IO3 Report on Innovation Tests Training the Trainer (TtT)

Astrid Wind, Heidelberg University

Content	page
1.- Introduction and bibliophraphy survey	**2**
2.- Discussion of feedback forms; umbrella schools and thematic schools	**3**
3.- Innovation needs identified by the graduate schools	**10**
4.- Innovation tests run by the graduate schools	**12**
5.- Suggestions, recommendations, next steps	**26**
6.- Bibliography	**29**
Annex: TtT questionnaire	

1.- INTRODUCTION

The Graduate SPIRIT project aims to improve the quality of European doctoral programmes in the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) in response to the needs and challenges faced by PhD candidates, supervisors and other actors in doctoral education. During the second and third year of the project, the nine participating graduate schools designed and implemented "Training the Trainer" (TtT) courses, workshops and lectures to support supervisors in PhD programmes. They also developed recommendations for them in line with the EU Triple I recommendations on doctoral training: to be international, interdisciplinary and intersectoral. This report describes at continuation the Graduate SPIRIT project phase that focused on the challenges of doctoral supervision and the TtT tests run by participating graduate schools.

Bibliography survey

The relationship between supervisors and PhD candidates has been identified as a core element of a successful doctoral experience both by the Graduate SPIRIT project partners and across the international literature on the topic. A recent study that reviewed 163 empirical articles about doctoral education, found that supervision was "the most widely researched factor, and considered to be the most influential in the doctoral experience" (Sverdlik et al., 2018, p. 165). Expanding the discussion, the *International Journal of Doctoral Studies* (IJDS) published in 2019 a number of articles dedicated to supervision practices (Johansen et al., 2019; Roberts et al., 2019; Kumar & Kaur, 2019;), while other articles and volumes dealt with doctoral candidates' perspectives of supervision and other aspects of this important topic (Davis, 2019; Helfer & Drew, 2019; Cornér et al., 2017; Devos et al., 2015). Similarly, several book-length studies of recent years (Dollinger, 2019; Hutchinson et al., 2014); Guccione, 2018; Tanggaard & Wegener, 2016) and several articles published in the last two decades in *The Journal of Higher Education*, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *Higher Education Research & Development*, *The Open Education Journal*, *Higher Education*, *Higher Education Research & Development*, *Studies in Continuing Education*, *Studies in Higher Education*, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, among others, also discuss the various facets of doctoral supervision.[1] Jones (2013), who reviewed forty years of publications on doctoral education in the *International Journal of Doctoral Studies* found that 15% of studies focus on the different facets of doctoral supervision. Two in-depth studies published in 2017 also deal with the topic: *Good Practices in Doctoral Supervision* by Reguero et al. from the Tarragona Think Tank and the Erasmus+ project "SuperProfDoc", which made its findings about good supervision practices available in *A Handbook for Supervisors of Modern Doctorate Candidates* (Fillery-Travis et al., 2017). Videos on mainstream online channels that offer both entertaining glimpses of

---

[1] See bibliography for an overview of recent articles published in these journals.

supervision experiences and helpful insight into a productive relationship between supervisor and PhD candidate complement the palette of how this topic has been approached in recent years.[2] The numerous publications point to the significance of the topic and the need to address it as central aspect of doctoral programmes. The present study, carried out within the framework of the Graduate SPIRIT project, takes at its focus the supervisor her- or himself and aims to offer a set of innovative practices for TtT formats and sessions that can be emulated and adapted in other graduate schools and doctoral programmes in the EU and beyond.

2.-Discussion of feedback forms; umbrella schools and thematic schools

The growing number of graduate schools and structured doctoral programmes in Europe offer doctoral candidates in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (SSH) an alternative to individual research and they offer in many cases a collegial research environment and support network for doctoral researchers. However, one of the most crucial factors in the doctoral phase continues to be the role of the PhD supervisors.[3] Dawn C. Duke and Pam M. Denicolo, who have extensively researched the topic, found not only that "Supervisors remain key to a positive experience for doctoral candidates" but they also point out that "supervisors need a broader range of skills and abilities" in order to prepare their doctoral candidates for the next stage of their career, which might lie outside of academia (Duke & Denicolo, 2017, p. 4). Taking stock of best practices and possible shortcomings in doctoral education, the Graduate SPIRIT project also identified supervision training and fostering the continuous, professional dialogue between supervisors and supervisees as key aspects for the continuous improvement of doctoral programmes. In the TtT survey carried out in the Graduate SPIRIT project, the nine participating graduate schools responded to questions about courses for supervisors of doctoral candidates that are already in place at their respective institutions. The questionnaire[4] asked the schools to include in their responses courses or course components that deal specifically with the Triple Is that are at the centre of the Graduate SPIRIT project. Questions were also asked about the frequency and the organisation of the courses, the participants, calls for and rate of participation, the evaluation of the courses, any legal provision for the courses, and institutional plans for the future. In a second step, the graduate schools were asked to evaluate their needs and challenges

---

[2] For example, the Dean of Graduate Research at Flinders University in Australia answers critical questions about doctoral supervision in her entertaining and helpful clips for PhDs: https://www.flinders.edu.au/people/tara.brabazon.

[3] See also the recommendations of the European University Association in the *Salzburg Principles* (2010), available at https://eua.eu/downloads/publications/salzburg%20ii%20recommendations%202010.pdf

[4] See annex for the questionnaire.

with regard to supervisory training. Based on these needs, the graduate schools discussed at a dedicated transnational meeting and in online meetings their plans for innovation tests and evaluation methods they were going to run and evaluate at their respective institutions. The results are described below, after the survey of extant courses.

TtT courses at the participating Graduate Schools

Courses for PhD supervisors exist in various forms and with varying frequency at some graduate schools, but they are not as prominent in the university landscape as recommended by experts and international research publications cited in the introduction to this section. As the participants of the Tarragona Think Tank suggest, "universities must provide PhD supervisory training and all its accompanying measures" to support supervisors adequately in meeting the changing demands of doctoral education (Reguero et al., 2017, p. 89). The graduate schools participating in the Graduate SPIRIT project have met the observed demand for supervisory training on different levels. **Umbrella organisations**[5] or university-wide graduate schools typically have a course to support researchers and professors in their role as project leaders or academic managers, though courses specifically aimed at supervisors of doctoral candidates are recent. The **University of Helsinki** provides support and specific training for supervisors at the Centre for University Teaching and Learning (HYPE)[6], which offers modules on academic supervision, pedagogical leadership and development of university pedagogy, challenges in learning and studying and related topics. In addition to the course modules on university pedagogy that HYPE offers, the **Helsinki Doctoral School in Humanities and Social Sciences (HYMY)** and faculties try to address and support supervisors of doctoral candidates through workshops. For example, the doctoral school has organised in cooperation with HYPE workshops for doctoral supervisors, and faculties have organised in cooperation with student services thematic supervision afternoon sessions with presentations. However, these are not regularly run courses with specific learning goals. At **Loughborough University,** new academic staff on probation will automatically be registered for the course, "Fundamentals of PhD Supervision", which is run by the Centre of Academic Practice.[7] The course is mandatory for inexperienced academics, who are hired on the basis of a three-year probation period. The course is designed to stimulate thinking and discussion around the provision of supervision support for PhDs. Using input from experienced supervisors and drawing on expertise of those in Academic Registry, Counselling, the

