A gateway to targeted professional development.
## WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10mins</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>Dr Owen Gower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10mins</td>
<td>RATIONALE &amp; PILOT PROGRAMME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40mins</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE PILOT PROJECT</td>
<td>Dr Karen Clegg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Paddy Hadoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Julie Sheldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Alex Standen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10mins</td>
<td>PERSPECTIVES FROM PILOT PARTICIPANTS &amp; THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION</td>
<td>Ian Covey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Gill Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mins</td>
<td>THE REVISED FRAMEWORK &amp; QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH SUPERVISION RECOGNITION PROGRAMME

An Introduction.
What is the Research Supervision Recognition Programme?

The Research Supervision Recognition Programme is a reflective practice toolkit which enables targeted professional development of supervisory practice and shines a light on an underappreciated form of academic practice.
A REFLECTIVE PRACTICE TOOLKIT

GOOD PRACTICE FRAMEWORK
Acknowledging complexity of role.

STRUCTURED SELF REFLECTION
A gateway to targeted professional development.

RESOURCES
Guide.
Webinars.
Bibliography.
Sign Posting.
RATIONALE & PILOT PROGRAMME

Laying the foundations for the recognition programme.
Historically...

- Doctoral supervision was an adjunct of the research function of academics. i.e., “...if one can do research, then one can presumably supervise it.”
  (Rudd 1985: 79-80)

- It was underpinned by ‘master-apprentice’ model with doctoral supervisors as experts passively transmitting expertise to novices who observed and hopefully emulated.
  (Manathunga and Goozee 2007: 309)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Supervisor relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversification of candidate population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and social composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for wellbeing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversification of modes of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversification of purposes of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated from:
All supervisors... conceptualised their current work with doctoral students as significantly different from their former experiences. They spoke of actively fashioning students’ development to address deficits in expertise; deliberately intervening to ensure timely completion; purposeful provision of tutoring or research assistance to minimise the risk of financial distress and withdrawal; and the deployment of personal networks to facilitate completion and ensure post-graduation employment.

Halse and Malfoy (2010: 80)
BUT INCREASING COMPLEXITY OF DOCTORAL SUPERVISION NOT NECESSARILY RECOGNISED BY INSTITUTIONS...

Can be seen as a ‘labour of love’ and not always recognised in:

• Workload models;
• Promotion criteria;
• Awards for excellence.
I'm drowning in doctoral students and their dissertations. I have so many that I have a hard time keeping count, and the university doesn’t count them in my workload... So the not being recognized element really hits home.”

Private e-mail, 24th May 2019
UKCGE RESPONSES

2016: Joined with the Times Higher to create the world’s first national award for outstanding research supervision (attracting more applicants than any other THE award).

2017: Created the Research Supervisors Network which offers a range of resources and opportunities for professional development.
GOOD SUPERVISORY PRACTICE FRAMEWORK

Shining a light on an underappreciated area of academic practice.
### Supervisory Activities

1. Recruitment and selection.
2. Relationships with candidates.
3. Relationships with co-supervisors.
4. Supporting candidates’ research projects.
5. Supporting candidates to write and giving feedback.
6. Supporting candidates’ personal, professional and career development.
7. Supporting progression and monitoring progress.
8. Supporting completion and final examination.
9. Supporting candidates to disseminate their research.
10. Reflecting upon and enhancing practice.

### Knowledge and Understanding

1. Subject material.
2. Disciplinary and programme frameworks.
3. How candidates learn to become researchers.
4. Use and value of technologies.
5. Methods for evaluating research supervision.
6. Implications of quality assurance and enhancement for research supervision.
7. Examining research degrees.

### Principles

1. Commitment to research supervision as an area of academic practice.
2. Recognition of the personal dimension of research supervision.
3. Recognizing and valuing diversity among the candidate population.
4. Setting high standards for candidates.
5. Serving as a role model.
APPLYING FOR RECOGNITION

- Process for gaining recognition involved providing evidence that applicants’ personal practice was aligned to each of the dimensions of good supervisory practice.

- Produce an account of supervisory practice.
RELECTIVE ACCOUNT OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICE

Brief introduction covering:

• Academic background;
• Supervisory experience;
• Completed supervisions;
• Other information, for example supervising international students, part-time students, distance students;
• Experience of examining, where appropriate.
Reflective Account of Supervisory Practice (Cont.)

