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Available on-line at [http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/newsletters#1](http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/newsletters#1)
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### Research Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment</td>
<td>Dr Markus Riegler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Culture and Society (ICS)</td>
<td>A/Prof Greg Noble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MARCS Institute</td>
<td>Prof Cathi Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute in Infrastructure Engineering</td>
<td>A/Prof Sergiy Kharkisvkiy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>A/Prof Terry Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics</td>
<td>Prof Wei Zheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>Dr David Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Humanities and Communication Arts</td>
<td>A/Prof Hart Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>Prof Michael Head (Jan-June); Prof Steven Freeland (July-Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>Dr David Mahns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>Prof Esther Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science and Health</td>
<td>Dr Graham Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Sciences and Psychology</td>
<td>A/Prof Michael Darcy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The HDR Director is the relevant Director (e.g. Director, HDR or Director, Research and HDR) as determined by the Dean, or an equivalent role as determined by the Institute Director.
All candidates at UWS have a supervisory panel of at least two supervisors. Many panels have three or more members, depending on the discipline and topic. The term “panel” is used to indicate that there is more than one supervisor. It is not a reflection of how the relationship works.

Why Panels?

Panels;
» provide a backup in case the principal supervisor is absent for any reason
» introduce additional expertise,
» mentor new supervisors in a co-supervisory role
» provide an opportunity to involve international colleagues and link candidates to international centres
» are used to involve experts who are external to the university (benefit to them is co-authoring and other collaborations)
» create opportunities for academic staff in an environment of limited admissions of research candidates.

There is no single panel model. It depends on the candidate, the topic and discipline. Some onshore overseas candidates are supervised using a cohort model. It is not unusual for panels to change during the development of a candidature.

Co-supervision is part of academic workload. The candidate record system can register any combination of percentage of time amongst the panel. However, unless otherwise specified by the School or Institute, the default allocation of load is 60/40 for a panel of two and 50/25/25 for a panel of three.

Changes can be made to allocation, as well as to membership, using: Vary Research Candidature/Scholarship form

Related Policy; Supervision of Research Candidates Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UWS Panel Composition 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 academic supervisors = 1 candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 academic supervisors = 20 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 academic supervisors = 185 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% of candidates have a panel of 3 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 academic supervisors = 592 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74% of candidates had a panel of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision at UWS
The principal supervisor must be a permanent or fixed term employee of UWS, hold current registration on the Graduate Supervisors Register and qualify on the UWS Register of Research Activity. If a fixed term employee, it must be for the duration of the candidature.

**Responsibilities of the Principal Supervisor**

**Extract From Supervision of Research Candidates Policy**

The Principal Supervisor is responsible for making recommendations on proposed changes to candidature. These include:

- Changes to thesis title
- Supervisory panel membership
- Mode of enrolment (full or part-time)
- Leave of absence
- Early submission for examination
- Extension of scholarship
- Extension of candidature
- Application to Upgrade to doctoral studies from research masters

The principal supervisor is responsible for ensuring that progress milestones are met. These include:

- Early Candidature Plan
- Confirmation of Candidature
- Annual Progress Reports

The principal supervisor is responsible for taking action if progress of the candidate is unsatisfactory.

The principal supervisor is responsible for ensuring that Ethics applications are submitted.

The principal supervisor is responsible for ensuring that *Conflict of Interest Guidelines* are observed.

The principal supervisor is responsible for ensuring that:

- agreement is reached between the candidate and members of the supervisory panel concerning authorship of publications and acknowledgment of contributions during and after candidature. Refer to the *Research Code of Practice*.
- candidates are aware of the *Misconduct - Higher Degree Research Candidate Misconduct in Research Policy*.
- candidates are aware of University policies on intellectual property and plagiarism.

The principal supervisor is responsible for taking action for infringement by the candidate of the *Research Code of Practice*.

**Exams**

The principal supervisor is responsible for:

- discussing potential examiners with the candidate;
- arranging for the appointment of examiners;
- making initial contact with examiners;
- endorsing lodgment of the thesis;
- commenting on exam reports and make recommendation to School or Institute Research and Higher Degrees Committee and/or the Research Studies Committee on the examination outcome;
- endorsing completion of amendments; and
- approving readiness for re-examination, if applicable.
Role of the Principal Supervisor

The principal supervisor has primary obligation for oversight of the candidate’s progress and takes a leadership role in managing the panel and candidature. In addition to the responsibilities listed above the principal supervisor should consider the following matters in leading the candidature:

Establishment
- The terms of the candidature negotiated and agreed among the panel and candidate on meeting protocols
- Meeting of commitments made by the panel and candidate
- Awareness of the panel and the candidate of relevant University policies
- Candidate access to resources
- Candidate understanding of the requirements of the degree
- Awareness of academic governance and how to action processes

Assessment and Progression
- Encouraging of candidates to develop their writing early in the candidature and to access University assistance with writing, if necessary
- Provision of timely and effective feedback to the candidate on progress
- Identification with the candidate the particular research skills that need to be developed
- Identification with the candidate and panel agreed methods and timelines for assessing progress, in addition to mandatory reporting requirements
- Project management
- Mapping of the project with the panel and candidate according to a timeline
- Where appropriate, instructing the candidate to prepare a budget estimate of costs associated with the research
- Assessment of progress against the timeline, taking action to adjust the rate of progress as required
- Ensuring that scholarship timelines and conditions are observed

Resources
- Ensuring access to facilities under the Research Higher Degree Candidature Essential Resources Policy
- Discussion of library resources (encourage direct contact with the Library)
- Seeking additional expertise on the panel, if required
- Encouraging the candidate to participate in skills development programs at the University, both face to face and on-line

Dealing with Difficulties
- Seeking of advice from relevant academic leaders, for example, School or Institute Director HDR, or equivalent

Research Culture
- Inculcation of research culture and good research practice
- Encourage the candidate to publish and giving strategic advice about when and where to publish
- Providing advice on researcher safety
- Acting as a career mentor
- Encouraging candidate participation in University research culture.
Leadership

- Acting as a mentor to fellow panellists.
- Ensuring that commitments made by the panel and candidate are met.
- Assisting the candidate to identify research opportunities.

An Acting Principal Supervisor of the supervisory panel must be appointed during any significant absence of the principal supervisor, i.e. more than a month at a time, and always during periods of absence due to any approved leave.

It is never acceptable for a candidate to have their candidature disrupted by staff absences. Please see the Variation of Program for advice on changing panel membership.

Mentoring Early Career Researchers

Principal Supervisors are implicitly expected to act as mentors to other panel members, especially to staff new to supervisory roles. How will you do this? By example? Or can you plan how it might be done?

Change in Load

Over time the ratio of work load amongst panel members may change. It can be adjusted using a Vary Research Candidature/Scholarship form

Co-Supervisors

Extract from Supervision of Research Candidates Policy

- Co-supervisors are encouraged to register on the Graduate Supervisor Register.
- Co-supervisors may be non-UWS staff.
- Co-supervisors will normally hold qualifications at the level being supervised and they are expected to be experienced researchers in the field.
- A co-supervisor may be requested to act as principal supervisor during an absence of the principal supervisor.
- There must be at least one co-supervisor. However, there is no upper limit on the number of co-supervisors although the principal supervisor must ensure that whatever the composition of the panel it must be manageable.
- If there is a conflict between the candidate and the supervisory panel, the candidate may refer the matter to the relevant School or Institute HDR Director.

Graduate Supervisor Register

Principal supervisors must be registered on the Graduate Supervisor Register.

The Graduate Supervisor Register. (Excel, 110Kb) is based upon the following principles:

- Recognition and encouragement of high quality postgraduate research supervision by academic staff
- Research supervision is a subtle and complex form of teaching and the quality of higher degree graduates is related to the quality of supervision
- Supervisors and associate supervisors require ongoing support for which the University assumes responsibility.
Research Supervisors Forums are a partnership between the Teaching Development Unit, Office of Research Services and Schools and Institutes.

We use the experience and expertise of staff at UWS and encourage the sharing of supervisory experiences and best practice through case studies and group discussions. UWS supervisors and research leaders are engaged as co-presenters and guest speakers. There are also at least two forums a year with invited special guest presenters from other Australian universities or from overseas.

You may register or renew registration on the Graduate Supervisor Register by attending a Research Supervisor Forum.

Staff new to UWS can apply for registration any time by completing the on-line program Introduction to Supervision at UWS. Email your staff id to Mary Krone to get access, m.krone@uws.edu.au

UWS staff may attend supervisor programs of members of a consortium comprising of UWS, UNSW, CSU, UC, and ANU. For more information see; http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/supervision#Forums

There are special introductory sessions for very senior staff who are new to UWS, by invitation only. Please contact Mary Krone for more information, m.krone@uws.edu.au

Registration Requirements
1. Attendance at a Research Supervisors Forum
or, if you are new to UWS, Completion of the on-line module Introduction to HDR Supervisor at UWS.

Email Mary Krone, m.krone@uws.edu.au if you would like access to the on-line module.

Re-registration requires attendance at a Research Supervisors Forum once every three years.

Dates and topics of Research Supervisor Forums:
http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/supervision#Register

Check your registration renewal date:
http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/supervision#Register

2. For initial registration you must complete a Graduate Supervisor Register Application Form and send it to your School or Institute HDR Director

Categories of Registration
» Eligible for appointment as principal supervisor of all higher research degrees
» Eligible for appointment as principal supervisors of Masters Honours and co-supervisor of doctoral level degrees
Changing Details on the Graduate Supervisor Register.
For example, updating qualifications or applying to be a principal supervisor;
Use the form: Graduate Supervisor Register Application Form

To register for a forum;
» Log into Staff On-Line
   https://staffonline.uws.edu.au
» Click on the MyCareer Online link under Staff Development (it will open in a new window).
» On the MyCareer Online Home Page simply type any portion of the forum title or a keyword into the Search box in the top right hand corner and press enter.
   » Any of the following keywords will return all RSFs - RSF, research, forum, supervisor
» Click on the ‘Title’ of the forum you want to register for from the search results
» Or scroll to the last entry in the middle column “Research Development”
» Register by selecting the ‘Request’ option next to your preferred date (you may need to scroll down to see available dates)
It is a legal requirement of the university that email correspondence between staff and students be conducted using UWS email addresses.

When sending an email to a student include the following email address in the ‘cc’ or ‘bcc’ field in the email: trim@uws.edu.au

Emails must be sent from an official UWS staff email account to the official candidate email account (i.e. student_ID@student.uws.edu.au) for this to work.

