RECOGNISED **ASSOCIATE SUPERVISOR AWARD**

Guide to Reflection

PROFESSOR STAN **TAYLOR**
DR KAY **GUCCIONE**
DR ELIZABETH **ADAMS**

UK Council for
Graduate Education

Structured **Reflection.**

Supervisors play a critical role in influencing doctoral candidates' chances of completing on time, in determining the quality of their final outputs and, most crucially of all, in shaping their experiences as doctoral researchers. The importance of good research supervision is, therefore, hard to overstate.

The *Research Supervision Recognition Programme* is underpinned by the principle that research supervision is a form of teaching, and as such, supervisors will benefit from reflecting on their practice.

This process of reflection is often a gateway to professional development as it reveals insights and new perspectives on the challenges inherent in your supervision work.

Of course, many of you are naturally reflective, so the programme's free-to-access resources, most notably the *Good Supervisory Practice Framework*, add structure to guide you through this reflective process. For those who are less familiar with reflective practice, this guide may help you to think through your experiences as a supervisor.

For those who wish to receive external validation of their supervisory practice, the *Research Supervision Recognition Programme* offers two distinct awards: the '*Recognised Supervisor Award*' (10 criteria) and the '*Recognised Associate Supervisor Award*' (5 criteria). Both awards are benchmarked to the *Good Supervisory Practice Framework*.

The Recognised Associate Supervisor Award

The introduction of the award of *Recognised Associate Supervisor* reflects the fact that staff who are not part of a formal supervision team - notably research staff (including postdoctoral researchers) and technical staff - often play an important role in supporting doctoral researchers through their doctoral journey. Such staff may not be formally recognised for this work through an official role or title and may not be involved in all aspects of the supervision process. In particular, institutional regulations may mean they are not able to be part of the recruitment or the examination processes. Additionally, the short-term nature of many research contracts might mean that these staff will be unlikely to see out the entire journey (from recruitment to completion, and beyond into employment) of a doctoral researcher, basis but may instead provide crucial input to multiple doctoral researchers, across a variety of points on their journeys. This may be as a formal point of contact with a defined role, or as an informal 'supporting player' offering day-to-day guidance and support.

For these reasons, we have structured the *Recognised Associate Supervisor* award to require reflection on 5 of the 10 criteria of the *Good Supervisory Practice Framework*. This comprises 3 'core' criteria, plus an opportunity for each individual applicant to select 2 'elective' criteria out of a further 4 possibilities. Your chosen 5 criteria will map directly to the *Good Supervisory Practice Framework* and the standard required for each is the same as for the *Recognised Supervisor* award. It is important to note that whilst not all 10 criteria for *Recognised Supervisor* will be met in the *Recognised Associate Supervisor* award, the required high standard is consistent across the two awards. It is also possible (and likely) that many applicants will have some degree of experience relating to the remaining 5 criteria and may find it useful to reflect on this as they plan how to continue their development journey as a supervisor. This 'future focus' is particularly recommended as a point for reflection in the Criterion 10, which is a core criterion for as part of the submission for *the Recognised Associate Supervisor* award.

Who is eligible?

This award is intended to provide opportunity for professional recognition to staff in Higher Education Institutes (and independent research staff), typically research staff on fixed term contracts (postdoctoral research associates, or postdocs), or others such as (but not limited to) visiting researchers, research fellows, teaching associates, research technicians, research facility managers, and doctoral school managers who hold a doctorate and work closely with doctoral researchers, and, who have been in a position to support those doctoral researchers for a minimum of around one year.

Whilst doctoral researchers are not themselves eligible for the *Recognised Associate Supervisor* award, the experiences gained during the doctoral period may be reflected on, with a view to completing the award once relevant staff experience has been gained.

Acknowledgements

The UKCGE would like to thank **Professor Stan Taylor** who authored the Good Supervisory Practice framework and the Guide to Reflection for the Recognised Supervisor Award and **Dr Elizabeth Adams** and **Dr Kay Guccione** who originated the Recognised Associate Supervisor programme and adapted and extended the Framework and Guide to support applicants.

Contents

The ***Recognised Associate Supervisor*** Award 3

Who is eligible? **4**

How to Use this Document 6

Completing Your Reflection: Core and Elective Criteria 6

What is Appropriate Evidence of Practice? 8

Structure of this Document 11

Criteria of Good Supervisory Practice 12

The **sector-approved definition** of good supervisory practice 12

1 Recruitment and Selection 13

2 Supervisory Relationships with Candidates 13

3 Supervisory Relationships with Co-supervisors 17

4 Supporting Candidates' Research Projects 20

5 Encouraging Candidates to Write and Giving Appropriate Feedback 24

6 Keeping the Research on Track and Monitoring Progression 26

7 Supporting Candidates' Personal, Professional and Career Development 27

8 Supporting Candidates Through Completion and Final Examination 31

9 Supporting Candidates to Disseminate Their Research 31

10 Reflecting Upon and Enhancing Practice 34

References 36

About the UKCGE 49

How to Use this Document

This document guides you through the process of reflecting on your supervisory practice and provides examples of how you might evidence the required 5 criteria of good practice in your application to become a UKCGE *Recognised Associate Research Supervisor*.

Completing Your Reflection: Core and Elective Criteria

Using the Reflective Account Form - which you find under "How to apply" - complete an evidence-based reflection on your practice covering 5 of the 10 criteria of good-supervisory practice.

The required criteria, which must be fully evidenced, are:

- The 3 core criteria (criteria 2, 3 and 10): These are considered to be essential foundational experiences for all supervision relationships and all are required to be evidenced.
- 2 out of the 4 elective criteria (criteria 4, 5 ,7 and 9): You may choose the two most relevant to your experience.

In your reflective account, under each of the 5 main headings, give one or two examples of your practice, citing the supporting literature where relevant.

The award of *Recognised Associate Supervisor* also requires evidence that the applicant has observed a supervision meeting, and reflected on this, as part of their application. This takes the form of a completed Supervision Observation Template which is then reflected on as part of Criterion 10.

Note

There is no expectation that you will address all the typical examples given below. Similarly, there is no expectation that you will cover all the literature, only that which is relevant to the examples from your own practice, that you choose.

Please refer to the Sample Reflective Account for an example of how to complete the application form.

The additional criteria (1, 6 and 8) from the *Recognised Supervisor* award have been listed as an appendix in this document. These are often explicitly linked to formal status and roles which may exclude certain staff groups from participating, and so they do not form part of the *Recognised Associate Supervisor* award. These additional, or 'development criteria', are not required to be evidenced in this award but could form part of your reflection on your future development needs.

Aim for your reflection to be no more than **2,500 words** (excluding the Supervision Observation Template).

Privacy, Anonymity and Confidentiality

Please be mindful that if you choose to submit to apply for recognition, your reflective account will be seen by two referees and at least two external reviewers.

Under no circumstances explicitly name colleagues or doctoral candidates in your reflection.

What is Appropriate Evidence of Practice?

Address all Criteria

You must – where able – address 5 (3 'core' and 2 'elective') of the 10 criteria of the Good Supervisory Practice Framework. If you are unable to provide evidence for a criterion you must state this on your application with supporting evidence of your claim — for example, a link to an institutional policy.

Personal

The evidence must be personal to you. It is your own specific supervisory practice that you are reflecting upon, and reviewers cannot assume your practice from your role in your school, department or research group or cluster.

For example, a statement to the effect that you have successfully worked alongside doctoral researchers, shared projects or co-authored papers, or trained them in a particular skill or technique for many years is not enough to evidence supervisory practice. Instead, you should write a short personal case study of how supervision work (e.g. doctoral researcher orientation, scaffolding, development, support and guidance) has been undertaken and what you have done to make it successful, why, and how.

Recent

The evidence must relate to your recent experience, usually defined as being within the previous five years.

Older experience may be referenced, for example if you reflect on your own experiences as a doctoral researcher to explain the origins of your practice, but the substance of your reflection on practice should relate to more recent experiences, to ensure currency.