---

[5] For a definition of the term see the IO1 report (https://www.gradspirit.eu/outcomes/organisational-models/).
[6] Refer to https://researchportal.helsinki.fi/en/organisations/the-centre-for-university-teaching-and-learning-hype
[7] See also https://www.lboro.ac.uk/services/cap/events/2017/june/fundamentals-of-phd-supervision-part-a.html

Library and Graduate School the course leaders aim to introduce some of the key support services available to supervisors and ensure a thorough introduction to the Code of Practice and relevant policy issues surrounding the doctoral experience. Course participants prepare materials during the first week and take a test in the second session. Supervisory training is a recent initiative at the **Collège Doctoral Paris Saclay**, where supervisors have been invited to come to a Brown-Bag Lunch that featured a series of central issues of doctoral supervision.[8] Supervisors were also invited to attend a two-day session for 20 participants that was organized by an external provider.[9] On the first day, the course focused on piloting a doctoral research project and enabling the PhD candidate to become an autonomous researcher. Participants scrutinised the role of the director, and they learned strategies to manage PhD candidates and how to facilitate the PhD´s integration into a team. The course included topics such as positive listening, feedback, ensuring the quality of recruiting, and fostering the professional evolution of the doctoral researcher. In order to improve doctoral supervision and to support new members of staff, **KU Leuven** also offers two courses, "iSupervise: Masterclass for Supervisors", which will be described in some detail below, and "Leading a Research Team". In the 3-day course, "Leading a Research Team", 12 junior academics, including PhDs and post-docs, are being trained to strengthen their leadership in different contexts. The course focuses on personal strengths and challenges, communication skills and on coaching tools. With regard to the applied method, the course description emphasises that "The course is interactive and experiential, with grounded theoretical background information. Methods used are group conversation, self-reflection, practical skills exercises, discussing real life cases, simulations etc."[10] The **Erasmus Graduate School of Social Sciences and the Humanities (EGSH)** offers three important courses that are somewhat related to the role of the supervisor, one of which one is mandatory for all teachers associated with a Dutch university, the University Teaching Qualifications. More advanced courses are offered, such as "Leadership in Education Courses", but there is no course specifically focused on PhD supervisory training at this time.

Thematic schools[11] do not necessarily develop their own courses, but interested supervisors can find support in courses offered at the university level. This symbiosis exists at **Leipzig University** and **Heidelberg University**, where the respective umbrella organisations for graduates, the Leipzig Research Academy and the Heidelberg Graduate Academy, dedicated Career Services, Equal Opportunities, and High School Didactic Centres offer a range of training courses for academics at all levels. In addition to a

---

[8] See details about the Brown Bag lunch under https://www.universite-paris-saclay.fr/fr/cafes-cadithe-0
[9] Association Bernard Gregory, "Where PHDs and Companies meet" https://www.abg.asso.fr/en/
[10] https://admin.kuleuven.be/personeel/english/trainings/the-supervisor-as-a-leader/leading-a-research-team
[11] Thematic schools are smaller in size and have limited resources; however, they are typically linked to larger university structures. See the IO1 report for a definition of the term.

course on the "Basics of teaching in higher education" and the range of courses offered by the Leipzig Research Academy, the **Graduate School Global and Area Studies (GSGAS)** at Leipzig University also offers the in-house workshop for multipliers, "Good scientific practice". The course runs for two days and has as its aims the acquisition of knowledge and dealing with scientific misconduct, the conception of learning opportunities, the acquisition and training of moderation skills and the reflection of one´s own role as a supervisor. Similarly, the **Heidelberg Graduate School for the Humanities and Social Sciences (HGGS)** collaborates closely with the Graduate Academy and other institutes and both doctoral candidates and supervisors have access to courses aimed at early career researchers, such as "University Leadership and Management". It focuses on the challenges faced by leaders and aspiring leaders working in higher education.[12] This particular course is available **online** and it covers the broad topics common to a management syllabus, including organizational change, strategic planning and managing people and resources. As at other large universities, researchers and teaching staff also have the opportunity to enhance their skills at dedicated workshops, but a course specifically aimed at PhD supervisors does not exist at Heidelberg University. The latter holds true for the **Graduate School for Social Research (GSSR)** at the **Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IFIS-PAN)** that offers no supervisory training at this time. Since the graduate school is housed in and cooperates with research institutes it does not have the student services usual in a university.

Triple I Training in TtT Courses

As part of the survey, participating graduate schools examined the importance of the Triple I training in supervisory courses. Several graduate schools reported that they run dedicated courses or workshops that deal with one or more of the Triple Is. Since **thematic schools** do not necessarily design their own courses, the offers of the **umbrella organisations** at the respective universities are taken into consideration.

With the drive to increase the **internationalisation** of higher education in recent decades, graduate schools and universities have also responded on different levels to the needs of the increasingly diverse academic communities. While internationality is important to both universities and academic staff, however, the set of skills that comes with internationalisation cannot always be taken for granted in the professional relationship between supervisors and doctoral candidates. As Bøgelund (2015), Walsh (2010) and others suggest, doctoral candidates come from an increasingly diverse background and the expectations of the PhD community are thus also more diversified than in previous decades. In this sense, the Graduate SPIRIT partners examined a particular aspect of internationalisation, namely **interculturality** as a key factor in

---

[12] See https://www.graduateacademy.uni-heidelberg.de/karriere/workshops/kursarchiv.html

doctoral supervision. Participating graduate schools have started to take up this important element in the supervision of international doctoral candidates in different courses.

In recent years, **EGSH** has offered a dedicated training course, "Professional supervision in a diverse, inclusive academic community", with the aim of sensitization of supervisors when working with international PhD candidates from different cultural and educational backgrounds[13]. The course addresses the difficulties and challenges related to the expectations of the PhD trajectory, the cultural and language barriers international doctoral candidates face as well as experiences of exclusion. The course emphasises the crucial role of supervision for the success of a PhD project in addition to the well-being of PhD candidates. Drawing on different educational theories on adult learning and diversity sensitivity coaching, the course aims to improve the (intercultural) communication skills of supervisors and helped them to become aware of their own supervision styles. Similarly, the **University of Helsinki** has been offering a course for lecturers and supervisors, called "International and collaborative environment". The course aims at supporting teaching staff in recognizing what kind of requirements internationalisation, multiculturality and the equality principle pose on university education, to develop teaching in line with the noted aspects, and to support learning and interaction in diverse student groups. **KU Leuven** offers a dedicated course on "Intercultural Communication"[14] that helps participants expand their frame of reference through a pluralist, system-theoretic approach to intercultural communication, enabling them to conduct effective conversations with people from different cultural backgrounds. They become acquainted with the TOPOI model, which provides key points and tools that can be put to use in conversations with people from different socio-cultural backgrounds. The first part of "Optimize your international cooperation"[15] at KU Leuven also deals with the intercultural dialogue and offers practical tools to optimize the international cooperation as it highlights differences in cultural and academic contexts through a case of "extended civilizations": Pillars (debate culture) versus Pyramids (hierarchy and meritocracy). The course scrutinizes, amongst other topics, different time concepts, planning and deadlines and it discusses views on efficiency and practices of meeting, consensus, agreements and it also analyses different ways of communication. At the **Collège Doctoral Paris Saclay** the status and expectations about PhD studies according to cultural backgrounds were on the agenda of a meeting for all supervisors, and the ABQ training described above also raises awareness of intercultural

