication of EuroDoc’Agro; participation in regional, national or European networks

Multiskilled background: biochemistry and nutrition, reinforced by research activities; management of innovation; she worked in private companies (the agrofood industry) as an engineer.
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Associate Director of the Joint Unit for Parasite and Fungus Immunology and Molecular Biology (BIPAR)  
ENVA, France  
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Activities related to the ICPD Conference:

- Promotion of European programs; support to the building of European projects of research and high education (Initial Training Networks, Erasmus Mundus...);
- Development of Academia-Industry networks;
- Evaluation of European FP5, FP6 & FP7 projects (including ITN projects);
- Organization and participation to innovative Master programmes (including an Erasmus Mundus Master) and participation to the optional Unit “Vocation for Research” set up at ENVA in order to encourage Veterinary students to apply to research studies.
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INRA, France
Email: muriel.mambrini@jouy.inra.fr

Muriel Mambrini is currently president of Jouy en Josas research center (1600 staff) of the French National Institute for Agriculture (INRA) and consulting professor at AgroParisTech. PhD in animal nutrition, she obtained an habilitation degree in animal genetics and coordinated Marie Curie training site in animal integrative biology and interdisciplinary networks merging science and humanities. She is at the initiative of the regional EuroDoc’Agro platform, aiming to transform scientist’s initiatives into European research training programs joining academia and industry, and feeding policies and strategies of 5 research and education organizations, in terms of mobility, research training and innovation.
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AgroParisTech, France
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- Development of European and International joint curricula (doctoral and master programmes)
- Development of academia-industry networks,
- Participation to European networks, benchmark on European good practices and recommendations / diffusion toward national institution
- Promotion of European and international programs; support to the building of European and international projects of research and high education (Initial Training Networks, Erasmus Mundus...);
- Development of innovative doctoral trainings for the doctoral school ABIES

Gwladys Jean-Josepha, Sylvain Bellierb, Lucia Belloni, Arnaud Callebard, Virginie Choye, Alice Francoisf, Thomas Goujong, Nadia Haddadh, Anne Krappia, Nadia Haddad, Anne Krappia, Sophie Le Poderj, Martine Meritank, Sophie Pleinetl, Muriel Mambrinin aManager of the EuroDoc’Agro platform, Pôle STVE, Domaine de Vilvert, F-78352 Jouy-en-Josas; bAssistant professor, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire d’Alfort, 7, Av du Général de Gaulle, F-94704 Maisons Alfort Cedex; clnternational affairs, Cemagref - Environmental science and technology research institute, Parc de Tourvoie, BP 44, F - 92163 Antony cedex; dEuropean and International Affairs Dept., French agency for food, environmental and occupational health & safety, 27-31 avenue du Général Leclerc, F-94700 Maisons-Alfort; e European officer, European affairs, INRA, 147 rue de l’université, F-75338, Paris cedex 07 ; fAgroParisTech & ABIES doctoral school, 14 avenue du Maine, F-75732 Paris 15; gPartnership deputy of INRA Division of Plant Biology, 2 Place Pierre Viala, F-34060 Montpellier cedex 1, hProfessor, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire d’Alfort, 7, Av du Général de Gaulle, F-94704 Maisons Alfort Cedex; iResearcher, Institut Jean-Pierre Bourgin (JPB), UMR 1318 INRAAgroParisTech, INRA, Centre de Versailles-Grignon, Route de St-Cyr (RD10), F-78026 Versailles cedex; jassistant professor, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire d’Alfort, 7, Av du Général de Gaulle, F-94704 Maisons Alfort Cedex ; kVice head,
Ecole Nationale Supérieure du Paysage, 10, rue du Maréchal-Joffre, F-78000 Versailles | Training officer, Human Resources Department, INRA, 147 rue de l’université, F-75338, Paris cedex 07, | mPresident of the Jouy-en-Josas research center, INRA, Domaine de Vilvert F-78352 Jouy-en-Josas.

1. General objective of this workshop

In the context of this international workshop focusing on “International perspectives on benchmarking doctoral qualifications,” EuroDoc’Agro proposes to experiment with a method for developing an innovative scheme for improving doctoral career paths, based on an instantaneous benchmarking.

EuroDoc’Agro proposes that the participants use the results already obtained as the basis for the activity of this workshop. We feel assured that all participants will share good practices and propose solutions to promote doctoral education towards socio-economic actors, the job market and society, in line with the best international standards and as contributors to international research, training and partnerships. We will ensure the transcription of the collective output in a publication and its translation into strategies.

2. Proposed timetable

An animator of the EuroDoc’Agro platform will introduce the proposed timetable and will animate the discussion.

The co-animators of the EuroDoc’Agro platform will watch the time and eventually widen the debate with new ideas.

a. Short introduction (10 minutes)

Research-Education-Partnerships at the European and international levels

The EuroDoc’Agro platform of the STVE cluster (more details about the EuroDoc’Agro Platform in the enclosed leaflet) was launched with the general objective of integrating and promoting the aims of the European Research Area (ERA) and the European Higher Education Area (EHEA):

- reinforce and structure initial training at a European level;
- improve career prospects through the development of wide-ranging skills;
- strengthen the ERA through human resources;
- encourage diversified careers by increasing the involvement of the private sector and create partnerships between industry and academia.

To achieve these results, EuroDoc’Agro supports the emergence and the incubation of European projects that associate the three dimensions Research, Education and Partnerships in all scientific areas covered by the STVE Cluster. In this context, calls for proposals such as Initial Training Network (FP7 People projects) and Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorates (DG Education) are identified as strategic and focal. Indeed, the platform uses the incubation of European research training projects as levers to promote the excellence and attractiveness of doctoral training / the PhD at an international level.

It groups a large diversity of actors and implements specific support for project leaders and administrative staff, manages five permanent workshops [i) mobility, welcoming and hosting of foreign researchers and management of their contract, ii) implementations of training and career plans, iii) project management and communication, iv) new methods for partnership relationships and v) construction, evaluation and capitalisation of the projects], and two brainstorming actions to enhance i) the quality of doctoral career paths and ii) industry-academia partnerships in research training.

This inter-institutional network relevant to all facets of these projects makes it possible to disseminate the excellence criteria promoted by the European Union, specifically with the overall objective of reaching the ambitions of the Lisbon Strategy, the Bologna Process and the Innovation Union.

A map of the PhD in an international landscape

The four axes below have been identified as being strategic for the development of high-quality doctoral career paths in a system characterized by an advantageous connection between Research-Education-Partnerships at the international level (see the map of the PhD in an international landscape that will be presented to the participant).

- Axis 1: The young researcher

What is the interest/added value of the training through research for Master Students and for other candidates? What are the personal motivations of the young researcher? What are the personal expectations of the young researcher? How can Higher Education Institutions (HEI) attract young people toward
scientific careers? What are the prerequisites to be enrolled in a doctoral program?

- **Axis 2: Actors of the supervision**

What should the composition of the supervisory team be (International, Interdisciplinary, Intersectoral)? Who must be involved in doctoral candidate supervision and mentoring? What should the specific role and level of involvement of each actor be (academic vs. socio-economic partners)? How can interaction between these actors be implemented or enhanced?

- **Axis 3: Individual training plan**

How and with which actors of the supervision can we improve the quality of the content of the Personal Development Career Plan (PDCP) and in particular the definition of the individual training plan? What is the compulsory set of scientific and transversal skills expected and acquired through doctoral training? How is the geographical and sectoral mobility integrated? What are the learning outcomes of formal trainings vs. non-formal trainings? How can we assure the individualisation of doctoral paths and on the other hand generate a critical mass of doctors for the employment market? How can we implement continuous and progressive thinking on research, training and professional projects? What are the advantages or inconveniences of pluridisciplinarity?

- **Axis 4: Impact and added values**

What are the added value and success indicators of a doctoral programme for a research project (publications, patents, etc.)? What is the added value of the doctoral degree in a competitive and international context? What are the added value and success indicators for the process of innovation? What are the added value and success indicators for the rate of employability in a competitive and international context?

b. **Roundtable (15 minutes)**

After a short introduction presenting a Map of the PhD in the international landscape, comprising the different levels of stakes and the actors’ network (this abstract may be sent to the participants before the workshop so that they will know in advance these different issues) an initial roundtable will be proposed:

- Each participant will be invited to present himself (name, institution, function)
- Each participant will be invited to answer a “simple question:” In the doctoral programme of your institution, what is (are) the main or innovative element(s)/practice(s)/example(s) contributing to the professionalisation of the young trained doctor in an international context? The animators will note each answer/solution on the map.

c. **Choice of solutions to develop (5 minutes)**

A vote by a show of hands will be proposed. The subject(s) (one or two, if equivalence) that has (have) received the most votes will be developed in small groups (the participants will be separated into two groups).

d. **Small focus groups (20 minutes)**

One animator of the EuroDoc’Agro platform will lead each group, assisted by a coanimator. One of the participants will be designated as the reporter and will take notes on the discussion in order to make a short synthesis of the solution developed.

e. **Report and conclusions (10 minutes)**

Each reporter will summarize their solution. One animator will build a consolidated scheme taking into account the proposed solutions. The idea is to highlight strategies to implement for a convergence between the “professional project” and the “personal project.” EuroDoc’Agro proposes to follow up on this international brainstorming by a publication.

3. **Team members (representatives of the EuroDoc’Agro platform)**

a. Animators

- Nadia Haddad, Associate Director of the Joint Unit for Parasite and Fungus Immunology and Molecular Biology (BIPAR), ENVA.
- Muriel Mambrini-Doudet, President of the Jouy-en-Josas research center, INRA.

b. Co-animators

- Alice François, Scientific and Doctoral Education Department, AgroParisTech.

**Annex**

Key elements already identified as being necessary for excellent and attractive doctoral training

- Include the young researcher at the core of the research project, while supporting strong scientific
and transferable skills within the timeframe of a PhD with a focus on innovative solutions

- Develop the best working ecosystem, early in the process, focusing on non-linear innovation processes and ways to overcome cultural discrepancies
- Promote knowledge, interdisciplinary and/or trans-sectorial exchange, with a focus on “areas of sharing”
- Promote synergy through the consideration at the earliest stage of knowledge property, and evaluation of intellectual heritage and respective investments of the actors.
Establishing professional doctoral culture is an inherent part of the programme leader’s leadership role. Historically culture has been used as an organisational identifier since the work of Waller (1932) and has been used to describe how organisations really work (Hofstede, 1991). Development and maintenance of doctoral culture remains a large part of the programme leader’s role. What characteristics and skills do leaders of doctoral programmes need in order to create a context for social interaction where knowledge creation can be created, legitimised and disseminated?

Academics who head up doctoral teams are required to work in many contexts and have to develop many skills. They are responsible for maintaining the overall quality of the doctoral programme from admissions, delivery of the programme through to final examination and beyond. How do they establish teams of academic others and in reality how are they supported to undertake this leadership role? What experience and qualities do programme leaders have on taking up this key appointment? Are they really leaders of knowledge creation or in reality managers of the academic work of others?

Defining academic leadership as a concept can be problematic; there are many perspectives about what academic leadership is and how it operates in practice. Finding a distinction between academic leaders and academic managers and the nature of such roles remains unclear (Marshall, Adams and Cameron, 2000, Yielder and Codling 2004). In a recent small study using narrative research a group of doctoral academic leaders saw some distinction between their work which is seen to be transactional (task-focused, managerial) and transformational (development-focused, leadership) work (Flanagan and Thompson, 1993).
Further interrogation of the data suggests that programme leaders adopt a very reflective position in order to evaluate their leadership role, embracing both elements of leading and managing. Their focus is about how their leadership drives the programme forward, how it allows students to have a quality doctoral experience and how they juggle ever-dwindling resources with which to do so. Many of the attributes shared by academic leaders synchronise with characteristics identified in the literature: setting strategic direction (having a vision for the programme), organisation of the programme, personal attributes related to trust, integrity, effective communication and general ‘people-skills’ based on a knowledge and experience of how the programme should be delivered (Bryman, 2007).