Reflective

Evidence must be presented in a way that is reflective rather than purely descriptive. For example, a statement that 'I have always enjoyed positive relationships with candidates' would not be enough to evidence the 'Supervisory relationships with candidates' criterion. You should provide evidence of why you think such relationships are important to the doctoral candidate's learning experience, how you have positioned your role in relation to the primary supervisor or supervision team, how you have gone about establishing good relationships with doctoral researchers, how you have monitored those relationships and, where appropriate, how you have changed strategies for supervision and with what results.

Example-based

For each of the criteria, you must provide evidence in the form of, at least, two concrete examples (mini case studies) derived from your practice.

So, a general exposition of the three main methods (e.g. 'I engage in self-review, peer review and student review') would not on its own be acceptable to evidence the 'Reflecting upon and enhancing practice' criterion. You must provide actual instances of how you have employed one or a combination of these methods to enhance your practice. what you did, what you learned, and how you went on to apply this in practice.

Scholarly

Your evidence should be supported by the scholarly literature on supervisory practice.

If you decide to submit your reflective account to apply for recognition of your supervisory practice (the *Recognised Associate Supervisor award*), there is an expectation that you will demonstrate an awareness of the literature on supervisory practice and how it has had an impact on your understanding of your practice, or supported you to change or reinforce your practice.

An application which makes no reference to the scholarly literature is not acceptable. It is expected that scholarly underpinning will be provided in relation to at least some of the examples you provide. **However, you are not expected to cite literature in defence of every aspect of your practice**. Keep the focus on your examples, not on providing chunks of literature, reviewers are not expecting to read a literature review.

For more guidance on the research into doctoral supervision, please see our "Resource Library".

Systematic

Finally, there is an expectation that you will take a systematic approach to developing your expertise in supervision.

For example, an entire account which provides no evidence of development over time would be unlikely to meet the 'Reflecting upon and enhancing practice' criterion. It is expected that you will provide evidence of taking appropriate opportunities (formal, or informal) to systematically develop your expertise in relationship to at least some of the criteria in the *Good Supervisory Practice Framework*.

Methods can range from informal conversations with other supervisors, observing others, through to being mentored or mentoring and attending workshops or completing accredited programmes. **You are also required to undertake a structured supervision observation and reflect on this as part of your application.**

Structure of this Document

Each criterion of good supervisory practice has its own section below - beginning with an overview of the criterion. The core and elective criteria have been clearly marked as such and the additional 'development' criteria from the *Recognised Supervisor Award* are available to support your reflection and plans for future development.

Typical Examples of activities that good practice might include are highlighted in the pale blue boxes.

The Literature and Evidence sections include suggestions of how, in your application, you might provide evidence, and a summary of the supporting literature underpinning the criterion.

Full references for the supporting literature can be found at the back of this document.

Supporting Literature Online

For links to online versions of the supporting literature, visit:

https://supervision.ukcge.ac.uk/resources/resource-library

Criteria of Good Supervisory Practice

The sector-approved definition of good supervisory practice

There are numerous definitions of 'supervisory practice' in the literature —see, for example, James and Baldwin 2009, Eley and Murray 2009, Grant et al 2014, Kearns and Finn 2017, Taylor et al 2018— but they contain all or most of the following domains:

10 Criteria of Good Supervisory Practice

1. Recruitment and selection.
2. Supervisory relationships with candidates.
3. Supervisory relationships with co-supervisors.
4. Supporting candidates' research projects.
5. Encouraging candidates to write and giving appropriate feedback.
6. Keeping the research on track and monitoring progress.
7. Supporting candidates' personal, professional and career development.
8. Supporting candidates through completion and final examination.
9. Supporting candidates to disseminate their research.
10. Reflecting upon and enhancing practice.

1 Recruitment and Selection

This **criterion is not required** in the Recognised Associate Supervisor programme.

Core Criterion

2 Supervisory Relationships with Candidates

Over the past three decades or so, the doctoral candidate population has become much more diverse in its composition, and supervisors need to be aware of this in forming effective relationships with candidates.

In order to do this, there is a need right from the start for supervisors and doctoral candidates to have clear expectations of each other and the first task is to discuss these and, where appropriate, negotiate how they are going to be met. For informal or day-to-day 'associate' supervisors, this can be a careful balance between supporting the candidate whilst also being mindful of the agenda and activities of the main supervisor or supervisory team.

Also, candidates and all formal and informal supervisors need to be able to work effectively with each other. Because each doctoral journey is unique, then each relationship will be different depending upon the style(s) of the supervisor(s) and the characteristics of the candidate, and their project and personal context. Expectations need to be aligned at the start, for the relationships, and the candidate to be successful.

That said, the relationship can and indeed should change over the course of time. As candidates move through the phases and challenges of their doctoral studies, their needs will change, and with that the nature of support that they require.

In a few cases, there may be serious issues leading to the potential or actual breakdown of the relationship, for which supervisors need to be prepared and aware of the sources of support both for candidates and themselves.

Typical Examples

- Acknowledging the increased diversity of the domestic candidate population and recognising its implications for supervision.
- Acknowledging the increased diversity of the international candidate population and recognising its implications for supervision.
- Supporting orientation, transition, and navigation of the research environment.
- Discussing and agreeing expectations with candidates at the start of their studies.
- Being aware of supervisory styles and their relationship to the doctoral researcher's needs and being able to align them at the start of doctoral studies.
- Being aware of how doctoral researcher's support needs change over the course of their doctoral studies and being able to recalibrate supervisory approaches.
- Being aware of institutional policies and procedures in the event of the breakdown of a supervisory relationship and of sources of support for both parties.

Literature and Evidence

Historically, the population of doctoral candidates has been disproportionately male, young, from high-status social-economic backgrounds, members of majority ethnic and/or racial groups, without a disability, and heterosexual (see for example Gardner 2009a, 2009b, Garner and Holley 2011, Petersen 2014). Now, it is much more diverse in terms of gender, age, class, race or ethnicity, disability, and sexuality (see for example Ostrove et al 2011, Offerman 2011, Gardner 2013, Wakeling and Hampden-Thomson 2013, Collins 2015,

Okahana et al 2016). Candidates from non-traditional backgrounds but may face challenges in undertaking doctoral studies. e.g. lack of confidence, isolation and discrimination. **As evidence, you may be able to give examples of how you have gone about forming effective relationships and supporting them to overcome challenges. Perhaps you have experience of helping candidates to connect to others, helping them build relationships with key players in your department or institution.**

While there is a long tradition of doctoral candidates studying in countries other than their own, over the past two decades or so there has been a huge increase in the numbers studying abroad (see UNESCO 2015). Such candidates may face the same challenges as non-traditional home candidates plus others including culture shock (see Manathunga 2014), different expectations of academic roles (Winchester-Seeto et al 2014), different styles of learning (Goode 2007), research experience and skills (McClure 2007), and conventions for verbal and written communication (Doyle et al 2017). **For evidence, you may be able to give examples of how you have gone about establishing relationships with international doctoral researchers and supporting them in their studies.**

Candidates will usually start their doctoral careers with some assumptions about what will be required of them and what support their supervisor will be required to offer but there is no guarantee that these will be complete or accurate (see for example Dann 2008, Kelly 2009, McAlpine 2013, Jindal-Snape and Ingram 2013, Holbrook et al 2014, Sambrook 2017). The upshot is that there can be mismatches between the expectations of candidates and supervisors which can adversely affect their relationship, and supervisors may need to ensure that these are calibrated. **You might evidence this through spending some time right at the start with the candidate going through the institution's Code of Practice or Handbook or checklist, pointing out the formal requirements and expectations placed upon them, and discussing how they will be met. Or by having conversations that help them to make sense of their supporting relationships, for example what types of support a supervisor can or cannot provide, and 'how academia works'.**

As numerous studies (see, for example, Pearson and Brew 2002, Davis 2004, Gatfield 2005, Grant 2005, Murphy et al 2007, Wright et al 2007, Deuchar 2008, Halse and Bansel 2012, Boehe 2014, Vehvilinen and Lofstrom 2014) have pointed out, supervisors may have preferred styles of supervision that embody different assumptions about the needs of candidates. As Malfoy and Webb (2000) have suggested, as long as there is a congruence between the supervisory style, the associated assumptions about the needs of candidates, and their actual needs, there should be no difficulties, problems can occur where there is discongruence. **You might evidence calibrating styles and needs through the initiation of discussions with candidates, or through reflection on what they need from an informal supervisor, using prompts such as the well-known Brown-Atkins (1988) rating scale.**