Outline of supervisory practice relating to the dimensions of:

- Supervisory activities (10 attributes)
- Knowledge and understanding (7 attributes)
- Principles (5 attributes)

Under each attribute, giving one or more examples drawn from the applicant’s supervisory practice.
REFLECTIVE ACCOUNT OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICE (CONT.)

Indicating familiarity with the scholarly literature on research supervision;

Aiming at an overall length of around 5000 words.
THE PROGRAMME PILOT

Putting the theory to the test.
13 Institutions from across England, Scotland & Wales and from each mission group took part in the pilot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILOT INSTITUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool John Moores University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Hallam University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East Anglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wales Trinity Saint David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PILOT PROCESS

• Institution nominated a total of 52 supervisors.
• Participants sent the Guide for Applicants and a sample application.
• Webinar on Applying for Recognition.
• Internal support from institutional leads.
• Participants given 2 months to submit 5,000 word reflection on their supervisory practice against the criteria citing evidence.
• 43 participants submitted applications.
• 4 two-person panels reviewing applications.
ABOUT PILOT PARTICIPANTS

How many doctoral candidates have you supervised to completion?

- 1 - 3: 4
- 4 - 10: 16
- 11 - 20: 8
- 20+: 4
- None: 1

73% Between 4 & 20
INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE PILOT

Feedback from pilot participants.
INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE PILOT

• Dr Karen Clegg | Head of Research Excellence, University of York
• Dr Paddy Hadoke | Reader in the Centre for Cardiovascular Science, University of Edinburgh
• Professor Julie Sheldon | Dean of the Doctoral Academy, Liverpool John Moores University
• Dr Alex Standen | Associate Director (Early Career Academic and Research Supervisor Development, University College London
Supporting supervisory practice - Dr Karen Clegg

Face to Face Training for supervisors:

- The PhD process: regulations, policy and progression
- Approaches and models of supervision
- Supporting PGR student welfare (including mental health)
- Digital skills
- Professional development and careers
- Completing the PhD

Plus: the PG Certificate in Academic Practice for new lecturers
Supporting the UKCGE recognition process – at York and beyond

- Jiscmail list for the 13 institutions involved in supporting applicants through the process to share practice
- Peer to peer discussion groups centred around sharing of good practice in supervision
- Annotated application form with examples of evidence
- Pedagogy resources including reflective practice
- One-to-one support for applicants
What worked at York?

The feedback you gave was very useful in terms of structuring my thinking about the submission. It enabled me to organise my thoughts and submission in such a way as to reflect what I do into a more appropriate framework.

It was very helpful to have the signposting to areas of pedagogy that relate to my practice. This enabled me to do some further reading on the topic and see how my own methods fit with current thinking. For me this was a real help in putting the submission together.

On a more practical note, having the support to liaise with UKCGE, reminding of upcoming events and deadlines was really helpful.
What else worked?

The group discussion and template with bullet points on was really useful.

The webinar slides and the documents are very well-written and give a lot of ideas about what they are expecting and heped me to understand the process. Additionally, I found the sample application useful and your [York] annotated version of the criteria was really good. Without these, I couldn’t have completed my application.

I cannot express enough how much I myself have learnt about PhD supervision - all in all, the entire process has been highly beneficial for me.
The value of recognition

I really like this idea of recognising research supervisors, because we (at least some of us) do take this aspect of our academic life seriously.. People put so much importance on getting papers published - but we (at least for me) provide SO much time to our research students sacrificing our own time so it is really nice to get recognised. Although for me it is not a `sacrifice' but pleasure in many ways.
What next for us?

