



Expectations of the Supervision Process



- ▶ **YOUR COMMON GOALS**
 - ▶ **THE NATURE OF SUPERVISORY INPUT**
 - ▶ **MONITORING AND QUALITY CONTROL**
 - ▶ **OBTAINING ETHICAL APPROVALS**
 - ▶ **REPORTING AND PROGRESS REQUIREMENTS**
 - ▶ **THE EXAMINATION PROCESS**
 - **NOMINATION OF EXAMINERS**
 - **THE WAIT PERIOD**
 - ▶ **CO-AUTHORSHIP OF PUBLICATIONS**
- 


▶ 1. TIME COMMITMENT

- ▶ In entering the Ph.D. programme, students have committed to devoting themselves either full-time (30 hours per week) or part-time (15 hours per week) to their studies.
 - ▶ Frequency of contact is likely to vary with the stage of the candidature. Typically, contact will be more frequent in the preparation of the proposal and just prior to submission of the thesis.
- 

▶ 2. WRITTEN WORK


- ▶ Supervisors are expected to negotiate with candidates a schedule for regular submission of written work, and to follow up with requests for the work if necessary. Candidates are expected to submit written work by the agreed dates or, for work that has been requested specifically, within a mutually agreed period, normally not later than one month after the request.
- ▶ It is acknowledged that the period required to produce written work may vary depending on a variety of factors including the scope of the work requested and personal schedules. It is suggested that for pieces of work which are expected to take longer than one month to produce, the candidate provides a progress report by an agreed date, which will normally be within one month of the date of request for the work. In this case the final date for submission of the work should also be mutually agreed and noted.
- ▶ It is expected that supervisors will comment, preferably in writing, on candidate's written work within a mutually agreed turnaround period, normally not later than one month after submission of the work.
- ▶ For pieces of work which are expected to take longer than one month to review, interim feedback may be provided by an agreed date, which will normally be within one month of the date of submission of the work. In this case the final date for receipt of feedback should also be mutually agreed and noted.
- ▶ **Quality Issues**
- ▶ **Expectations of Supervisory Input**

▶ 3. AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE CANDIDATURE

- ▶ Supervisors are responsible for:
 - ▶ (a) advising on and discussing with the candidate at the commencement of candidature the research process, aims, scope and presentation of the thesis, and any orientation, course work or supplementary training necessary for the research project;
 - ▶ (b) clarifying the candidate's and the supervisor's respective expectations of supervision and of the operation of the supervisory panel if applicable. On the basis of this discussion the supervisor and candidate should establish guidelines and expectations pertaining to, for example, frequency of formal meetings between the supervisor and candidate; the extent and style of the supervisor's input into the candidate's day to day activities; turnaround time for feedback on written work; any arrangements for co-supervision and interim supervision in the case of extended absence of the supervisor, if applicable; and the candidate's access to resources and space within the School.
 - ▶ (c) assisting candidates in planning an appropriate course of collateral reading, suggesting relevant background reading and giving advice on the literature review. Supervisors should also ensure that candidates are thoroughly familiar with the University resources available to them and that they are able to make full and proper use of literature sources;
 - ▶ (d) identifying specific areas in which the candidate requires development of his/her skills (eg computing, academic writing, statistics, English language) and referring the candidate to the appropriate sources of assistance.
- 


4. THROUGHOUT THE CANDIDATURE

- ▶ Supervisors are responsible for:
 - ▶ (a) monitoring, evaluating and reporting on progress.
 - ▶ (b) arranging acceptable meeting times with candidates for formal discussions and constructive evaluation of progress.
 - ▶ (c) encouraging candidates to provide a regular written progress report on what has been achieved and to indicate objectives for the next period.
 - ▶ (d) requiring written work from the candidate on a pre-arranged and agreed schedule; monitoring the progress of the work in accordance with the agreed schedule; discussing the progress of the work, and any impediments to maintaining the agreed schedule, with the candidate at regular intervals;
 - ▶ (e) ensuring that any major decisions about the candidate's research programme made in conversation between the supervisor and the candidate, or any major variations to agreed expectations and guidelines, are confirmed in writing and a copy given to the candidate, and to any other supervisor or advisor, and noted in the annual progress report. Use of the Candidate-Supervisor Checklist is encouraged to develop the broad framework of the supervisory relationship.
 - ▶ (g) encouraging the candidate to be, and as far as possible ensuring that they are, actively engaged in the research course in a manner likely to produce significant results by the time of the annual report and by the time the thesis is due to be submitted, or advising the candidate in writing that progress is unsatisfactory and identifying improvements necessary for continuation of candidature;
 - ▶ (h) submitting to the Head of School and Board of the Graduate Research School an annual report on the progress of the candidate, noting any significant achievements, difficulties and problems discussed with the candidate, including inadequate progress if applicable, and the action taken or advice given.