The aim of this workshop is to broaden and deepen our understanding of academic leader attributes that are important to delivering successful doctoral programmes. This workshop session may be of interest to those academics already working in a leadership capacity or for those aspiring to academic leadership. The findings from narratives of six academic leaders will be used to propose a model of programme leadership that can be used to foreground discussion and debate in the workshop. Participants will be given the opportunity to complete their own narratives and/or propose changes to the model that will help to nuance and further contextualise the nature of doctoral leadership.
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In the light of developments of professional doctorates in ‘creative’ subjects it is appropriate to review the precedents for how doctoral research is conducted in them. As Elaine Thomas noted in her review of research training (2001: 18) ‘an eclectic approach [to methodology] could be valuable’. This paper reviews examples of that eclectic approach in action, identifying a range of standpoints that art and design practitioners have adopted in PhD research. It uses abstracts in the ADIT (Art and Design Index to Theses) to discuss this range and its consequences for our understanding of this type of research.

It might seem reasonable to suppose that research that emerges from creative practice will tend to follow certain principles and use distinctive methods. We inherit culturally bound assumptions about art and its relationship to the human subject from romanticism, which may imply that research in creative practice has a natural affinity to research in the ‘arts and humanities’, rather than to the sciences. However, just as any humanities subject one might consider – history for instance – has its empiricists and its post-modernists, on closer inspection the range of standpoints from which it is possible to conduct research that relates to art and design practice seems to be equally as varied, and to have modulations that parallel those found in other subjects.

The ADIT database (www.shu.ac.uk/adit) brings together information about UK PhD projects from across the art and design disciplines completed since 1955. A study of the abstracts in the database makes it possible to see the variety of ways in which research relating to the practice of art and design has been conducted. This paper aims to classify some of these approaches, noting how they relate to the sub-disciplines in art and design and drawing out examples that illustrate the standpoints which they represent. It seeks to challenge assumptions...
about the ‘natural’ make-up of art and design research, demonstrating the variety of epistemological, ontological and theoretical standpoints from which it draws. The authors bring extensive experience of supervising PhDs in Art and Design, and in Education, and hope that this is a relevant discussion at a moment when Professional Doctorates are emerging in areas of creative practice.

Thomas, Elaine (Ed.) (2001) research Training in the Creative and performing Arts and Design, Lichfield: UKCGE.
This workshop enables conference delegates to examine the relative merits of a non-modular approach to Stage 1 of a Professional Doctorate. Anglia Ruskin University has operated this approach to supporting built environment professional doctorate candidates since 2004. The flexible programme requires candidates to complete three research papers and a research proposal over an 18 to 24 month period, before entering Stage 2. The papers act as the guiding focal point and driving force for the candidates’ studies. Their research is supported by a series of weekend workshops and an online Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). The VLE provides all the basic information required as well as a variety of online learning material, such as that provided by Epigeum. This complements the activities in the workshops which can concentrate on skill development. Candidates are not taught and the workshops do not have a set programme of training content, but comprise a series of learning activities relating to the candidates’ research. New members can join the single cohort at two set points each year in September and February. All are asked to present and defend their research to the whole group on a regular basis. The workshop topics, which are candidate centred, range from problems encountered in professional practice, engaging with relevant theory, to the selection of appropriate research methods. The material presented is used as learning material for all candidates. In this way, new and more established candidates are working together on common problems; learning from each other. Although this approach is an extremely difficult one to manage, to ensure that all receive the support they require, it is one that can be very rewarding. The programme is sustainable as it permits very small numbers to join each year with limited impact on resources; however candidates must take responsibility for their own learning.
Reflections on recognition and accreditation of learning towards a professional doctorate programme
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Hemda is a Professor of Environmental science and Public Health Education whose work aims to explore the complex interplay of environmental sciences with human and organisational behaviour in public health decision making processes. As an educational practitioner she aims to embed the knowledge gained in the practitioner community through the development of work-based professional Masters and Doctorate programmes. She is Framework Leader for the Doctorate in Professional Studies (DProf) Risk and Environment Pathways in the School of Health and Social Sciences at Middlesex University.

Gordon is the Framework leader for the Doctorate in Professional Studies (DProf) Health Pathway in the School of Health and Social Sciences at Middlesex University. Previously he has worked in the field of work based learning within a number of subject boundaries including business & management, health & social care and education. His research interests focus on leadership, management and professional development for teachers and learners in higher education and professionals within the public and private sectors.
The professional doctorate is directed at established professionals who are at a suitable level within their organisation to undertake research that can make a valid contribution to practice. The professional researcher will normally bring their stock of experience of the practice environment into their research programme. The authors have worked with professional doctoral researchers and have reflected upon some of the questions that constantly arise during assessment of such accredited works.

Over the past years of leading professional doctorate programmes, the authors have reflected upon the public works nature of the process of recognition and accreditation of learning (RAL) as well as the holistic evaluation of the assessment process. The following questions have emerged:

- What is the public works nature of recognition and accreditation of learning in the professional doctorate?
- How much experiential and evidenced learning can be considered (in terms of credit size)?
- How is the level of the learning determined (for example between level 7 and 8)?
- How should such experience be evidenced; through means of reports or other artefacts?
- How can ethical practice be considered in past work?
- How should the research methodological approach be considered?
- To what extent should candidates critically analyse their work in light of relevant literature?
- Should they consider their contribution to personal and or organisational practice as a justification for their claim for recognition and accreditation of past learning?
- What should be the currency of such evidence based claims?

The authors will present a brief outline of their current practice in facilitating candidate claims for RAL and theory as used for their current assessment process (Weller et al, 2010). The concept of recognition and accreditation of practice may be attractive to those intending to undertake a professional doctorate research degree. Any such claims for credit for previous learning and development must be based on genuine practice enhancement and change, assessed against appropriate research degree level descriptors and must be based on reliable and current evidence. Furthermore, the concept of evidence-based practice relates very well to the notion of recognition and accreditation of learning through enabling the research candidate to link past evidence-based practice to their current and emerging research plan. The importance of evidence-based practice, particularly within the health and social care sector has been discussed by Nutley et al (2007), where it has been recognised that small scale service improvement developments can form a useful foundation for more structured research projects, with the potential to influence public service provision, policy and practice.

In terms of preparation and planning for professional doctoral research, the RAL claim can be an indicator of authenticity, where research candidates can demonstrate that they have undertaken practice related change and enhancement and relate this to the research level descriptors. Any claim for recognition and accreditation of learning should involve the research candidate in critical review (of their own research and the research of others). Indeed as critical consumers of research, they should be able to understand the deficiencies in terms of research methodological approach and ethical issues in any past practice related projects. However, conveying such understanding is often difficult and can be almost unconsciously value laden by the experience of both research candidate and advisor.

Because of this, notions of identity, valence and effectiveness of the research candidate and the context of their RAL claim, must also be considered in any assessment process in addition to the formal level descriptors. In this respect, we have grappled with the question: should RAL be based on successful as well as unsuccessful change claims? It could be argued that equivalent learning may be achieved from both scenarios. Furthermore, critical reflection upon practice can be unique to the learning context and difficult to convey.

We need to question whether the RAL claim should focus only on demonstrating an element of practical wisdom or phronesis within their field, thus exhibiting in-depth understanding, or should it be more inclusive. If we are truly interested in enabling research candidates to demonstrate their understanding, should any such claim for RAL involve a Viva voce examination, whereby the candidate must defend their claim at the appropriate level in terms?

The authors are keen to explore the above questions and themes with other practitioners in the form of a round table discussion.
Dr Peter Critten is Project Manager Work Based Organisational Learning at the Institute for Work Based Learning, Middlesex University. He has been associated with the development of work based learning at the University since the early 90s. Before joining the University Peter had 25 years experience of organising training and development. He has published three books and numerous articles and conference papers on work based learning. In his current role he is working with organisations to help them connect up learning in the workplace in such a way as to have an impact on the organisation as a whole.

A professional doctorate graduate, commenting on his experience of the Viva when he submitted his dissertation, remarked that "the people that I most wanted to judge my output were the community of fellow practitioners; in my case these were sales executives, senior management and fellow sales training professionals " (Critten, Squire and Leppenwell 2010) In this round-table discussion Peter Critten argues the case for professionals and business leaders to have a closer engagement with assessment of professional doctorates.

June Boyce-Tillman read music at St Hugh’s College. She is now Professor of Applied Music at the University of Winchester. Her doctoral research into children’s musical development has been translated into seven languages. She is a composer and active in community music making, exploring the possibilities of intercultural sharing through composing/improvising. As a performer, her one-woman shows have been performed in three continents. Her most recent writings are on Music and Spirituality and Music and Peace-making. She was appointed Director of Postgraduate Research Study in 2008 and managed the acquisition of degree awarding powers and the development of professional and practice-led doctorates.

In a growing movement the West is trying to heal a rift that has developed in its intensely rationalistic culture. Gooch (1972) defines this rift in terms of two systems of thought, both of which co-exist in the human personality. The favoured characteristics of one system (System A) are

- activity leading to products
- objectivity
- impersonal logic
- thinking and thought
- detachment
- discrete categories of knowledge which is based on proof and scientific evidence.

The other system (System B) favours

- being
- subjectivity
- personal feeling
- emotion
- magic
- involvement
- associative ways of knowing
- belief and non-causal knowledge

He suggests that the Western world has chosen to value the first of these value systems. The second has therefore become devalued. I have called the ways of knowing that characterise System B ‘subjugated ways of knowing’, a term based on such theorists as Foucault (Ball 1990) and Belenky (1986). I would add to the second list embodied cognition which is linked with subjectivity, personal feeling and involvement (Boyce-Tillman, 2007) exemplified in Olu Taiwo’s description of embodied cognition which values the: practitioner’s subjective perceptions and experience with regard to their particular embodied practice. This method differs from participant observation in that when we are engaged in practice, we are totally immersed in the activity. Critically, we employ hermeneutics; the
reflective oscillation from the specific action to a reflection on the whole event. This facilitates a method of explicating our experience of ‘being in the act’ and not ‘observing the act internally, from a critical distance’. (Taiwo, 2012)

The values of any society are related to those who hold positions of power. These people set the values which ‘social artefacts, products of historically situated interchanges among people.’ (Gergen, 1985 p 267) In terms of embodied cognition, in general the people at the top of this map of powerful positions have been able to employ the bodies of others to carry out their minds – whether that is servants, soldiers or workers on a factory floor. These latter people have bodies which are controlled by the minds of the powerful. The powerful have minds but require somebody else’s body to execute them. This separation is reflected in the relative status given to various jobs. To be a manager is better than being a cleaner. These values are held by myths (like Cinderella):

A myth is a narrative, a foundational symbolic story or set of stories through which a nation or cultural group within it understands and remembers its origins and envisions its “end times” in order to live life meaningfully in the present. (Grey, 1996 p242)

So our society has an embodied/disembodied split, often within the self and certainly, as already illustrated in the wider society reflected in HE with the relative value positions of the PhD and the Professional Doctorate. The rise of Professional Doctorates represents an attempt to heal the split, for the two need to be in relationship:

He goes on to develop the notion of the Physical Journal - ‘embodied knowledge and memory, essential for proficient movement and development, in...vocational practices like: Engineering, Agriculture and Nursing.

The Cartesian split has been discredited in many areas (Damasio, 1994) but the PhD still lords it over Professional Doctorates. Claxton, Lucas and Webster outline how Descartes’ error has governed the development of education in western culture. They describe how this was born in classical Greece, endorsed by the Church and turned by the philosophers of the Enlightenment into ‘irrefutable common sense’. (Claxton, Lucas, Webster 2010). Rationality became the highest manifestation of our humanity. The advent of professional doctorates practice as well as theory represents the surfacing of embodied cognition from its subjugation position. Here there is a relation between the material and the thinking (Draper and Harrison, 2011 p98).