Supervisors have been challenged on occasions when candidates have claimed that they did not know about requirements such as the Confirmation of Candidature. All major milestones should be recorded and Trim-ed to studentno@uws.edu.au
Questions to ask about the panel when setting up the candidature:

» What role will be taken by each supervisor?
» What will be the workload percentages?
» Will the whole panel meet, how often?
» Do you have an adequate range of expertise?
» How often will the whole panel meet?
» How will you all ensure that conflicting advice is not given to the candidate? Perhaps by asking the candidate to write up panel meeting notes and circulating them to all members?
» Often the whole panel will not be present for meetings. How will you manage this? Circulate notes again?

Ideas for Setting-up Initial Meetings

» What will be the frequency and duration?
» Will the candidate have access to me outside scheduled meeting times?
» Who has responsibility to initiate meetings, if they are not regular?
» What is the protocol when one cannot make the meeting?
» Who takes meeting notes and circulates them?
» What will be the protocol for submission and return of work?

Time Frame

» Have we mapped projected progress against time?
» How long will each stage take?
» How will we monitor time/progress?

Questions about the thesis

» Will there be a non-text component?
» Will the thesis be submitted as a series of papers?
» Are there specific course guidelines, such as those found in some Professional Doctorates?
» What is the best structure?
» What is the difference between a thesis that passes and one that is exceptional?
» Titles of good examples in a particular field?
» What is meant by originality?
» When should writing occur?
» What is expected in a literature review?
» Have we sorted out Intellectual Property (IP) issues?
» Have we talked about authorship?
Advice and Support

» Confirmation of Candidature: how much input from the supervisor, how will this proceed?
» Expectations of feedback (style, how much, how often in what form, how soon?)
» Strategies to use when comments/corrections are not understood
» Support with content, e.g., resources, contacts, how much can be expected given the supervisor’s knowledge of the area?
» What other kinds of knowledge are needed? (e.g., research process, writing skills)
» Any personal circumstances that ought to be considered? (e.g., new baby, ill health)
» Attitudes to supervisor/candidate relationship (mentor/mentee, teacher/candidate, colleagues)

University Requirements

» Do you know what milestone reporting is required in the first year and do you have a plan of approach?
» Do you know of research activities in the School or Institute this year?

Supervisor Access to Student On-line Resources

» Do you have access to the supervisor version of the Postgraduate Essentials on-line Orientation program and Completion and Beyond (for mid-late candidature)?

Check in vUWS and if you don’t have access, email m.krone@uws.edu.au

Resources

» Does the candidate have access to resources?
» Do you know about support schemes within the University: candidature support and conference scholarships etc.?
» Are there any suitable conferences this year?
Quality in Postgraduate Research (QPR)

For links to Australian research into research higher degree education; http://www.qpr.edu.au/papersdatabase.php?orderBy=title#P

A QPR Conference is held once every two years in Adelaide and it focuses on research into Australian Research Higher Degree Education. You may like to attend a conference; all people involved in research education are welcome.

fIRST; for Improving Research Supervision and Training

fIRST was created by a consortium of Australian and New Zealand universities. Their aim is to review and share existing supervision development resources and to develop new resources for the benefit of consortium members.

UWS staff can log on to fIRST at http://www.first.edu.au/index.html

Logon; uwsedu Password; uws2747nsw

Doctorates Downunder Series

Doctorates Downunder and Supervising Doctorates Downunder are a comprehensive collections of essays designed to guide current and prospective doctoral candidates and doctoral supervisors through the journey of doctoral study with an Australian perspective. UWS staff are among the contributors.

Beyond Doctorates Downunder is designed to assist graduates use their doctorates in their lives and careers. The series is available in the Library.

Two good blogs to read, or follow them on twitter;

researchwhisper Research Whisperer https://twitter.com/#!/researchwhisper

thesiswhisperer Dr Inger Mewburn https://twitter.com/#!/thesiswhisperer
Strong research culture is found where research is highly regarded and where excellence in research is valued and actively promoted. For research candidates it means working in an environment of good research practice and having the opportunity to present work and to participate in discussions about research and research practice.

Research culture events for candidate include; public seminars, publishing, presentations, brown bag lunches, research evenings, School or Institute Research Conferences, academic employment, writing groups, external conferences, professional affiliations, tea room discussions, social network groups, newsletters and workshops. Events might be organised by the School, Institute, Office of Research Services, the Library, Teaching Development Unit or external parties.

In a rich research culture excellent research practices are encouraged, recognised and rewarded.

Growing a Research Culture
Professor Andrew Cheetham, PVC, Research UWS

Abstract
Professor Cheetham was invited to address the Academic Senate on the topic of Building a Research Culture. In his address Professor Cheetham tackled the topic from a very broad consideration of what a research culture might look like and why it is important not only to the University of Western Sydney but to the higher education sector in general. Why are so many universities around the world concerned about building their research culture? Having identified what a research culture might be, some strategies and actions for the building and strengthening of our research culture at UWS are discussed.

Read Prof Cheetham’s (PVC, Research) address to UWS Academic Senate Friday 4th May 2007:

Entrants present the Three Minute Thesis as a compelling three minute oration on their thesis topic and its significance in language appropriate to an intelligent but non-specialist audience. A single PowerPoint slide is permitted but no additional electronic media. See; http://www.uq.edu.au/grad-school/three-minute-thesis

With kind permission of Jorge Cham, See “Piled Higher and Deeper” http://www.phdcomics.com/comics.php?n=1247

2012 Three Minute Thesis Competition

UWS Final - 10 August 2012 at Parramatta Campus

Trans-Tasman Final at UQ - 11 October 2012

Schools and Research Institutes will hold preliminary competitions to select their finalists before mid August.


3MT develops academic, presentation, and research communication skills and supports the development of research students’ capacity to effectively explain their research in language appropriate to an intelligent but non-specialist audience.

Research higher degree (Doctoral and Research Masters) students have three minutes to present a compelling oration on their thesis topic and its significance. 3MT is not an exercise in trivialising or ‘dumbing-down’ research but forces students to consolidate their ideas and crystallise their research discoveries.
Eligibility

Anyone who is active in a *doctoral or *M(Hons) program (including thesis under submission) will be eligible to participate in 3MT. Graduates are not eligible.

Competitors who are eligible on the date of their first presentation in their local competition shall remain so for the Australia and New Zealand Final irrespective of subsequent changes to their status (e.g. those who subsequently graduate before the date of the Australia and New Zealand final).

*Note: degree must be at least two thirds research (definition drawn from Grant Guidelines 2006 for Higher Education Support Act (HESA) 2003)

UWS Prizes

» All participants will receive a UWS Flash drive.
» First prize of $2000 plus economy airfare, one nights’ accommodation and airport transfers for the winner and one supervisor to the University of Queensland to compete in the national title.
» Runner up prize of $1000
» People’s Choice prize of $500

Trans-Tasman Prizes

» Winner: $5000 research travel grant
» Runner-up: $2000 research travel grant
» People’s Choice: $1000 research travel grant

Rules

» a single static PowerPoint slide is permitted (no slide transitions, animations or ‘movement’ of any description)
» no additional electronic media (e.g. sound and video files) are permitted
» no additional props (e.g. costumes, musical instruments, laboratory equipment) are permitted
» presentations are limited to 3 minutes maximum and competitors exceeding 3 minutes are disqualified
» the decision of the adjudicating panel is final

Judging Criteria

» Communication style: was the thesis topic and its significance communicated in language appropriate to an intelligent but non-specialist audience?
» Comprehension: did the presentation help the audience understand the research?
» Engagement: did the oration make the audience want to know more?

What students say about 3MT

The 3MT brings networking, prize money, job offers, confidence in speaking, good practice in communicating research consolidates ideas, free food and people are interested in what you have to say.

3MT develops students’ capacity to communicate ideas well to non-specialist audiences and to the wider community.

It’s a lot of fun and generates public and media interest in what researchers do. Competitors report the 3MT helped them ‘crystallize’ thoughts about their thesis and how they communicate their research.
UWS conducts a Candidate Satisfaction Survey and we are surveyed by the Australian Government in the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ). UWS scores are comparable with the sector on most indicators but across the sector the section on Research Culture is poorly rated and possibly poorly understood. The university has been paying particular attention to Research Culture in order to improve the experience of research education at UWS.

For full information see; http://staff.uws.edu.au/staff/adminorg/corpserv/opq/stats
Dr Claire Aitchison, Student Learning Unit

The importance of writing in doctoral supervision is all too often recognized only when writing becomes a problem or impediment to completion. If writing is not a valued and integral part of the research process and the progression of the research isn’t documented, the student is less able to gauge their own achievement and the supervisor is unable to monitor a candidate’s progress. In the academic world, unless and until research is made public (usually through writing), it simply doesn’t count. In this sense research is writing.

With expanded entry pathways and diverse doctoral programs we can’t expect candidates will necessarily have the pre-requisite language and writing skills for successful doctoral candidature. Acquiring the requisite language competencies is rarely automatic or trouble-free, even for those who have English as their first language and with an unbroken ‘traditional’ university experience. This may explain why Paltridge and Starfield’s book *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language: A handbook for supervisors* has been so popular with a broad range of doctoral writers.

**Warning signs**

Candidates and supervisors are busy people and it’s not uncommon that scheduled meetings or commitments to produce text may need to be renegotiated from time to time. However if a student becomes a serial deferrer, regularly cancels meetings or fails to produce agreed-upon writing, there may be serious problems. Poorer writers sometimes engage in these and other avoidance behaviours. For example, they may prefer to talk about their ideas, or maybe they’ll only produce dot point outlines, or they’ll continuously rework the structure of a piece of text … such activities often consume enormous amounts of energy, but all the while the writer is failing to progress the text at issue. Whatever the cause, habitual avoidance of writing and failure to make writing ‘normal business’, can lead to serious problems.

“Help! My student can’t write!”

Supervisors who establish a writing-focused research culture are unlikely to find themselves in this situation. Like most things; in writing - practice makes perfect (well, near perfect anyway!). In addition, when writing is a normal and routine part of research, the chance of candidates experiencing ‘performance anxiety’ and ‘writer’s block’ is minimised.

**Strategies for developing a writing-focused research culture**

A writing focused research culture is one where writing is fully integrated in the supervisory pedagogy and the research plan. When supervisory pedagogical practices foreground writing, then students engage in writing as a normal part of scholarly life. Supervisors who establish practices requiring their HDR candidates ‘write early and write often’, stand a good chance of maximising student learning and progression and of minimising unpleasant surprises, poor progress and completion delays.
Making feedback effective

For higher degree researchers, the primary mechanism by which they learn about doctoral writing is from feedback on their writing from their supervisors. It is not surprising therefore that there is an increasing interest in the purpose and impact of feedback on doctoral writing. Many of the resources listed below provide useful information about effective feedback practices. In addition the supervisor forums regularly offer workshops on this topic.

