DClinSci Years 4 & 5

Their Aim:

to get to a successful Professional Doctorate!

Our Aim:

To advise the trainees on their research project

To guide them in writing their thesis

How do the roles of the two supervisors compare?

Workplace Supervisor

- Detailed knowledge of the project background
- Understanding of the constraints on the student
- Usually close by to give day—to-day advice

Academic Supervisor

- Understands the academic process for Doctoral degrees
- Has experience of supervising PhDs/MDs
- Understands the constraints
- Can find the University person to provide guidelines for the degree

How do the supervisors interact?

- Usually by Skype or teleconference.
- One face-to face meeting each year is important/preferable
- Who sets the dates for meeting?
- What happens if the project is not going well-who identifies this? Who do the supervisors get help from?
- Academic supervisor should take lead on reading drafts of thesis.

How to do project managementat a distance/in a team?



Opportunity for greater success

BUT

Greater risk of things going wrong!!!

How will you monitor progress?

- Workplace supervisor:
 - Decide on an appropriate communication/monitoring system (type and frequency)
 - steering group meetings
 - regular project team meetings
 - weekly/monthly updates (paper or email)
- Academic Supervisor
 - Take responsibility for deadlines on University system
 - Adapt planning timelines from PhD and fix meetings
- Constant communication and transparencyparticularly when things go wrong

What to do if you need advice?

- Academic supervisor
 - Contact administrators re guidelines
 - Liaise with Programme Directors about project content
 - Contact MAHSE about deferrals
- Workplace supervisor
 - liaise with line manager about time constraints
 - Contact NSHCS on HSST
 - Get advice on funding from the Commissioners



Shazia Dar



Libby Osborn



Kate Smith



Jessica Bowler

The people who can help



Karen Kirkby





Rebecca Dearman



Garry McDowell



Martin Stout



Kai Uus

What is a Professional Doctorate?

A Research Degree: meeting Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) *Level 8* criteria and FQ-EHEA for Doctoral Degrees

It requires:

- Creation and interpretation of new knowledge,
 - through original research or other advanced scholarship,
 - of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication.
- A systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge
 - at the forefront of an academic discipline
 - or at forefront of area of professional practice
- A detailed understanding of applicable techniques
 - for research
 - and advanced academic enquiry



How does Professional Doctorate differ from PhD?

1. Inclusion of structured elements emphasis on candidate acquiring skills relevant to professional practice, *in addition to producing original research*

2. Situate professional knowledge developed over time in an academic framework

- 3. The Research project is relevant to and embedded within candidate's profession
- Professional Doctorates aim to develop an individual's professional practice support them in producing a contribution to (professional) knowledge





Doctoral Standard Research

- It is not just optimising an assay/technique
 - although this can be part of the research if it includes for example:
 - evaluation of patients or samples
 - and extensive analysis to show improvement

Do something now if you think this may be a problem

Triangle of Constraints



Beware scope creep



• <u>Most</u> common reason for projects delivering late/over budget

If you need to change the scope, ensure that:

- Changes are beneficial to the project
- Everybody is aware of the impact on the schedule and outcomes of the project

Drill Down

Are the tasks do-able? How do you question their validity?



| Activity | Month | Month | Month |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Register | • | | | | | | | | | | | | • |
| Literature review | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deadline for literature review | | | • | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prepare and rehearse presentation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presentation to School/Department | | | | | | | | • | | | | | |
| Documented meeting with supervisors | • | • | • | • | | • | | • | • | ٠ | • | • | |
| Plan first research unit | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Present outline of first research unit | | | | | ٠ | | | | | | | | |
| First research unit | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review and analyse research results | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Survey of literature | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Courses/conferences | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Learning about equipment & techniques | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Holiday | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Second research unit planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Second research unit | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drafting transfer report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finalise transfer report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deadline for transfer report | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Transfer viva | | | | | | | | | | | | • | |
| Visit from leading professor | | | | | | ٠ | | | | | | | |

The reality of research

•Things go wrong!