The University of Winchester with its values – ‘to educate, to advance knowledge and to serve the public good’ - gave us the basis for a number of doctorates valuing embodied cognition:

- An EdD
- A DCreative Arts
- ProfDoc in Practical Theology
- A DBA in ethical business management

These are new developments in line with our mission, values and traditions and we are seriously looking at the best ways of supervising, assessing and valuing embodied cognition.
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Data are presented from a recent study entitled ‘Australian doctoral graduates’ publication and community outcomes’. This project investigated the relationships between doctoral graduates in 1998, 2004 and 2006 and the publication and dissemination from their doctoral research and theses, and their doctoral-influenced contributions to the professional work and the community generally. It compared discipline, types of candidature and features such as location and gender. The project had three main phases: 1) a bibliometric collection and analysis of samples by selected year of Australian PhD graduates’ publications; 2) a survey of a subsample from each year; and 3) interviews with a further subset from 2).

The research used multi-level qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate the relationships between doctoral graduates’ time since completion (two, six and ten years) and their doctoral outcomes— in terms of their publications and their professional and community contributions. The project drew on the Database of Australian Doctorates (DAD)—a coded data-base of over 85,000 Australian PhD theses developed from a prototype (see Macauley, Evans, Pearson & Tregenza, 2005). This database was used to identify Australian doctoral graduates from 1998, 2004 and 2006 from five selected Broad Fields of Study including: Creative and Performing Arts, Education, Information Technology, Natural and Physical Sciences and Society and Culture. The web-based questionnaire was developed and implemented to seek the graduates’ details of their publication outcomes and the doctoral-influenced contributions to their professional work and the community. Potential survey respondents were contacted individually by email and provided with details of the project and their individual publication records determined from the bibliometric and Web research. This approach elicited a total of 562 responses across 1998, 2004 and 2006. Respondents were also asked to indicate their current field of employment.

From the survey we established the professional and workplace fields in which graduates were employed. These included areas such as Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing; Education (other than Higher Education); Finance and Insurance; Government Administration and Defence; Health and Community Services; Mining; and Personal and Other Services. While more graduates were employed in the Health and Community Services sector and Government Administration and Defence (28 and 27 respectively), and collectively graduates from those sectors produced the greatest numbers of papers (561 and 438 respectively), the most productive graduates were from the Personal and Other Services, and Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing sectors. Those doctoral graduates produced a mean of 21.2 and 18.53 publications each. Not surprisingly, in total, the 1998 graduates produced the most publications (895) compared with 692 publications for the 2004 graduates and 541 publications for the 2006 cohort. This result was expected since the greater the time since graduating (as a credentialed researcher) the more time there is for publishing opportunities. The survey also sought to establish the influence of a graduate’s doctorate on the publications produced. Interestingly, it was the sectors, Finance and Insurance; Education (other than Higher Education); and Government Administration and Defence, in which the graduates’ doctorates most influenced their publications. Surprisingly, those from one of the most productive sectors for publishing, Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing, had the least influence from their doctorates for publishing. This may suggest their post-doctoral publication patterns shift to suit their roles in the field.

Digitally audio-recorded interviews were conducted with 55 survey respondents to determine their PhD and post-doctoral experiences. Two clear themes emerged: the opportunity (or more precisely, the lack of opportunity) to publish; and the need and desire to disseminate their research findings (which is congruent with doctoral graduates who work in academe). Interviewees often expressed frustration that it was not part of their professional work to publish. One interviewee, with three books and five journal articles to her name, described herself as ‘... a loner fighting my battle …’ as ‘I don’t have the time. I wish I had the time to move into academia and write more and do things’.

Another interviewee in a similar situation stated: ‘...I find that incredibly difficult now I’m in four or five different projects and to publish is really just not that easy. It’s not part of my core job but it’s what I want to be able to do’. There appears to be mismatch between their wants and needs, and as these graduates are not paid to research in their day jobs, their wants remain unfulfilled—unless they are prepared to undertake publishing in their own time. A pragmatic attitude was provided by another respondent who said:

[my] last (PhD) chapter was nearly ready for publication but working for a living became a priority because a lot of the research work that I do involves writing a lot of internal reports for clients so any time I’ve got time to do writing I’m doing it for earning an income... I don’t actually have any spare time...to finish off the last bit of research.
Doctoral graduates in professional and workplace fields believe that they do not have the opportunities to publish their research. However, in reality they still have those opportunities in terms of journals, publishers etc, but it is not possible to do so as paid work that is the concern. Furthermore, it was clear that some interviewees wanted an academic position to pursue their research ambitions; to do so they still need to establish a publishing track record and disseminate the findings of their research.

Dissemination of research findings was the second theme generated by the interviews. The passion to disseminate research findings was palpable through many of the interviews. The passion was apparent with one interviewee who stated:

... I think publication is important because we are sort of cutting edge stuff which I would like to publish widely in a scholarly way so that people can get to read about it, but there's also communication and dissemination of what we do which is basically community type work which we also do, but I also see an importance in academic publication for that reason; I want to share knowledge because no one else is doing it, no one else is writing about it....

Another doctoral graduate was just as enthusiastic: ‘I had this urge, this passionate urge to write about something and I thought if I don’t write about it it’s going to be hidden’. She discussed a subsequent book she published: ‘I had a passionate urge to publish that because there were people who were looking at students in the wrong way and I thought no I’ve got to do this’. However, once again, one could suggest that the passion to publish and disseminate one’s research comes from a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic reasons and that this is a fairly normal phenomenon for doctoral trained researchers. Intrinsic reasons could include the desire to share, and the common good of providing information to those who could benefit. Extrinsic reasons could include enhancing job prospects and promotion.

The presentation considers these findings in terms of how the graduates in professional and workplace contexts publish (in scholarly terms) and communicate their doctoral and subsequent research to their professional, workplace and community contexts. It discusses the extent to which such doctoral graduates value and perform scholarly publishing and also other means of dissemination in their professional lives.
1. Introduction

At the moment of enrolment on a professional doctorate programme, most candidates will already have a long history of generating new knowledge as a necessary and integral part of their professional lives. Knowledge created in the working environment has a particular resonance within the contemporary discourse about ‘knowledge workers’ and the ‘knowledge economy’ (Drucker 1968, pp. 263 - 380) and is frequently now defined in terms of a so-called ‘mode 2’ knowledge production (Gibbons et al 1994, pp. 1 – 16).

This paper explores the feasibility of utilizing such previously acquired knowledge from the workplace in a doctoral thesis. It describes the circumstances when this might be appropriate for professional doctorate candidates and discusses some of the theoretical and methodological approaches by which this might be achieved.

2. Modes of knowledge production

Mode 2 knowledge production is distinguished from the generation of (mode 1) theoretical knowledge within universities. As well as taking place in ‘the context of application’ (Ibid, pp. 3 - 4) and being ‘transdisciplinary’ in character (Ibid, pp. 4 – 6), it is also said to have two closely related features that are particularly pertinent to the present discussion.

The first relates to the dynamic and transitory nature of its outputs (Nowotny et al 2003, p. 186). These take the form of solutions to previously identified problems. The thinking on which they are based is
therefore unlikely to be formally codified, and will instead continue to reside in the minds of those who generated them. This aspect of mode 2 knowledge production has clear parallels with Polanyi’s (1966, pp. 3 – 25) distinction between explicit (articulated) and tacit (unarticulated) knowledge.

The second feature flows naturally from the first and relates to the challenges of evaluating, and legitimizing, knowledge produced in mode 2 contexts (Gibbons et al 1994, p. 8). In one sense the value of such knowledge is properly judged according to its utility in the context in which it is produced. However, such a pragmatic – and commercially driven – approach to quality control sits uneasily with notions of knowledge as being related to truth, and evaluated according to recognized and properly be described as being at the forefront of a Some of this previously generated knowledge may candidate’s discipline or area of professional practice.

3. The search for legitimacy

Some of this previously generated knowledge may properly be described as being at the forefront of a candidate’s discipline or area of professional practice. Apart from its tacit nature it may therefore already be of potential doctoral quality according to the requirements of common higher education policy descriptors (for example, QAA 2008, pp. 23 & 24). For these candidates the doctoral journey may be less about the traditional (mode 1) process of empirical data collection and analysis, and more about the task of seeking legitimacy for their existing (mode 2) tacit knowledge. The search for such legitimacy is a theme that runs through the professional doctorate literature and a number of solutions have been proposed that seek to identify alternatives to the traditional assessment of doctorates by thesis (for example, Usher 2002, Maxwell 2003, Lester 2004).

Nevertheless, given the conservatism of most university regulations in this regard (Rolfe & Davies 2009, p. 1271), it is argued here that legitimacy for these candidates will frequently have to be achieved through a process of converting their existing (mode 2) tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. This is then capable of forming the subject-matter of a conventional thesis, and of being judged according to the (mode 1) prescriptions that still dominate national policy statements and most university awards regulations. The conversion of tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge in this way might therefore be described as one in which the academic world is able to ‘harvest’ knowledge produced in a very different domain, and thereby to bestow legitimacy upon it according to criteria with which it is familiar.

4. Theoretical foundations

This presents challenges for doctoral candidates, and for those who guide them. As demonstrated by the familiar chapter headings of most research methodology textbooks, the academic world is more familiar with what is essentially an instrumental approach to the research process. In a world in which knowledge creation is frequently seen to consist of a self-conscious and forward-looking process of research design, data collection and data analysis, the concept of new academic knowledge being retrospectively assembled through the harvesting of prior experience and tacit knowledge can appear quite alien.

Nevertheless, this concept is neither new, nor unsupported by theoretical literature. Perhaps most obviously, although largely absent from the professional doctorate literature, the relationship between tacit and explicit knowledge – and the means by which organizations can harvest their employees’ tacit knowledge – provides a dominant theme in contemporary publications in the knowledge management field. The most widely cited example of this is Nonaka and Takeuchi’s (1995, pp. 61 - 73) ‘SECI’ (Socialization – Externalization – Combination – Internalization) model of knowledge conversion. The model demonstrates how, through sequential processes of ‘externalization’ and ‘combination’ tacit knowledge can first be made explicit, and then articulated to convey complex ideas in written form, for example in a thesis.

The similarities between these two processes, and Kolb’s (1984, pp. 42 & 76 - 78) concepts of ‘divergence’ and ‘assimilation’ (respectively, concrete and abstract reflection), are also notable and this provides a natural bridge between the knowledge management field and the (perhaps more familiar) literature on ‘reflection’. Indeed, the practical concepts of ‘experiential learning’ and ‘reflective practice’ can themselves be demonstrated to rest on sound theoretical foundations, including the work of Dewey (1910) and Habermas (1987). Although space does not permit a detailed exploration of these ideas, this paper’s central thesis is that tacit knowledge can be transformed to explicit knowledge through a process of reflection, that this process has a sound academic pedigree, and therefore the capacity to deliver legitimate academic knowledge within a doctoral thesis.

5. Methodological precedents

Despite the theoretical justifications for the use of reflection as a research methodology in its own right, the process is perhaps more closely associated with education or practice than with academic research. Doctoral candidates seeking to adopt reflection as a methodology do therefore have to build the case for it, typically by placing it within the context of the existing literature. In so doing it might, for example, be noted that Schon (1983, pp. 307 – 325) identifies a concept
of “reflective research” and that the process advocated in this paper is effectively mirrored in Jarvis’ (1999, pp. 131 – 155) description of theory development by practitioner researchers.

Moving away from the comfort of the practice-related literature, candidates will also find justification for this approach within the interpretative research tradition. At a general level the significance of the researcher’s tacit knowledge was highlighted throughout Lincoln & Guba’s (1985) seminal work, Naturalistic Inquiry. More recently Tesch (1990 pp. 69 – 70) has identified a distinct strand of qualitative research that is “based on reflection” which is used as a device for engaging with the researcher’s tacit knowledge.

Once again, lack of space prevents a detailed consideration of how these general observations might allow reflective research to be justified in more familiar terms. Nevertheless, as two parting examples, reflection on prior experience in the workplace may often be legitimately presented, less controversially, as ‘case study’ research. The theories resulting from reflection on experience of practice can also, of course, be properly described as being ‘grounded’ (Glaser & Strauss 1967) in the research data.