It can be useful for the supervisory panel to have common expectations of writing and to discuss these with new candidates in first meeting. Decisions about writing output, feedback responsibilities, practices for discussing and responding to feedback can be incorporated into the Early Candidature Plan. It is also a good idea to establish some protocols about writing deadlines and the kinds of things that you agree may, and may not be acceptable reasons for changing deadlines. Sometimes supervisory meetings may need to be cancelled, but this doesn’t mean writing / feedback commitments should be invalidated.

When doctoral writers and their supervisors have a shared knowledge of the piece of writing and common expectations of the purposes of sharing writing, feedback can be most productive.

Using Templates

One way of clarifying expectations is to use a template when submitting writing for feedback. Typically such templates detail the time, the history/maturity of the writing, the intended audience and purpose and the kind of feedback which is being sought. Examples of such templates, and other successful feedback practices can be found in the Doctorates Downunder series.

Writing tasks should suit particular purposes

Writing is a social activity. It is a means of communication that can take many forms depending on the socio discursive context, the purpose, the mode, the audience and the idiosyncrasies of the writer. Over the period of doctoral study, and in your relationship with your student, their writing and your response to it, should reflect the stage of candidature and the diversity of text types and purposes.

Our expectations of writing competence from new students and of early drafts will clearly differ from what is expected of near-to-final versions. Sometimes it can be helpful to discuss with students how different types of writing suit different purposes. For example early ‘thinking writing’ which aims to explore, test out and begin to articulate evolving thinking, is likely to contain grammatical or linguistic inaccuracies and its structure and punctuation may be poor. For this kind of writing, the most useful feedback will be about the ideas, rather than the writing itself.

The supervisor as writing model and mentor

As the supervisor you can be a powerful model by giving students the opportunity to see how you write and publish. For example you may show early drafts and/or invite your student to share their responses, or discuss reviewer comments on your own writing. Alternatively, you may wish to more actively mentor your student by co-authoring with them, or supporting them to undertake in-house
publishing or editing, or to by encouraging them to contribute to special editions of scholarly journals or monographs. Examples of such writing-focussed pedagogies can be found in *Publishing Pedagogies for the Doctorate and Beyond* (Aitchison, Kamler, & Lee, 2010).

**Writing groups**

Writing groups can complement the work of the supervisor in supporting and developing student writing. Writing groups help regularise and prioritise writing, they counter isolation and enable participants to establish productive, even long-term scholarly networks with other doctoral students. Writing group participants and supervisors alike have reported improved writing output, confidence and competence which flow from participating regular, guided and scholarly peer review of writing (Aitchison, 2009b).

The Office of Research Services has been offering writing groups for higher degree researchers since 2002. You may wish to encourage your student to join one of the course-length Thesis Writing Circles which are offered each year. Or middle to late stage candidates may join ongoing, multidisciplinary writing groups such as Research Writing Circle Continuers which meet fortnightly throughout the year. Claire Aitchison has written a number of accounts of writing groups for doctoral researchers which are listed below.

These writing groups and other writing-focussed workshops are facilitated by lecturers from the Student Learning Unit and offered and advertised on the Office of Research Services Web site; http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/candidate_support#1

**Writing Resources**


**Authorship**

Authorship is defined by the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and UA, ARC and NHMRC as substantial participation, where all the following conditions are met:

a) conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of data;

b) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content;

c) final approval of the version to be published.

‘Substantial participation’ is normally interpreted to mean input beyond that of:

a) providing instruction or advice;

b) granting use of laboratory space or equipment;

c) providing financial support or involvement solely in the acquisition of funding;

d) the collection of data;

e) general supervision of the research group or higher degree student.

Any part of an article critical to its main conclusion must be the responsibility of at least one author.

An author’s role in a research output must be sufficient for that person to take public responsibility for at least that part of the output in that person’s area of expertise.

No person who is an author, consistent with the definition outlined above, should be excluded as an author without his or her permission in writing.

‘Honorary authorship’ is unacceptable.

‘Honorary authorship’ is a practice in some medicine and laboratory sciences that lists a person as an author when they have not substantially participated in the research output consistent with the above.

Authorship of a research output is a matter that must be discussed between researchers at an early stage in a research project, and reviewed whenever there are changes in participation.

Where there is more than one co-author of a research output, one co-author (by agreement among the authors) should be nominated as corresponding author for that research output, and should take responsibility for record-keeping regarding the research output.

Due recognition of all participants is a part of a proper research process. Authors must ensure that the work of research students/trainees, research assistants and technical officers is properly acknowledged. Courtesy demands that funding agencies, individuals and organizations providing facilities should also be acknowledged.

In the case of higher degree students, supervisors must ensure that students are fairly treated. Agreement should be reached between the candidate and members of the supervisory panel concerning authorship.

of publications and acknowledgment of contributions during and after candidature. Unless there is a formal agreement to the contrary, students own their own intellectual property. (See Intellectual Property Policy http://policies.uws.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00085)

It will typically be the case that a student will be first author in any multiple authored article that is substantially based on the student’s own research project and unique contribution.

There should be open and mutual recognition of the candidate’s and any supervisor’s contribution on all published work arising from the project. (See Conflict of Interest Guidelines)

Candidates are told about Dr Suzanne Morris’s free on-line download Authorder for help when working out firstly who should be on the author list and secondly, in what order.

Authorder website for further information, useful links and download; http://www.authorder.com/

Facebook page for those interested in authorship matters: “Avoid authorship pitfalls with authorder®”
Supervisors should be aware of conflict of interest issues and where they feel there may be such a case they should discuss it with their HDR Director, ensure that it is openly declared and a management plan put in place, if necessary.

Extract from UWS Conflict of Interest Guidelines on Policy pages.

Conflicts of interest may occur in research candidate supervision. In addition to examples outlined in Clauses 26-29, examples of research candidate supervision-related conflicts of interest include:

a) An investigator or research candidate having a private interest in an organisation providing funding support to the research project or to the candidate, such as a grant or scholarship;

b) Participating in an activity or action overseen by a Supervisor that might impede the progress of a research candidate, for example undertaking excessive work on preparing a research grant or being employed on a Supervisor’s research project;

c) Participating in a teaching or assessment panel or committee, for example a supervisory panel or Confirmation of Candidature panel for a candidate with which there is a personal relationship;

d) Examining a thesis for a candidate with which there is a personal relationship, or where there is a personal relationship with a supervisor;

e) Situations where a personal relationship exists between two or more members of a supervisory panel. Wherever possible this should be avoided, but where this cannot be avoided, the management strategy should be discussed with and agreed to by the candidate.

You can ask the Office of Research Services or the Integrity in Research Committee for advice on potential conflicts of interest in relation to research or research supervision matters. Email Mary Krone in the first instance; m.krone@uws.edu.au

Extract From UWS Code of Research Practice:

Supervisors have a responsibility to impart knowledge of best practice research methods to research degree candidates under their supervision, guide them in acquiring research experience that conforms to the highest standards of integrity and professionalism as set out in this Code of Practice, and ensure that the conduct of their research meets relevant ethical, legislative and occupational health and safety standards, including in fieldwork.

You might also like to consider your candidates aspirations:

» How can you help them in realising their career ambitions beyond graduation?
» Will this impact on how and where they publish?
» Can you introduce them to other mentors/colleagues?
» Can you help them to think strategically about a career?
» If your candidate is from overseas can you select an examiner in their home country who might act as a mentor after graduation?
» Most graduates do not enter academia. How can you help your candidate identify the skills they have acquired for the purpose of career advancement?
» Who else in the university could help your candidate with these questions?
Candidates are encouraged to publish. It is a good idea to discuss this with your candidate early in the candidature and to think about the stage at which they should publish, the most suitable journal, whether to publish jointly and, if so, with whom. There are guidelines for joint authorship in the Research Code of Practice contained on the policy pages of UWS.

The Library runs regular training sessions which outline the tools available and searching strategies to assist with targeting potential publication outlets for your candidates research. Details can be found at http://library.uws.edu.au/training.php

The Office of Research Services and Student Learning Unit offer workshops on publishing. For more information see; http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/candidate_support/workshops
All candidates requiring Ethics and/or Biosafety approval must successfully complete a Confirmation of Candidature first. This is because the integrity and merit questions about the research are determined at the Confirmation of Candidature.

The Principal Supervisor's name is included on a candidate's Ethics application.

For information on the Human Ethics, Animal Ethics and Biosafety including requirements, application forms, meeting dates etc see; http://www.uws.edu.au/research/researchers/ethics/

**Integrity in Research Committee**

The committee provides confidential advice to both staff and students on ethical issues in research matters, including potential conflict of interest in funding and sponsorship.

**More Information**

For all matters relating to the Integrity in Research Committee please contact Dr Jane Hobson.

**Plagiarism**

Your candidate should have a comprehensive understanding of plagiarism and how to avoid it. It is the panel’s responsibility to ensure that candidates understand and comply with plagiarism policy.

Extract from *Misconduct - Higher Degree Research Candidate Misconduct in Research Policy*

Plagiarism; that is, submitting or presenting the work of another or others as if it were the candidate’s own work. In relation to research candidature plagiarism:

i) Applies to work submitted or presented at any stage during the candidature

ii) Includes any material, including drafts, submitted or presented, such as a paper, chapter or agreed piece of work required by the supervisory panel or work presented for examination.

Note that the definition applies to work presented any stage of candidature.


UWS subscribes to plagiarism prevention software. *Turnitin*, the plagiarism prevention software system, is available for research candidates from the Higher Degree Research vUWS site. Candidates can submit their research paper to *Turnitin* and receive an Originality Report which will indicate the extent of text matches to other sources.

For further information on *Turnitin* and how to use it, see UWS Library’s Turnitin webpages at http://library.uws.edu.au/turnitin.php

Candidate access to Turnitin is through the Completions and Beyond web resource for mid to late candidature. Access to given after Confirmation of Candidature.
Applications

1. Australian citizens, permanent residents and international applicants can apply at any time.
2. Link to forms, English language requirements, admission requirements. http://www.uws.edu.au/research/future_research_students/apply
3. Nominated supervisors must agree to being nominated before the admission is approved.
4. Academic Registrars Office is informed and the applicant is notified of the decision or the recommendation is sent to the International Office.
5. Any questions about admission? Contact sa-research@uws.edu.au

Selecting Candidates to Supervise

Your School or Institute will ask if you are interested. You may have already been contacted by the applicant and had some preliminary discussions.