---

[13] Erasmus University Rotterdam also has a dedicated website, "Diversity & Inclusion", with other offers; see https://www.eur.nl/en/about-eur/vision/diversity-inclusion

[14] https://admin.kuleuven.be/personeel/english/trainings/Intercultural_communication/intercultural-communication

[15] https://admin.kuleuven.be/personeel/english/trainings/optimize-your-international-cooperation/optimize-your-international-cooperation

communication in doctoral supervision. **GSGAS** at Leipzig University hosts Fireside Chats where supervisors and mentors from various disciplines meet and discuss their experiences. An important topic focuses on how to deal with different educational phases and problems that emerge with doctoral students from abroad. At **Loughborough University**, there is no dedicated course or course component about interculturality, but the course on supervision "addresses it indirectly since many supervisors come from different cultural backgrounds themselves", as a SPIRIT member from Loughborough observed. Courses about interculturality have increased in frequency in recent years at **Heidelberg University.** The Graduate Academy at Heidelberg University also offers dedicated intercultural training, such as "Team Communication - Key roles and intercultural contexts" that invites participants to analyse the most common difficulties and areas of conflict that arise in international projects and intercultural encounters discussing case studies and real life examples[16]. Importantly, they also learn more about their own conduct in an international, interdisciplinary work environment and learn to understand the motivations of colleagues and project partners. There are also shorter lectures in German and English at Heidelberg University, organised by the Graduate Academy, including "Intercultural Awareness", that address different behavioural patterns and thinking in relation to people´s cultural background. In a recent lecture and workshop, entitled "You have the clock, we have the time", two journalists from a major magazine aimed to open up intercultural understanding when speaking about communication, thinking and acting patterns in Arabic and German contexts. While courses and lectures at the Graduate Academy are primarily designed for doctoral candidates, the Continued Education Programme offers workshops on intercultural competences for tutors, post-docs and early career researchers, which are led by experts in intercultural training. The courses deal with methods and instruments for creating a positive teaching and learning atmosphere. Participants also learn how to deal with certain critical situations. Courses about intercultural communication that are aimed specifically at supervisors of doctoral candidates are not available at this time. **Internationalisation** and international visibility are important for the academic, economic and structural growth of universities and several universities invest in courses for PhDs, post-docs, lecturers and other staff members to expand their horizons in intercultural dialogues and understanding. With an increasingly international PhD community, however, TtT courses aimed at intercultural communication are an indispensable tool that could benefit many supervision teams.

Intersectorality and interdisciplinarity feature far less prominently in dedicated TtT courses. Most graduate schools and universities have started to offer courses that teach

---

[16] See this and related courses on the Graduate Academy website https://www.graduateacademy.uni-heidelberg.de/karriere/workshops/kursarchiv_en.html

PhD candidates transferable skills, but **intersectorality** is not openly addressed in PhD supervision by some members of the academic community in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Although there is a general awareness of the fact that many doctoral candidates will (have to) find a job outside of academia, it is not a topic that supervisors typically like to breach with their supervisees and they are not always equipped to prepare them for a career outside of academia. Alumni who participated in the Graduate SPIRIT Alumni Series confirmed that they had to be highly self-motivated to establish contacts to non-university employers as many PhD supervisors continue to focus in large measure just on the academic training and do not talk about alternative career paths with their doctoral candidates. Or, as a PhD candidate stressed in response to a recent survey of possible improvements at **IFIS-PAN**, PhDs need "more connections with other faculty members, more training of practical skills and - this needs to be written in all caps - TELL YOUR STUDENTS THAT THEY WILL NOT FIND EMPLOYMENT IN ACADEMIA AND THERE IS NO SHAME IN DOING SOMETHING ELSE AT THE SAME TIME OR AFTER YOUR STUDIES. Being a practitioner and an academic are not mutually exclusive." The open discussion of career prospects is a perceived need that should become part of doctoral supervision as early as possible.

The third Triple, I, **Interdisciplinarity**, is a key word that has gained high visibility in higher education papers and politics[17] and several large universities have created interdisciplinary research institutes to address the challenges and possibilities of the 21st century. Thematic graduate schools are also by nature interdisciplinary and they encourage interdisciplinarity through courses and by supporting PhDs in locating a second supervisor or mentor from a different discipline to drive ahead a specific interdisciplinary doctoral project. However, interdisciplinarity per se is something some people "do" but not always explicitly talk about. Workshops about the definitions and nuances of inter-, multi- and transdisciplinarity and their challenges, possibilities and limitations have received positive feedback from doctoral candidates, but they are still the exception rather than a common feature in PhD programmes. Recent surveys during the Graduate SPIRIT project also showed that interdisciplinarity is not always encouraged by PhD supervisors in the Humanities and Social Sciences. In their responses, some SSH supervisors made clear that they want their supervisees to become experts in their discipline and regard interdisciplinary as an unnecessary distraction from the core knowledge of a particular field. Interdisciplinarity is thus perceived as a threat to excellence in a disciplines and a discussion of its possibilities and implied risks is bracketed out from their doctoral supervision.

---

[17] See, for example, the Position Paper of the League of Research Universities: LERU (2016). *Interdisciplinarity and the 21st century research-intensive university*. Available at https://www.leru.org/files/Interdisciplinarity-and-the-21st-Century-Research-Intensive-University-Full-paper.pdf

3.-Innovation needs identified by the graduate schools

In their critical analysis of their needs and challenges with regard to supervisory training, the participating graduate schools agreed in their observation that a more systematic approach to supporting doctoral supervisors through courses and other means is a desirable and indeed necessary goal for the successful development of doctoral programmes. Training specifically focused on doctoral supervision is scarce at the participating graduate schools and while most universities and graduate schools offer training in the areas of university pedagogy, leadership, project management and related topics, the focus often lies on doctoral candidates or early career researchers; the target group does not include more senior lecturers or professors. The Graduate SPIRIT partners concurred with an observation made by G.M. Gurr (2001) that the lack of formal training for PhD supervisors often leads them to re-enact their own experiences of being supervised. The participating graduate schools also confirmed the observation that doctoral supervision has to adapt to the fast-paced technological and educational changes and requires more frequent and systematic training. In particular, the implementation of new IT-systems, the advances of Open Science and other developments in research and technology require a more thorough approach by the graduate schools and universities in their doctoral programmes and in doctoral supervision. In some cases, supervision can be understood as an exclusively academic responsibility, and supervisory training must thus necessarily "give awareness of the wider aspects of supervision and analysis of (both home and foreign) PhD candidates' likely experience (isolation etc.), followed by ways of working with the PhD to tackle these problems (training including cultural sensitivity)", as the Graduate SPIRIT colleague from **IFIS-PAN** observed. Or, as another graduate school responded, preparing supervisors for the changing "knowledge society" encompasses their multi-faceted roles "not only as scientific advisors, but also as expert, coach, mentor and specialist in funding applications. Furthermore, supervision takes place in a growing and globalizing world and an intercultural environment challenges the PhD supervisors" **(GSGAS).** These observations accord with the input provided by **EGSH** and shared by other Graduate SPIRIT members. In two work sessions on "Diversity sensitive supervision and teaching" at EGSH, creating an inclusive working environment, stimulating and supporting the development of diversity competences of supervising staff and enhancing everybody's responsibility to contribute to a diversity sensitive and inclusive climate were identified as key goals. Also, offering sufficient time to supervisors to be able to provide qualified guidance and support to PhD candidates was high on the agenda and is part of the innovation tests run by Graduate SPIRIT partners.