6. Conclusion

For some professional doctorate candidates, the harvesting of existing professional knowledge may therefore present a viable alternative to the more familiar instrumental approaches to research design. For this to be achievable the candidate’s previously generated knowledge must already be, potentially, of doctoral quality. The candidate must also be able to demonstrate, theoretically and methodologically, the process by which this tacit knowledge has been converted into explicit knowledge of appropriate doctoral quality. This paper has briefly proposed a number of theoretical traditions and methodological devices that might assist candidates in this process.
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Action research can be undertaken in many different contexts, from public sector to business sector, from organization to community and in a variety of fields such as healthcare, education, development, management, social work etc. and can include many research methodologies. With its focus on building theories within the practice context itself, it may be argued to be a key research strategy for the professional doctorate, lending itself to the pursuit of practical and theoretical outcomes at the same time. (Hart & Bond 1998). This makes it a very suitable approach for professional doctorate research, particularly when considering the researcher’s professional values over methodological considerations. We believe that a core principle underpinning professional learning is that motivation towards successful and generative learning is critical, consequently learning must be of personal relevance to the student intellectually and emotionally and in relation to their professional and organisational situation. This principle is a key focus of the Action Learning approach that is central to the core values and philosophy of our DBA programmes. The paper is based on the authors’ experiences of working with professional doctoral students on DBA (Doctorate in Business Administration) programmes at their respective institutions. An exploration of these experiences demonstrates how an action learning/research focus can beneficially enhance the doctoral student research experience and positively influence research outcomes. Management education, through the professional doctorate, has an important role to play in helping practitioners gain an intimate understanding of the way in which management knowledge is acquired, organized and developed. Action Learning, as it is now practised, is largely based on the principles of academics such as Revans in the UK and Argyris in the USA and has been controversial in terms of its 'championing the ideas of practitioners and action learners over those of experts and teachers' (Pedlar, Burgoyne & Brook 2005:49). Our practice of Action Learning may be seen to differ in part from the original principles developed by Revans (1997), in so much as DBA learning requires reflection on theoretically conceptualized issues of professional practice over and above action on difficult to solve problems, and that the learning is facilitated by experts (DBA graduates & academics) as well as by a set of professional colleagues. This approach encompasses the need for a focus on critical management theory (Wilmott 1994), particularly if action learning is to permit ‘management researchers to develop new modes of engagement by allowing them to pursue interests and objectives which are currently excluded by the dominant management discourses’ (Johnson & Duberley 2003:1291). Through Action Learning, theory is created through reflection and dialogue in order to explain and clarify experience. For our DBAs, Action Learning implies that learning is not only student-centred but also problem-centred with a
focus on practice and an integration of theory into that practice with a critical edge. It implies not only autonomy in learning, in the sense that the research student takes responsibility for the generation of a new understanding of the issues that confront him/her, but also collaboration.

Action Learning sets are introduced at an early stage of the DBA journey and are an integral part of the DBA programmes. They are intended to provide space for self-directed and Action Learning throughout the research journey, featuring strongly in the first two years of the programmes and expected to continue into year three and beyond (by which time they will be principally research student led). Learning sets also provide the opportunity for students to discuss their own progress, raise any issues around the DBA process and to identify training needs that may arise during the course of their studies. They are facilitated by DBA graduates who are appointed as visiting professors / fellows and/or academic staff. Having experienced the DBA journey themselves, many graduates are motivated to continue their professional development and contribution to professional practice in association with the Business School. Acting as learning set advisors thus, serves both their needs and that of the students.

Argyris (2000) suggests that this learning takes place when learning set members engage in double loop learning. The first step is an unfolding discovery of what he calls our espoused theory-in-use. This is our set of ‘common sense’ propositions about the nature of things – our organisations, the management of change, the nature of leadership and other key management issues. The second stage in the process of discovery is the emerging discovery of new meanings. Typically, this emerges from conversations and from a critical discovery of different theories and models that help us to generate new ways of looking at our world. The third stage is to take the significance of this new understanding into the production of new actions – for example, new ways of designing organisations, new approaches to managing change, and new approaches to leadership, that are based on sound diagnosis and informed new perspectives. The final stage is to embed this into some sorts of generalisation; at Doctoral level this is where the student makes new contributions to knowledge and/or professional/management practice.

The implication of this is that research students focus, with members of their Learning Set, on their own challenges or problems and generate solutions from which both they and their organisation will benefit. Each DBA cohort (typically between 6 and 12 students) form a learning set, with occasionally the formation smaller sets within the group, based for example on subject specialisms, organizational issues or local contexts. Doctoral students are encouraged to actively engage with the substantive subject matter of their research aims and with organisational issues, usually in interaction with others, as at the heart of Action Learning is a proactive approach to collaboration in learning. A key principle of Action Learning, although this is embedded in other parts of the DBA programmes as well, is the development of the reflective practitioner so that students develop their capability to reflect on their work in a developmental way. Even more desirable, and with the increasing emphasis in the management literature for the researcher to ‘think about their own thinking’ and to embrace the need to question our natural and taken-for-granted attitudes, such as, our prejudice, bias, thought and habits (Cunliffe 2003), it is arguably important for managers to become not only reflective but reflexive thinkers. Reflection can form the basis for more effective problem solving but it does not require one to question the ends, means and relevance of practices, which should be the aim of critical management research practices. Action learning and action research normally include several cycles during the course of the research, each usually involving four distinct phases; planning, action, observing and reflecting (see for instance Kemmis & McTaggart 1988). It is our contention that reflection should be involved more overtly in each stage, with the reflection stage clearly underpinned by reflexivity, enabling the researcher to change his own understanding as well as his/her practice, in line with French’s (2009) observation that it helps managers in their professional development by critically examining their own beliefs and practices; to question the basic assumptions of management practice there is a need to unsettle practices and discourses that are used in describing reality.

Our conclusion is that the process of action learning and action research, involving a series of interconnecting cycles, not only is a beneficial approach for professional doctoral research students but lends itself well to the practical delivery of professional doctorate programmes.
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The presentation explores and compares the approaches taken by two universities in two countries, England and Australia, for the implementation of government initiated postgraduate research skill development. In England VITAE and QAA have established attributes, skills or competencies to be achieved whilst undertaking doctoral research. Australia has also introduced attributes to be achieved. Progress in the achievement of these is reported upon in the individual annual student progress reports. The programmes of both cases incorporate professional development, portfolio development, taking formal courses, with similar monitoring but different implementation procedures. Quality Assurance regimes require extensive reporting and monitoring. In the UK case the research skill development programme is currently for the PhD students with extension to professional doctorate students in the near future.

The skills to be achieved include transferable skills needed for employment such as taking personal responsibility and being able to operate in uncertain situations (QAA, 2008, p.24), the knowledge and skills to do research, knowledge of the standards and requirements, the knowledge and skills to work with others and ensure the wider impact of the research, and personal qualities to be a researcher (Vitae, 2010). The Australian Qualifications Framework similarly emphasises for both PhDs and Professional doctorates the development of skills and knowledge and the application of these with authority, responsibility and autonomy (AQF, 2011). There is also an emphasis on career planning, useful and appropriate given that an increasing number of those graduating with doctorates do not enter the academy, and careers already embarked upon may be enhanced by a doctorate and have other doors opened. However the profile of the professional doctorate learner, generally presenting as mature aged mid career professionals working full time does not necessarily fit with this type of skills framework.

This presentation poses the question as to whether the emphasis on doctoral skills and competences overtakes the key focus of a doctorate – that is, to undertake the research to be presented in a thesis and whether it is inclusive of all doctoral candidates.
It is pertinent to ask how this focus on skill development contributes to the thesis and to the development of the learner? Are these goals for postgraduate researchers in conflict or complementary? How might the specification of attributes or competences be put in perspective in relation to the undertaking of doctoral research? These questions are considered in the presentation utilising a consideration of the similarities and differences between the two cases exploring learnings from the Australian system for the UK.
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Seeking to facilitate a deeper engagement with our objects of knowledge (Plato 380BC, Foucault 1972).

Professional Doctorate level descriptors (UK) by which a candidate is assessed make regular reference to variations of critical - demonstrates effective and critical selection, combination and use of research and development methods; provides evidence of work with ‘critical communities’ through whom a new or modified paradigm is being established; can critique and justify evaluations as constituting bases for improvement in practice; can give papers/presentations to ‘critical communities’ for developmental purposes. Criticality then is one of the fundamental criteria of assessment. Professional doctorates are concerned with transformations and changes in thinking and practice which are of benefit to practitioners, work communities and to society through the agency of the individual researcher. Therefore professional doctorates need to seek means to support a clearer articulation of what criticality is through an exploration of its function. There are three useful perspectives on the notion of ‘critical’ all of which pertain to doctoral level study. The first is the use of the term to denote judgement of an object that is informed by experience, knowledge and skill in the domain in which one is acting as judge. These ensure a level of objectivity so that the judgement can be believed.
Without such requirements, there is no judgement only a self serving rant. Critique would be the reflective method by which one arrives at the judgement. The second is its use in physics in relation to change. According to a range of standard dictionaries, in physics ‘critical’ refers to a state, value or quantity at which one or more properties of a substance or system undergo a change and in relation to fissionable material - having enough mass to sustain a change reaction. Criticality is the flash point of change. In professional doctorates the source of energy which gives the optimum conditions for change to happen, for a chain reaction to take place, be sustainable and enduring and of benefit to the widest number of stakeholders is the quality of criticality. The third is what can be extracted of use from philosophy, the most relevant to the purposes of this paper being the discourses of critical theory arising from the Frankfurt School (Institute of Social Research 1923). It will not concern itself with the degrees of difference between various philosophers from Kant to Marx on the definition, functions and application of critique but rather on the commonalities: the essentials of questioning to illuminate, clarify and challenge the limitations and validity of any human activity – theory, practice and praxis.

Criticality is the ability and the capacity to question the object or the process of the functioning of the object and its relatedness to other things, the object being both the thing which is being critiqued and the self of the one critiquing. The object as self requires of critique not only a state of being informed by knowledge and experience but a capacity to reflect and be reflexive. Questioning should be systematic, informed by accumulative knowledge and experience, evaluative and formulated to elicit potential consequences both negative and positive. In terms of criticality being fundamental to change agency, it can be considered as an exploration of the conditions required for change to happen and a challenging of culturally and subjectively embedded limitations.

Critical theory as developed by the social philosophers of the Frankfurt School proposed the study of the interrelatedness of individuals and society to more effectively achieve change in areas that are essential to human kind’s continued existence and development particularly in economy and culture. According to Macey’s (2001:75) distillation of Geuss (1981) critical theory provides a guide for human action, is inherently emancipatory, has a cognitive content and, unlike a scientific theory, is self conscious, self critical and non objectifying. This attention to the individual is a way to resist or even prevent the emergence of dominant ideologies in modern industrial society and the subsequent objectification of the worker, hence a movement away from ideology towards enlightenment. For Habermas (Thomassen 2010), a contemporary proponent of the Frankfurt school, critical theory is not just about a critical judgement of what is but of what is possible.

It is the ‘what is possible’ that occupies us in professional doctorates. As society becomes increasingly economically interdependent and technologically enmeshed, complexity is increased. One response to complexity is simplification into codes and regulations, another is to embrace complexity as a new frontier of knowledge with opportunities for new syntheses and new applications through the relatedness of peoples and different domains of knowledge and practice. Professional doctorates, therefore, need to encourage candidates to go beyond the simplification response whose seduction is in the controlling of variables and the ‘stitching up’ of the messy bits into areas which are relatively unchartered. To do this we need to address the purpose of criticality and the process of how a depth is achieved in which the self and thing as objects are not irrevocably entangled in the depths of complexity but lead to a better understanding of our objects of knowledge for our times and for the future.
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The aim of this round table discussion is to consider academic and personal challenges associated with the increasing recruitment of international students to university programmes as highlighted by Trice (2003), which includes professional doctorate courses. Current economic factors and changes to the UK higher education system have led to increasing initiatives to occur on large social and economic scales for many decades with populations finding easier communications, collaborations and information and inter-country mobility systems. For example, in Europe, the Bologna process was introduced to facilitate the internal mobility of students, teachers and administrative staff, due to the nature of this increase in international mobility of students (Cardoso et al, 2007).