Further signposting of the online PGR Progression and Training ‘Portal’:

SkillsForge

*Being an Effective Researcher Tutorial* (BERT) for PGR students. Revised for 2019/2020

*Being an Effective Supervisory Tutorial* (BEST). *Working Title* - in progress. A VLE based tutorial aligned to the six face-to-face training sessions and mapped to the UKCGE recognition criteria. Includes: policy information, signposted support, reading lists and ‘talking-head’ case studies from good supervisors and students who have recently completed.
The University of Edinburgh Experience of the UKCGE Research Supervisor Recognition Scheme

Dr Patrick Hadoke
Director of Postgraduate Student & Early Career Researcher Experience (CMVM)
University of Edinburgh

UKCGE Annual Meeting
Salford, 1st July 2019
TO ALL THOSE WHO GIVE THEIR TIME, TALENTS AND RESOURCES TO SUPERVISING STUDENTS

AND DON’T REQUIRE RECOGNITION FOR YOUR SELFLESSNESS
Supervisor Recognition

- Diversity
- Increased Expectation
- Health and Wellbeing
- Careers
- Inter-disciplinarity
- Co-supervision
- Time pressures
- No/ Poor Workload Allocation Model
- Simplistic Metrics
Recruitment

College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine

College of Science and Engineering

Centre for Cardiovascular Science
Centre for Medical Education

Completed Application
Awarded Recognition

Did Not Complete Application

College Postgraduate Board of Examiners
College Researcher Experience Committee

2x College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Reflections - participants

Maria,
Didn’t complete it:
“... timed towards the end of semester (exam season) ... found it very hard to set aside time to do all of that reflection and reading by myself.”

Main feedback
“... would have benefited from 2-3 scheduled sessions examining the evidence and pointing to helpful literature.”

Found the process interesting

Interesting, enjoyable, informative.
Positive feedback

Concerns –
Student input.
Institutional buy-in
Overlap with HEA
Additional Time Burden
Needs to be renewed
Withdrawal of accreditation?
A new 'quality mark' for PhD supervisors is not a good idea.

(1) In many university, graduate student supervision & research is included in the work allocation model.
(2) How would early career researchers gain the "mark of recognition"?

But you want me to fill in a form and pay some money for self reflection on my supervisor skills? That's not a helpful addition to my workload. Tell my employer that they should give me space in my diary to reflect instead please.

It is well intended but adds more work and more stress to a difficult task, without providing substantive benefits that can be better handled at an institution level.

A new national metric involves a huge amount of resource, both time and money. Could you please share what data the need for it is based on? Also, is there evidence-based research that has to solve, and why it would be the best solution?

1. Could you also provide @UKCGE's estimate of the time and financial cost of the development, implementation, and monitoring of this proposed framework or standard?

"... why does @UKCGE believe a framework of assessed metrics is necessary to enable self-reflection?"

"... how will it ensure these metrics benefit or encourage self-reflection rather than box-ticking?"

"Genuinely interested in the methodology that’s being used!"

“As a new Deputy PGR Director, supporting good supervision is super important to me. I’m concerned with how metriced this is esp given the increasingly well known issues with over metricing (eg 22 attributes!!!!)

1. Preliminary scan of the document suggests that everything is rather vague and anodyne. That’s probably good in terms of preserving flexibility but concerning when operationalised.”
Reflections – University of Edinburgh

Questions

• How does this align with the HEA fellowship programme? Is there / will there be a benefit to gaining accreditation through both of these routes or will there be a preference – on the part of universities or the part of individuals going through the accreditation?

• How will universities view this during academic recruitment (if at all)? and how will they compare the value of this compared to HEA fellowship?

• How will it be viewed as part of promotion criteria (if at all)? how will they compare the value of this compared to HEA fellowship?

• Will individuals feel it helps them to improve their supervisory practice or do things differently? Or is it just formalising what they already do? So, will it help institutions to improve their supervisory practice and as a result have a direct impact on PhD student experience?

• How will different levels of supervisory experience be recognised?

Barriers

• Not enough time

• Unclear Value

• Not a high priority
Conclusions

Better experience, better outcomes
Better support, better recognition, benefit to career development

MEANINGFUL WORK PROJECT

RECOGNITION

BENEFITS

REFRESNER COURSE
Supervisor Recognition
Supervisor Recognition
Liverpool John Moores University
What we did …

• Identified the area of practice we would foreground in each application;
• Signposted the appropriate literature;
• Shared experiences in lunches;
• Developed workshops for Pilots to present as part of institutional Supervisor Development Programme.
What we learned ...