The relationship between the supervisor and the candidate is not a static one but should change over the course of the candidacy. Usually, at the start the candidate is heavily dependent upon the supervisor and then, as he or she grows and develops towards becoming a researcher in their own right, they should become less dependent and more autonomous (see McAlpine 2013, Benmore 2014, Bui 2014). **Your evidence might be checking that styles and needs remain aligned either informally by raising the issue in supervisions or formally by using instruments such as Gurr's (2001) monitoring tool. Or it may relate to supporting students to take ownership or control of their doctoral experience, to build up their confidence or independence through positive reinforcement.**

In the vast majority of cases, relationships with candidates proceed smoothly, but in a handful, there may be serious problems; at the end of the day, supervisors and candidates are human beings who, for one reason or another, may fail to get on leading to serious problems in the relationship (see for example Gunnarsson et al 2013). **Here you could provide evidence that you know the relevant institutional procedures and sources of support both for candidates and for yourself.**

Core Criterion

3 Supervisory Relationships with Co-supervisors

Historically, the model has been for candidates to have a single supervisor. But over the last three decades or so there has been a move to co- or team supervision to enhance the experience of doctoral candidates by reducing their reliance upon a single individual and giving them access to a broader range of expertise and support.

However, co-supervision can have a downside. The involvement of more supervisors in the process can create a potential for disagreement and divergence within the team and leave the candidate playing 'piggy in the middle' to the detriment of their experience.

This dynamic is of particular importance to informal or associate supervisors who must be mindful of the bigger context for their support of candidates. This can require you as an informal source of support, to strike a careful balance between understanding the needs of and providing practical support to the candidate whilst also being mindful of the agenda and activities of the main supervisor or supervisory team. Informal supervisors often provide a complementary type of support to candidates, offering the guidance, detail and structure that works to support the formal supervisory team's vision and 'big picture' context. Informal or associate supervisors must maintain awareness of the agendas of all parties involved in order to ensure that their approach is complementary, rather than contradictory, or confusing to the candidate. This may be done with or without the formal supervisors' full awareness, and they may not have recognised your supervision work as such.

Typical Examples

- Clarifying roles with the main or lead supervisor and any co-supervisors, as well as candidates at the start of the candidacy.
- Raising the main or lead supervisor's awareness of the support you are/can provide.
- Clarifying expectations of the project with lead /co-supervisors and the candidate.
- Regularly reviewing relations between supervisors and with candidates during the course of the candidacy.

Literature and Evidence

Usually, supervisory teams include a designated main supervisor and one or more secondary supervisors. As Guerin and Green (2015) have argued, it is important that there is clarity within the team about the respective roles the supervisors will play and that this is understood by the doctoral researcher. **Your evidence here might include consulting institutional and/or research council guidelines of primary and secondary supervisory roles and discussing them with co-supervisors and candidates.** This is particularly important where supervisors come from external organizations and may have a limited understanding of the degree as in the case of many professional doctorates (see, for example, Neumann 2005, Fillery-Travis et al 2017), practice-led doctorates (see, for example, Allpress et al 2012, Duxbury 2012) and industrial or commercial doctorates (Malfory 2011, Cuthbert and Molla 2014). **Evidence could also include how you set boundaries with candidates, for example ensuring that you aren't expected to take action on their behalf, or find yourself in a situation where you are negotiating in a position between them and others in the supervisory team.**

As well as clarity of roles, as Parker-Jenkins (2018) has pointed out, there is a need for co-supervisors or informal associate supervisors to clarify their expectations of the research project itself, who supervises what (e.g. one the theoretical foundation, the other the empirical), and arrangements for feedback to the candidate. **Your evidence here might, for example, include informal discussion or formal review to check your understanding**, for example using Grossman and Crowther's (2015) comprehensive list as a basis for negotiating who does what, when, where and how. Again, this is particularly important in the context of collaborative doctoral programmes.

As well as starting off on the right footing, as Taylor et al (2018) have argued, there is a need for regular reviews of the relationships of co-supervisors with each other and with the doctoral researcher. Such reviews, perhaps once or twice per year, might be undertaken with the candidate present and be used to identify problems stemming from co-supervision at a relatively early stage and before they delay, fatally or otherwise, the progress of the research. **Your evidence might again include informal review or using Kiley's (2015a) questionnaire as a tool to check how things are going.**

Elective Criterion

4 Supporting Candidates' Research Projects

New doctoral candidates may have little or no experience of research, and hence little or no idea of what they are letting themselves in for. Supervisors may then need to induct them into research, including the nature of research itself, the key concepts, what it involves, and of good practice in undertaking it.

If the research project itself has been predetermined, supervisors will support candidates to understand the project, parameters, scope, methods and supporting literature. As well as how these relate to other projects in the group or department. Alternatively, supervisors may have a role in advising candidates about their choice of topic or direction, and then assisting them to produce a research proposal and to gain ethical approval. Irrespective of the discipline, supervisors will need to make sure that candidates have, or can acquire, the subject-specific knowledge and skills necessary for them to undertake their research topics. These may include the relevant experimental and technological skills, including information searching, retrieval, storage, and sharing.

Sooner or later all candidates are likely to encounter academic, procedural, methodological, or practical/experimental problems of one kind or another. It is important that if, and when, this happens, supervisors are aware and lend their support.

Typical Examples

- Discussing conceptions and misconceptions of research itself with candidates.
- Looking at key 'threshold' concepts in research.
- Considering issues of academic integrity, intellectual property rights, and co-publication.
- Advising on a choice of topic.
- Advising on theory, methodology and methods.
- Advising on a research proposal and plan.
- Advising on gaining ethical approval.
- Advising on skills development in relation to the project.
- Advising on issues arising in the course of the research.

Literature and Evidence

As Meyer et al (2005) have shown, doctoral candidates may have odd conceptions or even misconceptions of research at the start of their studies, and there is a clear need for dialogue with supervisors to what research is ultimately about otherwise there can be a potential for conflict and/or delays to completion (see Meyer 2007, Garcia-Perez and Ayres 2012). **Your evidence here may take the form of supporting candidates to critique a recent piece of research in the subject and discussing it with them through reading groups or journal clubs. Or it may be more ad hoc support when they get stuck or confused in their literature searches or reading.**

There is a substantial literature (see, for example, Kiley 2009, Kiley and Wisker 2009, Trafford and Lesham 2009, Kiley 2015b) suggesting that many research candidates struggle to grasp key 'threshold' concepts of research, including those of research paradigms, research

questions, theory, theoretical frameworks, methodology, methods, analysis, argument/thesis, and theorising findings. So, candidates may become 'stuck' in a state of uncertainty and consequently are unable to progress their research. **You may have helped candidates resolve this 'stuckness' by, for example, pointing to 'model' papers or books, pointing out key players in the field, by discussing key concepts arising from the literature, research seminars or conferences, or by signposting them to training and development activities.**

A further necessary discussion may relate to the ethics of research in terms of integrity, intellectual property rights, and possibly authorship in relation to co-publication. **You could evidence that you are aware of institutional policies in these areas and communicate these to candidates, for example through a checklist, discussion or ad hoc support for decision making.**

In many cases, supervisors themselves obtain the funding for and design research projects, but in others there may be an element of discretion for the candidate. In such cases, supervisors as Taylor et al (2018) have described, have a system of outlining the key criteria – whether the project is worthwhile, doable in the time available, and viable in potentially leading to the creation of new knowledge – and encouraging candidates to apply them until a suitable project is found. Candidates will also need advice about how to go about undertaking their research projects, including theories and theoretical frameworks, methodologies and methods, and you could give an example of how you have advised them about these matters. **You could supply a short case study of how you have gone about advising candidates about their choice of direction within projects. Perhaps from your wider or deeper knowledge of techniques or methodologies, or your greater appreciation of the timelines and practicalities of doing research.**

Candidates may then have to produce a research proposal and a working plan for the short and long term, which can be problematic if they have little or no experience of how to effectively get research done. One thing that **you might cite as evidence is asking candidates**

to look at the deliberately erroneous research proposals and plans set out in Delamont et al (2004) and critique them.