This ‘globalised knowledge market’ requires changes in the sector. Kehm (2007) suggests that doctoral education is no longer just a pursuit of knowledge but that knowledge assists in becoming a strategic resource in changing times. An international student may no longer be wishing to migrate for better working conditions; rather they may be wishing to develop the knowledge base for their own professions within their own countries of origin. McAuliffe and Cohen (2005) argue that research can answer local questions and identify patterns, meanings and relationships from cultural boundaries. According to Taylor (2007:154) ‘Doctoral education is set in the middle of this changing context for the university sector, and is subject to these wider imposed imperatives’.

Coupled with our own experiences of international students at the University of Huddersfield in the UK, it is appropriate to explore the unique challenges and issues that arise in the professional doctorate arena. There are academic aspects that create an impact for this specialised and diverse group of students. Wellington and Sikes (2006) suggest that doctoral students present with wide ranging academic, personal and professional needs. In addition, studying in a second language, which is often the case, in a different cultural context, or climate, presents complex situations for the student and the teaching/supervisory teams. Bartram (2008) suggests that socio-cultural needs take a priority over academic and then practical needs of international students. We believe that the cohort nature of a professional doctorate course may help to provide some valuable interpersonal support for all students. Furthermore, we acknowledge that we as senior academics can do more to influence these factors within the professional doctoral experience for our international students. Suggested items for discussion within this round table forum are: pre-course information, pedagogical issues and academic supervision.

Pre-Course Information

According to Evans and Stevenson (2010) the initial months and transitional stages of the doctoral course are a critical time for overseas students, requiring considerable support and structured input. This structured input should begin with the provision of clear information about requirements of undertaking a professional doctorate and ways of putting this message across to candidates from overseas. Communicating the differences of a professional doctorate with a traditional PhD route to home students is challenging enough, to communicate the uniqueness of such courses to overseas students can add to this challenge. This need to clearly identify structures, approaches and requirements of courses also involves identifying educational equivalencies clearly, outlining entry requirements explicitly and ensuring the candidate understands the required level of qualification prior to studying at doctoral level. Providing students with a full and unambiguous outline of the course structures and requirements is important. As increasing flexibility is being incorporated into many programmes, students need to understand their roles and responsibilities and instructional/assessment approaches, which may differ from previous experiences.

Pedagogical Issues

The different learning styles of international students need considering. Intercultural learning approaches and research etiquettes are important aspects with a view to increasing social capital and collaboration (Evans and Stevenson, 2011; Wang & Li, 2011). It is important to recognise that students from differing cultural backgrounds have differing approaches to and expectations of learning and the educational environment. For example, it is known that some cultures prefer authoritarian and formal pedagogical techniques, whereas others prefer a freer, more participative, adult oriented approach. A professional doctorate course requires students to attend teaching
and to show initiatives in the research process. The nature of supervision will therefore be very different for students of diverse backgrounds. It is impossible to be aware of every cultural nuance but Carroll and Ryan (2005) suggest there is a need to gain a meta-awareness of cultural differences relevant to education and research. In doing so there is a chance the student, supervisor and teaching team can build relationships that minimise these challenges and help gain shared perspectives.

Academic Supervision and Pastoral Support

Academic supervision, particularly when it involves research, should provide the necessary structured guidance that enables all doctoral students to attain their coveted award. The emphasis in research programmes is to ensure they interact with the material, and approaches at the right level. This requires course teams to ensure adequate learning support mechanisms are aligned with supervision to facilitate the student in delivering work that is at the correct level of criticality and analysis.

By its very nature, research supervision functions best when it is responsive and flexible to each student’s character, approach to study, confidence and ability. However, in addition to the usual difficulties such as accessing relevant literature, understanding various methodologies, determining the true foci of the research and grappling with ethics committees, international students may require further assistance in recognising cultural differences and approaches. It is important for supervisors and academic tutors, who have the remit of pastoral support, to make special efforts to identify cultural norms and differences that could potentially be problematic in designing, conducting and reporting upon the research.

We have offered some of our thoughts here and look forward to a fruitful discussion that will yield shared ideas on how to address some of these important challenges.
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Problem Statement

In August 2010, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) report, ‘The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health’ identified a need for more nursing education innovation to address the issues of quality and patient safety. This transformation calls for the design of new educational paradigms to meet this need. The clinical expert educator prepared with a practice doctorate is poised to meet the need for reform through the use of a reductionist philosophical approach in transforming nursing clinicians along the continuum of nursing education and practice. Patricia Benner (2001) describes a five step process of developing clinical expertise. The clinical expert who has tacit knowledge, as well as, a profound understanding of the discipline is able to envision a new educational system deeply rooted in practice. Therefore, as expert clinical educators, we propose the use of facilitated case-based learning as a framework to safe, reflective nursing practice.

Background

Education innovation in nursing has been driven by a need for clinicians to incorporate safety and quality into practice. In practice disciplines the expert clinical educator brings the use of reflective practice into his/her practice. According to Christopher Johns (2009), a reflective practitioner is one who is aware of self within the moment, open to the possibilities of that moment, and able to make decisions mindful of potential consequences.

Recommendations

We propose linking Benner and Johns’ theoretical models where learning safe practice takes on a deliberate level through the use of a heuristic approach thus linking current situations to past practice experience to assist in decision making. This learning method can be effectively applied along the continuum of practice in any teaching setting. It can further be duplicated in the educational realm of other practice disciplines.
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Developments in EdD programmes in the UK have highlighted issues relating to the nature of pedagogical practices within doctoral education (Boud and Lee, 2009). This in turn has raised important questions about the nature of engaging in doctoral work and idea of the doctoral process alongside the outcome (Flint, 2011). The significance of developing deeper understandings of knowledge arising out of practice and reflecting on the experience of engaging through deeper interrogation of practice opens up questions about the nature of pedagogical design within EdD programmes. In reality, doctoral engagement will ‘rock the world’ of the education professional, deconstruct the known and shake the very foundation on which professional life exists. This in turn leads us to question how professional identities are embraced within EdD curriculum.

This presentation will consider a range of conceptual frameworks that underpin the professional doctorate in education, specifically notions of the reflective practitioner and reflexivity. (Scott, Brown, Lunt and Thorne, 2004; Flint, 2011). How does doctoral pedagogy support notions of critical dialogue where there is movement between theory and practice? To what extent is dialogic pedagogy promoted in EdD programmes? How do structural issues embrace these complexities? In what way does content restrict or emancipate the students’? To what extent is the doctoral curriculum mediated?

This round table discussion specifically aims to consider:

What importance is placed on the pedagogical issues within programme design?

What is an appropriate doctoral curriculum?

What value is placed in what professional doctorate students bring?

How can we best interrogate these issues?
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The underlying premise for the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree, endorsed in the U.S. in 2004, was that it would offer a practice-focused level of doctoral scholarship for advanced practice nurses, rather than the traditional research-focused PhD degree as the only terminal degree option. As a new degree however, members of the existing nursing academic society, the vast majority of whom identify strongly as academicians, rather than as practicing nurses articulated the programmatic and role philosophies for the DNP.

To fully appreciate the complex “gap” that has long existed in the U.S. among the nursing academic establishment is perhaps very important to understand as a means to provide important background context for the following discussion. Philosophies regarding the values, contributions, and resultant levels of respect afforded varying members of the nursing discipline, and among nursing faculties in particular, has likely been the result of the traditional incongruity among nurse academicians versus advanced practice nurses in terms of their own academic credentials held. It has long been the accepted norm among nurse academicians that the PhD is the expected terminal degree required for success and advancement within educational institutions. Conversely, the only advanced degree option available for nurses choosing a career path in the advanced nursing practice realm has been the Master’s degree; clearly not a terminal degree and therefore not considered as sufficient for parity with those holding the PhD.

It follows then that until the very recent endorsement of the DNP in 2004, a rather systematic form of faculty inequality has existed whereby academicians exclusively, rather than practicing nurses teaching in the clinical setting, have been afforded decision-making power within the nursing discipline through their leadership in professional societies, while their MS-prepared, practicing counterparts have not. It is important to note here that numbers of doctorally prepared nurses in the U.S. is approximately 1-2%, as opposed to the numbers of practicing nurses without terminal degrees, who have comprised the remaining 98% of nurses. For many, this system has provided an interesting imbalance in terms of representation for charting the future course across the discipline, indeed.
This dichotomy among nurse educators may have resulted in the endorsed restriction on the conduct of clinical research in DNP Programs in the U.S., founded on the assumption that research is the domain of nurse scientists prepared with research-focused terminal degrees only. The recommendations for the terminal scholarly product for DNP graduates issued by the nursing academic society in the U.S., comprised predominately by doctorally prepared academicians, was that there be a “terminal scholarly project”, with several suggested forms that the project could take. Clinical research, however, and therefore the dissertation option, was deliberately discouraged as “contrary to the intent of the DNP” (AACN, 2006, Essentials of Doctoral Education, pg. 20). This restriction raises the question: Who should determine what form the scholarly project should take for students enrolled in practice-focused doctoral programs?

Faculty at a small number of DNP programs has since questioned the wisdom of the decision to restrict clinical research in DNP Programs across the U.S. Arguably, had a significant number of practicing nurses been involved during the decision making processes for DNP Programs, this restriction on the conduct of research for DNP students may not have succeeded. Opposing philosophies toward education and the DNP role in the healthcare system in the U.S. may, in fact, have swayed the design of the necessary terminal scholarly project toward a more traditional outcomes measure, the dissertation rather than a new “scholarly project” with somewhat nebulous measures of scholarship.

When considered in the context of terminal degree program requirements among other practice-based disciplines within the realm health professions education, the restriction on clinical research for DNP Programs seems even more perplexing. Given the fact that precedent for clinical dissertations as a terminal degree requirement have long been in existence in many fields, such as Clinical Psychology, it seems odd that a new “scholarly product” would be endorsed by the nursing academic society, rather than simply choosing to follow the established standard from a closely related, practice-based discipline.

To date, few schools of nursing in the U.S. allow clinical research as an option for DNP students or for the dissertation option. However, in the years since the first DNP programs to do so opened, others have followed suit, choosing to oppose national recommendations. In one New England state, four programs have opened in the past two years, all of which followed the precedent set by the first program in the state, which opted for the clinical practice dissertation. Will this trend continue as more DNP programs are established and more practicing nurses with professional doctorates become involved in the shaping and direction of these programs? The evolution will be interesting to observe.
Unlike the "traditional" PhD, there is little overall agreement on what constitutes a Professional Doctorate or any single, agreed template for such a qualification. “Professional Doctorate (ProfD)” is frequently used as an eclectic term used to describe a group of doctoral programmes, which can be quite different in their structure, content, duration, learning outcomes and award title. In 2007, the Schools of Health & Social Care, and Nursing, Midwifery and Community Health in Glasgow Caledonian University launched a part time Professional Doctoral programme; this programme was specifically designed as a research degree, enriched with a macro module aimed at developing the leadership and strategic thinking skills of the mid career student.

Debate within our academic community continues about the differences between the PhD and research ProfD; the ProfD is still not acknowledged as the equal of the PhD. It is argued that the key differentiating characteristic between the ProfD and PhD is that the Professional Doctorate aims to produce "Researching Professionals" and in that context the thesis should be set in the context of a work based issue, which clearly articulates how the new knowledge is advancing/contributing to the profession/work practice and/or policy. In contrast, the PhD is regarded as the educational hallmark for the “Professional Researcher”; while the thesis must demonstrate, new knowledge there is no requirement for this knowledge to be set in the context of work/professional practice.