•The direction of the research may change based on the results

•New data emerges from the research field



The project plan must anticipate all of this and more...

If the student is struggling or behind schedule?

This can suggest:

- project objectives are unclear
- They are unconvinced about the project
- The project is too large
- Unsure of responsibilities
- Need additional support or experience

As supervisor you can:

- Respond to delays early
- Consider implications if you adapt the plan
- increase resources and/or engage others



Comfort zone

Easy, stress free, "doing ok", no dramas, happy,

content

Stretch zone

Pushing performance, high effort, improving, excitement, adrenaline, growth

Panic zone

Anxiety, worry, bad decisions, irritable, concern, poor performance

The Examination Process

- Discuss when thesis should be submitted now
- Determine the appropriate format now and perhaps modify with time
- Six months to go-suggest external examiner by discussing at a supervisory meeting
- What is your role in reading the thesis?
- How do you set guidelines for giving feedback?
- Ensure care is taken to meet the University submission requirements
- Give advice on the examination process at viva
- Celebrate!!!!!

Overview

- Two formats
 Journal format or Traditional
- Suggested word count 20 40,000 words
- Pho
- Presentation should follow the policy of the registering institution
 - MMU <u>https://www2.mmu.ac.uk/graduate-school/regulations-cop-supporting-material/</u>
 - UoM <u>http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=7420</u>

Overarching Thesis Structure

| Journal Format | Traditional Format |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Abstract | Abstract |
| Systematic Review / Literature Review | Introduction / Literature Review |
| Empirical Paper(s) | Methodology (where appropriate) |
| Critical Appraisal Paper | Results Chapter(s) |
| References | Discussion and Conclusion |
| Appendices | References |
| | Appendices |

Standard Thesis Format

20-40,000 words (must not exceed 50,000 words) PhD thesis 80,000 words maximum

Detailed Structure:

- Electronically generated cover page
- Title page + Submission statement
- List of contents, tables, figures etc.
- Abstract + (optional) Lay abstract
- Declaration/copyright statement/Acknowledgements
 - Introduction/Literature review
 - Aims & Objectives
 - Methodology
 - Results chapters (1 or more)
 - Discussion/conclusion & future work
 - References
 - General Appendices
 - Appendix with details of rest of Course
 - Appendix with Innovation Proposal
 - Published papers arising from the thesis



Journal Format Thesis

Expected length 20-40,000 words (PhD would be 80,000 words maximum)

Detailed Structure:

- Electronically generated cover page
- Title page + Submission statement
- List of contents, tables, figures etc.
- Abstract + (optional) Lay abstract
- Declaration/copyright statement/Acknowledgements
- Rationale for submitting in journal format & description of thesis structure
- $\circ~$ Context of the research & rationale and strategy for the research
- Systematic Review or Literature Review
- Methodology & critical analysis of the methods
- *Empirical Results Paper(s)*-Presentation of results in format suitable for publication in peer-reviewed journal
- Critical Appraisal Paper-Summary/conclusion drawing together the various outcomes of the work in a coherent whole and future directions
- References
- General Appendix
- Appendix with details of rest of Course
- Appendix with Innovation Proposal

Systematic Review

- Default format for Literature Review –closely linked to the main research project
- May not suit all projects and should be discussed with supervisory team
- The level of systematic review should also be agreed
- Presentation:
 - Follow the format and guidelines for the target journal
 - If no word count given the review should be a maximum of 8,000 words (excluding references and tables)

Empirical Results chapter

- Paper(s) prepared in accordance with guidelines of a specific journal
- **Word count:** in line with target journal (if none stated 8,000 maximum)
- **<u>Co-authors:</u>** contribution of co-authors clearly acknowledged
- **<u>Reference list:</u>** target journal's referencing style. Include DOI numbers.
- Figures and Tables: formatted as in the journal
- **Footnotes:** Can be used to refer the reader to additional discussion points in the *critical reflections paper*

