Project number: 015/H01
Name: Peter Reinholdsson
Institution: The Development and Evaluation Unit
Uppsala University
Tel: +46 (0)18 471 18 22
E-mail: Peter.Reinholdsson@uadm.uu.se
http://www.UoU.uadm.uu.se/

Advance from Postgraduate Student to Full-time Professor

Abstract

A Proposal for Development of and Collaboration within a Programme of Education for Supervisors

The aims of this project comprise two interrelated parts: developing a centrally organised programme of education which would embrace three stages of advance for those involved in supervision at Uppsala University; and developing a model for collaboration regarding supervision and issues related to supervision, taking into consideration the level of centrally organised education, and the levels of Disciplinary Domain, of Faculty and of Department, respectively.

The idea behind the first aim is to develop and point to appropriate levels of education corresponding to the needs of supervisors making careers as researchers and university teachers. Each stage would be ascribed a credit value and render a profile and opportunities for promotion. For this purpose, three courses, relating to the three stages mentioned, are to be organised.

The first course will be designed for postgraduate or doctoral students and university teachers not holding a PhD, working as supervisors at the undergraduate level. The second course, which was initially given last year, is directed to PhD supervisors wanting to qualify as associate professor (reader, "docent"). The third course will attempt at capturing full-time professors wishing to further develop their skills as project leaders, supervisors and qualified researchers.

The second aim is put forward with the intention of elucidating different forms of supervision, trans-mission of ideas, staff development and responsibilities for organising postgraduate education within preferably the Disciplinary Domain of Arts and Social Sciences, so as to make for efficient exchange and sharing of ideas on supervision with both central and local levels of education in mind. A case study using the Faculty of History and Philosophy for assessment and development will be initiated.

Expected outcomes of the project are three recurrent courses on supervision, which would be funded by the University and given each year of study by the Development and Evaluation Unit –as well as the outcome of proposals for more efficient collaboration regarding issues about supervision in the Disciplinary Domain mentioned above. In the latter case, written guidelines taking its point of departure from both general and specific experiences acquired within the project would seem appropriate.

Project update (only in Swedish)

Årsredovisningen syftar till att mycket kort sammanfatta verksamheten under det gångna året, fram till 2002-05-15, i förhållande till tidigare ingiven projektplan.

I enlighet med steg 2 i det föreslagna utbildningsprogrammet för handledare vid Uppsala universitet har forskarhandledarkursen "Handledning utan gränser" vidareutvecklats och utvärderats. Denna fakultetsövergripande kurs anordnades första gången av Utvecklingsenheten 2000/2001 och utvidgades hösten 2001 från fem till sex dagar. Målgruppen utgjordes både av forskarhandledare som önskar meritera och förbereda sig inför docenturutnämningar och yngre docenter som strävar efter kompetensutveckling med sikte på professur.

Vidare iscensattes steg 1 motsvarande en grundläggande och fakultetsövergripande handledarutbildning för doktorander och odisputerade universitetslärare på 2,5 dagar. Kursen gavs för första gången nu i vår (2002) och gick under namnet "Att handleda examensarbetande studenter". I samband med förberedelserna spelade den i projektet medsökande doktoranden en mycket aktiv roll. Utvärdering har påbörjats.

Det sista och tredje steget i utbildningsprogrammet har under vårterminen 2002 börjat genomföras av Utvecklingsenheten tillsammans med Pedagogiska enheten vid SLU. Avsikten är att utifrån denna perspektivgivande samverkan ge totalt sex halvdagseminarier (tre heldagar totalt) rörande forskarhandledning och forskarutbildningsfrågor för att höja kompetensen hos professorer och erfarna docenter verksamma vid UU och SLU. Seminarieserien går under beteckningen "Från ord till handledning". Två seminarier har givits, och fyra är inplanerade.

I termer av nätverk har samarbete med Örebro universitet inletts rörande pedagogisk utveckling med tonvikt på handledning. För detta ändamål har projektledaren där deltagit i en handledarkurs organiserad av Lunds universitet och getts tillfälle att diskutera alternativa handledningsformer på grundutbildningsnivå.

Med ledning av material och information som insamlats av doktorandnämndens ordförande vid Samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten vid Uppsala universitet i samband med ett studiebesök i Oxford och Cambridge våren 2002 har projektledaren börjat närmre undersöka den Oxfordmodell som motsvarar den helhetssyn på handledning som föreliggande projekt strävar mot i termer av framtida modell för Uppsala universitets del. Att skissa på en idéskrift utgående

från Oxfordmodellen och att belysa olika möjliga infallsvinklar upplevs därför som angeläget.

Avslutningsvis har projektledaren också varit involverad i att, tillsammans med professor Håkan Rydin, utforma en ämnesdidaktisk forskarhandledarkurs på EBC vid Naturvetenskapliga fakulteten. Kursen omfattade fyra eftermiddagar (totalt två heldagar) under våren 2002 och gavs under namnet "Effektivare handledning". Genom att samordna kompetens- och fortbildningsinsatsen på centralt organiserad nivå och institutionsnivå har vissa synergieffekter kommit till stånd. Utvärdering har inletts.

From Post-graduate Student to Professor
A Proposal for Educational Development and Interaction within a Supervisor Training Programme

Peter Reinholdsson, PhD, Project Leader
Uppsala University
The Unit for Teaching and Interactive Learning
Division for Educational Development
Box 256
SE-751 05 UPPSALA

Magnus Ekblad, PhD Student
Uppsala University
Department of History
Division for Research
S:t Olofsgatan 12
SE-753 12 UPPSALA

The aims of this project comprise two interrelated parts:

> ➢ To develop a university-wide training programme that embraces three stages or courses matching the professional needs and expectations of research and teaching staff wishing to further develop their competence as supervisors in the line of career-building at Uppsala University (UU).

> ➢ To propose a future strategy for effective management of issues concerning super-vision policy and supervisor training at faculty and departmental levels, using the case of a particular Faculty as a point of departure for further discussion and action.

The idea for this project grew out of the discussions around the post-graduate education reform carried out within Swedish higher education in 1998. One of the aims of the reform seems to have been to try to use resources more effectively—study time should be shortened and it should be made clear that work on a doctoral thesis was an education, not a work in itself. Another aim seems to have been to increase the number of PhDs.

There were many questions; how should departments and lecturers manage the transition? Which parts of the education should be made more effective? Should quality deterioration in the actual theses be permitted? On the last question the answer was a unanimous no, the first two questions remained to be answered.

Supervision became of key significance in the debate. Supervision could be more effective as nothing really had happened here during the last few decades. Supervision could be modernised and be adapted to needs. Thus, it became a possible way of solving the equation—being more effective with maintained quality.[1]

Such a focus on supervising was also reflected in November 2000 when the Council for Renewal of Higher Education urged every institution within Swedish higher education to apply for project funding. First, an inventory of the present state of postgraduate supervisor training was to be made; second, a project embracing improvement and development of PhD supervising and supervisors was to be designed and applied for.

The above measures were well in line with the Government Bill 2000/2001:3 (p.164) which states that, 'PhD education should focus on the tutoring and the role and function of the supervisor. The education should include elements of communication knowledge, management of conflicts and research-ethical questions. Moreover, the education should also com-prise equality and gender questions.' In other words, laissez-faire communication and bad conflict management within post-graduate education may mar and hinder completion of the PhD work (see e.g. Frischer and Larsson, 2000).

---

[1] For an overview of and discussion about similar international experiences of having to rise to the occasion when it comes to improving and making for more effective PhD supervision and better management of super-visory issues at different institutional levels in higher education, see Phillips & Pugh (2000) and Delamont, Atkinson & Parry (1997). Those are excellent handbooks for PhD supervisors and post-graduate students wishing to put things into perspective and feeling the urge of getting to know how to handle issues relating to, for instance, PhD completion rate, 'quality' provision and turn-out of employable post-graduates.

Now, this project is made up of two integrated parts: a general-didactic or university-wide staff training programme in three stages, and a minor questionnaire and interview study, from now on referred to as the Case Study. The training programme consists of three course levels, together to meet the needs we believe arise in one's career as lecturer, researcher and super-visor. The Case Study aims at shedding light on the subject-didactic aspects of the supervisor question and supervision policy at faculty and departmental levels within the Disciplinary Domain of Arts and Social Sciences.

When reviewing literature on Swedish staff training of PhD and non-PhD supervisors, project leader's mind was struck by the fact that multi-stage and process-oriented approaches to career-building are lacking, meaning that the encompassing of different levels of competence rarely are considered when giving courses for developing supervisory skills and knowledge over time within training programmes. Also, there are few Swedish studies on the development of PhD supervisors' professional competence, as well as of their shared ideas and experiences of the supervisory role and functions—and even fewer studies relating to non-PhD supervisors who supervise graduate students.

The two major works on PhD supervision usually referred to are those published by Lindén (1998) and Bergenheim (2001). Both authors use narrations of or stories told by supervisors interviewed to illuminate the supervisory process. Lindén critically reflects on how to in general develop the competence of supervisors, and Bergenheim focuses on capturing and discussing impressions of PhD supervision and post-graduate education at Umeå University. As far as non-PhD supervision is concerned, a recent publication worth mentioning is that of Andersson & Persson (2002) on how to use coaching of supervisors and supervision of student groups to make supervision of degree projects more effective within graduate education.

