

DClinSci Year 3, 4 & 5

Aims:

to get to a successful Professional
Doctorate!

Focus:

How to help the trainees with their
research projects



Thanks to:



Programme Plan for Life Sciences -Semester 1				Semester 2			
Year 1	A1 Semester: 1 30 credits			Section B: Specialist Scientific Clinical Programme— FRCPPath Part 1 (75 credits)			
Year 2	Section B: Specialist Scientific Clinical Programme— FRCPPath Part 1 (75 credits)			A2 Semester: 2 20 credits			
Year 3	Submit Research Project Form (end of Sep)	A3 Semester: 1 30 credits	C1-Research Project Development Semester: 1	Submit Literature Review & Extended Project Proposal	A4 Semester: 2 20 credits	Give Lay Talk	C2 Semester: 2
Year 4	C2			Give Research Talk	A5 Semester: 2 20 credits	How to write a Thesis	How to write a paper How to give a Research Talk
Year 5	C2			Notice of submission	Submit thesis		

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



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 a Professional Doctorate differ from other research degrees?

1. Inclusion of structured elements

emphasis on candidate acquiring skills relevant to professional practice,
in addition to producing original research

2. Allows individuals to situate professional knowledge developed over time in a theoretical academic framework

3. The Research project is relevant to and **embedded within candidate's profession**

4. Professional Doctorates aim to
develop an individual's professional practice
support them in producing **a contribution to (professional) knowledge**



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 project 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 management- at a distance/in a team?



Opportunity for greater success


BUT

Greater risk of things going wrong!!!



What is an acceptable Research Project?

If we knew what it was
we were doing,

it wouldn't be called 'research,'
would it?



Triangle of Constraints




Beware scope creep

- Most 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




Engage all stakeholders in the research

Who will be affected?

Needed for support?

Interested in the outcomes?



How do you manage the stakeholders expectations?

Think about reporting and communication - help each to appreciate the value of the project throughout

What do you need to know about the roles of all those involved?

- What resources does each bring to the project?
- What do they expect in return?
- How much responsibility does each supervisor have?
- What's their level of interest?
- How are you going to engage with the other supervisor?
- Do you need to manage them?
- Are there potential conflicts between a supervisor and student?
- Are other collaborators involved and have you been involved in establishing guidelines with them eg author on a paper?

Doctoral Standard Research

Original contribution to knowledge:


- Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:
 - the 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 that is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice
 - the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems
 - a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

For a professional doctorate

- The research may be embedded in professional practice, driven by a problem identified from a 'real world' context, making a creative and critical intervention in that context, and leading to a practical outcome as well as a theoretically informed written thesis.
- **It is not just optimising an assay/technique**
 - although this can be part of the research if it includes
 - evaluation of patients or samples
 - and extensive analysis to show improvement


Drill Down

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



[illegible]

Project timeline - Gantt chart



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



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 transparency-particularly 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

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
 - Traditional
- Suggested word count 20-40k words
- Presentation should follow the policy of the registering institution
 - MMU
<http://www2.mmu.ac.uk/media/mmuacuk/content/documents/graduate-school/regulations-procedures2/Research-Student-Handbook-2017-18.pdf>
 - UoM
<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=7420>

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


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!!!!

Submission and Binding?

- Guidelines are on MAHSE website
 - Manchester Metropolitan University
 - University of Manchester

What skills will the student gain?



A project isn't successful until it's finished!



What one thing will you take away from today's session?

Journal Format

- The aim of journal format is to break the thesis into more manageable, 'bite-sized' chunks
- The advantage of this format is that it gives you the experience of writing in journal paper format.
- Comprises chapters that have been written in the form of journal papers – targeted to a relevant journal in the field.
- Format, presentation and word count will follow the guidelines of the target journal
- These may be papers that have been submitted to a journal, already accepted and published or chapters that are written as journal papers but are not yet submitted or ever intended to be submitted.

Systematic Review

- Default format for the Literature Review –closely linked to the main research project
- This may not suit all projects and an alternative approach should be discussed with the 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 Paper

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

Empirical Results - *presentation*

- This paper(s) should also be prepared in accordance with the guidelines of a specific journal
- **Word count:** in line with the target journal (if none stated 8,000 maximum)
- **Co-authors:** The contribution of co-authors must be clearly acknowledged
- **Reference list:** Apply the target journal's referencing style consistently. Include DOI numbers. Use Endnote.
- **Figures and Tables:** For your DClinSci thesis place these in the main text for reading ease but if your manuscript is to be submitted to the journal they should be placed after the reference list.
- **Footnotes:** Can be used to refer the reader to additional discussion points in the *critical reflections paper*

Critical Appraisal Paper

- The focus of this section should be a consideration of how your present project fits in with contributes to theory and clinical practice in the particular field.
- If you have done a systematic review and study, the critical appraisal paper should put the current review and project in the wider context of research and clinical practice and link the review /project findings to relevant theoretical underpinnings.
- *It is not expected that this paper would be submitted to a journal*

What to include?

- 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

Presentation

- **Word count** (no more than 6,000 words)
- **Duplication and length** - incorporation of publication-style sections in the thesis will invariably lead to some duplication (as each section will have self-contained components that overlap other sections) across the various sections of the thesis
- **References** ???