Empirical Results Paper

- Introduction: Present background and argument for your study. Be explicit about aims, research question and/or hypotheses. *Do not copy and paste from literature review to empirical results*.
- <u>Method</u>: Include type of review/design, inclusion/exclusion criteria for papers or participants, measures, procedures, quality appraisal or statistical analysis plan
- **<u>Results</u>**: Balance descriptive text and tabulated information with an analysis of data.
- <u>**Discussion:</u>** Present a summary, a discussion of findings drawing on relevant literature, strengths and limitations of study, clinical and/or theoretical implications, suggestions for future research, conclusions.</u>

Critical Appraisal Paper

- focus of this section is a consideration of how project contributes to theory and clinical practice in particular field.
- should put the Systematic review and project in the wider context of research and clinical practice and link them to relevant theoretical underpinnings.
- It is not expected that this paper would be submitted to a journal

What to include as Critical Appraisal?

- Refer to and appraise the research process as a whole, making reference to what was not done and why it was not done, as well as to the work that was actually carried out.
- Strengths and weaknesses of the project (i.e. the work actually carried out rather than the methodology or line of enquiry as a whole)
- Advantages and disadvantages of the broad methodological approach used in the project and consideration of alternative methodologies that could have been utilised.
- Limitations of the line of enquiry as a whole
- Implications for theory and for clinical practice
- Suggestions for further research or implementation

How to choose Standard or Journal Format?

Things to consider:

1. Does the data lend itself to more than one paper? How many? Not prescribed... (BUT - A SINGLE PAPER IS NOT USUALLY SUITABLE FOR JOURNAL FORMAT THESIS)

2. Conflict between producing multiple papers to fit Journal format or producing one much higher impact paper

3. Journal format theoretically makes it easier to get data to publication

4. May include published papers only on work done during project not before, draft papers, work in progress – but must tell a coherent "story"

5. Student has major role in any joint-authored paper and they must have written paper

Student and supervisors need to discuss this as early in the project as possible and revisit several times – don't leave the decision too late!

The Examination Process

- Discuss when thesis should be submitted now
- Determine the appropriate format now and perhaps modify with time
- Six months to go-suggest external examiner by discussing at a supervisory meeting
- What is your role in reading the thesis?
- How do you set guidelines for giving feedback?
- Ensure care is taken to meet the University submission requirements
- Give advice on the examination process at viva
- Celebrate!!!!!

Write-up timeline - Gantt chart



Examination process



- Thesis must be submitted in year 5
- Notice of submission must be given 6 months before this date.
- Notice of submission triggers nomination of examiners-usually chosen by Supervisors but requires approval by Programme Directors
- Internal and External Examiners will be notified by the Exams Office
- Usual for Supervisors to check the external examiner is willing and understands the nature of the Professional Doctorate before Notice of Submission.
 - Check when external can do Viva
- Programme Directors will act as Chairpersons in Viva

The External Examiner

Criteria for Examiners **UoM:** <u>http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=7444</u> **MMU:** <u>https://www.mmu.ac.uk/academic/casqe/examiners/</u>

An External Examiner must:

- i. have expertise in the area of work to be examined;
- ii. be experienced in research, and have recently published, or have equivalent professional experience;
- iii. normally have been an examiner for a postgraduate research degree (or had experience of the postgraduate research degree examination process)
- external examiners examining for the first time should have experience of supervising a research student and examining as an internal examiner

The External Examiner-continued

iv. hold a postgraduate research degree at level he/she is examining (or have equivalent professional experience)

v. hold/have held an appointment within university system, (although it is permissible to appoint an appropriate person from outside the university sector; e.g., a senior industrial scientist or professional practitioner who is aware of the standards required, but this should be discussed with the Academic Director)

Submission and Binding?

• Guidelines are on MAHSE website

- Manchester Metropolitan University
- University of Manchester

A degree programme isn't successful until it's finished!