Over the past years, some inputs to increase the PhD supervisory competence have been made at different institutions of higher education—mostly embracing short courses, seminars and workshops (see Lindén, 1998). However, examples of extended PhD supervisor training courses comprising several weeks may be found since 1994 at SLU (The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences) in Uppsala and as of 1997 at Umeå University. Given the incite-ment of the Council referred to above, a number of various measures may now be pointed to in terms of competence development and staff training of supervisors: for instance, a three-step supervisor training programme involving PhDs and PhD supervisors at Luleå University of Technology; programme for developing competence in PhD supervision at Blekinge Institute of Technology; tutorial programme for PhD supervisors at Mid-Sweden University College; teacher education programme for supervisors/educators in PhD education; process-oriented education of both doctoral students and PhD supervisors at Mälardalen University.[2]

Most interesting, and contrary to our belief when launching the project, no instances of Anglo-Saxon supervisor training programmes comprising three stages of competence (PhDs, PhD supervisors, professors), nor supervisor training courses

---

[2] For an overview of PhD supervisor courses and programmes at institutions of Swedish higher education, see *Council Financed Projects in Graduate Supervisor Training* on the following Web-site: http://hgur.hsv.se/activities/projects/forskarutb/handledarutbildning/index_financed_projects.htm

given for weeks or periods of months, were found when reviewing research and educational developmental literature on supervision. An attempt at launching a three-step staff development programme at the University of Ulster, beginning with a workshop for three days as part of an induction programme for inexperienced PhD supervisors—to be followed by development courses and targeted courses for experienced ones—has been reported in Moore (1995). Besides this case, the idea of a process-oriented, multi-stage supervisor training programme designed for career-building purposes to meet hierarchic demands in higher education seem to be neglected by staff trainers and university-decision makers.[3] Single supervisor training courses, workshops or seminars are, of course, frequently offered and developed by staff developers or educational consultants in the Anglo-Saxon world of higher education; and lots of guidelines and tips are often delivered as a point of departure for training design, among other things (see, e.g., Graham & Grant, 1997). By now, many handbooks are available on supervision and personal tutoring (cf., for instance, Wheeler & Birtle, 1993; Phillips & Pugh, 2000; Delamont, Atkin-son & Parry, 1997).

Referring to our expectations of the project, we hoped to make a picture of faculty and departmental resources allocated to professional development and training of supervisors within a particular faculty, as seen in relation to institutional resources. Rather than approaching supervisors and supervisees to capture viewpoints on the practices of supervision, we instead chose to approach university officials concerning supervisory policy and training by virtue of their key roles in managing and directing post-graduate and graduate educational issues at faculty and departmental levels, respectively.

Now, regarding the importance of the project to us and why, we believe that time has truly come to bring supervision out as a professional activity in its own right, both in post-graduate and graduate education. It can be regarded as an educational method well worth investigating into and developing further.

The following two questions, in terms of crucial aspects to be dealt with and discussed, may be derived from the aims previously stated in the beginning of the report:

> ➢ How can we contribute to developing professional competence of those supervisors wishing to make supervision visible for career-building purposes at Uppsala University?
> ➢ What strategies make for effective management and direction of supervisory educational issues relating to university decision-makers working at central, faculty and departmental levels?

---

[3] As far as supervisor training in the UK is concerned, this circumstance was corroborated by Professor Vicky Lewis (2002) in conjunction with her supervisory seminar in October of 2002 in Uppsala when appearing as a visiting lecturer on the third training course. To the best of her knowledge, being the co-author of a book on supervisory tips (see Lewis & Habeshaw, 2001) and given her broad experience of supervising at Oxford University, Open University and Warwick University, there are no supervisor training programmes corresponding to that of Uppsala University. Rather, single workshops or seminars on supervision are usually organised in the line of staff training whenever needed or called upon for. As far as she is concerned, she is frequently engaged by Oxford Brookes University—as reported from Rust (2001) to project leader. Also, the other visiting lecturer appearing on the third course, Dr Pamela Alean-Kirkpatrick at The University of Zurich, declared that she did not know about any Swiss supervisor training programmes; rather, single workshops or seminars are usually offered when staff training PhD supervisors.

A lot of supervision has taken place in Swedish higher education without much consideration being taken to it. This means that it has been withdrawn from the educational theory and practice of Swedish higher education which has grown in significance during the 1990s. Nevertheless, at the university and institutions of higher education, there are a number of academic practices established for supervising PhDs and graduate students. The hard thing is really being able to contextualise and articulate 'know-how' form of knowledge which has for long been subjected to tacit communication in the field of supervising and supervisory management and direction at faculty and departmental levels (see Lindén, 1998).

The key to developing supervisory competence would then be to facilitate situated learning and understanding of the supervisory process by having colleagues exchanging and sharing ideas between and among each other on supervising in the line of active learning or *learning-by-doing*. The phenomenon of effectiveness on the part of supervisors', supervisees', and university-decision makers' actions should also be considered when it comes to estimating effective teaching, supervision or decision-making in relation to own goals which are, in fact, socially constructed and negotiated. Successful supervising, as well as appropriate decision-making, may, as far as that goes, reflect what actors in the context value (see Brown & Atkins, 1988). Becoming aware of how to create a good environment for supervision and how to make supervision policy issues visible at faculty and departmental levels are, in our opinion, very much to the point.

We also believe that in promoting use of formal credentials, supervision will be made visible in teaching portfolios, becoming integral part of teaching and educational competence as such. The legitimacy of supervision is reinforced, and discussions on what skills and experiences the supervisor would like to acquire for career-building purposes can easily be sparked. By pointing to a supervisor training programme or access to a certificate involving a particular level of supervisory competence, the supervisor will be made aware of the possibility of obtaining the credential sought for.

Also, by trying to see supervision as we see other academic teaching, new fields for educational development have opened up. At institutions of higher education, new light can be thrown on supervision; one should research into it, teach the art of it and find ways to discuss and evaluate it.[4] This new view of supervision has been in the air for some while, all we have done is take a more radical step than many have dared or been able to do before. We have put the academic career in the centre and tried to build a programme which should support the supervisors from the beginning of their career in the direction of higher and higher positions. Instead of just a course for those in the middle of the hierarchy, we offer courses for all from graduate students to professors.

---

[4] For discussion about the different perspectives that may be put on the phenomenon of supervision, cf. Lauvås & Handal (2001). Examples of research into supervision in Norway may be found in Lauvås & Handal (1998). Research teaching and learning, involving PhD supervisory issues as well, in higher education of the UK and Australia are accounted for and discussed in Smith & Brown (1995). For an introductory overview of studies of research supervision, see, e.g., Brown & Atkins (1988). Those interested in supervisory issues relating to scientific and scholarly writing and manuscript design are, for instance, referred to Persson (1999) and Blaxter, Hughes & Tight (2001).

In the next section, we will account for the methods used, taking into consideration who were subjected to the training courses and the Case Study, as well as what, why and how things were done. The courses of the supervisor training programme and the Case Study will be presented in the section on results. The last section deals with discussion of the results of the project, involving analysis, implications and conclusions.

Method

Academic Staff

Those who were selected participants in the three courses within the programme were academic lecturers from doctoral students to professors. This wide target group was, as far as supervision is concerned, assumed to have a number of needs covered within the frame of the programme. The first course, in the following referred to as Stage 1, targeted non-PhD lecturers, i.e., doctoral students and/or young lecturers. The second course, referred to as Stage 2, targeted experienced supervisors who are on their way to becoming or who have recently become readers. (In total, N=16, including 5 readers, and 1 preparing for appointment as a reader; sex distribution: 12 females, 4 males). The third course, referred to as Stage 3, consequently targeted professors and well-experienced readers in top positions at UU. (In total, N=10, including 4 professors and 3 readers; sex distribution: 5 females, 5 males). Since this course was jointly designed with SLU (The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences), there were also PhD researchers and readers attending from SLU.

In the subject-didactic Case Study, we turned to university decision-makers or administrators active at the departmental and faculty levels within the Disciplinary Domain of Arts and Social Sciences. This we did with a questionnaire and interview survey, the Questionnaire sent to 9 directors of graduate studies within the Faculty of Arts and interviews done with 2 senior faculty administrators within the Disciplinary Domain mentioned above.

Innovation

In the following we will describe in more detail the design of the supervisor training programme, as well as the set up of the Case Study and how it was carried out.

Stage 1 corresponds to Course 1, i.e., 'Supervising Students for Degree Projects' (see Appendix 1). Stage 1, i.e., the course for non-PhD supervisors, had never before been in operation; neither at nor was another institution of higher education anything to depart form. There was thus a lot of space to test a new variant and then at a later stage make a modified approach based upon the evaluation from the first approach. There were therefore two variants of Stage 1: Stage 1A (given the first time in April 2002) and Stage 1B (April 2003). Below under the heading Results, we shall present what Stage 1A looked like and why and how Stage 1B was formed as it was.