Things to consider:

- Your workload
- The topic and whether you are really interested in it
- Are you confident that the student is well equipped and will perform well?
- Does the topic fit in well with other work you are doing?
- Have you spoken to the applicant directly?
- Have you asked them about their reasons for the topic, their motivation?
- If the applicant is overseas have you contacted them by phone? (if possible)
- The normal maximum load of research candidates is 3 eftsl. Selecting a mediocre candidate may mean an excellent one cannot be added later.
- Are you the best person in your School/Institute for this applicant?
Applying for Scholarships

6. Unlike admission, scholarship applications are date driven as scholarships must be considered in relation to one another.

7. The main round for local applicants is APA and UWSPRA, closing on October 31st of every year.

8. The main round for Internationals applicants is IPRS, closing date 31st August each year.

9. Applicants will not be ranked for a scholarship if they haven’t been approved for admission. These are two separate processes though they generally occur at the same time. For admission, UWS capacity to resource and supervise the candidature must be considered as well as the qualifications of the applicant.

http://www.uws.edu.au/research/scholarships

Transferring students

Australian Government requirements govern this process. The applicant applies as a new student, and must meet UWS admission standards. He/she will be treated as a transferring student in respect to any time already spent enrolled at the institution from which they are transferring. This time will be deducted from the available time at UWS. Staff in Academic Registrars Office will contact the other institution to verify time spent enrolled.

It is always helpful for students in this category to provide reasons for the transfer in their application and to demonstrate good progress and a timeline. Applicants can apply at any time.

Got a grant with a candidate scholarship?

Talk to Tracy Mills. Tracy is the Scholarships Officer and she has detailed guidelines and templates for recruitment of scholarship applicants. T.mills@uws.edu.au
Candidate Responsibilities

The advice below is extracted from the handbook given to commencing candidates, found at:
http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/newsletters#1

You have a responsibility to be aware of the requirements for the degree in which you are enrolled and the objectives of that degree. After initial enrolment you will be sent a copy of the current rules for your degree and if you are enrolled in a professional doctorate, additional course documents.

You are strongly encouraged to access UWS policy documents at the website:

The supervisory panel will expect that you understand:

a) The requirements for the degree in which you are enrolled and the objectives of the degree.

b) That a doctorate or research masters degree is research training with an output in the form of a thesis or major work, which measures the success of that training. It should be planned and carried out within a clear time frame. Part of the training is to be able to plan and execute a project within defined time limits. Planning the candidature; achievements and timing.

c) That the degree is undertaken under supervision. You have a responsibility to establish agreed methods of working and to fulfil your side of any agreement with the principal supervisor and other members of the supervisory panel.

d) That you must complete all compulsory reporting milestones; Early Candidature Plan, Confirmation of Candidature and Annual Progress Reports.

e) That you must provide evidence of progress to the panel at regular intervals, in addition to the formal reporting milestones mentioned in the preceding clause. You and your panel should plan together how and when material will be presented and how progress will be evaluated against the timeline.
f) That you must participate in such activities as are determined by the School or Institute Research and Higher Degrees Committee. Involvement in research culture is important for your development and candidates have much to offer the University; to supervisors, as models for other candidates and as contributors to the intellectual environment at UWS.

g) That you are responsible for ensuring that you understand and abide by relevant policies such as the Research Code of Practice, the Research Ethics Policy and Misconduct- Research Students Misconduct in Research Policy.

h) That you are responsible for notifying the principal supervisor if you have any difficulties. You should be aware of the mechanisms that exist to resolve these problems.

i) You are responsible for obtaining approval to take time away from candidature or vary the record of candidature.

j) You must ensure that you meet all the administrative requirements of the University, for example, re-enrolling each year and accessing your student email account.

k) You must work with your panel to construct a reasonable timeline and to decide how to judge progress against it and make adjustments when necessary.

l) Scholarship recipients must abide by their Conditions of Award, in addition to the degree rule.

m) You are solely responsible for the content, style and presentation of the thesis or work that is finally presented and for certifying its originality.
Candidature Processes

There are mandatory assessment tasks for all candidates. These are;

First year
» Postgraduate Essentials
» Early Candidature Plan
» Confirmation of Candidature.

From second year
» Annual Progress Report must be completed each year or part year of enrolment

Postgraduate Essentials

Postgraduate Essentials is an online course that provides an integrated academic orientation program for all new higher degree research candidates.

It consists of eight self-paced modules that familiarise candidates with higher degree research policy and protocol at UWS, and develop academic skills and management tools important for the first six months of candidature and beyond.

The online environment provides opportunities to interact with postgraduate peers across the University, receive updates on workshops and events for research candidates, and seek specialist advice from the Office of Research Services, UWS Library and Student Learning Unit.

Modules;

Overview; Starting Your Research Degree, Managing the Project, Working with Your Supervisor, Planning the Early Stages; Searching the Literature, Writing a Literature Review, Preparing for Confirmation, Meeting Ethical Standards.

There is a parallel, un-moderated, version available for supervisors. If you do not have access (check in vUWS), please send your staff id number and a request to Mary Krone, m.krone@uws.edu.au

As candidates complete they are given an email confirming their participation, which is required at the Confirmation of Candidature.

Early Candidature Plan

» The Early Candidature Plan is written at the commencement of candidature.
» It establishes goals and provides a framework for assessing progress in the early stages of candidature.
» The timing means it may be revised as the candidate progress.
» It should also be used to identify skills that the candidate may need to gain or update in preparation of those plans.

Early Candidature Plans are unique to each candidature, depending on the topic and the background and training of the candidate. For example, one candidate may need to master a new laboratory technique; another may need to explore library training and on-line search facilities.
The Early Candidature Plan is different from, and separate to, the Confirmation of Candidature and the two should not be confused.

**How to get the most benefit from the Early Candidature Plan:**
- Think in terms of additional skills/knowledge needed
- Develop a time frame, in particular, for the first year
- Talk about how progress will be evaluated in the first year
- Include timing of other hallmarks of progress such as the literature review, confirmation of candidature, ethics or biosafety approval.
- Discuss resourcing needs
- Check for suitable workshops and on-line resources

**Common errors with Early Candidature Plan**
- Incorrect timing of the process
- Supervisor and candidate not being in agreement about purpose or usefulness of the planning process.
- Goals being set that are unrealisitic or inadequate
- Confusing the plan with Confirmation of Candidature

**How the Early Candidature Plan differs from Confirmation of Candidature**
- The Early Candidature Plan is an early overview that sets out overall goals and plans in the first year.
- The Early Candidature plan may include a time frame for the Confirmation of Candidature.

- The Confirmation of Candidature is a formal and comprehensive process that reviews the progress and plan of the candidature from commencement to completion.
- The Confirmation of Candidature tests the proposal, research theme or question to be explored; intellectual context; research objectives and research procedures within the framework of the expectations of the degree and the available time frame.
- Confirmation of Candidature requires a written document, verbal presentation to a panel and formal feedback on the presentations and document.

**Timing for Completion of Early Candidature Plan**
- The range of time starts directly at commencement and extends up to six months from first enrolment.
- If the plan is to conduct the Confirmation of Candidature within the first six months the Early Candidature Plan should be completed well ahead of that time.
Higher Degree Research Candidature Timeline

Commencement of Research Degree

1st year includes the completion of:
- Early Candidature Plan
- Postgraduate Essentials Online Orientation Program

End 1 year
= 1 EFTSL consumed

Maximum time for Confirmation of Candidature (Full time Doctoral and all MHons)

End 2 years
= 2 EFTSL consumed

Candidate ends for MHons Students

End 3 years
= 3 EFTSL consumed

School or Centre may fund a scholarship extension subject to Award conditions.

End 4 years
Total available EFTSL consumed

Possible 1 semester unfunded place (subject to approval)

Fees are incurred from here

Scholarship payments end for MHons students

Scholarship payments end for Doctoral students

If Ethics clearance is required, application should be made as soon as possible after the completion of the Confirmation of Candidature.
Confirmation of Candidature is a formal and comprehensive process that reviews the progress and plan of the candidature from commencement to completion. The process may identify improvements that can be made and it is an opportunity to give positive feedback on progress.

The Confirmation of Candidature tests the proposal, research theme or question to be explored; intellectual context; research objectives and research procedures within the framework of the expectations of the degree and the available time frame.

**Rules**

- All candidates must complete the Confirmation of Candidature within the first year of enrolment.

- Postgraduate Essentials must be completed prior to Confirmation of Candidature.

- Human Ethics applications cannot be submitted until the Confirmation of Candidature has been successfully completed.

- The Confirmation of Candidature must be successfully achieved for enrolment in the second year.

Full-time candidates should complete their Confirmation of Candidature within six months wherever possible. All doctoral candidates have a maximum of twelve months to complete their confirmation.

Some Schools or Institutes may require Confirmation of Candidature to be undertaken as part of other activities such as the School or Institute conferences.

The process of candidature confirmation consists of:

- Submission of a written document between a minimum of 2,000 and maximum of 10,000 words. Most confirmation documents are 3,000 to 5,000 words. Length is determined in part by the focus of the work and the discipline area. Candidates should discuss a suitable length with their principal supervisor.

- A verbal presentation to an expert academic committee arranged by the principal supervisor.

- Assessment, advice and any required follow-up or other action recommended by the advisory committee or School or Institute Research and Higher Degrees Committee.

If the research involves use of human participants, animal subjects or involves biosafety or radiation, the candidate must also attain ethics or safety approval.

The Confirmation of Candidature tests the merit and integrity of the research, on behalf of the various ethics committees. Therefore, Confirmation must be successfully completed before Ethics applications can be lodged.
Responsibilities of Student

The candidate must submit the final, paginated manuscript to their principal supervisor for review and approval by an advisory committee at least a week prior to the Confirmation so that the committee has an opportunity to review and digest it.

Principal Supervisor’s Responsibilities

An advisory committee is established as described below. The committee is responsible for ensuring that the student has mastered the relevant literature, that the major research questions have been sharply defined, and that the research strategy is sound. The confirmation presentation offers an opportunity to crystallise ideas and to receive feedback from several experienced researchers at an early stage of the work.

The principal supervisor is responsible for;

» Ensuring that the confirmation document is suitable for submission to the advisory committee

» Establishing an advisory committee (with up to 5 members) comprising:
  » School or Institute HDR Director, or nominee (Chair)
  » Principal supervisor and committee members
  » 1 or 2 other persons with relevant expertise either from within the School or Institute or from elsewhere.