In order to undertake their research projects, candidates will need a range of skills, and it is important at the start to identify which ones they already have, those that they will need to acquire, and when and how they will be able to acquire them. **Here, you might cite as evidence conducting a development needs analysis early in the candidature**.

Candidates may also need support when the research is underway. They may expect that research is conducted in the same way as it is published, i.e. a linear progression. But research in the real world can be very messy and progress is often two steps forward and one backwards. Candidates may, for cultural reasons (see for example Shen 2009, Magyar and Robinson-Pant 2011) or variously through 'Top Gun' (see Taylor and Beasley 2005) or 'imposter' syndromes (see Kearns 2015) be unwilling to acknowledge that they are 'stuck'. **You might provide evidence of re-assuring candidates experiencing problems that they would be met with a sympathetic response and encouraging them to identify ways forward.**

Elective Criterion

5 Encouraging Candidates to Write and Giving Appropriate Feedback

Candidates need to produce written work throughout their studies to articulate what they are thinking, to reflect upon their findings, and to gain feedback. But candidates may prove reluctant to write particularly in the early stages and need encouragement and support from their supervisors to do so.

Once they have produced written work, supervisors must give feedback. It is important that feedback is high-quality and that it enables candidates to progress their research projects.

Typical Examples

- Encouraging candidates to write from the start of their studies.
- Supporting the development of the products of academic writing.
- Supporting the development of regular writing processes or habits and avoiding the pitfalls.
- Giving timely, constructive, and actionable feedback.

Literature and Evidence

The traditional view was that writing could be left to the end when the final submission was produced. But the consensus now (see for example Kamler and Thomson 2006), Bitchener 2018) is that writing is or should be an integral part of the research process and that candidates need to start writing at the beginning of their studies and continue throughout. **Your evidence for this might include asking them to keep regular research journals/diaries**

and setting mini-projects involving writing tasks. Or it may stem from from working with them to enable them to devise systems for keeping written records of their weekly reading, research progress, data generated, and any ongoing analysis.

That said, it is not just a matter of producing text but of producing what is a highly specialised form of writing, namely academic writing. As a number of studies (see Can and Walker 2011, Lee and Murray 2013, Lindsay 2015) have shown, doctoral candidates rarely arrive at the start of their studies with the capacity to produce such writing and, left on their own, they may struggle to acquire it. In recognition of this, many institutions now provide courses, groups, or mentoring support for academic writing for doctoral candidates. **Have you supported candidates to recognise that they would benefit from such support, and access it?**

But it may still be that you as their day-to-day supporters are asked to be the 'first readers' of texts destined for the formal supervisory team, and you may be regularly asked to provide guidance about their writing style or content. **Evidence of such guidance may take the form of referring candidates to good examples in the literature, sharing your own draft or completed writing, or showing them how to re-write a paragraph or two. It may also be in encouraging them to join or form peer writing groups** (see Aitchison 2010, Wellington 2010a, Carter and Kumar 2016, Wegener et al 2016).

Giving feedback on written work is of course one of, if not the, most vital functions of the supervisor. Such feedback needs to be timely in the sense of enabling candidates to move on with their studies (see, for example, Odema and Burgess 2015, Carter and Kumar 2016). It also needs to be constructive; as numerous studies (see for example Whitelock et al 2008, Wang and Li 2011, Can and Walker 2011, Aitchison and Mowbray 2013) have shown, candidates have a very strong emotional investment in their draft submissions, and criticism is often taken personally. Finally, as McAlpine and Amundsen (2012) have pointed out, it needs to be actionable in the sense that candidates can understand the points being made

and incorporate changes. **Evidence would be of how you take these three considerations into account when you are giving feedback to candidates.**

6 Keeping the Research on Track and Monitoring Progression

This **criterion is not required** in the Recognised Associate Supervisor programme.

Elective Criterion

7 Supporting Candidates' Personal, Professional and Career Development

Doctoral candidates are subject to the usual ups and downs in their personal lives, that can affect us all. Supervisors should take a sensitive and ethical approach to any disclosures of ongoing personal information or issues, particularly in relation to well-being and physical or mental health and be able to direct candidates towards the relevant support systems and professional services. Supervisors must also recognise that they are likely to be role models for their candidates, in how they respond to disclosure, act with personal integrity, and maintain a work-life balance.

Supervisors also have a responsibility to support the professional development of doctoral candidates in terms of socialisation within their disciplinary and institutional communities and, where appropriate, in undertaking related activities for example teaching, public engagement and outreach, and service work such as committee or representation duties.

Traditionally, such activities helped to support doctoral candidates to prepare for academic careers, and supervisors have had a direct role in informing them about faculty work and life. In recent years, however, only a minority of doctoral graduates have become academics, while the majority have found employment in other spheres. Here, supervisors may have a role in supporting candidates to prepare for non-academic careers.

Typical Examples

- Supporting candidates with (inter)personal issues, including those relating to their well-being and physical and mental health.
- Being good role models in terms of work-life balance and professional conduct
- Inducting candidates into disciplinary networks and activities.
- Supporting their development as teachers, subject ambassadors and engaged academic citizens.
- Informing them about academic careers.
- Supporting them to prepare for non-academic careers.

Literature and Evidence

Supervisors will normally have some pastoral engagement with candidates over the course of their doctoral studies as events in their private lives impinge upon their professional ones (Hopgood et al 2011, McAlpine et al 2012, McAlpine 2013). Minimally, supervisors need to be alert to the prospect of candidates experiencing personal issues and problems, for example by regularly checking with them, and listening. When such issues, including those relating to well-being and physical or mental health, are identified, supervisors need to be sympathetic, conscious of the boundaries of becoming directly involved, and aware of the professional services to whom candidates can be referred for further support. **Evidence here, for example, could consist of a case study of how you have supported a candidate at a time of personal crisis, concern, or disclosure.**

Supervisors need to be good role models for candidates is in terms of achieving an appropriate work-life balance. The latter can be an issue for candidates and there is some

evidence that it is a factor in poor mental health ((see Cohen 2011, Margrove et al 2014, Levecque et al 2017), non- or delayed completion (see Barry et al 2018), and in putting candidates off an academic career (McAlpine 2017). **You may be able to evidence this by describing how you have acted as a role model, e.g. by communicating your own efforts to maintain effective work-life balance to the candidate, or by ensuring that they take annual leave and work reasonable hours. Or perhaps you have helped them to develop good coping strategies to manage workload or project related stress.**?

As Walker et al (2008) have put the matter, supervisors are 'stewards of the discipline' and responsible for inducting candidates into the disciplinary community. This may include encouraging them in joining appropriate professional or local institutional community networks (see Thein and Beach 2010), attending conferences, giving presentations, and possibly in publishing their work during candidacy (see also Criterion 9). **Evidence again might consist of a case study of how you have invited or inducted candidates into a disciplinary or departmental community, supported them at a conference, or shone a light on their work and credited their ideas or contribution.**

Many candidates will engage in teaching during their studies, often on modules led by their supervisors, or in public engagement or outreach activities. In such cases, as Muzaka (2009) and Jepsen et al (2012) have pointed out, supervisors have a responsibility to ensure that graduate teaching assistants are fairly informed and recruited, adequately prepared and are supported to undertake teaching duties and that they are fully informed about the content methods, time commitment, responsibility, and sources of support. **Again, you might provide a brief case study of how you have supported a doctoral candidate in their teaching work.**

Often, candidates embark upon the doctorate in the expectation of an academic career, and one obvious source of information is their supervisor. However, studies (see Austin 2002, 2011, Campbell et al 2005, Austin and McDaniels 2006) have found that their supervisors tended to assume that doctoral candidates either arrived with an understanding of what

academic work involves or would acquire one by a process of osmosis during their studies. Good practice is then for supervisors to least be prepared to discuss what is involved in a career post-doctorate, including research, teaching and supporting learning, academic administration, public service, and entrepreneurial activity. Following Pitt and Mewburn (2016), **one way of evidencing this would be if you discuss with candidates the key selection criteria in advertisements for post-doctoral and academic posts in your field. Alternatively you may have provided mentoring sessions about the role and responsibilities, opportunities and restrictions of postdoc life.**

Doctoral candidates go on to secure and excel in a wide variety of careers - both within and beyond academia (see Hancock 2014, Hancock et al 2015, McAlpine and Emmioglu 2015, Kweik 2019). While, unless they have worked outside universities, supervisors may be unable to directly advise candidates seeking positions beyond the academy, they can support them to acquire the universal or transferable skills that are necessary to enable them to compete and succeed in a range of careers. **You may evidence this through conducting development needs analyses, identifying ways to gain new insight, skills or experiences, or through brokering introductions to contacts in your professional network, who are employed beyond academia and encouraging candidates to spend time exploring a variety of career avenues.**

8 Supporting Candidates Through Completion and Final Examination

This **criterion is not required** in the Recognised Associate Supervisor programme.