Course 2, i.e., 'Supervising the PhD beyond Boundaries' (see Appendix 2), was originally designed in the spring of 2000 and subsequently offered in the autumn,

prior to and thus independent of the onset of the project.[5] It was linked to Stage 2 in the autumn of 2001 and, in terms of relation to the other levels of competence involved, further developed to better fit into the whole picture of the supervisor training programme. The course was thus extended from 5 to 6 days by adding a lecture on what and how to prepare for appointments of readers, with reflections given on the educational phenomenon of lecturing. Blend of participants was, as previously, sought across faculty and departmental boundaries. Enrolment was still on a voluntary basis, but the seminal idea of making the course compulsory for PhD supervisors aspiring to become readers/senior lecturers was further substantiated through introducing the lecture on academic readership.[6] The subject matters dealt with involved problem-solving and conflict management, gender- and ethnicity-related issues, research ethics, conversational skills, the regulatory framework for higher education, interaction between supervisor and supervisee, and reader appointment.

Course 3, i.e. 'Implementation of Supervision Theory'(see Appendix 3) relates to the third stage within the programme. This entirely new seminar course, which was based on a series of five half-day seminars and one extended workshop, was a joint effort on the part of UU and SLU. It was conceived and designed by project leader and two educational consultants from SLU.[7] A decision was made to cater for 10 participants from UU and SLU, respectively. The target group of UU consisted of professors and readers with a lot of experience of PhD supervision while that of SLU comprised a mix of experienced and less experienced PhD supervisors (in a couple of cases, also doctoral students taking part in developing the PhD education at SLU). The supervisors had previously completed the compulsory PhD supervisor training course at SLU and were now involved in further training for the purpose of developing a supervision policy to be practised at their own department. In the case of UU, basically the same participants attended the course from beginning to end. The participants from SLU attended whenever possible while taking a four-week course at SLU, with the jointly organised seminar course being part of that course. The seminar course delivered topics for discussion relating to doctoral students' perspectives on post-graduate education, supervision and ethnicity, examples of British and Swiss approaches to supervising PhD students, Norwegian self-assessment of how PhD supervision is done, and reporting of supervision policies developed at a couple of departments at SLU.

---

[5] It may be well noted that this PhD supervisor training course was designed by project leader in response to requests made by the Advisors for the Rector at Uppsala University and the Doctoral Student Board in Uppsala Student Union. Until 2000, according to the internal information given, single seminars, workshops, and 1- or 2-day courses on PhD supervision had been offered intermittently by The Development and Evaluation Unit. Now was the right time to make PhD supervisor training more visible and to increase its legitimacy by launching a 5-day course. The course would cater for 16 participants, knowing no boundaries for sharing ideas on supervision, research, ethical issues, among other things. In order to better meet the expectations and training needs of PhD supervisors, project leader composed a multidisciplinary reference group of four professors, a research assistant, chairman of the PhD committee, and an educational consultant from SLU. Different approaches and models for design were discussed. Decision was made to purchase the expertise of recognised research specialists and training providers at Uppsala University, involving project leader as director and facilitator of the course.

[6] This lecture is a longstanding and much appreciated teaching contribution in the compulsory PhD supervisor training course offered at SLU since the mid-90's.

[7] The educational consultants initially involved were Bengt Ekman and Laine Strömberg. Later on, in the autumn, a swap was done, with Lotta Hansson replacing Laine Strömberg.

The main aim of the subject-didactic Case Study was to illuminate a few aspects of the view of supervision policy and of the role of a supervisor held by certain key university decision-makers—directors of studies and senior faculty administrators—in both graduate and post-graduate education within the Faculty of Arts and the Disciplinary Domain of Arts and Social Sciences. The aim was more specifically to find out how these actors view competence development and exchange of experience in the case of supervision both within the departments and at faculty level. By doing so, we hoped that further discussion and action would be sparked regarding how to create a good environment for decision-making relating to issues on supervision policy and supervisor training.

The reason we chose this main aim is that the project's main part—further training for supervisors in three stages—must be organisationally and structurally related to both the formal and informal competence development which already exists in the domains, faculties and departments. To be able to create a supervisor training programme at central level which both functions well and is in demand, one must first know about what type of supervisor training exists and does not exist at other levels within the University and which decision-making positions that are connected to different supervisory activities.

The survey has in this way created a base for going further with the investigation of how educational developmental inputs concerning supervision are possible to make in co-operation with the domains, faculties or departments, given the three training courses which already exist. The survey did not therefore aim at proposing concrete and widely applicable solutions—thereby the name Case Study—but rather aimed at identifying through limited empirical material, a possible working area for educational developmental inputs within the field of supervision.

Hence, the present case study was concerned not so much with matters of sample size, consistency and generalize ability across different contexts and studies, and similar issues consistent with psychological or pedagogical research paradigms. Instead, we strived for a qualitative approach, making use of interpretative evidence and contextual sensitivity.

Finally, with reference to workload distribution, it may be well noted that the doctoral student of this project participated actively from the onset. The responsibilities given and shared include: outline of current project after completion of inventory; joint preparation and facilitation of Course One, with a summative approach to assessment and follow-up; joint design of case study and outline of questionnaire and interview with a senior faculty administrator; poster presentation of project at a Quality Conference in Malmö; participation in tutorial discussions between project leader and doctoral student; co-writing of this final report for the Council. However, doctoral student has not been involved at all in conceiving Stages 2 and 3, nor in planning and facilitating the corresponding training courses (Courses 2 and 3).

Procedures

Before delivering the three training courses in the supervisor training programme, it was clear that every course would have to be assessed at the end using a standardized summative approach. Basically, the same design and set of questions would be employed to make for easy comparison.

However, in order to better find out what and how well the course participants were learning in and responding to these courses (in particular, Courses 2 and 3, but not Course 1, due to its short and compressed format), a few Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) (cf. Angelo & Cross, 1993) were also deployed, involving coded and/or non-coded responses from the participants. By coded responses we mean multiple-choice or scaled answers developed to agree with a question using a 1–5 rating scale (e.g., 1=very negative, 2=negative, 3=quite positive, 4=positive, 5=very positive). Non-coded responses refer to participant's own written comments to questions posed. Needless to say, coded responses are an integral part of summative approaches as well.

On Course 2, the participants, for a formative purpose, were given Director-Designed Feedback Forms on the different sections or scheduled occasions relating to the organisation of the course (see Results). The items asked for in each section (partly including the fourth and last) basically made use of both coded and non-coded feedback from the participants on the following: impression of the section, achievement of the goals set, usefulness in terms of subject matter dealt with, future supervisory applications, forms of working for facilitating participant's learning, and expectations met. It may also be noted that the participants at the end of the first day of the course were invited to summarise and write evaluative comments about the class. In doing so, they responded to a couple of steps in a CAT called RSQC2 (Recall, Summarize, Question, Comment, Connect).

Furthermore, on Course 3, a Teacher-Designed Feedback Form was handed out by one of the foreign visiting lecturers at the end of her seminar and responded to non-coded in class by the participants. Electronic Mail Feedback was implemented by the director (project leader) to follow up another foreign visiting lecturer's seminar. A summative approach to assessment was made on the sixth and last occasion, employing a similar structure and design as in the summative approaches used for Course 1 and 2.

The procedures above for gathering and processing evaluative information were supplemented by those of the subject-didactic Case Study targeted at certain decision-makers within the Faculty of Arts. The material was collected through questionnaire and interviews. The Questionnaire, involving both coded and non-coded responses (see Appendix 4), was sent to 9 directors of graduate studies within the Faculty of Arts, five of whom answered. The interviews were performed with two senior faculty administrators active within the Disciplinary Domain of Arts and Social Sciences.

Among those who answered the Questionnaire and those interviewed (seven in total), we found all are men, all were born between 1942 and 1957 and that all but one has a PhD. This implies that with respect to age, sex and academic degree, the group is relatively homogeneous. The Questionnaire and interviews consisted of both quantitative and qualitative parts. In general, attitude questions were posed, but in several of the responses to the open qualitative questions a number of more concrete conditions also appeared. The answers to the quantitative parts were circled on a 1–5 rating scale by those answering (cf. Trost, 1994, for a methodological discussion). The two senior faculty administrators were interviewed individually on separate occasions. During the interviews, notes were taken which formed the basis for the following analysis.

The choice of Faculty and Domain was for pragmatic and context-sensitive reasons; the authors' own experiences of research and post-graduate education are to be found here (Musicology and History, respectively). Also, due to the fact that the survey encompasses a minor sample, which in addition has a low response frequency, no attempt will be made at coming to general conclusions; still, the results imply an indication of some more or less significant tendencies.

Results

The starting point for Stage 1A, i.e., Course 1 offered in April of 2002, was to give an orientation with the purpose of making the participants think about what they do and why in their supervisory work. The ambition was not therefore that the course should offer training in practical skills but should—with the guest lecturers in combination with group discussions—be a springboard for self-reflection. The choice of course content, goals, aims and forms of working were based on what a reference group contributed with opinions based upon their own experience and opinions. The place in the 3-stage programme of this course was thus obvious—it would be the base for participation in Stage 2, which would among other things continue building with special skills in varying forms.

There is in the course assessment quantitative and qualitative indications that the participants did not think the course reached the set goals. Even worse, the goal itself was questioned. Many wrote that they desired practical advice, tips, didactics, conversational skills, roleplay, 'do-it-yourself' inputs and problem-based learning, something which had been consciously demoted as a priority. In connection hereto, there were suggestions for an extension to the course by half a day to have time for these parts.