• We have remarkable examples of supervisory expertise to share; the application takes time to develop (6 weeks of fairly constant attention);

• Participants reviewed their practice with satisfaction and with sharpened sense of focus;

• This audit of practice was thought to be more meaningful than PDPR reviews.
Feedback for the Scheme:

• Bandwidth of experience necessary;

• Should there be a minimum eligibility for the scheme? Difficult to write if you haven’t extensive experience or been in a PG leader role; guidance on inclusion of evidence (fear that less scrupulous applicants could fake it);

• S1 and S6 the supervisor has little control over since this is often centrally provided;

• A summary box would be welcome since they felt their statements ended abruptly;
UKCGE Supervisory Recognition Pilot –
Experiences at UCL

Dr Alex Standen
UCL Arena Centre for Research-based Education
UCL Context

• Large, multidisciplinary institution: 11 Faculties, 6,000+ PhD students.

• Refreshed programme of development for supervisors:
  – New online course
  – Expanded programme of face to face events
  – Published guides.
Our group

• 4 volunteers: Psychology & Human Development, Biomedical Sciences, Language Sciences, and Speech Sciences
• Range of supervisory experience; one Departmental Graduate Tutor and one Divisional Education Lead
• One nominated by her students.
Our (lack of!) organisation

• Initial meeting after the webinar
• Two follow up meetings
• Lots of emailing…

• What did they need from me?
  – Literature and references
  – Help with mapping
  – Prompting to be reflective and evaluative.
What did they gain from each other?

- Peer support
- A new, cross-disciplinary, network
- Ideas – both on the application and on enhancing their supervision.
What have they said about the scheme?

Practical matters:

• I thought the information provided was UKCGE was as helpful as it could be for a new scheme, and we all worked hard to engage with the materials to meet the brief as we saw it.
What have they said about the scheme?

Personal benefits:

• The exercise really got me thinking about best practice and immediately taking some action too, so it has been overall very positive to this point.
• It did make me reflect and I have already implemented some supervisory changes in response to completing this.
What have they said about the scheme?

Considerations for taking it forward:

• I'm still unsure of the benefit of two separate recognition programmes.

• It was too long and I would have preferred to reflect more deeply on specific elements of supervisory practice rather than lots of topics which meant less meaningful engagement.
Wider interest at UCL

- Two thirds of respondents to a survey about supervisor training (24/36) said a professional recognition scheme would be of interest.
- Two questioned crossover with HEA Fellowships
- ‘Rather than a somewhat random approach to my development, it could help to provide a structured set of resources/events for which there is some form of recognition for completion.’
Next steps

• Capacity and benefits of keeping it small
• Formalising the peer networking / adopting a more structured approach?
• Understanding the standards
• Embedding in the wider work of our team.
PERSPECTIVES FROM PILOT PARTICIPANTS & THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Results of pilot evaluation and community consultation.
POST PILOT EVALUATION
Did you find the exercise of completing the reflective application beneficial in itself?

- Yes
- No
Do you think completing it will improve your research supervision in future?

- Yes: 29
- No: 0
- Don't Know: 4
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES

How valued do you think research supervision is as a part of academic practice?

86% Highly valued or valued

56% Highly valued or valued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Research Supervisors</th>
<th>By Higher Education Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Valued</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undervalued</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Undervalued</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Valued</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undervalued</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Undervalued</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION RESPONSES

How well do you think the criteria reflect good supervisory practice?

92% Very Well / Well
THE REVISED FRAMEWORK

Incorporating responses from the pilot evaluation and community consultation.
1. Recruitment and selection
2. Supervisory relationships with students
3. Supervisory relationships with co-supervisors
4. Supporting the research project
5. Encouraging writing and giving feedback
6. Keeping the research on track and monitoring progress
7. Personal and professional support for the candidate
8. Completion and examination
9. Dissemination
10. Reflective practice
REVISED SCHEME - PROCESS

• Applicants to write reflective accounts of practice giving at least two examples under each of the 10 headings with a maximum of 5000 words;

• For purposes of authentication ?????;

• Reflective accounts to be read by two reviewers from other institutions;

• Reviewers to judge whether criteria have been met or whether further work is need and recommend acceptance or referral;
• Where referral, one additional attempt allowed;
• Where disagreement between reviewers, application send to a third independent reviewer whose decision is final;
• Successful applicants will be ?????;
• Recognised supervisors will be expected to remain in good standing by continuing to enhance their practice.
QUESTIONS?