» Arranging for each committee member to receive a copy of the final confirmation document at least seven days before the meeting

» Arranging a meeting room and formally advising the candidate and all members of the committee in writing of the meeting date and time. The meeting should not be held in a staff office.

» Administrative follow-up after the meeting which will include ensuring that the candidate and the School or Institute HDR Director are given copies of the report. The committee should agree on the main points to be included in the report on the candidate’s confirmation.

» The committee chair has responsibility for the committee report on the Confirmation of Candidature document and presentation; however, the principal supervisor should collate the main points discussed at the meeting and prepare a draft report for consideration by all members of the committee and final written endorsement by the committee chair.
The Meeting

» The meeting is chaired by the School or Institute HDR Director or equivalent and should take from one to one and a half hours.

» The format of the meeting will be at the discretion of the Chair but usually the will give an oral overview of the confirmation document for approximately 15 minutes and this will be followed by a question and answer session where both you and the committee may ask questions. The student may be asked to leave the room for a few minutes while the committee confers and gathers their thoughts.

Feedback

» Preliminary feedback will be given directly to the candidate at the meeting.

» The advisory committee will complete a report to be signed by the committee chair and principal supervisor.

» If the School or Institute HDR Director is not on the Committee, the report will be forwarded to them.

There are four possible outcomes of the confirmation process:

A candidature is confirmed.

B The candidature is confirmed subject to minor amendments/rewriting identified by the Confirmation of Candidature Advisory Committee. These amendments are to be undertaken to the satisfaction of the Principal Supervisor and the HDR Director, or equivalent.

C The candidature to be confirmed subject to major amendments/rewriting identified by the Confirmation of Candidature Advisory Committee. The amendments will be circulated electronically to the Advisory Committee (a second presentation is not required).

D That the candidature not be confirmed on the basis of the submitted Thesis Proposal and the student be asked to resubmit a new proposal with a second presentation required.

A copy of the written report given to the candidate, together with the signed coversheet should be lodged with the Office of Research Services. A copy of the confirmation document should be lodged with the School or Institute.

The Document

Content of the Document
There is capacity for individual initiative and variations in research style, however, the following elements must be included:

Thesis Title
This should be clear, informative and unambiguous.

Research Case
This section is to demonstrate that you understand the research theme or question and are able to define the theme/question in terms that indicate that the research will provide insights into its resolution.
The Research Case should include an outline of:

1. A description of the project as a whole

2. A thesis statement, comprising:
   a. The proposition(s) that the thesis will demonstrate
   b. A description of the main focus of the thesis
   c. A description of how the various themes/questions are interrelated
   d. A demonstration of the worthiness of the proposed research with respect to gaps or conflicts in present knowledge or understanding

Intellectual Context
This section should contain:

» A detailed discussion of the conceptual and empirical aspects of the research
» A comprehensive and critical literature review related to the problem situation
» An explanation of how the thesis is related to the literature or other research in the discipline
» Account should be given of the theory(ies) that will be considered and the method(s) that will be employed in selecting, organising and analysing the material that will make-up the main body of the thesis
» Likely sources of information, archival resources, field work, survey and other empirical data which will be necessary
» A topical outline and the general content by areas or by chapter, with description and relationship of each to the others may be included

» The expected contribution of the thesis to the advancement of knowledge in the relevant field of study

Research Outcomes
This section should clearly demonstrate that you have identified a potentially solvable or resolvable research proposal and has a plan of action whereby this will be achieved within the required time frame. It may be in the form of a general statement and/or a list of more specific aims that will lead to accomplishing the general objective.

Research Method
This section should set out the logical steps to be followed in meeting the research objective(s). The method should be set forth including an expression of why it is important to the particular research field and how the method will generate and verify the conclusions reached in the thesis.

You should include a time line of expected progress and milestones to be achieved.

Length of Confirmation Document
Confirmation documents vary in length according to the requirements of the topic. Most are from 3,000 to 5,000 words with a minimum of 2,000 and maximum of 10,000.
Policy

Research Higher Degree Candidature Essential Resources Policy

UWS offers a range of support and resources for higher degree research candidates. The Research Higher Degree Candidature Essential Resources Policy document describes standard resources available to research candidates.

Candidates can apply for project related funds by submitting a Candidature Project Funds Application Form.

Candidature Project Funds

There are funds available for expenses directly related to candidate’s research. For advice on entitlements and to apply for funding refer to the CPF Application Form (MS Word, 359Kb) and your School or Institute HDR Director.

Workshops

These are offered on a regular basis and are free for all UWS higher degree research candidates (MHons or Doctorate). Topics include;

» Introduction to Research Training
» Thesis Writing Circle
» Tables, Graphs and Figures in Your Thesis
» Writing About Your Data in Qualitative Research
» Postgraduate Essentials Online Workshop
» Preparing for Confirmation of Candidature
» Getting Ready to Write your Literature Review
» Managing Final Stages
» Writing a Literature Review
» NVIVO (Intro/Intermediate/Advanced)
» Introduction to SPSS
» Word for Thesis Writing
» Presenting Your Research Orally
» Preparing for Confirmation of Candidature

http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/candidate_support/workshops

Mathematical and Statistical Analysis Support

Maths & Stats Consulting provides expert assistance for UWS postgraduate research candidates who wish to use mathematical and statistical techniques in their research. Researchers from all disciplines are welcome to apply.
ACSPRI: Australian Consortium for Social and Political Research Incorporated

ACSPRI offers courses in social research methods and research technology. Courses cater for researchers in the social and political sciences, and in areas such as behavioural, health and medical sciences, policy research, education, economics, epidemiology, law, management, marketing, public relations and human resource management.

ACSPRI Programs have a high reputation for presenting a practical and applied approach to research methods and data analysis, promoting hands-on learning opportunities, and using highly skilled and experienced instructors.

For more information:
UWS is a member of ACSPRI.

Completion and Beyond
Completion and Beyond is available to candidates who have completed Confirmation of Candidature. It is designed to support candidates through the final stages and in managing the transition from university into a suitable and satisfying career path. There is practical advice on the presentation and submission of the thesis and assistance with academic writing issues. The program also includes vodcasts of experienced supervisors talking about how they prepare their students and about research conducted in Australia on how examiners perform their task.

“Footnotes” Newsletter
“Footnotes” is a newsletter with stories about research candidates and items of interest to candidates. It is emailed to all candidates via student email accounts and posted on the UWS e-update email notice.

http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/newsletters

Please contact Mary Krone to submit an article m.krone@uws.edu.au

Resources for Candidates
Scholarship holders should view their candidature as their main occupation and focus of their financial income. There are strict limitations on the amount of paid work they can undertake. Part-time candidature is permitted only in compelling personal circumstances and according to the Australian Taxation Office is subject to tax (stipends for full-time study are tax free). All previous enrolment time prior to receiving an award will be deducted from the duration of the award. It is a good idea to discuss the conditions of the award with your candidate to determine how those conditions may impact on the management of the candidature.

Candidates must notify the Scholarships Officer if they intend to take annual leave and the principal supervisor will be asked to confirm the dates of leave.

Sick Leave on Scholarship.

For APA/UWS PRA;

Ten days informal sick leave per year may be taken, there is no need for formal approval. Student tells the supervisor and the supervisor keeps track.

Extended leave; after 10 days the student may apply for up to 3 months extended sick leave and their scholarship will be extended for the period of the illness. For approval of extended sick leave the student must apply using a variation of program form and attach a medical certificate from a GP or medical specialist attesting that they are unfit for study, stating the period of time.

The extended sick leave provision does not apply to most international scholarships, nor many externally funded local awards. Conditions of Award should be checked. If in doubt contact the scholarships officer by emailing t.mills@uws.edu.au
Candidates are considered UWS travellers if they are conducting work overseas that contributes towards their degree, whether funded by UWS or not.

Candidates must apply for permission of their School or Institute to travel overseas to conduct field work.

Candidates must abide by the UWS Travel (Overseas) Policy.

UWS Travel arrangements are processed using the UWS Travel Portal
www.uws.worldtravel.com.au

Applications must be lodged via the UWS Travel Portal using an e-TAN, at least 21 calendar days before the planned departure.

Research candidates undertaking field research are subject the University’s OH&S obligations and must consider any travel advice issued by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). UWS travellers must adhere to and monitor DFAT travel advisories when organising and travelling overseas.

Applying for permission to travel

All candidates travelling overseas to conduct research should apply using the Vary Research Candidature/Scholarship form (PDF, 108Kb). International candidates are advised to contact UWS International to ask about the validity of their visa if they leave Australia for any period. This must be endorsed by an International Student Advisor.

Australian citizens and permanent resident scholarship holders may take up to 12 months field work overseas and remain in receipt of their scholarship. However, certain conditions must be met regarding supervision during that period and relevance of the work to completion of the degree, see; Research Higher Degree Scholarship Policy

The candidate must apply for permission to the School or Institute at least three months before the proposed date of departure.
All HDR candidates undertaking laboratory-based work are required to use official UWS laboratory notebooks. These books are international industry standard and compliant for Good Laboratory Practice, and mandatory for Intellectual Property (IP) management in all major research institutions and Contract Research Organisations. Many regulatory agencies (Food and Drug Administration- USA, Therapeutic Goods Administration, etc) and the USA/AUS Patent offices/courts require the laboratory notebooks to establish the correct inventors and dates of idea/invention conception in IP disputes. Laboratory notebooks are considered legal documents. Any serious national and international Research and Development investor requires access to the notebooks to substantiate ‘due diligence’ prior to signing licensing agreements. Some leading journals request access to laboratory books in allegations of misconduct.

The UWS laboratory notebooks can be bought by the School or Institute from UWS Print Services for $90 per box of 10 (in 2010) and may be provided to the students. These books are industry standard quality and are controlled research documents at UWS. The notebooks remain the property of UWS; however students are encouraged to take photocopies for their own use when they complete their degree. UWS retail shops also sell generic laboratory notebooks for approximately $23.

There are guidelines (provided by IP Australia or patent attorneys) in the front pages of every laboratory notebook to assist researchers. UWS Innovation periodically run workshops on the proper use of Laboratory Notebooks or further information on the UWS labbooks can be obtained from UWS Innovation at any time via email at ip@uws.edu.au or calling Robert Burnside on 9685-9742.
Library Support for Research candidates

This section provided by Ms Susan Robbins, Library

“As a PhD candidate, I assumed I knew how to research – but the UWS Library upped my game. I can’t say enough good things about the UWS Library and the librarians! My life was made easier and my work much better for every time I visited.”

UWS PhD candidate

The Library is committed to providing high quality scholarly information, resources and services in support of UWS research endeavours. As supervisors you are well placed to encourage candidates to take advantage of the range of and resources and services.

http://library.uws.edu.au Quick Links>Postgraduate outlines the full range of services offered.