One could say that the need of this target group was misjudged and that experience was underestimated. They did not want a course which offered orientation aimed at self-reflection of what they did when supervising. Clearly, they wanted instead to learn skills and gain knowledge in supervising based on what the others did and were able to do. In some way, what was desired in the assessment was a course similar to Stage 2 but which could keep the target group doctoral students and lecturers supervising graduates.

This implied first of all that the aims of the whole supervisor training programme had to be changed somewhat. Instead of seeing knowledge acquisition as cumulative, i.e. to offer some in Stage 1 and a little in Stage 2, the emphasis was placed on offering as many skills and abilities as possible already in Stage 1. These skills can then be repeated and further analysed in Stage 2. By introducing more didactic question formulation in combination with training in conversational skills, Stage 1 would be more like Stage 2. The course thereby became a preparatory base for the later parts of the training programme.

Stage 1B was given in April 2003 and a review of the course assessment showed immediately that the criticisms met in Stage 1A had changed for the better. In general, the participants were much more satisfied with the course as a whole but also with the different parts. One quotation from the course assessment shows that Stage 1B succeeded better than Stage 1A,
'The course gave more information which was much more concrete than I had imagined before. The other participants from other parts of the university could

contribute with new aspects and points of view on the role of supervisor—I had not expected this to the extent which they did'. On a 1–5 rating scale, the 'overall impression of the course' was rated with an average of 4.15 and a median value (M) of 4.00.

What was previously an empty space on the map was now getting contours. The experience we had here does not, to the best of our knowledge, really seem to be comparable to anything else in the field of staff training in Swedish higher education.

Course 2, corresponding to the previously established course 'Supervising the PhD beyond Boundaries' and now part of Stage 2 within the training programme, comprised six days during a period of three months. The structure was 3 + 1 + 1 + 1 days, involving a division into four sections or occasions. The course basically aimed at clarifying what the supervisor can and should do in the light of work at his/her own department in addition to making the supervisor aware of different aspects, conditions and strategies of importance concerning the interaction between supervisor and post-graduate student. Judging from the assessment data gathered, involving both coded and non-coded responses, the course managed to meet the expectations of the participants well and to achieve most of the goals well— particularly in the first section, and to some extent in the three other sections. Thus, the impression of the first section was rated very positively with an average value of 4.40 (M = 4.00). The second and third section scored at 3.50 (M = 4.00) and 3.87 (M = 4.00) on average, respectively; the overall impression of the course was rated in the last section, at an average of 4.27 (M = 4.00).

Good spread of participants from different faculties and scientific areas was enabled due to the excessive number of applicants in combination with appropriate procedure for selection using several parameters (such as faculty affiliation, past experience of supervising, male/ female, among other things). This spread was appreciated very much and highly rated among the participants in terms of goal achievement relating to the value added of the faculty and interdisciplinary exchange of experience for the participants. In fact, by assessing this goal twice (in the beginning and at the end of the course), project leader found out that appreci-ation increased significantly over time: the first rating was at an average of 4.07 (M = 4.00), the second one of 4.53 (M = 5.00). Another variant of a two-step formative approach to assessment was made use of by project leader when assessing goal achievement relating to the creation of deeper understanding of the interaction between supervisors and post-graduates and the dynamic character of the research tutorial or supervisory meeting in theory and practice. The first rating, in the first section, scored at an average of 4.20 (M = 4.00). When assessing the second time, considerations to ethical, ethnical and gender-related aspects were also taken and integrated into the interaction-oriented goal. This time, the score was much lower, at an average of 3.33 (M = 4.00). The reason for this will be analysed in the next section.

Teaching methods embraced training in practical skills, seminars, shorter lectures, applied exercises (role play and problem analyses), group discussions, as well as individual home assignments between scheduled occasions. Needless to say, the principle of active learning involving training, group-work, assignments, among other things, was responded to very well, resulting in several high ratings (small-group discussion on literature assignment was, for instance, rated at an average value of 4.57 (M = 5.00)). Conversely, bad lecturing, few discussions and inferior connection

to participant's reality of supervising raised lots of criticism in the assessments: a session delivered by invited PhD supervisors and doctoral students on the very first day of the course scored in terms of relevance of content at an average value of 2.60 (M = 2.00); another session on readership and the psychology of lecturing scored in terms of value added at 3.50 on average (M = 4.00).

Also, a crucial feature of the course was, and still is, to rely extensively on participants' own willingness to describe and share their personal experiences using either the perspective of the supervisor or the PhD. However, this time, most unexpected, one of the 17 participants did not comply with the instructions given beforehand regarding the individual design of a case (narration) for discussion and use as a point of departure for the exchange and sharing of previous supervisory experiences among the course participants. Concomitantly, upon arrival, the participant was asked by the lecturer in question not to attend the case session. Excepting this incident, the session, in terms of relevance of content, scored at an average value of 4.60 (M = 5.00); and the form of working used (discussing and sharing ideas on individually designed cases) was rated at 4.33 (M = 4.00).

Course 3, i.e., Stage 3 within the programme, was, on the part of UU, conceived of as a seminar course, aiming at supervisors in top positions—assumedly involving those who are the hardest to reach and influence in terms of staff training, meaning well-experienced readers and full professors.[8] For this reason, given the exploratory and co-operative nature of the course involving both UU and SLU, the strategy adopted was to approach former course participants in PhD supervision training, as well as professors and readers already familiar to the course directors. The idea was to entice this target group into taking a supervisor training course to further develop their understanding of the complex supervisory process. Other aims were to facilitate exchange of ideas on PhD supervision across disciplinary boundaries among colleagues from both universities, and to give both international and national perspectives on PhD supervision and post-graduate education.

Unfortunately, for various practical reasons, attendance in class during the course varied significantly (no one actually managed to come to all six seminars: two in the spring and four in the autumn). New faces kept showing up on single occasions which, as pointed out by one participant from UU, rather turned the course into a series of independent seminars with an ever changing learning environment and questions arising in one's mind about who were really attending. In this regard, the course did not meet the expectations of some of the participants from UU. Still, 8 of 10 of the participants (5 females, 3 males) completed, having attended 4–5 seminars on average. Worth noticing is also the fact that only one PhD super-visor from the Disciplinary Domain of Arts and Social Sciences took part. Spread of participants from different faculties and scientific areas were thus not so good, as seen from the perspective of this lonely scholar.

---

[8] According to Alean-Kirkpatrick (2002), those working as staff developers and educational consultants in the field of higher education in Switzerland have a really hard time enrolling professors and readers to supervisor training courses, seminars or workshops. A similar problem seems to prevail in the UK (Lewis, 2002). Conversely, at the University of Ulster, when designing a staff development programme for PhD supervisors, planning team was requested by the vice-chancellor to ensure that there would not be any training of 'dinosaurs' since new forms of doctorate were being developed within the university (see Moore, 1995). In other words, this group of very experienced PhD supervisors does arouse emotions abroad, disregarding whether they are targeted or not.

The procedure for gathering summative written feedback turned out unsatisfactory since in total only five participants responded: four from UU, one from SLU. Thus, in the case of UU, the response rate was 50 percent. The assessment forms were handed out on the sixth and last occasion. It was suggested that the participants fill in the forms afterwards and send their responses by e-mail to course director(s). Of course, making calculations of the average and median values of the coded responses of the course assessment seemed slightly off target, in view of the low response rate and the high level of statistical uncertainty involved.

Nevertheless, regarding the overall impression of the course, those few responding to and rating this item seemed to be satisfied: an average value of 4.00 and a median value of 4.00 were scored, respectively. The goal relating to further development of and self-reflection in role as PhD supervisor was in terms of achievement scored at 4.20 on average (M = 4.00). The item encompassing international and national perspectives on PhD supervisor's views of supervising and post-graduate education was rated at an average value of 4.00 (M = 4.00). The goal-oriented facilitation of exchange of ideas across boundaries scored 3.80 on average (M = 4.00). As far as relevance of content was concerned, the seminars delivered by Pamela Alean-Kirkpatrick and Per Lauvås were appreciated the most: the former scored 4.33 on average (M = 4.00), the latter 4.25 (M = 4.50).

As regards the Case Study, concerning the first two questions in the Questionnaire (about Supervision Policy and the Target Group for Supervisor Training—see Appendix 4) there seemed to be consensus between the two interviewees. The directors of studies, on the other hand, had to some extent another perspective. The senior faculty administrators emphasised the importance of new PhDs and newly appointed supervisors as the target group. The direct-ors of studies, on the other hand, expressed in a few cases that it ought to be the supervisors who get the possibility of attending a training course. They did not find any great need to divide the broad group of supervisors into different target groups. The view on how long a training course for supervisors should be varied; one of the interviewees considered 48 hours as suitable, the other 18 hours. Even in the Questionnaire answers we found variation; 1–2 weeks, 18 hours, or a working week.

Another important result of the Case Study is that those who answered expressed a row of similar thoughts and needs independent of each other. The clearest example of this is the need for a mentor project/networking. One of the senior faculty administrators answered 'mentor networking is a good forum'. The other answered similarly; 'good idea, gives contact and insight'. It is important to point out here that they had different views on the working form for competence development which were given as alternatives in the question. The idea concerning networking among mentors was even appreciated in the Questionnaire. On a 1–5 rating scale the average value for this form of working was 4.0 which should be seen as fairly high when the other alternatives (see Appendix 4) scored between 3.2 and 3.4 on average.