In addition to these perceived needs and recommendations, essential **Triple I** questions and issues that were discussed during the Graduate SPIRIT project would ideally ask TtT course leaders to address the following questions with the participants:

	Interdisciplinarity	**Intersectorality**	**Internationalisation**
PhD research topic	1.-Is it part of your (good) supervision practice to discuss interdisciplinary aspects of the PhD candidate's research topic?	2.-Is it part of your (good) supervision practice to discuss the PhD candidate's research topic in light of possible intersectoral connections, or opportunities for collaboration with non-university actors?	3.-During your supervision, do you discuss whether the partial or final results of the PhD project are relevant or significant for other scientific cultures and other cultural contexts and realities?
Work relationship supervisor and PhD candidate	4.-Is the transition from research to non-academic work a topic that you breach with PhD candidates?		5.-In your supervision meetings, do you dedicate time to get to know a PhD candidate's educational or cultural background and motivation?
	6.-Is it part of your (good) supervision practice to organise regular colloquia, where doctoral candidates present their work to a peer group or do you invite PhD candidates to participate in research teams?		

TtT courses, workshops and other TtT formats ought to encourage PhD supervisors to reflect on these lead questions. The table can be expanded and adapted according to specific circumstances, yet they reflect key concerns identified both in the project and in the literature on the topic.

The working tables at the Graduate SPIRIT transnational meetings that departed from the project's IO2 list of best practices in the participating graduate schools[18], the surveys of doctoral candidates and supervisors at participating Graduate SPIRIT schools, and the literature cited in the introduction all point to the crucial significance of a well-balanced and informed approach to doctoral supervision. The participating graduate schools agreed that higher education in general and graduate schools in particular need to focus their attention on supporting the relationship between doctoral candidates and supervisors through different means as the professional relationship between PhD candidate and supervisor is vital for a successful PhD phase. In the discussions at the transnational meetings in 2018/19 and in online conferences, the graduate schools not only exchanged their needs with regard to supervision training, but they agreed upon

---

[18] IO2 report available at https://gradspirit.eu/wp-content/uploads/io/ReportIntellectual_Output2.pdf

different courses, workshops and other formats to improve supervision that were tested and evaluated at different graduate schools.

4.-Innovation tests designed and tested by Graduate SPIRIT partners

HYMY Survey and Workshops: "Best Practices in Doctoral Supervision"

HYMY´s base of the TtT innovation is three-fold as it describes supervisory training that combines the best practices of multiple graduate schools with the needs of both the supervisors and the supervisees. The latter were asked in a survey about their experiences with doctoral supervision.

HYVÄT, the PhD association at the University of Helsinki, carried out a **survey** of PhD candidates in 2018, which provided an important departure point for new discussions about doctoral supervision.[19] Overall, as seen from doctoral candidates' point of view, supervision practices received positive scores, but one out of six PhDs gave a negative opinion about their supervision. In their opinion, if there is a problematic situation, the university as a whole does not have a systematic way of addressing the problems. Electronic follow-up through the PhD tool "Thessa"[20] is an improvement, as PhD candidates thought, but it is not sufficient. Also, doctoral candidates felt that practical ways to intervene in problematic supervision relationships were needed.[21] Among the needs and concerns the doctoral candidates mentioned in their feedback is the scheduling of regular meetings. Having regular meetings with their supervisors to plan their work and receive clear instructions and feedback is a perceived need by doctoral candidates. As one PhD wrote, "If I could even see my supervisors sometimes. I've been supervised by a postdoc that is not my official supervisor and is not obligated to do so. But that is all I have because my other two supervisors simply don't care." As the survey suggest, doctoral candidates believe that besides the practical issues they need to be connected to their supervisors emotionally since the PhD phase is very challenging, and regular support and encouragement is needed. They expect the supervisors not to look at them as mere "producers of articles" but as "human beings who have feelings". They

---

[19] Some of the issues that HYVÄT raised have received more attention, for example a process description and guidelines for in cases for problems in supervision, available at https://guide.student.helsinki.fi/en/article/problems-phd-supervision.

[20] Thessa is the electronic Doctoral Studies planning and reporting tool at Helsinki University; see https://guide.student.helsinki.fi/en/article/thessa

[21] See the HYVÄT report: https://blogs.helsinki.fi/phd-association/files/2018/03/HYV%C3%84T_survey_report_.pdf

explained in their comments that these practical issues, plus the lack of emotional support, could lead to stress, anxiety and burnout.

In total, 42 respondents wrote that supervision is the most important topic in HYVÄT advocacy. As one PhD candidate suggested, "There seems to be an increasing amount of dissatisfaction between supervisor and student[22] relationships and more and more rumors about students being fired. Perhaps better agreements, checkpoints and contracts between students and supervisors are needed. In any case, this issue should be investigated more thoroughly." Some PhDs only answered the question about the most important topic in their PhD career with one word, "supervision", but many gave specified explanations on the problems with supervision and among these the need for help and support for solving conflicts with the supervisor was often mentioned. 42 called for improved supervision, among these; 14 mentioned support for better supervisor relationships, creating a system for solving supervisory conflicts; 2 mentioned education for supervisors; 2 mentioned that international candidates are in an even more vulnerable position in relation to supervisors, and that they may need extra support; 1 mentioned the need for supervisory groups. These survey results are an important input for the supervisor – supervisee relationship in general and for the workshops on supervision in particular, which are described at continuation.

HYMY doctoral school organized for its supervisors together with the UH Centre for Teaching and Learning (HYPE) **two workshops on doctoral supervision**, one in May 2019 in English, and another one in October 2019 in Finnish. The workshops were designed for around 20 participants and led by Professor Kirsi Pyhältö, who conducts research in international research groups about early-career researchers and higher education.[23] The workshops focused on the key questions, "What is important in doctoral supervision? How can research on doctoral supervision inform supervisory practices?" The aim was to enhance research-based understanding of doctoral supervision and to provide a forum for discussing and sharing doctoral supervisory practices with fellow supervisors. The workshop consisted of short presentations summarizing recent research on doctoral supervision and hands-on tasks employing interactive methods and group discussions.

HYMY asked the supervisors to describe their needs and concerns before coming to the workshop, which are categorized under three headings with examples of each. The questionnaire that course participants completed in preparation to the workshop raised the following key topics:

---

[22] In this and other quotations, the word "student" refers to PhD candidate.
[23] Prof. Pyhältö also published an article together with the course leader of the TtT workshop at CEU, Prof. Lynn McAlpine; see McAlpine et al. (2018).