The Library holds over 66,000 unique journal titles, (98% of which are electronic) and an extensive monograph collection both in print and online. Intercampus transfer of material is available. Candidates may also access subscribed electronic resources off campus.

Research Services Librarian

» Conducts training and individual consultations on citation tracking to assist with literature reviews and searching for theses. Conducts training and individual consultations on utilising available tools to identify appropriate publication outlets for the candidate’s research. To be used in conjunction with advice from supervisors.

Susan Robbins, Research Services Librarian may be contacted at s.robbins@uws.edu.au or 9852 5458.

Liaison Librarians

» Conduct individual consultations to familiarise candidates with Library services and resources and information retrieval, including identifying the best discipline specific databases, advanced searching techniques and initiating alerting services.

» Each research student is allocated a Liaison Librarian at the commencement of candidature.

Information Central (Ph 9852 5353)

» For general assistance throughout all Library opening hours.

Training

Training sessions are conducted on multiple campii and cover:

» Citation tracking
» Smart Publishing
» Patent searching
» EndNote
Document Delivery

Document Delivery service obtains items not held within the UWS Library system in support of research. To register, and submit requests:
http://library.uws.edu.au Quick links>Postgraduate>Document Delivery

Bibliographic Management

RefWorks and EndNote are bibliographic management systems for storing and managing references. They each have a ‘Cite While You Write’ function which allows users to insert citations, images, graphs, charts etc. into a Word document and automatically generate a bibliography from the citations.

RefWorks is a web based programme and is available at
http://library.uws.edu.au Quick Links>Postgraduate>Training and Support>RefWorks

EndNote is a database programme which requires a software download available from the Library web site and is available at
http://library.uws.edu.au Quick Links>Postgraduate>Training and Support>EndNote

EndNote Web is a web based version of EndNote with slightly less functionality than the software programme.

Purchasing Research Material

Research students may suggest purchases online
http://library.uws.edu.au Quick Links>Postgraduate>More>Suggestions for Purchase

Research Resources Webpage

Contains information and printable documents on a range of areas including searching for theses, advanced searching techniques, locating grey literature, publishing advice and additional research tools.

Wireless Enabled

All UWS campus Libraries are wireless enabled.
Annual Progress Report

From the second year all continuing candidates must complete a Research Higher Degree Annual Progress Report 2009 (Word, 175Kb). This applies to all candidates enrolled in either of the previous two sessions.

First year candidates do not complete an annual progress report.

Annual Progress Reports are due mid year. Annual progress reports are a good mechanism for reflecting on achievements and revisiting the completion plan. The report is a direct signal to the School or Institute and Research Studies Committee that there may be problems, of any nature, and it is a means of recording successes, such as publications and conference presentations.

“I didn’t realise how much I’d achieved last year till we reviewed it and put it all together or the annual progress report”

HDR candidate

Annual reports may initiate a School or Institute recommending specific actions where progress is not satisfactory. This may include setting a series of tasks with due dates and a period of review. The School or Institute may in rare circumstances request termination of a candidature as a result of the annual report process.

The Research Studies Committee reviews reports and makes resource and policy decisions using summative information and there may be direct intervention in individual candidatures. Annual reports are checked when candidates apply for leave or an extension and when the candidate or panel question aspects of the candidature, particularly in relation to satisfactory progress. Failure to complete and return a report will jeopardise continued enrolment.

Australian Postgraduate Awards - Industry (APA/I) candidates must also complete an Australian Research Council (ARC) Report. The Office of Research Services will contact the candidate if an ARC report is required.

Candidate’s Report and Supervisor’s Report

Students and supervisors are strongly encouraged to meet to discuss the annual report.

The report must contain:

» a summary of work undertaken in the last 12 months, or since commencement,
» a timeline for the next year,
» comment on progress in relation to expected completion,
» comments by the supervisor (principal or preferably the whole panel).

If the candidate and the panel/principal supervisor cannot meet together, the candidate should complete their section and email or mail it their principal supervisor.

Problems

The completion of the Annual Report Form should not be the first point at which a supervisor and candidate discover there is a
problem. If problems do arise, normally both parties would take active steps to solve them when they occur.

However, the Annual Report provides a medium for documenting problems and failure to do so could be to the disadvantage of candidate and supervisor.

Problems within a research candidature are not uncommon and there are resources available that can be called upon to assist you, so please use them.

**Unsatisfactory Progress**

If, as a result of this process, a School or Institute is of the opinion that the standard of a candidate’s work is unsatisfactory, the School or Institute shall and make a recommendation for immediate action, which may involve conditional continued enrolment.

**Monitoring Progress**

The panel and candidate should have agreed methods of monitoring progress outside formal reporting requirements.

If progress is unsatisfactory the panel should take action early. This may include setting work with deadlines and/or advising that the candidate take a Leave of Absence. The Principal Supervisor may wish to seek advice from the School or Institute HDR Director.

**Dealing with Difficulties**

There are informal and formal ways to deal with difficulties. It is always best to solve problems by the most simple and direct method. Sometimes, a seemingly intractable problem can be overcome fairly easily, without animosity or continuation of the problem.

Informal means of problem solving can start with discussing the issue within the panel and with the candidate. This can work where there are mismatches in understanding of some issue. Sometimes, it might be helpful to involve a third party, for example, another academic staff member, or the School, or Institute HDR Director. Informal problem solving may include identification of a problem, e.g., writing skills, and agreement on the nature of the problem and how it might be overcome. You and your candidate may agree to review the progress of your solution, in case there needs to be a change of strategy if the solution has not worked as well as you had anticipated. The School or Institute Director HDR, or equivalent
is a good resource for discussing these matters and may be able to make helpful suggestions.

The candidate-supervisor relationship can be very intense, making it easy for personal issues to become confused with other differences of opinion. You must exercise judgement in calculating the best solution to problems caused by a conflict in personal styles and be aware that at times personal conflicts can be confused with failures of an academic nature.

You should take action if you believe that your candidate is not meeting his/her responsibilities. Start by discussing the matter with other panel members or the School or Institute HDR Director.

Many issues can arise in a candidature, problems are often complex and effective resolution requires an accurate understanding of the underlying causes. Strong protocols are a good practice and an insurance policy. Things are less likely to go wrong if everyone knows their role and responsibilities and understands that they will be held accountable.

There are methods of dealing with troubled candidatures that are between informal approaches and formal reporting to the Research Studies Committee. This will usually involve the School or Institute HDR Director. Sometimes, it is helpful to expand the supervisory panel for a specific period. This may include formal meetings with the School or Institute Director HDR, or equivalent in addition to regular panel meetings with the candidate to check on progress. Candidates may be asked to undertake a specific set of tasks within a defined timeframe, with a view to making a decision on progress when the tasks are assessed or the panel may recommend an additional Confirmation of Candidature to test progress of the plan for completion.

Formal steps may be taken as part of the annual reporting process. See Annual Progress Reports.

Additionally, the degree policies specify formal means of dealing with failure to progress. Candidature may be terminated for failure to make academic progress during the period of candidature, and for academic misconduct.

If the principal supervisor is of the opinion that the candidate is not making satisfactory progress, in consultation with the supervisory panel, they should recommend to the School or Institute Director HDR, or equivalent that the candidate be invited to “show cause” why the candidature should not be terminated. The recommendation will be decided by the Research Studies Committee.

The candidate will have the right of appeal under the Higher Degree Rules – Appeals Policy in respect of decisions made by the Research Studies Committee under this clause.

Checklist if Progress is Unsatisfactory

Informal:

» Discuss the issue within the panel and with the candidate.

» Involve a third party, for example, another academic staff member, or the School or
Institute HDR Director.

» Identify the problem, e.g., writing skills, and reach agreement on the nature of the problem and how it might be overcome.
» Review the progress of your solution
» Change the strategy if the solution has not worked as well as you had anticipated.

Personal conflicts can be confused with failures of an academic nature.

Between informal approaches and formal reporting to the Research Studies Committee;

» Usually involves the School or Institute Director HDR, or equivalent
» It may be helpful to expand the supervisory panel for a specific period.
» This may include formal meetings with the School or Institute in addition to regular panel meetings with the candidate to check on progress.
» Candidates may be asked to undertake a specific set of tasks within a defined timeframe, with a view to making a decision on progress when the tasks are assessed on the due date
» The panel may recommend an additional Confirmation of Candidature to test progress of the plan for completion.

Formal Action
Formal steps may be taken as part of the annual reporting process. Supervisors can recommend one of the following outcomes and this will be referred to the School or Institute Research Committee for action or the Research Studies Committee, if required.

» Continuation of candidature
» Continuation of candidature with specific qualifications
» Continuation of candidature with interim review
» Candidate should transfer from doctorate to research masters
» Termination of candidature

If the candidature is terminated the candidate may appeal to the Academic Senate, which may determine the matter as it thinks fit.

Additionally, the degree policies specify formal means of dealing with failure to progress.

Candidature may be terminated for failure to make academic progress during the period of candidature, and for academic misconduct.

If the principal supervisor is of the opinion that the candidate is not making satisfactory progress, in consultation with the supervisory panel, they should recommend to the School or Institute Research Committee that the candidate be invited to “show cause” why the candidature should not be terminated.

The School or Institute Research and Higher Degrees Committee will recommend to the Research Studies Committee, which make a decision on the recommendation of “show cause”.

“Show Cause” may also result form non-compliance to mandatory reporting such as the Confirmation of Candidature or Annual Progress reports.
Changes to candidature details must be formally approved and recorded on the student record system (Callista).

The Variation of Candidature form is available at:  
http://www.uws.edu.au/research/research_candidates/supervision/variation_of_program

All enquiries about variations of candidature and notices of change of personal details should be made to sa-research@uws.edu.au

**Variation of Thesis Title**

The thesis title is recorded on the student record system. Candidates may refine the topic as they progress and use a “working title” in the interim. Major changes, however, that indicate a substantial shift in direction will be questioned. Candidature and/or scholarship duration cannot be extended because of a topic change. Minor changes need not be made until final submission.

**Change of Supervisor or Co-Supervisor**

Panel membership change requires the permission of the School or Institute Research Committee. It is a good idea to change membership as additional expertise is required or if members are unable to continue in their role.

However, a word of caution is offered about panel changes. It may appear to be an easy fix for a range of problems. It is not always the best response to difficulties. The candidate-supervisor relationship can be very intense, which makes it easy for personal issues to become confused with other differences of opinion. You should exercise judgement in calculating the best solution to problems caused by a conflict in personal styles and be aware that at times personal conflicts can be confused with failures of an academic nature.