Discussion

Analysis

Using the course evaluations for Course 1, we can see that the goals were fulfilled to a much better degree in Stage 1B. As described in the methodological section, changes were made after the course evaluation of Stage 1A contributing to a better result. What may be pin-pointed in Stage 1B as contributory factors for this? The question can be answered with the following: good and satisfactorily conducted discussions; time allocated for processing impressions; reflection following upon practice; some (but not too much) overlapping of different parts of the course; parts that complemented each other; and the lecture concerning the importance of ethnicity in supervisory situations was appreciated. All this meant that the participants' impressions of the different parts of the course together meant that the course aims were fulfilled.

Course 2 started off very well. In fact, the first section was appreciated the most as compared to the three other sections. Also, having deployed for assessment the interaction-oriented goal the second time, after integrating ethical, ethnical and gender-related aspects into the formulation of this goal, project leader found a significant decrease, in terms of goal achievement, of the average value. Why was that? Judging from the non-coded responses in the assessments, the seminars on these complex aspects (especially gender and ethics in the second section) did not meet the participants' expectations for the following reasons: the participants' own experiences of those issues were not discussed, dealt with, or responded to; the supervisory process, involving supervisor and supervisee, was neglected or not touched upon; no use made of concrete examples connected to participant's everyday reality of supervising; teaching approaches were experienced as being too theoretical and abstract—even 'old-fashioned'.[9]

Also, the change previously made and accounted for regarding the addition of a seminar on the phenomenon of lecturing and readership was rated as 'to some extent relevant'—but no more than that. Does such rating, in terms of relevance, make for further use in Course 2, in the light of many years of refined delivery at another institution of higher education? Well, according to the participants taking the course recently, definitely so. The seminar then actually managed to score 4.67 on average (M = 5.00).[10] All of this points to the fact that each class or group of participants is context-specific, having its "own particular dynamic, its own collective personality, its own 'chemistry'" (see Angelo & Cross, 1993, p. 5). Facing up to this circumstance as a staff trainer, educator, or teacher is a great and inspiring challenge.

---

[9] Originally, project leader had two other lecturers on gender and ethics in mind, recalling participants' good responses to their style of facilitation last time the course was offered in the autumn of 2000. However, due to unanticipated events, these lecturers had to cancel late. Finding good substitutes did not prove that easy, and those found were apparently not intent on communicating in a two-way direction. Changes were made back for the better in the course given recently (in the autumn of 2002).

[10] The overall impression of the course was rated at an average value of 4.75 and a median value of 5.00. Careful selection of lecturers/facilitators and recurrent connection to participant's everyday reality of supervising, among other things, paved the way for excellent reception of the course. Worth noticing in passing is also the fact that the course scored 4.83 on average (M = 5.00) the first time it was given in 2000.

Another challenge involves knowing how to approach non-compliant participants who are unwilling to play by the rules set for a training course, such as the incident previously mentioned regarding the individual design of a written case (narration). Initially, being a non-native speaker of Swedish, the participant referred to language problems as a reason for not being able to prepare the assignment. Later on, after the course, factors of cultural determination were brought up, making it hard for the participant to comply with the instruction given for the assignment. Be that as it may, the participant was kindly requested to complete the assignment some other time, whenever more appropriate.

Speaking of challenge, the design, delivery and assessment of Course 3 on the part of project leader also proved to be partly intricate, involving moments of excitement, bewilderment and despair. Prior to launching the course, discussions were for marketing reasons conducted on whether it should be characterised as a 'course', or as a 'series of seminars'. Would a professor prefer to take a series of seminars rather than a course? As it were, the latter option seemed more appropriate in the case of SLU, the former in the case of UU. Concomitantly, a brewage emerged encompassing differences in a number of aspects relating to motivation: goal attainment; participant's training needs and desires; attendance in class; participant's professional position; prior knowledge of and skills in PhD supervising; usefulness; career-building; time-management; forms of assessment. All of this might have contributed to creating some confusion about who were to supposedly be attending the course (or series of seminars) and why—as experienced and brought out by one participant from UU.

Concerning the outcome of the qualitative part of the Questionnaire Survey in the Case Study, we can mention a few aspects. In comparison with the fairly brief answers of the directors of studies, the senior faculty administrators answered much more thoroughly. It can of course depend on the oral interview situation as such and its demands on more extensive answers. Another explanation can be that the senior faculty administrators with their overview quite simply had more to say about the present role of supervision policy and possible future forms of supervisory management and direction. This might appear self-evident but it must anyway be seen as an important result.

Implications

For obvious reasons, we have not yet been able to measure and evaluate if supervision has changed as a result of the supervisor training programme or of the different courses in particular, but instead analysed the summative and formative approaches to course assessment to see if the courses were well received by the participants.

Judging from the coded and non-coded responses in the assessments, most participants were influenced in some way or another, expressing their intentions of trying to change or modify supervisory action—for instance, by designing and implementing individual action plans—and, in some cases, indicating great desires to bring up discussion on and establish super-vision policy and networking among supervisors at departmental level. This, in combination with the fact that so far about 100 supervisors have been involved in taking courses in super-visor training during 2001-2003, should provide a good starting-point and sooner or later give an impetus

to supervision at UU—provided that the university-wide super-visor training programme is established, preferably along with other supervisor training inputs at faculty and departmental level.

As far as the implementation of the programme is concerned, we are also very much aware of the fact many years will progress for participants wishing to build their careers as supervisors from Stage 1 to Stage 3, i.e., in terms of advance from doctoral student to full professor. In addition, as is already the case, PhD supervisors omit Stage 1 in favour of Stage 2 or 3.

Conclusions

The university-wide supervisor-training programme was offered through The Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning. Training needs and issues relating to recruitment of participants were partially identified by the reference groups and partially by the authors. Three training courses were planned, administered and delivered within the programme. A case study, using the formats of interview and questionnaire, was launched within the Faculty of Arts to capture the views of senior faculty administrators and directors of graduate studies on supervision policy and supervisor training.

What could then be done in the future to ensure improvement and development of supervisors tutoring at graduate and post-graduate levels in the line of career building? What is needed to meet the requirements of more effective management of supervisory issues at different levels of organisation?

Below, we propose new strategies for interaction between and among academic staff members working at central level and in particular at faculty and departmental levels within the Disciplinary Domain of Arts and Social Sciences.

➢ Provide future institutional resources for establishing the centrally organised super-visor training programme. We believe that three levels of supervisory competence should be made visible, involving the targeting of PhD students/non-PhD lecturers (Stage 1), of research assistants/ younger readers/PhD supervisors (Stage 2), of full professors/ experienced readers (Stage 3), respectively.

➢ Establish a supervision policy at faculty level (beginning with the Faculty of Arts), either as a complement to the individual study plan decided on by the Faculty Board and/or for the purpose of further developing the Individual Study Plan.

➢ Develop guidelines on appropriate supervisory actions and departmental supervision policies, meaning that each and every department within the Faculty of Arts could be encouraged to write a supervision policy document clarifying and explicating the supervisory process and relationship between supervisor and supervisee in the light of the subject-related practice used for PhD supervision at one's own department.[11]

---

[11] To study some examples, see the supervision policy documents produced so far at four departments in SLU. Web site: http://www-ubyr.adm.slu.se/IMPLEMENTATION%20OF%20SUPERVISION%20THEORY2.htm

➢ Use mentoring or design a programme/project for mentors, i.e. more experienced PhD supervisors taking care of and stimulating younger PhD supervisors. Mentor is thus an educational advisor, focusing on PhD-related issues on, e.g., communication skills. Collaborative groups of and scheduled meetings with mentors across boundaries would be an interesting strategy to try out.

➢ At the faculty and departmental levels, establish part-time role as doctoral research tutor (see Philips & Pugh, 2000). The educational tutorial system at The University of Oxford (the 'Oxford Model') could surely serve as a point of departure for the acquisition of interesting and challenging insight into the art of tuition and supervising at post-graduate and graduate levels of education in the UK and for further modelling extending from that.

➢ Establish role as director of post-graduate studies within the Faculty of Arts. The directors of graduate studies interviewed in the Case Study pointed to their lack of knowledge regarding PhD-related issues, to their feelings of insecurity experienced when responding to the Questionnaire and to the possible benefits of establishing such a role within the Faculty.[12] Given the fact that a training course for directors of graduate studies already exist at Uppsala University (so far, the only one in Sweden), the next step would be to provide training for directors of post-graduate studies.

➢ Perform interviews with the participants from the three different courses, with the aim of investigating into how they apply their knowledge in practice. This can be used to develop the university-wide supervisor-training programme further and to give the foundations for developing supervision policy documents at faculty and departmental levels.

➢ It is apparently necessary to draw an educational-historical perspective to understand how supervisor culture has been formed and changed. What is it that affects supervision? What decides how the supervisor and supervisee relate to each other?

In sum, we believe that the supervisory ideas accounted for in this report point to the future, being the end of the beginning. Even if these ideas on more effective supervision and management of supervision policy were born in a specific situation, perhaps the results of the project can be seen as applicable even at other institutions of higher education, both within and outside of Sweden, even where the stresses and change mentioned in the introduction of this report have not given rise to such a project.