Elective Criterion

9 Supporting Candidates to Disseminate Their Research

Giving that completing a doctorate involves making an original contribution to knowledge and understanding, it is vital that the outcomes are made available to the disciplinary and/or professional community for scrutiny and the advancement of research in the subject. One responsibility of supervisors is to support candidates to disseminate their research findings.

Typical Examples

- Setting expectations at the start of the candidacy.
- Modelling the process of publication.
- Encouraging candidates to publish as they go.
- Co-publishing.
- Establishing a post-doctoral publications plan.

Literature and Evidence

In some countries prior publication is a condition of the award of the doctorate but in other cases it is not mandatory or undertaken voluntarily with the result that many theses and dissertations are left, to quote a supervisors cited by Walker et al (2008: 79) '…like John Brown [to] lie mouldering in their literary graves'.

Failure to publish often reflects, as Kamler (2008: 284) has put it that '…for the most part, doctoral candidates appear to be left to their own devices to sort out how to publish their research…with poor results'. Many are daunted by the mechanics of publication in terms of identifying key journals and preparing appropriate submissions (see Cuthbert and Spark 2008, Lei and Hu 2015) and are discouraged from sending in papers. But even those who negotiate these hurdles often send in papers which are unsuitable for publication (see Paré 2010).

One way of encouraging publication is for supervisors to indicate to candidates in the transition processes right at the start of their studies that they will be expected to produce papers, what peppers are, how publishing works, and identify key journals. Another way is for supervisors to model the process by, for example, through showing candidates how they themselves went about publishing a key paper, including targeting an outlet, understanding the scope, responding to the requirements, and where appropriate taking on board the comments of referees prior to final publication. **Here, you could provide a short case study as evidence of how you support candidates to gain knowledge of publishing, making the invisible processes and timelines of publishing more explicit**.

Candidates may also be encouraged to publish as they go. i.e. write up their research as journal articles and submit them during candidature. This can have disadvantages (see Paré 2010) but can enable rapid dissemination and provide convincing evidence of publishability to examiners. **You may be able to provide evidence of supporting candidates to publish thor work during their studies**.

As several studies (see Kamler 2008, Can and Walker 2011, and Jiang et al 2015) have suggested, perhaps the most effective way of assisting candidates to publish is for supervisors to write a joint paper with them for publication and take them through all of the stages from initial conception through to the appearance of the paper in print or electronic form. **You may be able to provide a case study of a joint paper**.

A final possibility, particularly if no publications have resulted during the period of doctoral study, supervisors may support their candidates to devise a publications plan, setting out what they intend to publish, which outlets might be appropriate, and a timescale for submission. They may also have supported 'pre-publishing' writing development work (writing 'towards' publication) such as encouraging peer writing groups, less formal scholarly writing opportunities such as blogging, or critical analysis of literature with view to understanding how publications are constructed. **Evidence might include an example of a plan you have created with a candidate. Or of supporting the development of writing *towards* publication.**

Core Criterion

10 Reflecting Upon and Enhancing Practice

If supervisors are to improve their practice, they need to evaluate it, reflect upon it, determine their strengths and weaknesses, build upon the former and address the latter.

As with other areas of academic practice, supervisors should undertake appropriate professional development to enhance their practice, which may include networks, mentoring, peer-conversations, workshops and programmes as well as familiarity with the scholarly literature and its implications for practice.

Where supervisors identify good practice, then wherever possible they should disseminate it for the benefit of others.

Typical Examples

- Using an appropriate mix of methods for evaluating supervision.
- Undertaking initial and continuing professional development.
- Familiarity with the scholarly literature.
- Where appropriate, contributing to the professional development of other supervisors.

Literature and Evidence

As Taylor et al (2018) have suggested, supervisors can self-evaluate their supervision by, e.g. after each supervision meeting, or learning encounter with a candidate, by spending a few

minutes completing a simple reflection on 'what went well?', 'what went less well?' and 'what will I do differently next time?' and/or by keeping a reflective diary or notebook.

Peer observation is a familiar part of staff development in taught programmes, and it is equally applicable to the teaching that occurs within doctoral ones (see for example Goode 2010, Hill 2011). It is a requirement of the Recognised Associate Supervisor award that you engage with and reflect on your observation of a supervision, led by a colleague who is part of a formal supervision team. **Your evidence here will include your completed Supervision Observation Template, and an expanded reflection on your learning from this and how you will apply it to your future practice.**

It can be problematic to use individual questionnaires to seek feedback from doctoral researchers as the latter can be identified and may be unwilling to be critical of their supervisors. But a general discussion of how the doctoral researcher feels about the quality of supervision, possibly based upon list of topics such as that developed by Lee and McKenzie (2011) can support relationship building as well as supervisor development. This open and developmental conversation is often easier to accomplish for an informal or associate supervisor, who is a near-peer, than it is for the supervisory team who are seen as figures of authority. **Your evidence here might include 'field notes', self-evaluation, critical reflection, or candidate feedback.**

Nearly all institutions now have initial professional development programmes for supervisors (though we acknowledge that these may not always be accessible to all staff), and many have 'refreshers' for established supervisors (see Taylor 2018). **As evidence of development, you might cite examples of workshops that you have attended. Be careful to also also include what you learned, and how this has influenced your practice to complete the reflection**. Also, there is now a substantial scholarly literature on the practice of research supervision, and **you could give examples of how published studies have influenced your practice**.

References

Aitchison, C. (2010)

Writing groups for doctoral education.

Studies in Higher Education , 34(8): 905-16.

Aitchison, C. and Mowbray, S. (2013)

Doctoral women: managing emotions, managing doctoral studies.

Teaching in Higher Education, 18(8): 859-70.

Allpress, B., Barnacle, R., Duxbury, L. and Grierson, E. (2012)

Supervising Practice- led Research by Project in Art, Creative Writing, Architecture and Design.

In B. Allpress, R. Barnacle, L. Duxbury, L. and E. Grierson (eds) Supervisory Practice for Postgraduate Research in Art, Architecture and Design. Rotterdam, Sense: 1-14.

Austin, A. (2002).

Preparing the Next Generation of Faculty: Graduate School as Socialisation to the Academic Career.

The Journal of Higher Education 73(1): 94-122.

Austin, A. (2011)

Preparing Doctoral Students for Promising Careers in a Changing Context: Implications for Supervision, Institutional Planning, and Cross-Institutional Opportunities.

In V.Kumar and A. Lee (eds.) Doctoral Education in International Context: Connecting Local, Regional and Global Perspectives. Malaysia, Universiti Putra Malaysia Press: 1-18.

Austin, A. and McDaniels, M. (2006)

Using Doctoral Education to Prepare Faculty to Work Within Boyer's Four Domains of Scholarship.

New Directions in Institutional Research, 129: 51-65.

Bair, C.R. and Haworth, J.G. (2004)

Doctoral Student Attrition and Persistence: A Meta-Synthesis of Research.

In J.C.Smart (ed.) Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research X1X. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 481-533.

Barry, K., Woods, M., Warnecke, E., Sirling C., and Martin, A. (2018)

Psychological health of doctoral candidates: study-related challenges and perceived performance.

Higher Education Research and Development, DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2018.1425979.

Benmore, A. (2014)

Boundary management in doctoral supervision: how supervisors negotiate roles and role transitions through the supervisory journey.

Studies in Higher Education, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2014.967203.