- The scope of assistance to the doctoral candidate, including time management and scheduling in a good/healthy manner as well as correct and sufficient guidance;
- How to deal with problematic supervisee relationships when doctoral candidates lack skills, procrastinate, are very dependent, come from different backgrounds and other challenging situations in the supervisor – supervisee relationship;
- The support they themselves need as a new supervisor as they need to familiarize themselves with practices and requirements, improve their own time management, work on communication skills and learn how to build a good supervision relationship.

The foundation of the supervisory training that HYPE provides is to analyze the results of their higher education research. HYMY thus not only provides a platform for supervisors to discuss their practices and concerns with colleagues, but also shares research-based evidence to back up the views and discussions, thus engaging the supervisors more closely. In addition, the survey of PhD candidates at the University of Helsinki grants supervisors and course participants important insight into the doctoral perspective of the supervisor – supervisee relationship.

Evaluation

An online questionnaire in Finnish was sent to the 15 course participants and seven people returned their feedback (47%). In response to the question, "How well did the workshop help you to notice the key points in doctoral supervision?", five out of seven respondents responded "Extremely well" and two thought that it helped them "quite well". In response to the question, "Does the workshop have an impact on your supervision practices?", five out of seven respondents indicated "Very likely" and two marked "Possibly". Participants were also asked to respond to the question, "Besides supervising the scientific content, have you discussed any of the following themes with your supervisee?" The responses were distributed as follows:

- Mutual expectations and practices: 6/7
- The scientific and/or cultural background of the doctoral candidate: 5/7
- Project management and scheduling: 5/7
- Funding: 6/7
- The interdisciplinary aspects and possibilities of the doctoral research: 4/7
- The intersectoral aspects and cooperation possibilities of the doctoral research: 3/7
- The international aspects and cultural relativism of the doctoral research: 4/7
- How the doctoral candidate is doing (incl. wellbeing): 7/7

- The doctoral candidate's career options either in or outside academia: 5/7.

Participants were also asked which topics they found hardest to discuss, on which issues or topics they would like to get more guidance or support, and they were invited to add other comments of the workshop. Overall, the workshop received very positive feedback. The organizers were pleased to hear that the participants felt that the workshop will have a positive impact on their supervisory practices. It was also a positive surprise to find that it seemed to be a general practice for the supervisors to ask the doctoral candidate about their wellbeing. Discussing mutual expectations and research funding were also common topics. With regard to Triple I practices, some discussed the interdisciplinary and international aspects of the research at hand, but only a few spoke about the intersectoral possibilities.

Participants of the workshop on supervision were also asked which kind of activities they would like HYMY to organize for supervisors in the future. Respondents thought that the current format worked very well as it allowed to share ideas and good practices. They also suggested bringing together supervisors from different disciplines to meet and discuss about challenges and how these have been solved, to disseminate good practices, to focus more on central themes, such shared expectations and commitment (what it is), and to address the challenges and opportunities of working with international doctoral candidates. The suggestion was also made for a peer network, where supervisors could share their experiences and practices on a more regular basis.

In conclusion, HYMY observed that supervisors and supervisees can perceive quite different challenges in doctoral supervision; fluid communication is thus crucial to ensure a successful PhD phase. While TtT courses and workshops are perceived as a valuable tool to improve doctoral supervision, academic staff members do not automatically sign up to participate in extra training. As the project partners at the University of Helsinki summed it up, "it is usually the 'good' supervisors" – meaning those who pro-actively work with PhD candidates and want to improve their supervision – who attend this kind of voluntary workshops. This is an observation shared by other project partners as we can see at continuation.

HGGS Survey, Lecture and Panel Discussion: "Good Practices in Doctoral Supervision"

At Heidelberg University, the HGGS and the Graduate Academy collaborated in designing and advertising an encounter of supervisees and supervisors that focused on good practices in doctoral supervision. In order to take stock of the current state of supervision, the HGGS previously invited both PhD candidates and supervisors to respond to an online survey.

The **survey** that was sent to PhD candidates and supervisors at the graduate school in October 2018 asked about the characteristics of good doctoral supervision, whether interdisciplinarity was an important part of supervision, and in how far respondents considered the intercultural exchange with international doctoral candidates an important aspect of supervision or a challenge. Emails with the request to participate in the survey were sent on a personal basis and yielded a 45% return. Responses were sent in English, German and Spanish and there was a considerable overlap in certain key areas. Most supervisors at the HGGS are German, whereas about 65% of the PhD candidates in the HGGS are from an international background. The most frequent observations made by PhDs were that they considered "good" supervisors to engage in an open manner with the supervisees as individuals, taking into account different needs and ways of work. International PhDs thought that supervisors need to be open to cultural differences. Several respondents thought that regularity and punctuality are characteristics of good supervision and that supervisors could organise regular group meetings. It was suggested that an academic community would foster the exchange among peers and help international PhDs to establish more quickly in their new environment. The open communication with supervisors was a desirable goal for PhD candidates, who believed that they would benefit from a two-way exchange based on trust and mutual respect rather than a master-pupil relationship. It was also important to PhDs that supervisors impart implicit knowledge and make them aware of important conferences and possibilities for publishing their work. In their responses to the survey, supervisors concurred with PhDs in the observation that a regular contact was important for the successful development of the PhD phase. Achieving a "good balance between guidance and freedom; availability" and "the ability to communicate criticism in a constructive and helpful way" were also important to supervisors, who in turn expected from the doctoral candidates to invest all their energy and time in the thesis. *Interdisciplinarity*, a core principle of the HGGS, was also very important to the majority of PhDs, while it was viewed less favourably by supervisors. About 90% of the PhD candidates thought that interdisciplinarity was an important plus for their doctoral work and that it could open doors to future employment, including non-university jobs. Few PhDs (10%) thought that the main focus must be laid on the main discipline. The majority of supervisors (85%), however, answered cautiously about the significance of

interdisciplinarity and its relevance to the specific PhD project in question. *Interculturality* was of importance both to the German supervisors and the mostly international PhD candidates, who responded to this survey. Supervisors admitted that the intercultural exchange, especially with PhDs from a non-Western background, could be a great challenge; yet at the same time, it "is often fruitful and helps to broaden horizons" and an important asset to international research. Some international PhDs had a difficult start in the new country and at the new university and wished for a more open dialogue about cultural differences at least in academic terms. As one PhD from a non-Western country suggested, one expects or hopes from supervisors "a basic comprehension of cultural and academic characteristics of the student" to at least understand differences in the way of communicating and working relationship and to start a fruitful supervision and PhD phase. The survey led both PhD candidates and supervisors to reflect upon their practices and set the stage for the discussion about this important topic.