---

[12] Actually, according to doctoral student Magnus Ekblad, such a role has most recently, during the spring of 2003, been established at the Department of History. This followed upon a request issued by the Faculty Board, not only to this department but to the other departments within the Faculty of Arts as well, to establish role as director of post-graduate studies. Our proposal is thus well in line with what university-decision makers might have, or might have had, in their minds within the Faculty.

Appendix

Appendix 1. Copy of Introduction, Aims, and Content in Invitation to
'Supervising Students for Degree Projects'
(Course 1 in Supervisor Training Programme).

<div align="right">
INVITATION
16 January, 2002
</div>

Supervising Students for Degree Projects

Do you supervise students who are writing their term papers or degree projects at graduate (basic) level? Would you like to be trained for supervising? Do you wonder about supervision as an educational and psychological phenomenon? Are you aware of that supervision can give educational merit when applying for a position within higher education? In that case, this course, arranged by the Development and Evaluation Unit, is something for you!

The course is mainly intended for post-graduate students but also for lecturers not holding a PhD who supervise students in independent work (essay or degree project) at graduate level at Uppsala University. The supervisory experience of the course participants will form the base for the course with discussions, examples and theoretical perspectives, which shed light upon concrete supervisory situations.

The extent of the course is 2.5 days and is held during the period April 9–11, 2002.

Aims

To give course participants knowledge of the foundation of supervision and to offer a base for the development of the ability to apply and critically evaluate their knowledge from the perspective of the supervisor and of the supervisee.

By foundation is meant:
- Supervision as an educational method.
- Supervision's social and psychological aspects.
- How to develop as a supervisor.
- Reflection on how the merits of supervision are assessed when appointments are made within higher education.

Content

- Different methods of supervision, how you choose to adapt the method, assessment of supervision, supervisor and supervisee.
- The idea of a contract, management of conflict, division of responsibility, communication, interaction.
- How do learn to become a good supervisor?
- Supervision when appointments are made within higher education. Orientation about the Higher Education Act and the Higher Education Ordinance.

Course Directors

Peter Reinholdsson, PhD, from The Development and Evaluation Unit*, and Magnus Ekblad, post-graduate research student at The Department of History at Uppsala University, will be responsible for the course. You will be notified later of other lecturers.

* As of January 1, 2003, a new organisation is in operation, using the designation 'UPI (The Unit for Teaching and Interactive Learning', meaning that the old designation 'The Development and Evaluation Unit', no longer is used.

Appendix 2. Copy of Aims and Content for 'Supervising the PhD beyond Boundaries' (Course 2 in Supervisor Training Programme).

Aims

After the completion of the course we expect you to:

- have knowledge of, and in a critical way be able to, reflect on and independently assess the aims of modern post-graduate education and its content and forms in the light of historic, national and international perspectives.

- be aware of the value added of the faculty and interdisciplinary exchange of experience for PhD supervisors at Uppsala University.

- have a deeper understanding of the interaction between supervisors and post-graduates and the dynamic character of the research tutorial in theory and practice, with consideration to ethical, ethnical and gender-related aspects.

- be able to find support in the communicative and problem-solving training which you have received based on different supervisory situations, with the aim of giving increased confidence in the role of supervisor and as preparation for appointment as a senior lecturer/reader.

Content

Interaction between supervisor and post-graduate student: 'drawing up a contract' (rights and obligations), the research tutorial, problem solving and management of conflicts, different supervisory situations, giving feedback.

What does the framework describing modern post-graduate education in contemporary Sweden look like? How have the conditions for supervisor and PhD student changed? What should apply in senior lecturer/reader appointments and how do you prepare yourself?

How can gender and ethnicity-related opinions and attitudes influence the actors in the supervisory process? What is stated about equality in the regulatory framework for higher education? How do problems arise in practice?

What ethical points of view should PhD supervisor and post-graduate student depart from? How are both parties expected to behave in a professional way?

Communicating as a post-graduate/supervisor respectively; the long journey from being accepted as a post-graduate to the final examination of the PhD (the post-graduate's career steps and the different roles of the supervisor).

Course Director was Peter Reinholdsson, PhD, from UPI/The Unit for Teaching and Interactive Learning/Division for Educational Development at Uppsala University (formerly The Development and Evaluation Unit).

Appendix 3. Copy of Invitation to 'Implementation of Supervision Theory' (Course 3 in Supervisor Training Programme).

Implementation of Supervision Theory

Would you like to get a better perspective of your role as PhD supervisor? Do you feel you have worked for a while as a supervisor but would now like new impulses and angles? Then this seminar course can be for you!

During spring 2002, The Development and Evaluation Unit at Uppsala University together with the Unit for Pedagogical Development at The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) will offer a seminar course entitled 'Implementation of Supervision Theory'. The target group is experienced supervisors (mainly readers/senior lecturers and professors). The course is financed by funds from the Council for Renewal of Higher Education starting from the development projects for supervision managed by Uppsala University and SLU respectively.

The seminars in spring are to be followed by 4 seminars in autumn. The first in spring focuses on problems and general structure questions within post-graduate education and supervision at the national level. A critical approach is made seen from the perspective of the post-graduate student. How do you in your role as supervisor handle the problems and questions asked by the student?

The second seminar views the same question from the perspective of the supervisor. What international experience of supervising can be utilised? What makes for more effective supervision of Swedish, as well as foreign, post-graduates?

The below times and premises are fixed. The names of the seminar leaders will be notified later.

Seminar 1:
Tuesday 19 March 09.00 – 12.00 (incl. lunch)
Premise: Eklundshof, Uppsala

Seminar 2:
Wednesday 10 April 09.00 – 12.00 (incl. lunch)
Premise: Hotel Linné, Uppsala

We would like to receive your application by 12 March. As this is a seminar course, it is desirable that you participate on both occasions. 10 places are reserved for Uppsala University and 10 for SLU.

Staff Contact: Peter Reinholdsson, 018/471 18 22, Susanne Vikström, 018/471 18 25.

Appendix 4. Copy of Questionnaire Sent to Directors of Graduate Studies within the Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University.

From PhD to Professor
On Supervision Policy and Supervisor Training

Questionnaire to Directors of Studies within
the Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University

You have received this form in your role as Director of Studies (Educational Director) at your department within the Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University. We would very much appreciate if you would give us your opinion to a number of statements and questions below for the purpose of enabling us to make a picture of your view of how a future supervision policy and supervisor training could be structured and organised at the faculty or departmental level.

In addition to rating by marking the figures on a scale 1–5, there is space for you to write down your own comments and ideas. We would very much like you to make use of this space!

1. What would you like to state as the main aim of a supervision policy within the Faculty of Arts? Assess how you experience the below statements by marking to what extent you agree.

	Don´t agree at all	Agree to a low extent	Agree	Agree to a high extent	Agree very much
a) The main aim is that the PhD will be good.	1	2	3	4	5
b) The main aim is that the post-graduate student will be a good supervisor after completing PhD.	1	2	3	4	5
c) The main aim is that the flow of PhDs will be good.	1	2	3	4	5
d) The main aim is that the post-graduate student will be an independent and critical researcher.	1	2	3	4	5
e) The main aim is that the post-graduate student will socialise into the academic world.	1	2	3	4	5
f) The main aim is that the	1	2	3	4	5

research student will be prepared for a career either within or outside of higher education.

Comments:

2. **Who can you imagine is the primary target group for different inputs from the faculty management to improve the competence of supervisors?**

3. **What are the minimum time demands for participants of such an input, which you would find reasonable?**

4. **Consider the following variations of teaching and work forms which can form the base of an input in the development of supervisor competence within the Faculty. Consider the degree of relevance for each respective variation.**

	Not relevant at all	Of low relevance	Relevant	Relevant to a high degree	Very relevant indeed
a) Seminars (a series of Seminars over the term).	1	2	3	4	5
b) Workshops (a special input with different content once a year).	1	2	3	4	5
c) Networking among supervisors at departmental level (group of supervisors working together on Supervision related issues	1	2	3	4	5
d) Networking among supervisors at faculty level (group of supervisors working with Supervision related issues). Consider how such a group would relate to other groups working with post-graduate educational matters.	1	2	3	4	5
e) Networking among mentors	1	2	3	4	5

(meetings where
experienced
supervisors take care of and
meet younger supervisors
in
connection to different
events).

f) Own suggestions

Comments:

5. **Consider the roles of different people in a supervisor-training development**
   input. Try to assess to which degree of relevance you think that each person
   should have. Feel free to add comments to your decisions!

	Not relevant at all	Of low relevance	Relevant	Relevant to a high degree	Very relevant indeed
a) Director of graduate studies (basic education)	1	2	3	4	5
b) Director of post-graduate studies (research education)	1	2	3	4	5
c) Head of department	1	2	3	4	5
d) Professor	1	2	3	4	5
e) Senior faculty administrator	1	2	3	4	5
f) Faculty developer (Educational consultant)	1	2	3	4	5

g) Other positions

Comments:

May we thank you for taking the time to answer these questions!!

References

Alean-Kirkpatrick, P. Conversation directed by Peter Reinholdsson in Uppsala on the 9th of October, 2002.