Bernstein, B., Evans, B, Fyffe, J., Halai, N., Hall, F., Jensen, H.-S., Marsh, H. and Ortega, S., (2014)

The Continuing Evolution of the Research Doctorate.

In M. Nerad and B. Evans (eds.) Globalization and Its Impacts on the Quality of PhD Education. Rotterdam, Sense: 5-30.

Bitchener, J. (2018)

The relationship between reading, thinking and writing: the literature review component of a doctoral confirmation proposal.

In S. Carter and D. Laurs (eds/) Developing Research Writing. London, Routledge: 9-16.

Boehe, D. (2014)

Supervisory styles: a contingency framework.

Studies in Higher Education, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2014.927853.

Brown, G. and Atkins, M. (1988)

Effective Teaching in Higher Education.

London, Methuen.

Bui, T. (2014)

Student-Supervisor Expectations in the Doctoral Supervision Process for Business and Management Students.

Business and Management Education in Higher Education, 1: 12-27.

Can, G. and Walker, A. (2011)

A Model for Doctoral Students' Perceptions and Attitudes Towards Written Feedback for Academic Writing.

Research Higher Education (52): 508-536.

Campbell, S.P., Fuller, A.K., Patrick, D.A.G. (2005)

Looking beyond research in doctoral education.

Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 3(3): 153-60.

Carter, S. (2008)

Examining the doctoral thesis: a discussion.

Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 45(4): 365-74.

Carter, S. (2011)

English as an additional language (EAL) viva voce. The EAL doctoral oral examination experience.

Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 37(3): 273-84.

Carter, S. and Kumar, V. (2016)

'Ignoring me is part of learning': Supervisory feedback on doctoral writing.

Innovations in Education and Teaching International, http://dx.doi.org.10.1080/14703297.2015.1123104.

Carter, S., Kensington-Miller, B. and Courtney, M. (2017)

Doctoral Supervision Practice: What's the Problem and How Can We Help Academics?'

Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice, 5(1): 13-22.

Chown, M, Bearson, L., Martin, N. and Ellis, S. (2015)

Examining intellectual ability not social prowess: removing barriers from the doctoral viva for autistic candidates.

Autism Policy and Practice, 2: 1-14.

Collins, B. (2015)

Reflections on doctoral supervision: drawing from the experiences of students with additional learning needs in two universities.

Teaching in Higher Education, 20(6): 587-600.

Cohen, S.M. (2011)

Doctoral Persistence and Doctoral Program Completion Among Nurses.

Nursing Forum, 46(2): 64-70.

Cryer, P. (2006)

The Research Student's Guide to Success. 2nd ed.

Buckingham: Open University Press.

Cuthbert, D. and Spark, C. (2008)

Getting a GriP: examining the outcomes of a pilot programme to support graduate research students in writing for publication.

Studies in Higher Education, 33:1, 77-86.

Cuthbert, D. and Molla, T. (2014)

PhD crisis discourse: a critical approach to the framing of the problem and some Australian 'solutions'. *Higher Education*. framing of the problem and some Australian 'solutions'.

Higher Education, 69(1): 33-53.

Dann, S. (2008)

Applying services marketing principles to postgraduate supervision.

Quality Assurance in Education, 16(4): 333-46.

Davis, G. (2004)

Advising and Supervising Doctoral Students: Lessons I have Learned.

Available on-line at http://misrc.umn.edu/workingpapers/fullpapers/2004/0412_052404.pdf

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P., and Parry, O. (2000)

The Doctoral Experience: Success and Failure in Graduate School.

London: Falmer.

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P., and Parry, O. (2004)

2nd ed. Supervising the PhD: A Guide to Success.

Buckingham, Open University Press and Society for Research into Higher Education.

Deuchar, R. (2008)

Facilitator, director, or critical friend? contradiction or congruence in doctoral supervision styles.

Teaching in Higher Education, 13:4, 489-500.

Donelan, H. (2016)

Social media for professional development and networking opportunities in academia.

Journal of Further and Higher Education, 40(5): 706-729.

Doyle, S., Manathunga, C., Prinsen, G., Rallon, R. and Cornforth, S. (2017)

African international doctoral students: Englishes, doctoral writing, and intercultural supervision.

Higher Education Research and Development DOI: 10.1080.07294360.2017.1339182.

Duxbury, L. (2012)

Opening the Door: Portals to Good Supervision of Creative Practice-led Research.

Allpress, R., Barnacle, L. Duxbury, L. and E. Grierson (eds) Supervisory Practice for Postgraduate Research in Art, Architecture and Design. Rotterdam, Sense 15-23

Eley, A. and Murray, R. (2009)

How to be an Effective Supervisor.

London. Open University Press.

Fillery-Travis, A, Maguire, K., Pizzolatti, N., Robinson, L., Lowley, A. Stel, N., Mans, P, van Wijk, J., Prodi, E., Sprerotti, F., Dobrinnski, C., Peacock, J., Taylor, R., Vitale, T. (2017)

A handbook for supervisors of modern doctoral candidates. SuperProfDoc.

Available on-line at http://superprofdoc.eu/?page_id=71

Gaffney-Rhys, R. and Jones, J. (2010)

Issues surrounding the introduction of formal student contracts.

Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 35(6): 711-725.

Gardner, S. (2008)

"What's too much and what's too little": The Process of Becoming an Independent Researcher in Doctoral Education.

Journal of Higher Education, 79(3): 326-350.

Gardner, S. (2009a)

The Development of Doctoral Students: Phases of Challenge and Support.

Josey-Bass, San Franciso CA.

Gardner, S.K. (2009b)

Coming out of the Sexual Harassment Closet: One Woman's Story of Politics and Change in Higher Education.

National Womens' Studies Association Journal, 21(2): 172-95.

Gardner, S. (2013)

The Challenges of First-Generation Doctoral Students.

New Directions for Higher Education, 163: 43-54.

Gardner, S. and Holley, K. (2011)

"Those invisible barriers are real": The Progression of First-Generation Students Through Doctoral Education.

Equity and Excellence in Education, 44(1): 77-92.

Gatfield, T. (2005)

An Investigation into PhD Supervisory Management Styles: Development of a dynamic conceptual model and its managerial implications.

Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 27(3): 311-25.

Garcia-Perez, A. and Ayres, R. (2012)

Modelling research: a collaborative approach to helping PhD students develop higher-level research skills.

European Journal of Engineering Education, 37(3): 297-306.

Gilbar, O., Winstok, Z., Weinberg, M., and Bershtling, O. (2013)

Whose Doctorate Is It Anyway? Guidelines for an Agreement Between Adviser and Doctoral Student Regarding the Advisement Process and Intellectual Property Rights.

Journal of Academic Ethics, 11: 73-80.

Goode, J. (2007)

Empowering or disempowering the international PhD student? Constructions of the dependent and independent learner.

British Journal of Sociology of Education, 28(5): 589-603.

Guerin, C. and Green, I. (2015)

'They're the bosses': feedback in team supervision.

Journal of Further and Higher Education, 39(3): 320-335.

Grant, B. (2005)

Fighting for space in supervision: fantasies, fairytales, fictions and fallacies.

International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18(3): 337-54.

Grant, K., Hackney, R. and Edgar, D. (2014)

Postgraduate Research Supervision. An 'Agreed' Conceptual View of Good Practice through Derived Metaphors.

International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 9: 43-60.

Green, P. and Bowden, J. (2012)

Completion mindsets and contexts in doctoral supervision.

Quality Assurance in Education, 20(1): 66-80.

Grossman, E. and Crowther, N. (2015)

Co-supervision in postgraduate training. Ensuring the right hand knows what the left hand is doing.

South African Journal of Science, 111(11-12). Available on line at http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2015/20140305

Gunnarsson, R, Jonasson, G. and Billhult, A. (2013)

The experience of disagreement between students and supervisors in PhD education: a qualitative study.

BMC Medical Education, 13: 134

Gurr, G. (2001)

Negotiating the "Rackety Bridge" - a Dynamic Model for Aligning Supervisory Style with Research Student Development.

Higher Education Research and Development, 20(1): 81-92.

Halse, C. and Bansel, P. (2012)

The learning alliance: ethics in doctoral supervision.

Oxford Review of Education, 38(4): 377-92.