In most cases of conflict within a panel, the best solution is to work through those issues with the assistance of the School or Institute HDR Director.

To change panel membership a Variation of Candidature form must be completed, signed by the relinquishing and new members and endorsed by the School or Institute HDR Director.

A change of principal supervisor is a decision of the School or Institute Research Committee, who will make a determination after discussion with all involved. Supervision of research candidates is a workload issue for academic staff and this will be taken into consideration.

**Change of Mode**

Candidates may change between full and part-time enrolment if necessary, for example cessation of scholarship and the need to find part-time work.

International candidates are not permitted to enrol part-time; this is an Australian government visa requirement.

In normal circumstances scholarship holders must be enrolled full-time.
Candidature Time and Extensions:

All doctorates: 4 years maximum (or equivalent eftsl). All research masters 2 years (or equivalent eftsl). Domestic candidates enrolled with a funded place may apply for a one session extension, for which the university will be not be funded and the candidate will not pay fees. For any further enrolment full fees will apply. Fees apply to all extensions of fee paying candidatures.

A detailed timeline, report on progress to date, an explanation of what remains to be done and a reason for the delay must be provided with the application. Scholarships are funded for three years and a candidate may request an extension of scholarship that does not require extension of candidate.

Application for extension;
Extend Candidature or Scholarship form

Candidates are advised to negotiate new time lines with you as they are completing. It is not reasonable for them to impose unfair expectations on you in order to meet deadlines that they have not planned well.

Extension of Scholarships

Supervisors and Candidates should consult the UWS Scholarships Policy and the individual conditions of award given to the candidate.

As a general rule, scholarships that permit an extension do so for one session only on condition that the delay has been unavoidable, is related to the research and not of a personal nature.

Fees

Fees apply where doctoral extensions are beyond 4.5 eftsl and research masters extensions are beyond 2.5 eftsl.

It is the responsibility of the supervisory panel is to keep the candidate on track so that they complete in good time.

Application for Early Submission for Examination

Candidates who wish to submit work for examination before completion of the minimum period of candidature must apply in writing to the Research Studies Committee with the support of their supervisory panel and School or Institute. The Research Studies Committee will seek evidence that no purpose would be served by continuing the candidature in terms of academic readiness of the work.

Leave of Absence

Candidates may normally apply for a maximum of two sessions leave in any one candidature.

Candidature is recorded in whole sessions. It should be applied for well before the census dates of the two main research sessions, that is, by the end of March for session one or the end of August for session two.

When to take a formal Leave of Absence?

The candidate should take leave if he/she is having problems that are interfering with progress and there is an expectation that a
Variations of Candidature

A period of leave will give them time to resolve the problem. The problems may include ill health, health problems within the family, short term professional pressures, grief etc.

Leave of Absence should not be seen as a means of “buying time” in a troubled candidature. It is better to address the issues directly, as it is likely that problems will persist on return to study.

During periods of leave the candidate is not enrolled and may not access UWS resources. This includes contact with the supervisory panel because you will not have been allocated workload to deal with the candidature. The candidature clock stops during periods of leave, that is, the maximum period of enrolment is adjusted to account for the period of leave.

**Upgrade to Doctoral Studies from Research Masters**


The application must address the following criteria:

1. The quality and originality of the research already completed: General quality will be reflected in an original methodology or procedure of originality and merit and/or an original analysis of compelling significance.

2. The scope and complexity of the project: It must be shown that the scope and complexity of the project are beyond that which could be reasonably expected of a Research Masters degree. However, the complexity must be well thought out and the project must be shown to have a clear focus.

3. Research capabilities of the applicant: The assessment of the research capability of the applicant will normally be demonstrated by the completion of a significant body of material, including written research design and analysis.

The application must be endorsed by the School or Institute Research Committee and referred to the Dean or Director for a decision.

The application should address timing issues; will the candidate have sufficient time to complete a doctorate after upgrade? The time spent enrolled in the research masters will be deducted from the time available for the doctorate, for example if the candidate has been enrolled for one eftsl, they will have three, not four eftsl remaining.
The PhD policy allows submission of a thesis for examination as a series of publications.

- The work must be completed during enrolment
- The candidate writes an overarching statement of at least ten thousand words.
- The requirement is four publications; accepted, in print or published in peer reviewed publications.
- The candidate will normally be the first author.

This mode of submission will be very suitable for some candidatures but not all. Supervisors and candidates should think carefully about whether it could apply to them, especially in terms of time. For most candidatures it will be better to publish during candidature and produce a thesis. It should be kept in mind that the four publications and overarching statement do not guarantee a pass; the work must still be assessed by an examining panel according to the usual standards required of a doctorate.

**Extract from PhD Policy**

**Thesis as a Series of Papers**
Candidates may submit a series of publications as their examinable work.

The work must be accomplished during the period of enrolment.

Requirements for submission of thesis as a series of publications:

a) Overarching Statement - The overarching statement serves as an introduction to the assessable work. It makes reference to the research papers and explains the research components in terms of their temporal sequence and interdependence, and their contribution to the candidate’s personal and professional development, and to the field of scholarship. It should be at least 10,000 words, under the advisement of the supervisory panel.

b) Four scholarly research papers that have been peer reviewed, that is accepted, in print or published in peer reviewed publications. Each paper will have a designated scholarly outlet in a refereed journal, or as a book chapter in an edited academic volume.

Where there are multiple authors, the candidate will normally be the first author.
**Examination of Thesis as a Series of Papers**

The examiners are asked to make a global judgement about the scope and quality of the work contained within the portfolio and to indicate the extent to which its cumulative nature warrants a Doctoral award. The work should meet the criteria specified in clause 100 of this policy.

**PhD by Publication**

The PhD by Publication is available to staff only, in those cases where an academic has a long and distinguished career as a researcher but has not had the opportunity to undertake a doctorate. The candidate enrols for one session full-time, or two part-time, and writes an overarching statement to contextualise and unite the research as a coherent line of enquiry that is the equivalent of a doctorate. The research will already have been undertaken and published. It is an unfunded degree as it does not meet Commonwealth guidelines for research training funds (short period of enrolment and work undertaken before enrolment).

This degree is very different to the one mentioned above where a candidate submits a thesis a series of publications. See: Doctor of Philosophy by Publication Rule on the UWS policy site http://policies.uws.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00165
A comprehensive booklet on examinations may be found at: http://www.uws.edu.au/research/current_research_students/examination/thesis_presentation

The booklet contains information on all aspects of examination, from resources for candidates to choosing the examiner, approaching the examiner, what they are asked to do, honorarium rates, presentation guidelines, writing the abstract, confidential material, publications, how to submit, early examination, candidates and examiner choice, examination outcomes, library copy and other matters of process.
What does being a supervisor mean to you?

Supervision of research higher degree candidates is a subtle and complex form of teaching of research practice. There are many models of supervisory practice and various disciplinary traditions. Supervisory practice also reflects personal styles in teaching and learning.

You may like to reflect on your practice and think about your strategies for ensuring that your supervision is excellent and rewarding, for you and your candidate. Are you a leader in research education? You may like to use your skills and knowledge to raise the profile of research supervision in your School or Institute. Look beyond what will get your candidate over the line and ask how will you make their research education experience the very best and what will make them a first-rate researcher and leader in the future?

The university provides resources for you and your candidates. Take advantage of what may help you and encourage your candidate to use what’s on offer. If you have difficulties, seek advice; speak to research education leaders in your School or Institute. Use university policy; policies set the operational framework so that you know what is expected of you and what you can expect from others. A good understanding of who is responsible and accountable within the university and where and when you should seek advice or assistance will help you as a supervisor.

Discussion Points

Here are some points to consider as you reflect on your supervisory practice.

“What qualities do you bring to your supervisory practice?”

“What are your reasons for being a supervisor?”

“How do you know you are a good supervisor? Can you measure success by the number of graduates and time taken to complete, the publication output of your candidates?”

“Is a good supervisor one who can turn around a troubled candidature, even though it may take a longer time? Or someone who mentors new staff or collaborates with external parties, or all of these?”

“Are your supervisory practices the same as when you were a candidate?”

“Are you confident that you could take action if your candidate was not progressing well?”

“Do you know what other sections in the university can offer your candidate?”

“”How can you ensure that your candidate distinguishes academic critique from personal criticism?”

“Do you have a role in mentoring fellow panellists?”
The Supervisory Relationship. Do you agree?
Papers of Interest

The examples that follow include the citation, abstract and link to the full document;


http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/cher/2009/00000028/00000002/art00004

Abstract. PhD supervision is increasingly embedded in frameworks that link research to issues of knowledge transfer involving the translation of knowledge to domains outside the university where it can be taken up and applied. This tends to require research that goes beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries and raises questions of the nature of knowledge relationships required in this context. This paper draws on the work of Basil Bernstein to identify the organisational, knowledge and interpersonal relationships that these changes now require, describing the nature of the work involved in weakening boundaries between disciplines and its implications for supervisor student relationships. The paper then outlines the challenges this presents to universities, with specific reference to the humanities and social sciences, attempting to implement strategic programs reconciling pedagogic requirements with the quality, impact and completions they must attest to in order to secure public funding.


http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ764306&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ764306

Project work has been a common feature of undergraduate degree programmes for many years. While it has been named in a variety of ways, it typically involves students undertaking a substantial learning activity that is partly self-initiated and managed. More recently, programmes organised Academic Registrars Office and the idea of work-based learning partnerships have emerged. These can be regarded as programmes that rely on significant amounts of work-based project work. This paper examines the implications of practices in these new programmes for project advising more generally. It argues that the conception of the role of academics in project work needs to change from one focused on project supervision to one of learning adviser. It identifies key features of this practice and discusses differences in advising from one context to another. It suggests that the activities in which academics engage need to be reappraised and that the skills and knowledge of those acting in the role of adviser be extended.
Almost ten years ago, Rudd commented that ‘research into postgraduate education that has made any significant contribution is somewhat sparse’ (Rudd, 1984, p. 109). Although there have been many studies of Australian and overseas graduate education since then, there is still dissatisfaction with supervision expressed by students and supervisors and concerns about continuing long completion times of students. Some of the difficulty may be because not enough heed has been taken of the advice of Moses that ‘All that we need now is to implement what has already been realised as good practice!’ (Moses, 1993, p. 49). This report addresses the continuing dissatisfaction by attempting a reframing of the issues to encourage the rethinking of practice. In attempting such a reframing, this report seeks:

» to explore the interaction over time of varying factors in supervisory practice and particularly to distinguish between what is common and what is particular across disciplines; and

» to avoid concentration upon the individual relationships which obtain between students and supervisors by locating that relationship in a broad context and enabling thereby the identification of strategies independent of, or moderating, individual differences.


http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ721257&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=EJ721257

**Abstract**

There has been a substantial increase in the number of candidates enrolled in PhD programmes in the past decade. Whereas the literature is relatively informative with its advice to candidates and supervisors, there is little evidence of research related to supervisory styles and changes of style over the supervisory period. This paper attempts to close that research gap by examining 60 items from the literature related to supervisory styles and changes of style over the supervisory period. Eighty key variables identified from the literature were used to build a four-quadrant supervisory style management grid based on the Blake and Moulton Managerial Grid model. The grid was subjected to a verification study through the results obtained from 12 in-depth interviews with supervisors. Further, a hypothetical model was developed to examine changes in supervisory style over time, along with the managerial implications for supervisors. The study was taken within an Australian context using the European style of PhD structural practices which do not necessarily reflect the contemporary American model. The study has significant implications for alternative dissertation completion approaches where high levels of supervision are required.
Papers of Interest

Grant, B. (2000). Pedagogical issues in research education. In M. Kiley & G. Mullins (Eds.), Quality in postgraduate research: Making ends meet (pp. 31-34).