Andersson, G. & Persson, A. (2002) *Coaching och handledning av grupper – inom universi-tets- och högskoleutbildning*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Angelo, T.A. & Cross, K.P. (1993) *Classroom Assessment Techniques. A Handbook for College Teachers*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bergenheim, Å. (2001) *Inspirationskälla, föredöme, tränare och kollega. Forskarhandledares visioner och verklighet*. Skriftserie från Universitetsförvaltningen, 2001:1. Umeå universitet: Universitetspedagogiskt centrum.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C. & Tight, M. (2001) *How to research*. 2nd ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brown, G. & Atkins, M. (1988) *Effective Teaching in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Council Financed Projects in Graduate Supervisor Training. Retrieved June 17, 2003, from The Council for Renewal of Higher Education Web site: http://hgur.hsv.se/activities/projects/forskarutb/handledarutbildning/index_financed_projects.htm

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. & Parry, O. (1997) *Supervising the PhD. A Guide to Success*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Frischer, J. & Larsson, K. (2000) Laissez-faire in Research Education. An Inquiry into Swedish Doctoral Program. In *Higher Education Policy, vol. 13, nr. 2*, s. 131-155.

Graham, A. & Grant, B. (1997) *Teaching More Students, 8 Managing More Post-graduate Research Students*. Oxford: The Oxford Centre for Staff Development.

Lauvås, P. & Handal, G. (2001) *Handledning och praktisk yrkesteori*. 2:a uppl. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Lauvås, P. & Handal, G. (1998) *Hovedfagsveiledning ved Universitetet i Oslo*. Rapport fra prosjektet "Vitenskapelig veiledning", nr 1.

Lewis, V. & Habeshaw, S. (2001) *53 Interesting Ways to Supervise Student Projects, Dissertations and Theses*. 2nd ed. Plymouth: Technical and Educational Services.

Lewis, V. Conversation directed by Peter Reinholdsson in Uppsala on the 19th of September, 2002.

Lindén, J. (1998) *Handledning av doktorander*. Falun: Bokförlaget Nya Doxa.

Moore, I. (1995) A Staff Development Programme for Supervisors of Research Students. In *Research Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, pp. 95-101. London: Kogan Page & The Staff and Educational Development Association.

Persson, R. (1999) *Vetenskaplig handledning*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Phillips, E. M. & Pugh, D. S. (2000) *How to Get a PhD. A Handbook for Students and Their Supervisors*. 3rd ed. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Rust, C. Communication by E-mail on the 14th of December, 2001.

Smith, B. & Brown, S. (Eds.) (1995) *Research Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page & The Staff and Educational Development Association.

Trost, J. (1994) *Enkätboken*, Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Wheeler, S. & Birtle, J. (1993) *A Handbook for Personal Tutors*. Buckingham & Bristol: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Author Note

Contact addresses of the authors are the following:

Peter Reinholdsson, PhD
Uppsala University
UPI
Educational Development
Box 256
SE-751 05 UPPSALA
SWEDEN
Phone: +46 (0)18 471 18 22
Fax: +46 (0)18 471 76 80

Magnus Ekblad, PhD student
Uppsala University
The Department of History
Division for Research
S:t Olofsgatan 12
SE-753 12 UPPSALA
SWEDEN
Phone: + 46 (0)18 471 15 60
E-mail: Magnus.Ekblad@hist.uu.se

Cellular: 070 283 02 08
E-mail: Peter.Reinholdsson@uadm.uu.se

Developing Graduate Supervisor Training

FROM POST-GRADUATE STUDENT TO PROFESSOR. A PROPOSAL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERACTION WITHIN A SUPERVISOR TRAINING PROGRAMME

Case study for institutional project 015

Uppsala University

Budget:		Council funding:	300,000 SEK
		Other:	-
Staffing:			0.45 FTE
Audience:	Participants in the three supervisor training courses that comprised the programme were academic lecturers at different stages in their careers, from doctoral students to professors across all disciplines. The first course was designed for graduate students, as well as university teachers without a graduate degree, with both involved working as supervisors at the undergraduate or graduate level. The second course was given for graduate supervisors who wanted to qualify as associate professor (reader or "docent"). The third course attempted to engage experienced readers and full professors who wanted to hone their skills as a project leader, supervisor and researcher. In the case study, we turned to university decision makers and administrators active at the departmental and faculty levels within the disciplinary domains of the arts and social sciences, in particular the Faculty of Arts, encompassing directors of graduate studies and senior faculty administrators.		

Project Overview:

The program sonsists of three stages. Stage 1 corresponds to Course 1, i.e., 'Supervising Students for Degree Projects'. As far as we know this course for graduate students and lecturers without graduate degrees had never been given before; either at Uppsala or was any other institution of higher education . There was thus a lot of room to innovate and subsewquently modify things at a later date based upon the evaluations of the first approach. There were therefore two versions of Stage 1: Stage 1A (given the first time in April 2002) and Stage 1B (April 2003). 18 participants attended Stage 1A and 13 Stage 1B. The starting point for Stage 1A was to give an orientation comprising 2.5 days with the purpose of making the participants think about what they do and why in their supervisory work. The ambition was not therefore that the course should offer training in practical skills but should—with 7 guest lecturers in combination with group dis-cussions—be a springboard for self-reflection. The choice of course content, goals, aims and forms of working were based on the opinions and personal experiences of a reference group. On the basis of their reccomendations, Stage 1B offered as many skills and abilities as possible already in Stage 1, using the approach of 'learning-by-doing' rather than 'learning-by-thinking' and concomitantly providing the opportunity to repeat and further analyse these skills in Stage 2. By introducing more didactic question formulation in combination with training in conversational skills, Stage 1 would be more like Stage 2.

Course 2, i.e., 'Supervising the Graduate Student Beyond Boundaries', was originally designed in the spring of 2000 and subsequently offered in the autumn, before the onset of this project. It was then linked to Stage 2 in the autumn of 2001 and further developed to better fit into the whole picture of the supervisor training programme. As before, a mixed group of 17 participants was selected across faculty and departmental boundaries. Enrolment was still voluntary, but the decisive idea of making the course compulsory for graduate supervisors aspiring to become readers/senior lecturers was further sustained by introducing a lecture on academic readership. The course was given in 4 blocks over a period of 4 months (3 + 1 + 1 + 1 days). 12 facilitators delivered the course content through a combination of practical exercises to develop skills, seminars, short lectures, applied exercises (role play and problem analyses), group discussions, as well as individual home assignments between scheduled occasions. The course basically aimed at clarifying what the supervisor can and should do in the light of work at his/her own department in addition to making the supervisor aware of important aspects of the interaction between supervisor and post-graduate student. The subject matter dealt with problem-solving and conflict management, gender- and ethnicity-related issues, research ethics, conversation skills, the regulatory frame-work for higher education, interaction between supervisor and supervisee, and reader appointment.

Course 3, 'The Implementation of Supervision Theory', is third stage of the programme. This new seminar course, comprised of a series of 5 half-day seminars and 1 extended workshop (2 events in spring and 4 in the autumn), was a joint effort between Uppsala University and The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU). It was conceived and designed in the spring of 2002 by the project leader and two educational developers from SLU. Of the participants in the intitial course, 10 professors and readers with a good deal of supervision experience came from Uppsala University and 10 participants with various levels of experience came from SLU, including some graduate students involved in one of their graduate education development initiatives. (See institution project 011.) The course covered doctoral students' perspectives on post-graduate education, supervision and ethnicity, examples of British and Swiss approaches to supervising graduate students, a Norwegian self-assessment of possible modes of graduate

supervision and the supervision policies some of the SLU departments.

In the disciplinary case study, we surveyed a number of university decision makers and administrators at the departmental and faculty level in the arts and social sciences at Uppsala University with a questionnaire and interviews.

Goals

- To develop our three stage institution wide training programme to meet the professional needs and expectations of our research and teaching staff in the context of an academic career at Uppsala University.
    - The goals for Stage 1 are to give course participants a foundation in supervision and a sound base to develop their ability to apply and critically evaluate their knowledge from a joint supervisor:graduate student perspective.
    - The goals of Stage 2 are to give an orientation in modern postgraduate education and its content and forms; to promote understanding of the interaction between supervisor and graduate student in the light of ethical, ethnical and gender-related aspects; to offer communicative and problem-solving training based on different supervisory situations; to give opportunity for faculty and interdisciplinary exchange of experience for graduate supervisors at Uppsala University.
    - The goals of Stage 3 are to further develop an experienced graduate supervisor´s understanding of the complex interaction between supervisor and graduate student; and to give national and international perspectives on supervision and Graduate research education.

The intent is also to propose future strategies for the effective management of supervision policy and supervisor training issues at the faculty and departmental levels, based on the case study carried out at the Faculty of Arts.

Objectives

To make supervision activities visible in teaching portfolios, promote the use of formal credentials, and promote supervision as an integral part of teaching and educational competence, as such. The legitimacy of supervision will gradually be reinforced, enabling an institutional conversation on the skills and experiences the supervisor necessary for career-building purposes.

Upon completing Course 1, participants will be in possession of basic ideas about supervision as an educational phenomenon, the social and psychological aspects of supervising, how to further develop as a supervisor, and how the merits of supervision are assessed when appointments are made within higher education.

After completion of Course 2, participants should be able to critically reflect on and independently assess the aims of modern post-graduate education and its content and forms in the light of historic, national and international perspectives; be aware of the added value added of faculty and interdisciplinary exchanges of experience; have a deeper understanding of the interaction between supervisors and post-graduates and the dynamic character of the research tutorial in theory and practice, with consideration to ethical, ethnical and gender-related aspects; be able to find support for their communicative and problem-solving training in different supervisory situations, with the

aim of giving increased confidence in the role of supervisor and as preparation for appointment as senior lecturer/reader.