Hancock, S. (2014)

Science in action: doctoral scientists and identity construction.

Paper presented to the Society for Research into Higher Education Annual Conference, 10th December. Celtic Manner, Newport. Available on-line at www.srhe.ac.uk/conference2014/abstracts/0122.pdf. Accessed 7th January 2016.

Hancock, S., Hughes, G. and Walsh, E. (2015)

Purist or pragmatist? UK doctoral scientists' moral positions on the knowledge economy.

Studies in Higher Education. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.1087994.

Harrison, N., Trudgett, M. and Page, S. (2011)

The dissertation examination: identifying critical factors in the success of indifenous Australian doctoral students.

Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 42(1): 115-127.

Holbrook, A., Shaw, K., Scevak, J., Bourke, S., Cantwell. R. and Budd, J. (2014)

PhD Candidate Expectations: Exploring Mismatch with Experience.

International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 9: 329-346.

Hopwood, N., Alexander, P., Harris-Huemmert, S., McAlpine, L. and Wagstaff, S. (2011)

The Hidden Realities of Life as a Doctoral Student.

In V.Kumar and A. Lee (eds.) Doctoral Education in International Context: Connecting Local, Regional and Global Perspectives. Malaysia, Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.

James, R. and Baldwin, G. (1999)

Eleven Practices of Effective Supervisors.

Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education and the School of Graduate Studies, University of Melbourne.

Jepsen, D., Verhagyi, M. and Edwards, D. (2012)

Academics attitudes towards PhD students' teaching: preparing research higher degree students for an academic career.

Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34(6): 629-45.

Jiang, X., Borg, E. and Borg, M. (2015)

Challenges and coping strategies for international publication: perceptions of young scholars in China.

Studies in Higher Education, DOI: 10.1080/03075079:2015.1049144.

Jindal-Snape, D. and Ingram., R. (2013)

Understanding and Supporting Triple Transitions of International Doctoral Students: ELT and SuReCom models.

Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice, 1(1): 17-24.

Joyner, R. (2003)

The selection of external examiners for research degrees.

Quality in Higher Education, 11(2): 123-27.

Kamler, B. (2008)

Rethinking doctoral publication practices: writing from and beyond the thesis.

Studies in Higher Education, 33(3): 283-94.

Kamler, B. and Thompson, P. (2006)
Helping Doctoral Students Write: Pedagogies for supervision.
Routledge, London.

Kearns, H. (2015)
Imposter Syndrome: Why successful people often feel like frauds.
Flinders, Thinkwell.

Kearns, H. and Finn, J. (2017)
Supervising PhD Students: A practical guide and toolkit.
Flinders, Adelaide: Thinkwell.

Kelly, F. (2009)
Supervision Satirized: Fictional narratives to student supervisor relationships.
Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 8(3): 368-84.

Kiley, M. (2009)
Identifying threshold concepts and proposing strategies to support doctoral candidates.
Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 46(3): 293-304.

Kiley, M. (2009)
'You don't want a smart Alec': selecting examiners to assess doctoral dissertations.
Studies in Higher Education, 34(8): 889-903.

Kiley, M. (2011)
Government Policy and Research Degree Higher Education.
Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management 33(6): 629-40.

Kiley, M (2015a)
Possible issues to discuss with co-supervisors.
Available on-line at http://margaretkiley.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Issues-to-discuss.pdf.

Kiley, M. (2015b)
'I didn't have a clue what they were talking about': PhD candidates and theory.
Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 52(1): 52-63.

Kiley, M. and Mullins, G. (2004)
Examining the examiners: how inexperienced examiners approach the assessment of research theses.
International Journal of Educational Research, 41(2): 121-35.

Kiley, M. and Wisker, G. (2009)
Threshold concepts in research education and evidence of threshold crossing.
Higher Education Research and Development, 28(4): 431-441.

Kweik, M.
Changing European Academics.
London, Routledge and Society for Research into Higher Education.

Lee, A. and Murray, R. (2013)

Supervising writing: helping postgraduate students develop as researchers.

Innovations in Education and Teaching International. 52(5): 558-70.

Lee, A. and McKenzie, J. (2011)

Evaluating doctoral supervision: tensions in eliciting students' perspectives.

Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 48(1): 69-78.

Lei, J. and Hu, G. (2015)

Apprenticeship in Scholarly Publishing: A Student Perspective on Doctoral Supervisors' Roles.

Publications 3: 27-42; doi:103390/publications3010027.

Lindsay, S. (2015)

What works for doctoral students in completing their thesis?

Teaching in Higher Education, 20(2): 183-96.

Lovitts, B.E. (2001)

Leaving the Ivory Tower.

London, Rowman and Littlefield.

Lovitts, B.E. (2005)

Being a good course taker is not enough: a theoretical perspective on the transition to independent research.

Studies in Higher Education, 30 (2): 137-54

Lovitts, B.E. (2008)

The Transition to Independent Research: Who Makes It, Who Doesn't and Why.

The Journal of Higher Education, 79(3): 296-325.

Magyar, A. and Robinson-Pant, A. (2011)

Special issue on university internationalisation – towards transformative change in higher education. Internationalising doctoral research: developing theoretical perspectives on practice.

Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 17(6): 663-76.

Malfoy, J. (2011)

The impact of university-industry research on doctoral programmes and practices.

Studies in Higher Education, 36(5): 571-84.

Malfoy, J. and Webb, C. (2000)

Congruent and incongruent views of postgraduate supervision.

In M. Kiley & G. Mullins (eds.), Quality in Postgraduate Research: Making Ends Meet. Adelaide: Advisory Centre for University Education, the University of Adelaide.

Manathunga. C. (2014)

Intercultural Postgraduate Supervision: Reimagining Time, Place and Knowledge.

London, Routledge.

Margrove, K., Gustowska, M. And Grove, L. (2014)

Provision of support for psychological distress by university staff, and receptiveness to mental health training.

Journal of Further and Higher Education, 38(1): 90-106.

Mason, S. (2018)

Publications in the doctoral thesis: challenges for doctoral candidates, supervisors, examiners and administrators.

Higher Education Research and Development, DO1 10.1080.07294360.2018.1462307.

Mason, S. and Merga, M. (2018)

Integrating publications in the social science doctoral thesis by publication.

Higher Education Research and Development. DOI 10.1080/07294360.2018.1498641.

McAlpine, L. (2013)

Doctoral supervision: Not an individual but a collective institutional responsibility.

Journal for the Study of Education and Development, 36(3): 259-80.

McAlpine, L. (2017)

Building on Success? Future challenges for doctoral education globally.

Studies in Graduate and Postdoctoral Education, 8(2): 66-77.

McAlpine, L. and Amudsen, C. (2012)

Challenging the taken-for-granted: how research analysis might inform pedagogical practices and institutional policies relating to doctoral education.

Studies in Higher Education, 37(6): 683-694.

McAlpine, L. and Emmioglu, E. (2015)

Navigating careers: perceptions of sciences doctoral students, post-PhD researchers and pre-tenure academics.

Studies in Higher Education, 40(10): 1770-1785.

McAlpine, L., Paulson, J., Gonslaves, A. and Jazvac-Martek (2012)

'Untold' doctoral stories: can we move beyond cultural narratives of neglect?

Higher Education Research and Development, 31(4): 511-23.

McClure, J.W. (2007)

International graduates' cross-cultural adjustment;experiences, coping strategies, and suggested programmatic responses.

Teaching in Higher Education, 12(2); 199-217.

McCulloch, A. and Thomas, L, (2012)

Widening participation to doctoral education and research degrees: a research agenda for an emerging policy area.

Higher Education Research and Development, 32(2): 214-227.

Mewburn, I., Tokareva, E. Cuthbert, D. Sinclair, J. And Barnacle, R. (2013)

'These are issues that should not be raised in black and white': the culture of progress reporting and the doctorate.

Higher Education Research and Development. DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2013.841649

Mewburn, I Cuthbert, D.,and Tokareva, E. (2014)

Experiencing the progress report: an analysis of gender and administration in doctoral candidature.

Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36(2): 155-71.

Meyer, J., Shanahan, M. and Laugksch, R. (2005)

Students' Conceptions of Research: A qualitative and quantitative analysis.

Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 49(3): 225-244.