This presentation will therefore explore the results of a 5-year audit into the impact of the GCU research Professional Doctorate on professional practice in Health and Social Care. Data from five cohorts of students (n=90) will be presented and discussed, even though the majority of these students are still currently continuing on their doctoral journeys. The presentation will explore:

- Impact on student
- Impact on career to date
- Impact on their profession/work
- Impact on patients/clients
- Impact on policy
- Impact on line manager/colleagues
- Professional standing

The presentation will conclude by showing that the intermediate outputs from a Professional Doctorate programme do make significant contributions to professional practice and society, and offer something different to the PhD.
Introduction

Historically, the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education lacked individual distinction leading to both confusion of purpose and differentiating characteristics of each program (Shulman et al, 2006). To further illustrate the matter, Levine (2007) states:

[Researcher preparation programs and the degrees they award suffer from confused and overlapping purposes. Too often, they provide the same program to meet the differing needs of future researchers and practitioners, and they arbitrarily award Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees to mark completion of those programs (p. 17).]

Levine (2007) goes on to describe education schools whose job it is to prepare professionals in careers as either researchers (Ph.D.) or practitioners (Ed.D.).

The problem is that the doctoral programs offered and the degrees awarded by education schools are a mishmash. Programs for the preparation of researchers and the education of practitioners generally look very much alike, with a decided predilection toward research. The degrees graduates receive are fungible. Some institutions award the Ph.D. to practitioners, others award the Ed.D. to future scholars, and a plurality grant both degrees, with the distinction generally determined by differences in the course credits required or the number of research courses students must complete (p. 37).

Not long after the Shulman (2006) publication, the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID) was founded. While CID focused its efforts on program initiatives associated with the Ph.D., the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) organized in 2007, served to further distinguish the two programs and define the Ed.D. as the professional practice doctorate in education (Shulman et al, 2006). “The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) is a national effort aimed at strengthening the education doctorate, or Ed.D.” (CPED, n.d. a).

Distinguishing the Ed.D. is underscored by four design concepts: developing a scholarship of teaching and learning, identifying signature pedagogies, constructing laboratories of practice and
creating capstone experiences for assessment (Perry & Imig, 2008). It is through UCF’s partnership with CPED, and its member universities, that we continue to find the support needed to change and redesign our Ed.D. in Education program.

Background and Context

The University of Central Florida (UCF) was founded in 1963 and is a public university serving the needs of over 55,000 students on its main campus and 11 regional campuses. The second largest university in the United States, UCF offers over 200 degree programs to students from across the country and around the world.

The UCF College of Education (CED) offers both the Ph.D. and Ed. D. The Ph.D. requires students to attend full time in preparation for the professoriate and to be researchers. Scholar practitioners are students in the Ed. D. who will use research to guide decision-making in leading education organizations (Taylor, 2011, p.2).

The Ed.D. in Education at UCF was initially redesigned using the CPED philosophy in the fall semester of 2008. After initial feedback from faculty, students and community stakeholders, the program was again redesigned in the fall of 2011 to more fully address the needs of all three partners and stakeholders. The new program closely aligns with the CPED design elements previously stated. The new program of study includes 24 credit hours of core classes; 18 credit hours in an area of concentration, including 6 credit hours of laboratories of practice; and 12 credit hours of capstone for a total of 54 credit hours. In addition to the required course work, students enrolled in the Ed.D. in Education are required to successfully complete 3 milestones throughout their program and produce a portfolio demonstrating the habits of mind (scholarship), heart, and hand. Each student’s capstone study must be defended in front of a committee made up of college faculty and at least one expert member of the community that served as a mentor to the candidate.

Partnership in the Pursuit of Excellence

Through UCF’s continued association with CPED, and its 60 member universities, we continue to seek innovative ways to meet the needs of our clients, namely doctoral students, as well as the community at large. As part of a $700,000 grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) the consortium continues to work to define two, clear, distinctly different approaches to doctoral education. The goal is to collaboratively develop new professional practice doctorates using the current efforts of others while engaging in critical examination of the best ways possible for preparing leaders in education (CPED, n.d. b).

CPED is currently entering its second phase of data collection regarding the work in which its member universities are engaged. The purpose of the study is to judge the impact/influence of CPED on creating institutional change in its members. “The notion that schools of education need to change organizational structures and faculty roles before they can redesign the Ed.D. is an underpinning of phase II of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED)” (Perry, 2011, p.2). The CPED FIPSE research agenda has 4 stated goals:

1) document and evaluate change in the organizational structures of schools of education to accommodate new professional practice degrees for school and college leaders; 2) document and evaluate change in the signature learning processes, learning environments, and patterns of engagement of faculty and candidates in Ed.D. programs that participate in CPED; 3) document and evaluate fidelity to the set of guiding principles for programs developed in Phase I; and 4) disseminate lessons learned and best practices for the design and implementation of professional practice degrees to a new cohort of schools of education (Perry, 2011, p.3).

It is not the goal of CPED or the FIPSE research agenda to design programs for universities. Indeed, as stated in CPED’s memorandum of understanding to partner universities, the role of CPED and its leadership “…is to inspire and synthesize, but not to design or dictate process or outcomes for Partner projects” (CPED, n.d. c, para. 4). By working collaboratively with member institutions UCF has developed an Ed.D. program that is aligned with CPED philosophy, and meets the needs of its clients and community partners and stakeholders.

To date, UCF has a total of 26 doctoral students enrolled in the latest redesign of the Ed.D. in Education program. These students are half way through their first year and continue to provide feedback on the overall program as well as course content at the end of each semester through the use of surveys. See figure 1.1. When asked if the content of the first two core courses was relevant to their career, eighty-one percent (81%) either Agreed or Strongly Agreed. Nearly eighty percent (80%) of respondents either Agreed or Strongly Agreed with the statement, the courses in the first two core courses met my expectations with regard to course content. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of respondents either Agreed or
Strongly Agreed with the statement, the courses in the first two core courses met my expectations with regard to course load. When queried further, sixty percent (60%) of the respondents that rated these questions either Disagree or Strongly Disagree did not feel that they were prepared for the amount of work that the courses offered. Eighty percent (80%) of respondents either Agreed or Strongly Agreed that the scheduling of the courses was convenient for them. For this cohort, both core classes are being offered on the same night of the week, back to back in an effort to alleviate some of the logistical difficulties associated with commuting to the university more than once per week. Finally, when asked if the amount of time spent preparing for classes each week was reasonable, sixty percent (60%) either Agreed or Strongly Agreed.
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Figure 1.1 Ed.D. End of Semester 1 Survey

Please select the answer that most represents your experience regarding each of the following statements

1. The course work in EDP 7517 was relevant to my career
2. The course work in EDF 7457 was relevant to my career
3. EDP 7517 met my expectations with regard to course load
4. EDF 7457 met my expectations with regard to course load
5. EDP 7517 met my expectations with regard to content
6. EDF 7457 met my expectations with regard to content
7. The scheduling of the course was convenient for me
8. The amount of time I spent preparing for class each week was reasonable

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Mostly Agree
Agree
Strongly Agree
Mary Ellen Smith Glasgow, PhD, RN, ACNS-BC is a Professor and Associate Dean for Nursing, Undergraduate Health Professions, and Continuing Nursing Education at Drexel University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In her role, Dr. Glasgow is responsible for all nursing and undergraduate health professions programs that serve 3,310 students, including curricular review, accrediting body quality assessment, faculty hiring, and fiscal planning for the division. Dr. Glasgow was formally the Director of the Undergraduate Nursing Programs where she developed the BSN Accelerated Career Entry, BSN Co-op, RN-BSN Online Programs, as well as other academic health professions programs. To date, the undergraduate pre-license nursing programs have graduated over 2,100 BSN graduates with a 98.7% NCLEX pass rate. In addition, Dr. Glasgow leveraged the uniqueness of Drexel University’s technology cache to create innovative technology infused educational programs. The co-operative model of education, which integrates work experience and education, was also implemented in all undergraduate education programs. Dr. Glasgow is also responsible for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of several national nursing conferences. Dr. Glasgow has authored 50 publications and conducted over 100 presentations both nationally and internationally in the areas of nursing education, nursing leadership, and bone marrow donation. She completed a fellowship at Bryn Mawr College and HERS, Mid-America Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration. She is a 2009 Robert Wood Johnson Executive Nurse Fellow. She is the recipient of the 2010 Villanova University College of Nursing Alumni Medallion for Distinguished Contribution to Nursing Education and a Trustee of the Princeton HealthCare System. She is certified as a Clinical Specialist in Adult Health Nursing by the ANCC and is on the Editorial Board for Holistic Nursing Practice and Oncology Nursing Forum. She also serves as the Associate Editor for Oncology Nursing Forum responsible for the Leadership and Professional Development Feature. She is the co-author of two textbooks: Role development for Doctoral Advanced Nursing Practice, a 2011 AJN Book of the Year, and Legal issues confronting today’s nursing faculty: A case-study approach.
The academy has long been known for pursuit of knowledge and lifelong learning. Faculty members often prepared with the PhD or comparable terminal degrees are promoted based on research, scholarly efforts, university and disciplinary citizenship. In some disciplines, faculty move from the doctoral program directly to the professorial role with little or no “real world” experience. Hence, the term “ivory tower” has been used to describe academics that are shielded from the realities of the workplace in many respects. A new academic movement, the professional doctorate has created a disruptive innovation in academia. Clayton Christenson, a Harvard Business School Professor and innovation leader, first coined the term disruptive innovation (Christensen, 1997; Christensen, Grossman, & Hwang, 2008). Clayton Christensen investigated why some innovations that were radical in nature reinforced the incumbent’s position in certain fields, contrary to what previous models would predict. The central theory of Christensen’s work is the dichotomy of sustaining and disruptive innovation. A sustaining innovation hardly results in the demise of established businesses because it improves the performance of existing products along the dimensions that the mainstream values. Disruptive innovation, conversely, will often have characteristics that traditional segments may not want, at least initially. Such innovations will appear as cheaper, simpler and even with inferior quality if compared to existing products, but some marginal or new client segment will value it. For example, one disruptive innovation is the nurse practitioner who provides primary care in a more cost-effective manner than his/her physician colleague (Christensen, 1997; Christensen, Grossman, & Hwang, 2008). The author purports that the Professional Doctorate is also a disruptive innovation in academia. While some traditional academics, may view the professional doctorate as less rigorous, less scholarly, and less prestigious. The faculty member with a Professional Doctorate will bring a sense of practicality and realism to academia that has not been the norm; thus, bringing value to a new constituency. With the introduction of the Professional Doctorate in academia, some critical questions need to be raised: 1) Do we need to reconnect with the practice context of many disciplines? 2) Who should teach the Professional Doctorate students in the 21st century? 3) Is the Professional Doctorate a disruptive innovation or merely a degree that clashes with the values of the traditional doctorate in the academy? and 4) Does a diverse group of doctoral level faculty (professional doctorate and traditional doctorate) enrich the academic experience?

Clearly, faculty members prepared with the professional doctorate bring value to practice disciplines such as nursing. Practice faculty, prepared at the doctoral level are still connected to their clinical practice roots and are viewed as clinical experts by students, colleagues, and the public. A strong foundation in clinical research will only add to the faculty’s worth. During the presentation, a case study will be presented addressing the issues of the professional doctorate in academia utilizing the nursing discipline as an exemplar. Clayton Christensen, heralded as the guru for innovation may have described the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree as a disruptive innovation (Hathaway, Jacob Stegbauer, Thompson, & Graff, 2006). The author foresees DNP graduates creating new practice knowledge and practice evidence for the nursing discipline, and efficiently translating this evidence and disseminating it to the practice setting. Furthermore, the DNP prepared faculty member is in a unique position to integrate the knowledge they present in the classroom with a clinical practice context (Dreher & Smith Glasgow, 2011).

In academia, there is also a growing tension in many nursing departments between the traditional faculty and practice faculty in the United States. With the explosion of the doctor of nursing practice degree, more and more faculty prepared with professional doctorates are entering the academy. Recent reports of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) indicate that there has been a 176% increase in DNP enrollment while PhD enrollment has increased 0.10% (Fang, Tracy, & Bednash, 2010; Raines, 2010). Further, the nursing discipline is poised to lose half of its faculty by 2016 due to retirements, with the current doctoral student enrollment demographics, it makes sense to expect even more future nursing faculty prepared with the professional doctorate rather than the traditional PhD. How will these forces change the academic climate, faculty role, faculty workload formula, and tenure and promotion system is yet to be determined. In addition, will the DNP prepared faculty member be viewed as an equal faculty colleague or will the PhD prepared faculty member become an elite subset of the academy?