After completion of Course 3, participants will have deeper understanding of their role as supervisor, as well as the relationship between supervisor and graduate student, and embrace both national and international perspectives on graduate supervision and post-graduate research education.

Participants will hopefully be aware of how to create a good environment for supervision and how to make supervision policy issues visible at faculty and departmental levels. This applies not only to participants trained for supervision but also to university decision-makers working with those issues after participating in a minor case study launched by us on academic staff within the Faculty of Arts.

The expected outcome for teachers and researchers wishing to prepare and further develop themselves as supervisors for undergraduate, graduate or postgraduate levels of education is thus the establishment of a university-wide supervisor training programme comprising three recurrent courses funded by Uppsala University and offered each study year by the Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning. We also hope that the future strategies proposed will stimulate the further development of supervision policies and training programs among university decision-makers at different levels.

Format/Length

The new supervisor training programme designated 'From PhD Student to Professor' is a university-wide training programme that embraces three stages of competence for academic teachers and researchers involved in supervising at Uppsala University. Each stage of competence corresponds to a course designed to satisfy the demands of supervisors wishing to develop themselves in the line of career building. Course 1 comprises 2.5 days and is addressed to graduate students and non-graduate lecturers supervising students for degree projects at either the undergraduate or graduate level. Course 2 encompasses 6 scheduled days and is directed to research assistants, researchers and young readers supervising graduate students at post-graduate level of education. Course 3 is oriented to professors and experienced readers and embraces 5 to 6 half-day seminars on national and international perspectives on graduate supervision and issues relating to supervision policy.

Partners:

Internal: The Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning provided the expertise and implemented the programme. Uppsala University provided venues within and outside the University for the courses, as well financial support for the project leader/course director. The Department of History offered significant post-graduate student support in terms of active participation, shared responsibilities and the outlining of parts of the programme.

External: The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences were actively involved in the planning, designing and delivery of Course 3 of our programme, inviting course participants from The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences and acting as co-convenors at the seminars.

Faculty: Course directors from The Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning at Uppsala University were involved in facilitating Course 1 and 2. Uppsala University and The Swedish University of

Agricultural Sciences jointly facilitated the third course. Speakers mainly included faculty from Uppsala University across disciplines with specific area content expertise in the two first courses. Course 3 featured international lecturers from Great Britain, Switzerland and Norway, as well as lecturers from different institutions of higher education in Sweden.

What makes this program effective?

Program: Three different supervisor training courses and stages of competence take into consideration the diverse career needs and desires of a heterogenous group of supervisors, ranging from supervising at undergraduate or graduate through post-graduate levels of education; opportunities for participant interaction, active learning, sharing of ideas and networking; emphasis on practical career and supervisor training according to choice and stage of competence desired; use of condensed two-and-a-half-day format (Stage 1) in combination with extended four-month format (Stage 2) and two-term format (Stage 3), which makes for a dynamic and flexible structure of the practice over time.

Participants: Diverse disciplinary and educational/professional backgrounds (graduate students, lecturers not holding a graduate degree, graduate supervisors (researchers, research assistants, readers, professors)), university-decision makers (directors of graduate studies, senior faculty administrators).

Assessment:

Measures used: Initial needs assessment discussion and analysis carried out by the course directors together with a reference group (prior to implementation of Course 1).

Preparatory discussions and the exchanging of views on design, content, delivery and assessment of Course 3, involving both the director from Uppsala University and those from The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (prior to implementation of Course 3).

Background survey of participants before selecting them for the courses.

Standardized, summative assessment at the end of each course, involving the use of more or less the same design and set of questions to make for easy comparison between the courses, via rating form and coded, as well as non-coded, responses.

Classroom assessments built into seminar sessions in Course 2 and 3 - CATs (director-designed feedback forms, parts of RSQC2, teacher-designed feedback form, electronic mail feedback); various methods used each term.

Needs assessment survey on supervision policy and supervisor training within the Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University through a questionnaire to nine directors of graduate studies

and interviews with two senior faculty administrators.

Results/Impact: In total, courses within the supervisor training programme attract at least 80 applicants each study year for 42 slots.

Judging from the coded and non-coded responses in the assessments, most participants were influenced in some way or another, expressing their intentions of trying to change or modify supervisory action—for instance, by designing and implementing individual action plans—and, in some cases, indicating great desires to bring up discussion on and establish supervision policy and networking among supervisors at departmental level.

So far, about 100 supervisors have been involved in taking courses in supervisor training during 2001-2003. This should provide a good starting-point and sooner or later give an impetus to supervision at Uppsala University—provided that the uni-versity-wide supervisor training programme is established, preferably along with other supervisor training inputs at faculty and departmental level.

The senior faculty administrators interviewed expressed a row of similar thoughts and needs independent of each other. The clearest example of this was the need for a mentor project/networking among graduate supervisors. The idea concerning networking among mentors was also appreciated in the Questionnaire.

The idea of establishing role as director of post-graduate studies within the Faculty of Arts was well responded to by interviewees and directors of graduate studies in the Questionnaire, respectively.

In the spring of 2002, the project leader was, together with the co-ordinator of post-graduate studies at the Evolutionary Biology Centre, involved in planning, designing and facilitating a subject-didactic part-time training course for 12 graduate supervisors working at the Department of Evolutionary Biology. The idea was to use this depart-mental course as a point of departure for establishing a future graduate supervisor training course at the Faculty of Science and Technology, as a condensed alternative to the centrally organised and extended training course already offered by The Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning.

Next Steps in Assessment:

Determine short- or mid-range impact by performing interviews within a year or two with participants from the three different courses, with the aim of investigating into and evaluating how they apply their knowledge in practice. This can be used to develop the university-wide supervisor training programme further and to give the foundations for

developing supervision policy documents at faculty and departmental levels.

Determine longer-range impact of the courses, of the interrelationship between the courses within the programme, and of the whole programme as such, using the interview approach mentioned above.

Promote build-up of networking and follow-up on supervisory ideas between supervisors who have taken one or two training courses of the programme and participants involved in taking those courses.

Lessons learned:

- Planning and development of Course 3 was, for a number of reasons, done under time-pressure, and the problems of finding good speakers for the two first events in the spring of 2002 were a challenge. If possible, try to line up a number of speakers well in advance.

- Be clear about whether training events are supposed to constitute a course or merely a series of seminars, as this is significant to know about when creating good learning environment and conditions for interaction and exchange of ideas.

- With reference to the preparations made for Course 1, carefully compose a diverse reference group of at least 5-6 well-experienced people to get different sets of minds rather than a group consisting of a couple of colleagues from the same disciplinary domain as oneself.

- 'Learning-by-thinking' may be fine, but 'Learning-by-doing' is still preferred on training courses, judging from the points of criticism raised towards Course 1A offered in the spring of 2002.

- Be prepared for late cancellations on the part of invited lecturers and see to it that good back up is provided. Careful selection of speakers for the purpose of meeting participants' needs and expectations is crucial.

The future

- The Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning hopes that future institutional resources will be provided for establishing the centrally organised supervisor training programme. We believe that three levels of supervisory competence should be made visible, involving the targeting of PhD students/non-PhD lecturers (Stage 1), of research assistants/ younger readers/PhD supervisors (Stage 2), of full professors/ experienced readers (Stage 3), respectively.

- The Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning also hopes that a supervision policy will be established at faculty level (beginning with the Faculty of Arts), either as a complement to the Individual Study Plan decided on by the Faculty Board, and/or for the purpose of further developing the Individual Study Plan.

- Establishment a position for the director of post-graduate studies within the Faculty of Arts. Given the fact that a training course for directors of graduate studies already exist at Uppsala University (so far, the only one in Sweden), the next step would be to provide training for directors of post-graduate studies.

- At the faculty and departmental levels, establish part-time role as doctoral research tutor. The educational tutorial system at The University of Oxford (the 'Oxford Model') could surely serve as a point of departure for the acquisition of interesting and challenging insights into the art of tuition and supervising at post-graduate and graduate levels of education in the UK.

- Develop guidelines on appropriate supervisory actions and departmental supervision policies, meaning that each department within the Faculty of Arts could be encouraged to write a supervision policy document clarifying and explicating the supervisory process and relationship between supervisor and supervisee in the light of the subject-related practice used for PhD supervision at one's own department.

- Develop mentoring or a programme/project designed for the mentors, i.e. more experienced PhD supervisors taking care of and stimulating younger PhD supervisors. The mentor becomes an educational advisor, focusing on PhD-related issues on, e.g., communication skills. Collaborative groups and scheduled meetings with mentors across boundaries would be an interesting strategy to try.

Contact Person:	Peter Reinholdsson
Title:	Educational Developer
Sponsoring Dept.:	The Unit for Development of Teaching and Interactive Learning (UDTIL)
Address:	Uppsala University, Box 256, SE-751 05 UPPSALA
Telephone:	+46-(0)18-471 18 22
Fax:	+46-(0)18-471 76 80
E-mail:	Peter.Reinholdsson@uadm.uu.se
URL for practice:	http://www.UoU.uadm.uu.se/peterr.html http://www.upi.uu.se