Following the survey, the HGGS, in collaboration with the Graduate Academy, invited doctoral members and supervisors of the HGGS and Heidelberg University in November 2019 to a **lecture and panel discussion**, each with the duration of one hour. The workshop was announced via email to all HGGS members and via the newsletter of the Graduate Academy to doctoral candidates at Heidelberg University. The session was followed by an informal social gathering in the hallway. The impulse lecture on "Leadership" was given by a psychologist from the German Association of University Professors and Lecturers; it was followed by a question round and set the stage for the ensuing panel discussion with four supervisors from different fields of study, including two not represented in the HGGS. This choice was deliberate in order both to open the discussion up for doctoral candidates from other institutes and to allow members of the HGGS to learn more about supervision practices in other faculties. The discussion focused on three key questions: "How does good supervision of doctoral projects work?", "What are best practices and success factors in everyday university life?", and "What are essential contributions of PhD researchers and supervisors alike?" The questions were aimed at giving the topic and the event itself a positive spin and to set optimistic impulses for future supervision practices on both sides. In the session moderated by the director of the Graduate Academy, the supervisors responded briefly to the three lead questions and then discussed with the PhD candidates their understanding of the issues at stake. The PhD audience was asked to provide input on what they considered a "good" or even an "excellent" supervisee/supervisory situation and what their expectations were regarding their PhD supervisor(s). The panel members were invited to speak about their expectations of PhDs and which qualifications, skills, behaviour etc. they expect from the "perfect" supervisee. Other central concerns discussed by PhDs and panel members focused on the frequency of interaction, experiences with dual supervision and Thesis Advisory Committees.

Evaluation

The exchange after the lecture and during the panel discussion was cordial and the joint event received positive feedback. The evaluation of the lecture and panel discussion was threefold: participant-observations, feedback forms and qualitative feedback from participants. The four supervisors readily agreed to participate in the panel discussion as they share the value of promoting good doctoral supervision for both parties, PhD candidates and supervisors. The day of the event, one supervisor called in sick, but the panel with three professors was in proportion to the group of PhDs who attended the event. Despite the high relevance of the topic, only four PhDs signed up after the first call and the workshop would have had to be cancelled. In order to boost numbers, personal emails were sent to PhD members to encourage their participation, and a group of 16 PhD candidates in total then attended the lecture and panel discussion. Of the 16 doctoral participants, eight closely engaged with the lecturer and the panel members and seem to have found the discussion interesting, as one could observe based on the questions and observations made by the active group during the session and afterwards, at the informal gathering. The verbal feedback of the supervisors was also encouraging. At the end of the session, six PhDs took the time to complete a written evaluation of the academic event. Five out of six respondents thought that the goals of the session were clear and well-defined. They were in their second year or higher of their PhD. One respondent, who is at the onset of the PhD, wanted a more clearly defined content delivery, but nonetheless had an overall "very good" impression of the lecture and panel discussion. All respondents thought that the group atmosphere was constructive and that valuable new insight was gained through the exchange.

At the organisational level of the HGGS and the Graduate Academy, the overall evaluation of the two-fold academic event was positive. The internal collaboration worked well and can be a model for new joint efforts to improve doctoral education at Heidelberg University. Also, it was encouraging to see how supportive faculty members from different areas were and that the panel discussion was both an important contribution to thematising supervision from both sides – PhD and professorial level – and to the interdisciplinary exchange about the central topic of supervision. Following up on the survey and the panel discussion, the HGGS and the Graduate Academy are now planning to host an essay and podcast competition about best supervision experiences. A jury made up of professors from different faculties will select the best contributions and award travel grants to academic events and book vouchers. The HGGS and Graduate Academy will also publish the contributions online.

GSGAS Workshop: "Professionalization of PhD Supervision"

Following the evaluation of the needs of their own graduate programme and the discussions with the Graduate SPIRIT partner organisations, GSGAS designed a TtT workshop for postdocs in November 2019. GSGAS announced the workshop within the two faculties involved in the graduate school. Twelve post-docs registered for the workshop, which was structured in the following fashion:

- Introduction into the workshop and the international state of professional supervisor development programmes,
- Introducing participants and their expectations to the workshop,
- Working and supervising with the Supervisory Biography,
- Phases, measures and objectives in the PhD trajectory,
- Expectations, roles and supervisory relationship,
- Transparency and awareness in the supervisory relationship: The importance of clarifying expectations and roles,
- Short interactive group exercise on clarifying mutual expectations,
- Selection of doctoral candidates,
- Selecting suitable candidates and building a talent pool,
- Interactive group exercise on choosing and testing selection criteria,
- Warning signs and remedies,
- When the PhD project is going to fail. Warning signs and possible solutions,
- Introduction into topics and use of the "Doctoral Supervision Handbook",
- Final discussion on awareness and skills of the good and the weak supervisor,
- Plans, perspectives and follow-ups for the time to come.

Evaluation

After the workshop, the organisers asked the participants to fill in an evaluation form with questions about the course format and the content. All participants emphasized the usefulness of the material distributed, which supports their work in supervision: "In particular, the accompanying materials for the workshop are very helpful for reflecting on the supervision of doctoral candidates". The workshop itself highlighted challenges in supervising doctoral candidates and participants found the discussion of these challenges and possible solutions helpful. It was possible to sensitize the participants to different aspects of supervision, such as the selection of doctoral candidates, supervision during the doctorate etc. The main criticism of the participants related to the concept of the workshop and some thought that the course was too little structured, too time consuming, and that too little progress was made; however, no further explanations for these observations were given.

EGSH EUR Workshop: "Key skills for future supervisors: communicating in an international setting"

In 2019 neither EGSH, nor Erasmus University as a whole, offered a TtT course and interested Erasmus staff members had to go to neighbouring universities to participate in supervisory training. In line with the TtT needs identified by the Graduate SPIRIT consortium, EGSH thus designed a three-hour workshop on "Key skills for future supervisors: communicating in an international setting", scheduled for October 2019. Taking as its premise that one´s own cultural framework and being able to read those of others is a key to success in an international university setting, the workshop examined "culturally influenced aspects of communication and how they play out at work." The workshop aimed at creating "a deeper understanding of cultural diversity" and "cultural communication styles" as well as equipping participants to "communicate successfully in cross-cultural situations". The workshop covered the following topics in theory and praxis with a linkage to different cultural backgrounds:

1. Non-verbal communication (e.g. personal space and gestures)
2. Different speech patterns (e.g. use of pause in our speech)
3. Low-high context culture (e.g. the need to read between the lines)
4. Debate vs Consensus cultures (e.g. extent to which opinion of various stakeholders is taken into account)
5. Leadership role model (e.g. preferred role of a leader)
6. How vs Why communication (e.g. the way we put arguments forward)
7. Gender and intercultural communication: are there differences in how female leaders need to behave and how male leaders need to behave in your country of origin?
8. Hofstede's five cultural dimensions (power distance, masculinity vs femininity, Individualism vs Collectivism, Uncertainty avoidance. Long-term orientation).

The workshop was designed for a teaching team. The first instructor recruited for this workshop was a HR policy advisor on the topic of diversity and inclusion with considerable international experience herself. The second colleague was also a policy advisor, with significant experience on incoming international academic migration, such as scientists as well as PhD candidates

Evaluation

An evaluation by the course participants was foreseen but could not be obtained since the workshop did not take place. Although the workshop was advertised in a timely fashion and addressed some of the key needs identified by the graduate school partners, EGSH had to cancel the course due to a lack of participants. EGSH came to the conclusion

that among current PhDs, postdocs and assistant professors there seems to be little interest for this topic. They believe that it is more likely, however, that the workshop was designed for and targeted at the wrong group. The lesson learned is thus that designing such a workshop or course needs careful consideration in terms of needs of the target group, design and marketing of the course.