“When one ponders the radical transformation that will be required for nursing education in the 21st century, the author asserts that the reconstruction of nursing education and reconnection to practice will only be achieved by a diverse group of “doctoral-level faculty” (Dreher & Smith Glasgow, 2011, p. 462). To achieve this goal, the academic climate will experience politics, growing pains and paradigm shifts to accommodate a “new” faculty member in their ranks, one who will gain expertise in both clinical practice and academia. It is the author’s belief that in time, the academy will adapt
to the disruptive innovation and will be stronger in the end if the faculty members learn to appreciate each other’s unique strengths and differences.
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What counts as knowledge in a Professional Doctorate? Where is it appropriate to use more formal and less formal theoretical frameworks in practice enquiry?
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The paper explores aspects of espoused theory on the relationship between theory and practice knowledge underpinning the University of Chester’s Doctor of Professional Studies programme. A social constructivist perspective is adopted which sees theorising about the world as viewed as an everyday activity both as an explanatory mechanism and also the basis for problematizing it. Everyday theories in the context of workplace practice are literally ‘working theories’. Such theories do not obey the rules of formal theorising and are often implicit rather than explicit although there are surprising parallels including the idea of refutation and confirmation by empirical investigation, the presence of ‘puzzles’ as in a Kuhnian paradigm and reliability resting on upon notions of probability. However there are also profound differences since the relationship between working theories and action (unlike formal theorising) is inextricably connected such that research is consumed (in the sense of providing the immediate basis for action) at the point of production. Within this more general approach there are circumstances where it is appropriate to work within a formalised, universalist theoretical framework. Using examples from practice the paper explores circumstances where it is appropriate to do so and those where espoused/ working theory/ Mode 2 provides a more suitable framework.
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Christine is Co-Director of the Ageing Society Grand Challenge and a Co-Director of the Workplace Wellbeing Applied Research Group. She has a key role in exploring the progression and achievement of minority student groups, and works with international partners to develop an inclusive approach to teaching, learning and assessment, to improve the student learning experience in Higher Education.
This presentation addresses questions around how to reconcile developing practice in professional doctorates (PD) with accreditation, standards, quality assurance and quality enhancements issues. In particular, we focus here on our experience of attempting to develop PD within an university-wide framework. There is in the UK considerable interest in the future of the doctorate in the context of international educational developments. In a recent policy statement, the UK Higher Education (HE) International and Europe Unit claims that, ‘One of the recognised strengths of the doctorate in the UK is innovation in different types of doctorate, all with the core value of original research. This includes professional doctorates, engineering doctorates and performance based doctorates in the Arts. This has led to UK HEIs developing considerable expertise in collaborating with non-HEIs in providing doctoral programmes.’ Though programmes may be innovatory, it is important to note that emphasis is placed on the value of original research. This, in turn, gives rise to issues concerning the definition of original research and how it should be assessed. The UK’s HE Quality Assurance Agency is currently carrying out a consultation exercise on a draft code of practice, and points out that ‘Thought will also need to be given to the assessment criteria to be used in different subjects such as the performing or visual arts and for different research programmes, including professional doctorates.’

Concerned with low completion rates for research doctorates, our University introduced, in 2008, a curriculum framework that explicitly links the progress of individual researchers to the satisfactory fulfilment of annual programme stages. However, in expanding our provision, we have faced the challenge of how to integrate into this framework a PD model involving cohorts of students undertaking taught programme elements assessed collectively. We have in recent years approved a suite of programmes leading to PD awards – in Business, Law, Engineering, Education and a range of areas in Health and Social Care. In every case, we have ensured that the PD may also be classified as a research doctorate on the basis that a thesis ‘element’ comprising original research and accounting for at least 50% of the overall assessment for the award. In attempting to strike a balance between institutional responsibility and accountability, providing a diversity of doctoral programmes, and underpinning researcher autonomy, we are conscious that, potentially, our objectives may conflict. This reflects debates over developing a metric for measuring the value of PDs. We outline here ways in which we are able to demonstrate a concept of ‘doctorateness’ that does not create a dichotomy by differentiating PDs from research PhDs.

Our framework assumes, therefore, that the research life-cycle may be divided into linear stages through which all of our doctoral students are required to progress. These may be characterised as a registration phase where taught components, self-study, blended/flexible learning or work-based learning provide underpinning knowledge and skills development, a research phase where a project is created or investigation undertaken that represents an original contribution of significance to the subject area and, finally, a completion phase in which the work is synthesised, integrated, critically evaluated and presented for examination.

What is different about the framework is that this research life-cycle is then sub-divided into several stages through which a doctoral student is required to progress. These stages reflect the various milestones and ‘deliverables’ that typically go to make up doctoral work, such as mandatory induction and research methods training and a selection of subject-related courses in the early stages, through to the production of draft material for the thesis and conference papers in the latter stages. Each of these deliverables is assigned a notional credit value commensurate to the amount of work required to achieve it. The progress of every research student is formally reviewed on an individual basis by a panel every 12 months, and progression to a next stage is determined by what has been achieved in the preceding stage. At all times, it should be added, students are encouraged to take additional, voluntary modules or courses where appropriate, and to participate in a wide range of other university-based activities. While the PD students follow more prescriptive programmes, their progress is reviewed in the same way as it is for all other research students. Yet, at the same time, a mechanism for reviewing the progress of an individual student, and reaching a decision that insufficient progress has been made in meeting one or another of the student’s

3. The well-established Doctorate in Clinical Psychology is jointly awarded with the University of Warwick, and so falls outside of the present discussion.
4. Tony Fell, Kevin Flint & Ian Haines, Professional Doctorates in the UK 2011, UKCGE publication.
targets may, consequently, also act in such a way to disrupt the coherence of a PD programme.

The developing nature of doctoral education questions andragogical issues. In line with Salzburg II Recommendations, our educational aims are to encourage all doctoral researchers to create and interpret new knowledge at the forefront of an academic discipline or an area of professional practice, to conceptualise, design and implement a project, and to work independently in dealing with complex and unpredictable situations in professional or equivalent environments, and to accept full accountability for the outcomes arising from critical dialogue. The implementation of our framework for doctoral programmes is kept under constant review and revisions are made to the structure, or the way it is operated, when thought appropriate. But it seems clear that any assessment or quality assurance regime must be made sufficiently flexible if developments in PD education are to be facilitated.
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The Professional Doctorate candidate is typically an individual who is very experienced in their profession and already will have made a significant contribution to their field. A disadvantage of this level of expertise is the potential for what Baumard has termed ‘territorialisation’ (Baumard, 1999). That is, their knowledge and therefore their strategic approach to their professional practice is bounded by the cognitive map that they have created within that context, which can be a barrier to the creation of new knowledge in different situations. This will cause problems not only with the systematic acquisition of new knowledge as required by the professional doctorate, but also in professional life where there is an increasing emphasis on interprofessional working. For example, in healthcare there is a worldwide interest in how better teamwork and collaboration among health, social care and other professionals, working in partnership with clients and their families, may more effectively address challenges in health promotion and health care delivery (Barr et al, 1995).

The challenges of this relatively new type of working are often at odds with traditional forms of education that concentrate on subject specific knowledge, skills, and competencies. As far back as 2003, The Committee on the Health Professionals Education Summit for the board of Health Care Services of the Institute of Medicine in the US noted that:

- There is a major disconnect between isolated professional education and increasing expectations for interdisciplinary team-based care and that interdisciplinary (interprofessional) education is not yet the norm.
- There is reluctance to expand interdisciplinary education related to lack of research evidence on the relationship of this type of education to interdisciplinary practice (pg 133).

In the UK there have been similar concerns, and a recent report by the Health Professions Council (2011) argues that perhaps professionalism is less about a discrete set of skills than a meta-skill, comprising situational awareness, contextual judgement, and an ability to set aside deep-rooted personal values if they are dissonant with those of the profession.

Despite this recognition that interprofessional working and understanding is becoming increasingly part of the role of modern professionals, the education system, at least at the stage of pre-qualifying studies, has been slow to respond. Barr et al (2005) describe how exposure to other professions often can be seen to be a distraction or ‘contamination’ at this level, and that pressure to increase profession-specific studies leaves no time for interprofessional studies – this despite the fact that there follows a need to collaborate with other professions almost from the day of qualification (Dombeck, 1997; Pirrie et al, 1998).

In the area of doctoral education, however, there has been over recent years a growth in the number of programmes that have as a key feature some element of interprofessional development (Fulton et al, 2012). These are sometimes referred to as the second generation of professional doctorate (Maxwell, 2008) or the generic DProf (Boud and Tennant, 2006), which aims to attract people from a wide range of disciplines, as opposed to other programmes which focus on one area of professional practice, such as nursing or education. The thrust of the (generic) professional doctorate is the development of professional practice within the real world context, taking into account all of the ambiguities, issues, complexities and difficulties which this implies; or the “broad based capacity as opposed to a discipline based experience” (Doncaster, 2002). Malfroy and Yates (2003) describe candidates on these programmes as being ‘on the cusp’ of different cultures of learning – the university, the profession and the workplace, which suggests quite a different model of ‘what is learned’ to the accepted academic knowledge-based model.

These ideas have informed our approach to Professional Doctorate programmes at the University of Sunderland. We have developed a model to facilitate the development of our candidates as reflective practitioners and researching professionals, who can work across territorial boundaries of knowledge and seek solutions to problems from outside their established professional field. (Sanders, 2010; Sanders et al 2011).

Our model is built upon exploration of professional identity (and through that, exploration of personal and professional values, beliefs and motives), (Ibarra, 1999; Schein, 1978), and interprofessional dialogues to improve capacity for reflection, self-awareness, and appreciation of alternative professional discourses (Barr et al). Trying to create classroom experiences in which these processes work effectively has been a challenge and our approach has developed over time with each cohort experience. In this paper we aim to share that practical experience.

The paper describes how, as part of the Reflective Practice module, candidates were asked to explore their own professional identity through use of metaphor, and also given a complex case study to
consider. They were asked to explain and discuss their chosen metaphor with candidates from different professions. The case study formed the basis of a community of enquiry exercise in class. Candidates were then asked to consider a range of questions about the values, beliefs and professional norms that underpinned their original reflections and how these might have changed through their interdisciplinary discussions.

In this paper we present key findings from this study and discuss ways of maintaining this interprofessional dialogue.

References


Health Professions Council (2011) Professionalism in healthcare professionals. London: HPC


The findings reported in this paper indicate that over the past decade there has been a substantial increase in enrolments in Coursework Masters programs in Australia and an even more substantial decrease in the number of Research Masters. It is particularly important to consider these changes in light of the funding model in Australia. Postgraduate coursework programs (including coursework masters) are fee-paying whereas the tuition costs for all domestic (Australian and New Zealand) candidates in research degrees, that is, Research Masters and Doctorates, are funded by the Australian Government. A research degree is defined as having more than two-thirds research. The traditional pathway to a doctorate in Australia has been through Honours (an additional one year undergraduate program involving intensive research training by means of a research project) or a Research Masters. With this background, the question asked in the research reported here relates to the increasing number of students undertaking a Coursework Masters and then seeking entry to a doctorate.
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What are the options for a doctorate after completing my Coursework Masters?

Tuesday 3rd April
Session Z – 1.45pm – 2.15pm
and repeated 2.15pm – 2.45pm
Additional data suggest that there is both an increase in the age of entrants into a doctorate with the mean being 33 years at commencement. Furthermore, there has been an increase in the percentage of candidates undertaking their doctoral study part-time; a trend that commenced some years ago, and which appears logical in light of the increasing age of candidates. The percentage undertaking their study part-time is now 40 per cent of the total, with an overall growth of 10 per cent in 2010. Most of these students have had considerable work experience and are often seeking to enhance their professional qualifications as well as their understanding of professional practice.