The author asks; how does supervision differ from other forms of teaching? And what might the pedagogical issues in postgraduate education be?

http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075070902906798

Abstract
A competitive higher education environment marked by increased accountability and quality assurance measures for doctoral study, including the structured training of doctoral supervisors, has highlighted the need to clearly articulate and delineate the work of supervising doctoral students. This article responds to this imperative by examining the question: in the contemporary university, what do doctoral supervisors do and how might their work be theorized? The response draws on life history interviews with doctoral supervisors in five broad disciplines/fields, working in a large metropolitan university in Australia. Based on empirical analyses, doctoral supervision is theorized as professional work that comprises five facets: the learning alliance, habits of mind, scholarly expertise, technê and contextual expertise. The article proposes that this model offers a more precise discourse, language and theory for understanding and preparing for the work of doctoral supervision in the contemporary university.


Abstract. Interventions in the quality of research training provided in universities today focus largely on educating supervisors and monitoring their performance as well as student progress. More private than any other scene of teaching and learning, postgraduate supervision - and more generally the pedagogic practices of the PhD - has largely remained unscrutinised and unquestioned. This article explores the problematic character of ideas of autonomy and the independent scholar that underpin the traditional practices of postgraduate pedagogy, particularly in the humanities and social sciences disciplines. These ideas are found to guide the practices of several different models of the supervisory relationship, whether they be of a pastoral care or more distant kind. The gendered character of the ideas of autonomy and the subject of knowledge that underlie these practices of postgraduate pedagogy are examined, as is the paradoxical nature of the processes of the production of the autonomous scholar self. The
article concludes by suggesting some possible lines of thought for the future in addressing the problems in doctoral education identified through this analysis.


Supporting Indigenous Researchers: A Practical Guide for Supervisors was written by Alison Laycock, with support from Diane Walker, Nea Harrison and Jenny Brands at the CRC for Aboriginal Health. The guide and its companion volume, Researching Indigenous Health: A Practical Guide for Researchers (due out later in 2009), have been developed by the CRCAH in response to a growing need for resources in this area. Indigenous health research needs to be driven by priorities set by Indigenous people, to be of practical use to the Indigenous health sector and to develop research capacity within the Indigenous community.


http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0307507070802049202

Literature about doctoral supervision has concentrated on describing the ever lengthening lists of functions that must be carried out. This functional approach is necessary, but there has been little exploration of a different paradigm, a conceptual approach towards research supervision. This article, based on interviews with supervisors from a range of disciplines, aims to fill this gap. The main concepts identified are: functional – where the issue is one of project management; enculturation – where the student is encouraged to become a member of the disciplinary community; critical thinking – where the student is encouraged to question and analyse their work; emancipation – where the student is encouraged to question and develop themselves; and developing a quality relationship – where the student is enthused, inspired and cared for. Supervisors of doctoral students are also trying to reconcile the tensions between their professional role as an academic and their personal self, as well as encouraging students to move along a path towards increasing independence. The concepts are examined in the light of these tensions. Finally, the research illuminates the power of the supervisor’s own experience as a student, and suggests that supervisors need to be aware of both the positive and negative aspects of each of these conceptual approaches.

**Abstract**
Research to date on the examination process for postgraduate research theses has focused largely on the deconstruction of examiners’ reports. This article reports on a study of the processes that experienced examiners go through, and the judgements they make before writing their reports. A sample of 30 experienced examiners (defined as having examined the equivalent of at least five research theses over the last five years), from a range of disciplines in five universities was interviewed. Clear trends emerged with regard to: the criteria used by examiners and the levels of student performance expected by them; critical judgement points in the examination process; the examiners’ perceptions of their own role in the process; the influence on examiners of previously published work, the views of the other examiner(s) and their knowledge of the student’s supervisor and/or department, and the level of perceived responsibility between student and supervisor.


**Abstract**
This paper describes the development of an instrument--The Reflective Supervisor Questionnaire (RSQ). The RSQ maps the domain of research supervisory practice as a facilitative process involving educational tasks and activities. It is designed to assist research supervisors explore, by means of self-reflection and reflection on feedback from others, how they practise supervision. In developing the RSQ 58 items were generated describing 5 hypothesised constructs derived from prior research. The resulting instrument was tested on postgraduate research students in 2 institutions. The questionnaire correlated highly with an established questionnaire supervision scale and with an overall satisfaction measure. Four factors identified in an exploratory analysis closely approximated the hypothesised constructs and extended the theoretical framework being developed. These 4 factors identified 4 subsets of facilitative supervisory practice: Progressing the Candidature, Mentoring, Coaching the Research Project, and Sponsoring Student Participation in Academic/Professional Practice. Issues in the interpretation of the findings and the possible usage in academic development programs of an instrument based on them are discussed.
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**Abstract**

Research that specifically investigates PhD completions, times to submission and the influences that give rise to them is limited. The research underpinning this report was therefore designed to add some empirical evidence to the national higher education knowledge base. The research focuses on both individual and institutional influences on PhD completions derived from two sets of data: a two-phase national survey of 5,450 and 1,032 supervisors who supervised PhD candidates over the period 1990-97 in 26 State and private universities across all Australian states and territories; and in-depth face-to-face interviews with 83 PhD supervisors and 26 present or former PhD candidates across 17 universities.

Findings indicate that both university type and research discipline influence the timely completion of PhD candidatures, but that research discipline has more influence than university type. 64% of PhD candidates supervised over the 1990-97 period were awarded their doctorate, but comparatively more candidates in the natural sciences (75%) received the award than in the social sciences (52%), the humanities and arts (54%) and other disciplines (61%). 40% of the candidates submitted in four years or less, 57% in five years or less.
In terms of PhD supervision, the following observations are made: Successful supervision involves assisting commencing candidates to demystify and structure their candidature. It requires frequent, timely and collaborative intervention by the supervisor and others in the first year of candidature. The supervisor should develop a trusting relationship with the candidate designed to boost confidence, sort out confusion, and monitor and celebrate the progress of the candidate through their research process. While interventions decrease in frequency and depth as the candidate becomes more self-reliant, there should be a greater emphasis on text generation by the candidate and rapid turnAcademic Registrars Officeund of text by the supervisor. This project was funded under the DEST Research Evaluations Programme.


http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562510802045402

The supervision of part-time doctoral students is a long-term academic enterprise requiring stamina both on the part of the supervisor and the student. Because of the fractured student identity of the part-time doctoral candidate, who is usually balancing a range of work, study and family commitments, strategies to support their progress have to be proactive, well planned and sensitive to individual circumstances. Part-time students, however, cannot be seen as a unitary group as their learner motivation, personal circumstances and support needs are highly individual. Drawing on ideas shared at a cross-faculty development workshop for PhD supervisors, this essay discusses approaches to supporting these students focusing on the themes of communication, planning and empathy. It highlights the benefits of a student-centred pedagogy within postgraduate research education that takes account of both the pastoral and academic elements of the supervisor/supervisee relationship.

Section Five

UWS policies directly relevant to supervisors of research candidates.

**Conflict of Interest Guidelines**

**Cotutelle Policy**
Policy on joint badged degrees based on a French Government initiative

**Doctor of Philosophy Rule**
Degree policy on admission, English language requirements, progress reports, requirements of the degree, examinations.

**Doctor of Philosophy by Publication Rule**
Degree policy on admission, progress reports, requirements of the degree, examination.

**Doctor of Business Administration Policy**
Specific course requirements of DBA, to be read in conjunction with Professional Doctorate Policy

**Doctor of Creative Arts Policy**
Specific course requirements of DCA, to be read in conjunction with Professional Doctorate Policy

**Doctor of Cultural Research Policy**
Specific course requirements of DCA, to be read in conjunction with Professional Doctorate Policy

**Doctor of Education Policy**
Specific course requirements of EdD, to be read in conjunction with Professional Doctorate Policy

**Doctor of Medicine by Publication Policy**
Degree policy on admission, English language requirements, progress reports, requirements of the degree, examinations.

**Doctor of Medicine Policy**
Degree policy on admission, English language requirements, progress reports, requirements of the degree, examinations.

**Doctor of Philosophy (Political and Social Thought) Rule**
Degree policy on admission, English language requirements, progress reports, requirements of the degree, examinations.
Section Five

Higher Degree Rules - Appeals Policy
Appeal procedures; against allocation of a scholarship or examination result, on procedural grounds.

Intellectual Property Policy

Misconduct - Research Students
Misconduct in Research Policy
Definition, identification, reporting and consequences of Research Misconduct.

Occupational Health and Safety Guidelines and Procedures

Professional Doctorate Policy
Generic policy, Outlines candidate entitlements and School or Institute Research responsibilities in delivering resources. Individual course documents should be read as well, see DBA, DCA, EdD.

Research Code of Practice
Particularly relevant sections are authorship, plagiarism, inculcation of good research practice, responsibilities to research candidates.

Research Higher Degree Candidature
Essential Resources Policy
Outlines candidate entitlements and School or Institute Research responsibilities in delivering resources.

Research Higher Degree Scholarship Policy - Australian Citizens and Permanent Residents
Outlines conditions of award applying to scholarship with stipend holders. There may be additional award conditions in individual cases.

Research Masters (Honours) Policy
Degree policy on admission, English language requirements, progress reports, requirements of the degree, examinations.

Supervision of Research Candidates Policy
Roles, responsibility and eligibility of research higher degree supervisors.
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