New versions of TtT Courses

Three Graduate SPIRIT partners implemented and closely observed a new version of TtT courses at their institutions that ran during the second and third year of the Graduate SPIRIT project. A version of these courses had been previously designed by the universities, but they matched the needs and challenges described by the project partners and were hence adapted and evaluated during the Graduate SPIRIT test phase.

CEU Round Table: "PhD supervision: Questions I have asked myself or should have asked myself ..."

In response to their TtT needs identified at the institutional level and in the exchange within the Graduate SPIRIT project, CEU organised the 2019 Round Table on "PhD supervision: Questions I have asked myself or should have asked myself ...", offered through the Center for Teaching and Learning, which had also previously organized events for CEU faculty, doctoral programme directors and doctoral candidates on the topic of doctoral supervision. In the call for participation, which was voluntary, CEU made special reference to the fact that supervision *per se* is not sufficiently discussed by all stakeholders: "We don't often have opportunities to discuss supervision, and this session is a chance to do so. The idea is to set out a collective list of questions beforehand to explore during the session. When we meet, we will pool our experiences to address the issues - drawing as possible on the research evidence" (CEU source). Organised as a 2½ hour lunchtime meeting, the first round table meeting took place in February 2019 and was led by Lynn McAlpine, Professor Emerita of Higher Education Development at the University of Oxford and Professor Emerita at McGill University, who is internationally recognized for her research conducted in the UK, Europe and Canada, into PhD and post-PhD career trajectories in and outside the academy.[24] Her workshops and discussion sessions provided a critical analysis of this research, including the topic of supervision and participants had the opportunity to reflect on their own contexts and practices in a structured manner.

---

[24] See also other publications by McAlpine & Amundsen (2011, 2016 and 2018) in the bibliography.

There were separate sessions for CEU faculty and PhD candidates. Professor McAlpine's discussion session with faculty revolved around the question how research on supervision influences supervisors' own practices. Together with her, colleagues from respective CEU departments drew on their own experience as well as the large body of research on supervision to think about how certain aspects of their individual practice might be changed. Professor McAlpine also led a session for doctoral programme directors where she focused on an institutional view of supervision by exploring how research on supervision might inform policies and supporting structures in order to enhance both PhD candidates' progress and supervisors' institutional work. Doctoral programme directors reflected on the kinds of institutional guidance that, according to their view, would help new PhDs and (especially new) supervisors at CEU. In the second session CEU doctoral candidates had the benefit of a hands-on approach about ways to ensure the PhD benefits their post-graduation career. Professor McAlpine claimed that it was never too early to begin building the post-PhD career; she introduced the broader context of post-PhD opportunities (labour sectors, types of jobs) and together with the participants she explored both what they were doing and could do to better use the PhD to build a post-graduation career. In November 2019, the Center for Teaching and Learning organized follow up sessions with professor McAlpine which followed a similar structure. During the meeting with CEU faculty and programme directors a collective list of questions that had been assembled beforehand was discussed, drawing when possible on the research evidence. Participating in the sessions was voluntary. In the faculty session about 25 people participated (combined), while the PhD session counted over 30 participants.

Evaluation

A written evaluation was not implemented at the end of the courses. However, at the end of each session, the participants were asked verbally to evaluate the meeting and how useful it was for their personal work. In their responses, participants expressed satisfaction with the way the sessions were run and found the sharing of personal experiences in the area of supervision very informative. They also emphasized the usefulness of relying on research in the field as a guiding principle.

KU Leuven "iSupervise: Masterclass for Supervisors"

Through its masterclass, "iSupervise: Masterclass for Supervisors", KU Leuven supports new members of the Senior Academic Staff in their role as supervisor of a research team and makes them aware of the tasks and responsibilities a supervisory role entails. The KU Leuven Graduate SPIRIT partner is Director of the Doctoral School of Humanities and Social Sciences and in that capacity is involved in the design and delivery of the masterclass. In addition to providing information, the class allows time for questions, discussion, reflection, hands on exercises and mutual exchange about these topics with colleagues. The residential masterclass, which is free of charge, was designed for 12-40 participants. It runs for one and a half days, starting at at 2pm the first day and finishing at 5pm the second day.

The Doctoral Schools, the Human Resources Department and the Research Coordination Office at KU Leuven share the responsibility of teaching the masterclass, which deals with the cornerstones and processes of the doctoral process, including

- The most important elements of the doctoral process: the university regulations covering the predoctoral period and the predoctoral examination; doctoral research and the doctoral process (phases, milestones, possible bottlenecks).

- Aspects that are important to doctoral researchers: scientific integrity, among other things (co-)authorship, data management, ombudsperson for doctoral researchers, etc.

- Aspects that are important to the research team: recruitment and selection, leadership, professional and career development, well-being and stress, diversity/multiculturality in the research team, etc.[25]

Expected results are the participants' awareness of these issues and of good practices to ensure they are appropriately addressed in all stages of the doctoral process.

Evaluation

The Graduate SPIRIT partners at KU Leuven monitored the new course version in February 2020 and provided the following evaluation results. The masterclass is mandatory for all newly appointed senior academic staff: they receive a personal invitation reminding them that they are expected to take the class within the first two years of their appointment. The masterclass has a maximum capacity of 40 participants; in the February 2020 session 35 newly appointed senior academic staff attended.

---

[25] https://admin.kuleuven.be/personeel/english/trainings/isupervise-masterclass-for-supervisors/isupervise-masterclass-for-supervisors

All participants were asked to fill out an assessment form. 29 of the 35 (83%) submitted their assessment. Participants were asked to score various components of the organisation and programme in terms of relevance and quality on a scale of 1 (not satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The results below are the composite scores.

Overall assessment	4,33
Organisation	4,74
Accommodation	4,48
Information session Doctoral Schools	3,72
Workshop Scientific Integrity	3,88
Workshop Recruitment & Selection	4,00
Workshop Supervisor as Leader-Coach	3,97
Session Leadership	4,18
Session Interpersonal Relationships and Well-Being	4,27
Session Group Dynamics in Research Teams	3,75
Session Competence Based Panel Interview	4,47

The masterclass organisers are pleased with these generally positive results but will continue evaluating and fine-tuning the programme after each iteration. A particular issue that needs to be addressed on the basis of recurring open comments in the assessment is the right balance between sessions aimed at all disciplines in a comprehensive university and sessions zooming in on issues peculiar to specific groups (e.g. Humanities, Biomedical Sciences, Social Sciences, Engineering etc.). The masterclass is deliberately designed to serve all disciplines, and many of the participants welcome meeting colleagues from all corners of the university. Yet, in some sessions, participants feel there is a lack of focus on the specificities of their own discipline. This is most clearly the case in the workshop on scientific integrity, where discussions about, for instance, first and last author in an article with often more than twenty authors in biomedical sciences sound surreal to academics working on literary history. However, the organisers also feel that exposure to these different traditions in different disciplines is essential for the creation of a research ecosystem actively favouring interdisciplinarity.