What do these findings mean for students seeking entry to a doctorate in Australia, the programs being offered to them, the pedagogical practices related to a diverse range of entrants, as well as the organisational and administrative issues involved? This paper examines the extent to which a Coursework Masters provides an effective, supportable entry to a doctoral program.

The findings that will be reported are based on the results of semi-structured interviews with convenors of Coursework Masters programs that have substantial numbers of graduates going onto doctoral study, candidates who sought entry into a doctoral program based on the results of their Coursework Masters degree, and supervisors of such candidates.

The discussion following the presentation will focus on the curriculum issues related to these findings and how universities might recognise, enhance and build on these enrolment trends through a range of doctoral programs.
In the United States, an often-cited statistic is that it takes 17 years to bring practice change from the bench to the bedside (Balas & Boren, 2000). One possible etiology for this may be that in the U.S., health professions education takes place in two distinctly different settings, the university campus and the practice setting. While medical education has employed the use of joint-appointments for medical school faculty, whereby physicians spend time in both the academic and clinical settings as standard procedure, this model has not been as widely utilized in nursing.

In nursing education programs, practicing nurses have been utilized routinely as clinical faculty, however the majority of didactic instruction on the university campus often has been provided primarily by tenured faculty with expertise in research and education, rather than active engagement in practice. This arrangement may have evolved as a result of the very small numbers of nurse faculty holding terminal degrees in the U.S., with even smaller numbers of practicing nurses with doctoral education to serve as faculty.

In light of the recent establishment of Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) programs in the U.S. however, the composition of the nursing professoriate may be poised for change. With increasing numbers of DNP-prepared, practicing nurses with joint-appointments similar to their medical faculty counterparts, perhaps the traditionally wide space between the academic and practice settings can be bridged in a more effective, timely fashion. Increased numbers of jointly-appointed faculty may result in improved collaboration between academic and clinical institutions, with both partners benefiting from these successful new partnerships in terms of cost-sharing, resource-sharing, and renewed efforts toward joint enterprises. Additionally, jointly appointed DNP-prepared nurse faculty will serve as positive role models for practice-focused doctoral students, providing a distinctly new and different identification for nursing faculty compositions.
Students on part-time professional Education Doctorate (EdD) programmes benefit from the development of an in-depth reflexive understanding of phronetic social science (Flyvbjerg, 2001) as part of the professional contribution to knowledge cultivated in the doctorate. This developmental process can be regarded as a journey of personal and professional growth in practical wisdom (phronesis), as EdD candidates grapple with the complexity of combining advanced theoretical research with the studied application of skilful practical reasoning in the workplace. Furthermore, the emergence of phronetic understanding in social sciences doctoral research is not a straightforward evolutionary process: progress can be both slow and erratic: students may need to go through many trials along the way. Students may be challenged by the process of coping with the ‘complementary and contradictory’ burdens of a complex identity as a ‘student/researcher/practitioner’ (Fenge, 2010) and need specific support from expert supervisors to pass through several transitional developmental phases successfully. While the doctoral requirements of the ‘taught’ elements of the first two years of study are facilitated by the cohort delivery approach (Jameson, 2011), mature professional doctoral students in particular may find the transition into the thesis phase demanding. Building on Taylor’s observations, it is clear that the ‘sense of group identity and camaraderie’ characteristic of the professional doctoral ‘taught’ cohort (Taylor, 2008:68) may be more appealing to EdD students than the lonelier processes of study of the later years: some students may feel intimidated by this transition. Nevertheless, effective supervisory techniques for the support of professional doctoral students can be applied to assist students to transform themselves from the mouse-like timidity of their first attempts, so that they develop an authoritative voice that ‘roars’ with confidence by the time of the doctoral viva and post-doctorate publication stages.
Healthcare delivery in the United States has become an undertaking that requires the collaboration of multiple disciplines. The integration of patient care and business in healthcare presents the challenge of developing a common understanding upon which organizational decisions are made. The Johns Hopkins School of Nursing has developed a graduate course in Evidence-Based Teaching in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins Schools of Business, Public Health, Medicine, and Education. This multidisciplinary approach to course development allows for integration of the constructs from each discipline. The result is a curriculum for health care educators with multidisciplinary underpinnings that inform the content and delivery.

This collaborative effort is based on the universal design for learning (UDL), adult learning theory and transformative learning theory consistent with current recommendations (unknown, 2011a, 2011b). The instructional format blends both traditional classroom interaction and web-based learning experiences. This combination required the development team to examine their own beliefs and values about how to best create a course that provides the tools and understanding needed to deliver evidence-based teaching.

This poster presentation will depict the organizational challenges in creating the course development team, the collaborative process of the five disciplines, and an exemplar from the implementation of the course.
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DProf Islamic Cultures is a programme that is a unique multi-institutional doctoral framework, offering routes for professionals and groups from the private, public and voluntary sectors and from various belief systems to come together and share their professional experience and experiential learning in support of mutual understanding between and within diverse communities. It promotes cohesion and cooperation by challenging stereotyping through collaborative knowledge generation and encounters: firstly by recognising the skills and experience of Muslim and non-Muslim workers in Muslim communities and secondly by assisting them in reflecting on, articulating, validating and disseminating their growing knowledge of working at the interface of various cultures and belief systems.

Based on this, two particular modules were designed to provide the candidates with knowledge of a range of approaches and methodologies relevant to professional practitioner research work; and enable them to design and plan a work-based doctoral project relating to or relevant to Muslim cultures; building on the critical awareness of particular research philosophies, approaches and techniques. This is essentially set around a second module designed essentially to equip the candidates with the necessary skills and knowledge of a range of Islamic resources and approaches to undertake enquiry into practice and carry out a work-based learning project within or relating to Muslim cultures. This would enable the candidates to examine their role as a practitioner and researcher and to begin a process of selection of the most appropriate approaches for an intended project, ensuring the fulfilment of the aims of that project including its impact on practice, on organisational or community development and on new ways of thinking at the interface of cultures. This also provides the candidate with the opportunity to access major reference works in Islamic thinking and achievements and assess Islam’s role, value and contribution at the interface of faiths and cultures.
Recent unprecedented growth in the Saudi population challenged its infrastructure and intensified demand for higher education and healthcare. In response, both the government and the private sector founded numerous colleges and universities, increasing the overall number from 8 to 49 institutions of higher education. A significant portion of the expansion at these new institutions has been in the health professions higher education, which also included the establishment of new teaching hospitals and other medical training facilities. As part of this growth, clinical practice doctorates have been introduced to the Saudi higher education system. The first of these degrees is the doctor of pharmacy (PharmD) that has been formally adopted as the terminal professional degree in the field. Others are in the works. Data were collected from reviews of the literature and individual institutional websites of Saudi colleges, universities and salient governmental regulatory and national accrediting agencies. Results are presented using descriptive methods. This paper will present the status and state of clinical practice doctorates implementation in Saudi Arabia. It will conclude with a recommendation for concerned stakeholders, including policy makers, educators and practitioners.
The purpose of this poster is to compare and contrast guidelines from the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and the American College of Cardiology (ACC) concerning Acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS) with the intent of exploring how the similarities can be translated into best international evidence-based practice. As advanced practice nurses, it is our professional responsibility both to be aware of the evidence and establish mechanisms to incorporate them into daily practice. It is with an eye towards merging the best that European and American guidelines have to offer, in an effort to establish premier practice for optimal patient outcomes that drives the course of this poster. By examining the variations between European and American strategies, new areas of research will declare themselves and provide a rich fountain of opportunities for study.

Myocardial Infarctions (MI) and heart disease rank among the leading causes of disability and death around the globe. The financial burden alone is staggering irrespective of the emotional toll. Rapid intervention by the healthcare team when an MI occurs is paramount to the survival of both the individual and their family, as well as impacting on society as a whole. Countless hours of research and untold financial resources have been poured into this very topic in order to gain a better understand of the pathology, along with developing treatment strategies aimed at preserving life. With all of this knowledge available to the health care practitioner, the issue then becomes how to translate this data into accepted best practice around the world.
Relevance

Simulation in medical education was introduced to provide learners with the opportunities to practice and perfect skills. Teaching professionalism to medical students is difficult. Methods have included large group lectures, reflective papers, medical dramas, and clinical role models. Didactic and small group teaching methods allow for transfer of knowledge but can be plagued by group-think and participation bias. Reflective writing allows for the inner process of decision making, but can also be biased by allowing time for reflection. The addition of simulation places students “on the spot” as physicians are often placed in novel questions of professionalism. This presentation describes the use of all of these techniques but includes simulation to allow individual students to experience questions of professionalism that can then be discussed in greater length.

Description of content

Participants will be given 30 minutes of background information on professionalism, medical education of professionalism, and the use of simulation to teach medical students professionalism. The group will then discuss and review the concepts of simulation in medical education and professionalism for 15 minutes. The group will then break up into small groups (if the participants are too few in number the group will not split into small groups). Seven professionalism behaviors will then be assigned and each small group will design a scenario using simulation to demonstrate the behaviors. The remaining time will be used to present the scenarios and discuss the merits and potential complications of the scenarios.
This paper will deal with issues related to both individual accreditation, and the accreditation of in-house company training. The former is practised in a range of ways in a number of UK universities, providing routes of access to Higher Education, both in terms of general and specific credit. Important issues to discuss:

- Overall standards and transferability
- Ethics
- Level and extent of credit.

Accreditation of in-house company training is newer in the field of work based learning, enabling an organisation to present its training programme to the university for approval. The recruitment, delivery and assessment of that programme are the responsibility of the organisation. The intellectual property is always theirs. The university, however, is responsible for maintaining a tight quality framework around the whole process, which is in two stages.

Firstly, approval of the proposed accreditation. This involves initial assessment before it is presented to a board for approval. After approval, a link tutor is responsible for the second stage of the maintenance of a quality framework i.e. annual monitoring. The link tutor samples the work which is then sent off to a relevant external examiner. When the standard of the work has been confirmed, certificates of credit can be issued.

Certification of in-house company training, as with individual accreditation, enables individuals and cohorts to complete university awards. It can also be part of engaging with an employer through organisational development.

Issues raised in addition to those listed above:

- Should the ethics of an organisation influence our acceptance of their programme?
- How can the University control the use of their logo by accredited partners?
- Are ‘third sector’ partners welcomed/given financial concessions?
- Is the University ready for a cross-University service?
As a private, online university with close to 16,000 doctoral students, Walden University provides an opportunity for students to not only have access to higher education, but to make a difference in their local communities. As of 8 years ago, every Walden doctoral student has been required to conduct an applied research study that effects positive social change as per the university’s social change mission and scholar-practitioner model. Walden also requires students to share their research results with all relevant stakeholders in an audience-appropriate format. It is this commitment to social change that drives the school to grow to meet demand. Instead of having a set number of doctoral positions, enrollment is adjusted to allow individuals of varied backgrounds the opportunity to obtain skills which can be used to positively impact their communities. Thus, Walden students make research contributions that impact thousands of local communities in the fields of education, psychology, public health, management, and public policy. There is great range in the types of organizations who partner with Walden students, including schools, school districts, private businesses, non-profit agencies, international organizations, government agencies and health providers. Through the years of implementing this model, we have observed that one significant pragmatic challenge for students is balancing their own research goals with the objectives of the organization and culture where the research takes place. A unique aspect of the Walden social change model is to go beyond teaching basic academic skills and also train students to identify local or global social issues that could benefit from a scholarly approach to implement positive social change. To this end, the Walden curriculum trains students in how to use research to identify possible solutions specific to their community. It is hoped that our curriculum prepares students to effectively conduct research that will benefit their local organizations and communities. In this study, university records and survey responses from 300 organizations who partnered with Walden student researchers over the past 3 years will be analyzed to describe patterns in partner sites’ value and impact ratings of the students’ doctoral research. Possible adjustments to the scholar-practitioner and social change training curriculum will also be discussed.
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