- ▶ **5. PREPARATION OF THE THESIS**
 - ▶ Supervisors are responsible for:
 - ▶ (a) to be a guide, advisor and critical reviewer rather than co-author or editor;
 - ▶ (b) acknowledging that preparation of material for publication should not be at the expense of timely submission of the thesis;
 - ▶ (c) developing with the candidate a timetable for preparation and submission of the thesis;
 - ▶ (d) discussing the form and content of the thesis, and the processes of thesis planning and writing;
 - ▶ (e) advising on the outline of the thesis and providing guidelines and feedback about appropriate style, accuracy and use of English;
 - ▶ (f) where necessary, referring the candidate to appropriate sources of assistance with such matters as English expression, academic writing and statistical analysis and interpretation;
 - ▶ (g) commenting on the content and the drafts of the thesis and, at the time of submission, certifying that the thesis is properly presented, conforms to the Regulations and is, therefore, prima facie, worthy of examination;
 - ▶ (h) developing with the candidate a timetable for preparation and submission of material for publication and assisting to prepare these, with appropriate agreements about co-authorship.
- 

Obtaining Ethical Approval



- ▶ **KEY PRINCIPLES**
 - ▶ **Informed Consent**
 - ▶ **Permissions**
 - ▶ **Design Considerations**
 - ▶ **Confidentiality Vs. Anonymity**
 - ▶ **The New Process**
- 

Publishing Your Work and Authorship Issues

Publishing Research


- ▶ Responsibilities to publish research:
 - “Researchers have a duty to disseminate research results to stakeholders, to other researchers, to their students, and to the general public” (AARE Code of Ethics, 1997).
- ▶ Advantages of publishing during candidature
- ▶ Goodyear, Crego, and Johnston (1992):
 - authorship issues were among the "critical incidents" identified by experienced researchers in supervisor–student research collaborations
- ▶ Some reasons why such issues are critical:
 - Fairness – all decisions must be deemed fair to all parties
 - Quality control – supervisors have a responsibility to control the quality of publications that go out under the UWA banner
 - Accurate representation of skills – it is unethical to claim sole authority for work that has relied on skills that the student does not possess; this constitutes misrepresentation to the scientific community


Generic Principles

http://www.research.uwa.edu.au/policies3/guidelines_on_research_ethics_and_research_conduct

- ▶ 1. Intellectual ownership of, and therefore co-authorship rights to, research work is shared by *all* and *only* those who have made significant intellectual or scholarly contributions to that research. In the case of empirical research, significant contributions are typically made in the conception and design of research, or in the analysis and interpretation of data collected. The “Vancouver Protocol” lists data acquisition alongside these areas, but participation in data collection alone is not sufficient. In the case of nonempirical work, significant contributions may include proposing or significantly shaping the main ideas or arguments in a piece, or providing significant input to elaborating the supporting arguments or rationales. Again, in this case, participating in the collection of source material alone (e.g., acquiring articles for use in a literature review) would not provide sufficient grounds for co-authorship creditation.

- ▶ 2. According to the Vancouver Protocol, all individuals who take up the option to co-author a paper must then contribute either to drafting the paper or revising it for important intellectual content, and must give final approval of the version to be published. This principle relates not so much to proper representation of researchers' contributions, but provides journals with assurance that at least one of the researchers involved can take responsibility for every section of the final manuscript. Thus, it does not imply that it is acceptable to draw on the intellectual input of others in conducting research (e.g., in the conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of data, in empirical research), but then justify excluding them as co-authors by opting to write the paper without their input.


- ▶ 3. Individuals who contribute only to editing surface aspects of work (e.g., grammar), or to very confined procedures used in conducting the research (e.g., advice on question wording for an instrument that is used in, but is not the focus of, an empirical study), do not meet co-authorship criteria. Individuals in the latter category may instead be listed within the acknowledgments (but *only* with their permission; acknowledgements can sometimes lead readers to infer endorsement of a work as a whole).
- 


- ▶ 4. Issues relating to the general valence or quality of interpersonal or professional relationships between researchers, either during the conduct of the research, or at the point of preparing and submitting resulting manuscripts for publication, are irrelevant in decisions about co-authorship.
 - ▶ 5. The institutional roles that individuals occupy whilst making their contributions to research (e.g., supervisor, student, research assistant, CI/PI on a grant), as well as other factors such as relative time or effort expended, are irrelevant in decisions about authorship. These judgments must rest wholly on the significance of the intellectual contribution made to the work.
- 

- ▶ 6. The significance of any contribution made to research is judged on the quality (in the “nature of” sense), not on the quantity, of that contribution. In general, the quality of a contribution can be seen in the impact that it has had on the work. A few brief conversations with another researcher may dramatically impact the overarching direction/s or design of a research work, and thus provide warrant for coauthorship creditation. Conversely, an external party to a project may invest considerable time in helping with the data collection work, but will not meet criteria for co-authorship unless he/she makes an intellectual contribution to the work.