Meyer, J., Shanahan, M. and Laugksch, R. (2007)

Students' Conceptions of Research: An exploration of contrasting patterns of variation.

Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 51(4): 415-33.

Minocha, S. and Petre, M. (2012)

Handbook of Social Media for researchers and supervisors. Vitae and the Open University.

Available on-line at https://www.vitae.ac.uk/vitae-publications/reports/innovate-open-university-social-media-handbook-vitae-2012.pdf

Murphy, N., Bain, J.D., Conrad, L. (2007)

Orientations to research higher degree supervision.

Higher Education, 53(2): 209-234.

Muzaka, V. (2009)

The niche of Graduate Teaching Assistants: perceptions and reflections.

Teaching in Higher Education, 14(1): 1-12.

Neville, B. (2008)

Creating a research community.

Qualitative Research Journal, 8(1): 37-46.

Neumann, R. (2005)

Doctoral Differences: Professional doctorates and PhDs compared.

Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 27(2): 173-88

Odena, O. and Burgess, H. (2015)

How doctoral students and graduates describe facilitating experiences and strategies for their thesis writing learning process: a qualitative approach.

Studies in Higher Education. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1063598.

Offerman, M. (2011)

Profile of the Nontraditional Doctoral Degree Student.

New Directions in Adult and Continuing Education, 129: 21-30.

Okahana, H., Feaster, K. and Allum, J. (1016)

Graduate Enrolment and Degrees 2005-15.

Washington DC, Council of Graduate Schools.

Ostrove, J, Stewart, A. and Curtin, N. (2011)

Social Class and Belonging: Implications for Graduate Students.

The Journal of Higher Education, 82(6): 748-774.

Paré, A. (2010)

Slow the presses: concerns about premature publication.

In C. Aitchison, B. Kamler and A. Lee (eds.) Publishing Pedagogies for the Doctorate and Beyond. London, Routledge: 30-46.

Parker-Jenkins, M. (2018)

Mnid the gap: developing the roles, expectations and boundaries in the doctoral supervisor-supervisee relationship.

Studies in Higher Education, 43(1): 57-71.

Pearson, M. and Brew, A. (2002)

Research Training and Supervision Development.

Studies in Higher Education, 27(2): 138-43.

Pells, R. (2018)

Millions in public funding award to UK PhD applicants without interview.

Times Higher Education, 3rd May: 8.

Petersen, E. (2014)

Re-signifying subjectivity? A narrative exploration of 'non-traditional' doctoral students' lived experience of subject formation through two Australian cases.

Studies in Higher Education, 39(5): 823-834.

Phillips, E. and Pugh, D. (2010)

How to Get a PhD. 5th edn.

Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pitt, R. and Mewburn, I. (2016)

Academic superheroes? A critical analysis of academic job descriptions.

Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 38(1): 88-101.

Research Information Network (2011)

The role of research supervisors in information literacy.

London, Research Information Network (book)

Sambrook, S. (2016)

Managing the Psychological Contract within Doctoral Supervisory Relationships.

In P. Blessinger and D. Stockley (eds.) Emerging Directions in Doctoral Education (Innovations in Higher Education Learning and Teaching, Volume 6). Bingley, UK: Emerald: 61-87.

Shen, W-Q., Liu, D. and Chen, H. (2017)

Chinese PhD students on exchange in European Union Countries: experiences and benefits.

European Journal of Higher Education, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2017.1290885.

Taylor, S. and Beasley, N. (2005)

A Handbook for Doctoral Supervisors.

London, Routledge.

Taylor, S. (2016)

UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) Dimensions of the Framework for Doctoral Supervisors. Higher Education Academy.

Available on-line at https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/ukpsf_dof_doctoral_supervisors_150416_final_0.pdf

Taylor, S. (2018)

The Research Supervisor's Bibliography. UK Council for Graduate Education.

Available on-line at http://www.ukcge.ac.uk/Resources/publications.aspx

Taylor, S., Kiley M. and Humphrey, R. (2018)

A Handbook for Doctoral Supervisors. 2nd Ed.

London, Routledge.

Taylor, S, and McCulloch. A. (2017)

Mapping the landscape of awards for research supervision: A comparison of Australia and the UK.

Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 54(6): 601-614.

Thein, A. and Beach, R. (2010)

Mentoring doctoral students towards publication within scholarly communities of practice. In C. Aitchison, B. Kamler and A. Lee (eds.)

Publishing Pedagogies for the Doctorate and Beyond. London, Routledge: 117-136.

Trafford, V. and Lesham, S. (2009)

Doctorateness as a threshold concept.

Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 46(3): 305-16.

UNESCO (2015)

Science Report: Towards 2030. Paris, UNESCO.

Available on-line at http://en.unesco.org/node/252168

Vehvilainen, S. and Lofstrom, E. (2014)

'I wish I had a crystal ball': discourses and potential for developing academic supervising.

Studies in Higher Education, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2014.942272.

Wadesango, N. and Machingambi, S. (2011)

Post Graduate Students' Experiences with Research Supervisors.

Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology, 2(1): 31-37.

Wakeling, P. and Hampden-Thomson, G. (2013)

Transition to higher degrees across the UK: an analysis of national, institutional and individual differences.

Higher Education Academy. Available on-line at https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/Research/Postgraduate_transition

Walker, G., Golde, C., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. and Hutchings, P. (2008)

The Formation of Scholars: Rethinking Doctoral Education for the Twenty-First Century.

San Francisco, Josey-Bass. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Wang, T. and Li, L. (2011)

'Tell me what to do vs. 'guide me through it' Feedback experiences of international doctoral students.

Active Learning in Higher Education, 12: 101-112.

Watts, J. (2011)

Preparing doctoral candidates for the viva: issues for students and supervisors.

Journal of Further and Higher Education, 36(3): 371-81.

Wegener, C., Meier, N. and Ingerslev, K. (2016)

Borrowing brainpower – sharing insecurities. Lessons learned from a doctoral peer writing group.

Studies in Higher Education, 41(6): 1092-1105.

Wellington, J. (2010a)

More than a matter of cognition: an exploration of affective writing problems of postgraduate students and their possible solutions.

Teaching in Higher Education, 15(2): 135-50.

Wellington, J. (2010b)

Supporting students' preparation for their viva: their pre-conceptions and implications for practice.

Teaching in Higher Education, 15(1): 71-84.

Whitelock, D., Faulkner, D and Miell, D. (2008)

Promoting creativity in PhD supervision: Tensions and dilemmas.

Thinking Skills and Creativity, 3(2): 143-153.

Winchester-Seeto, T., Homewood, J., Thogersen, J., Jacenyik-Trawoger, C.Manathunga, C., Reid, A. and Holbrook, A. (2014)

Doctoral supervision in a cross-cultural context: issues affecting supervisors and candidates.

Higher Education Research and Development, 33(5): 620-626.

Wright, A., Murray, J.P., and Geale, P. (2007)

A phenomenographic study of what it means to supervise doctoral students.

Academy of Management Learning and Education, 6 (4): 458-74.

Wakeling, P. and Kyriacou, C. (2010)

Widening Participation from Undergraduate to Postgraduate Research Degrees: A Research Synthesis.

National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement and Economic and Social Research Council. York, University of York.

About the UKCGE

Established in 1994, the UK Council for Graduate Education is the national representative body for postgraduate education and research. The UKCGE champions and enhances postgraduate education and research by enabling collective leadership across UK HEIs, research agencies and funding bodies.

It has a specific remit to support research supervision: for example, in 2017 it launched the first ever national award for excellence in research supervision; and in 2021 it undertook the *UK Research Supervision Survey*, funded by UKRI and the Wellcome Trust.

The UKCGE publishes the *Good Supervisory Practice Framework*, the *Research Supervisor's Bibliography* and runs the UK's *Research Supervision Recognition Programme*.

www.ukcge.ac.uk

Tel: 01543 308602

Email: ukcge@ukcge.ac.uk

UK Council for
Graduate Education

UK Council for Graduate Education
Lichfield Centre
The Friary
Lichfield
Staffordshire
WS13 6QG
UK

supervision.ukcge.ac.uk

Tel: 01543 308602

Email: ukcge@ukcge.ac.uk

Registered Charity No. 1061495