- ▶ 7. Most disciplines have conventions for indicating the relative contributions made by authors in a multiauthored work. In education, order will typically be commensurate with significance of contribution (i.e., first author – most significant; last author – least significant). In other disciplines, however, the student author or the author who made the most significant contribution will go as first author, but the senior researcher will go last. In other cases still, where authors' contributions have been equal, the authors are listed alphabetically, and authors are encouraged to describe specifically the contribution/s they have made in the paper itself. Such decisions must reflect the conventions both of the discipline in which the student's work is based, and of the journal to which the work is submitted.


Implications for, and Principles Specific to, Student–Supervisor Co–Authorship

- ▶ 1. Student–supervisor co–authorships constitute a special case owing to the inherent power and research experience differential within the relationship. In recognition, a paper co–authored with a student often lists the student as first author.
- 

- ▶ 2. In accordance with the above generic principles, it is unethical for supervisors to accept co-authorship of students' publications if they have not provided significant intellectual input to the work on which these are based. Equally, however, if a student receives significant intellectual input to his/her work from more experienced researchers (e.g., significant guidance on the research aims, design, analysis, or interpretation), it would be unethical for the student to publish the work independently, despite the fact that research students are both entitled and encouraged to seek such input. As noted above, in academia, intellectual ownership is a function of intellectual input – questions about whether a person was obliged or otherwise to seek or provide this input (e.g., as a research assistant, or as a supervisor) are irrelevant.
- 

- ▶ 3. In some disciplines, supervisors customarily provide significant intellectual guidance to research students, and will thus *typically* meet the requirements for co-authorship. This must, however, be determined on a case-by-case basis. General supervision of a research group does not provide warrant for co-authorship creditation. If a student has been highly independent in conducting his/her work (e.g., has submitted finished work for progress monitoring purposes or invited broad comments on final work drafts, but identified the problem/s to be addressed, proposed the aims, designed the research, and analysed and interpreted the data collected, with little or no substantive input), co-authorship would not be appropriate.

- ▶ 4. In accordance with the generic principles above, the relative contributions of supervisors and students to research are judged on the quality (i.e., impact), not on the quantity, of the input. Supervisors often invest less *time* and *effort* in specific projects than do their students, but may nonetheless make an equal or greater intellectual contribution to the work. As the supervisor will typically be more experienced than the student, who will be learning new skills through doing the research, a supervisor would be expected to be able to contribute to the work more efficiently. Further, supervisors often do not become involved in the “day-to-day” implementation work in a project, because students need to do this to learn the processes, but may nonetheless make an equal or greater intellectual contribution to the work.

- ▶ 5. Less experienced researchers can find it difficult to judge whether the contributions made by others to their work is intellectually significant. This is not surprising, as making these judgments relies on having some understanding of the overall process involved in doing original research. As above, the significance of a contribution is generally seen in the impact it has had on a work. Thus, if a contribution has determined, or clearly altered (i) the rationale for, or research questions addressed in, a study, (ii) the design of the study, (iii) the analyses performed in the study, or (iv) the interpretation of the study outcomes, it is significant regardless of the time invested in making it.
 - ▶ 6. The level of skill and understanding involved in implementing research varies considerably across disciplines. In some, implementation will require a high level of skill and intellectual understanding (e.g., complex laboratory work), while in others, implementation work may be largely administrative (e.g., disseminating a survey form to prospective participants). In the latter cases, students may be expected to contribute more in other areas (e.g., design, analysis) to ensure that they have had opportunity to make an intellectual contribution/s to the work.
- 

- ▶ 7. If a supervisor or other researcher directs a student to his/her already published work, but provides no input beyond that (e.g., contributing significantly to adapting general principles to a specific study), this would not constitute grounds for co-authorship. The already published work should obviously be cited, however, if the ideas presented within it significantly influence the student's own ideas.
- ▶ 8. On enrolling in a research degree, a student may be offered a project that is actually a component of an existing research programme (which may or may not be funded by an existing grant). In these cases, the supervisor/s is/are likely to have made a significant *prior* contribution to the student's project through its initial conception and design. If this is so, these people will already have met preliminary criteria for co-authorship, and will thus have the right to contribute significantly to the writing and final approval of any papers that emerge from the work. Students who are offered such a project, but would prefer to do one *not* subject to these conditions, must discuss this with their supervisor/s *before* agreeing to undertake the work.
- ▶ 9. If a student wishes to publish a paper, but the supervisor feels that the paper would not make a significant contribution to its context field, the supervisor reserves the right to refuse co-authorship