Collège Doctoral Paris Saclay: Workshop on "Supervision Training for SSH PhD Mentors"

The innovation series concludes with another new versions of a TtT course that has been designed as part of the Graduate SPIRIT project by the SPIRIT partners at the Collège Doctoral Paris Saclay. The three-day session on training the trainers to take place targeting SSH PhD mentors was scheduled for April 2020, but it had to be postponed due to pubilic health restrictions. Nonetheless, a detailed description of the workshop is available.

The training aims of the workshop for 15-20 PhD mentors are:
- To build a common vision for the supervision of a doctoral candidate
- To become familiar with the fundamentals of management and apply them to the supervision of doctoral candidate
- To develop the autonomy of doctoral candidate
- Experimenting with critical situations in student-supervision

Programme:
Day 1 (9:00 - 17.30):
- Welcome, presentation, questions and answers
- The roles of thesis director and doctoral candidate, how to build an effective relationship, individual and collective reflection
- Active listening, situational awareness and contributions
- Role games
- Debriefing

Day 2 (9:00 - 17.00):
- The integration of a doctoral candidate and the key role of the first year, case studies in sub-groups and feed-back
- Supporting the doctoral candidate's autonomy, feed-back
- Prevention, detection and management of physical and mental health issues of doctoral candidates

Day 3 (9:00 - 17.00):
- Recognition, Feed-back
- Promoting the professional development of one's doctoral candidates, exchange of practices and feed-back
- Ensuring the quality of the recruitment of doctoral candidates, exchanges and feed-back

Teaching method: Managing is a skill that is enriched by experience but which must be based on solid fundamentals. For example, the way doctoral and post-doctoral candidates are supervised affects the quality of their work and later on their ability to become good team leaders. This training is therefore designed to develop with the participants the principles and practices that will give meaning to their mentoring activity. The workshop will be led by a team from the aforementioned Bernard Gregory Association, including Sophie Pellegrin, head of the Innovative Training and Coaching Division, Training Department Manager, and Vincent Mignotte, Executive Director of the Bernard Gregory Association, as well as by Sylvie Pommier, Director of the Doctoral College of the University of Paris-Saclay.

Evaluation

The Graduate SPIRIT partners tested a shorter version of the workshop in September 2019 and received a short but thoroughly positive evaluation, especially about the part on recruiting new PhD candidates. This newly-designed version had been scheduled for April 2020, but it had to be postponed. A formal evaluation is thus not available at this time.

5.-Suggestions, recommendations, next steps

The Graduate SPIRIT partners found that regular training formats for doctoral supervisors continue to be an exception, not the rule, at graduate schools and universities. Where they are provided, they are often under-subscribed. A more pro-active approach to providing a support network to doctoral supervisors is both desirable and necessary in order to adapt to new developments in research and society and future prospects of the PhD candidates. During the second and third year of the Graduate SPIRIT project, the participating graduate schools thus designed, implemented and evaluated different course formats geared towards enhancing doctoral supervision and supporting PhD supervisors and supervisees. The courses, workshops, round table, lecture and panel discussion mapped out the responsibilities of both sides, the supervisors and supervisees, and provided guidance for creating a fruitful working relationship during the doctoral phase. The high satisfaction rate of the participants in the courses implemented during the innovation phase of the Graduate SPIRIT project are a measure of success. The SPIRIT partners recommend the implementation of these or comparable formats at other graduate schools.

In spite of the positive feedback the TtT courses have received, recruiting participants has been a challenge and the participation in voluntary training courses aimed at PhD supervisors has been low. As **EGSH** reported about its intercultural training for supervisors, "only three supervisors participated, partly due to the non-mandatory character." Other graduate schools and universities had similar experiences, including supervisees who showed little interest in courses designed for them. At **Loughborough University** and **KU Leuven**, new teaching staff has to take TtT courses, but where TtT course formats are voluntary, they sometimes failed to attract sufficient interest. In this context, the project partners discussed certain initiatives as effective measures that could raise the visibility of supervisory practices and training. One example was a graduate school or university-wide competition for "outstanding doctoral supervision", which is already in place at some universities (University of Helsinki, Erasmus University Rotterdam and others). Awards, essay or podcast competitions or similar

initiatives can raise awareness about this important topic (Heidelberg University). Similarly, the surveys of both PhD supervisors and PhD candidates at some Graduate SPIRIT partner schools move supervision into the limelight and the needs and expectations by supervisors and supervisees can deliver the foundation to elaborate more tailor-made TtT courses and materials to enhance doctoral supervision at the respective graduate schools and universities.

We can summarise the essential elements TtT courses ought to feature in a table, with special reference to the Triple I dimensions:

Indispensable characteristics of good supervision	Internationalisation with a focus on *interculturality*	Interdisciplinarity	Intersectorality
Regular and continuous **exchange and communication** must take place between supervisor and supervisee.	Educational and cultural differences can be a barrier to success in doctoral work. Supervisors need to be **pro-active about learning** more about the cultural and educational background of their supervisees	Interdisciplinarity is indispensable for research in the face of **complex 21st century challenges.** Supervisors need to evaluate with the supervisee in how far they can address interdisciplinarity in the PhD project at hand.	Supervisors need to discuss **career opportunities** with their supervisees and support them in the transition from the PhD to their first employment.
Supervisor ought to provide **access to networks**, such as doctoral seminars, peer groups, (inter-)national meetings, to foster the academic growth and the exchange of PhD candidates and to prevent the isolation of supervisees.		Supervisors need to encourage or allow doctoral candidates to explore interdisciplinarity because it lets them explore new academic crossroads that can lead to **innovative doctoral work.**	Supervisors should give advice on **transferable skills** supervisees need to acquire for the PhD and their first jobs, which might not necessarily be in academia.
Supervisors need to adapt their supervision to the **individual**, taking into account the supervisee's particular motivation, background and other circumstances.		Supervisors need to encourage interdisciplinary approaches as they can open up new possibilities for the **transition from the PhD to the first job.**	

This table reflects key concerns identified both in the project and in the literature on the topic, and it can also be expanded and adapted according to specific circumstances.

When the results of the innovation phase were evaluated at the transnational meeting in March 2020, which took place online due to the health crisis, the project partners also discussed the feasibility of offering TtT courses on a larger scale. While on-site courses are the norm, the temporary shutdown of universities and indeed most public life moved online courses into the limelight. In collaboration with universities, some well-known providers of online teaching in higher education have made key courses free of charge. Lecturers, post-docs and PhDs at participating universities can teach themselves from their home office about online teaching, blended learning and other fundamental digital tools as health restrictions force educators to learn new methods. Online courses can also offer solutions for problems related to timing, physical space and trainer capacities. While in-house TtT courses can deal with specific areas of concern at a particular graduate school or university, online courses can have the added benefit of enhancing the international dimension of TtT courses and allow the exchange with a much larger academic community. PhD supervision needs to adapt to changing times, including new career perspectives for PhDs in the 21st century, and the need to support supervisors through different TtT formats should be high on the agenda of all graduate schools interested in providing excellent doctoral programmes for the new generation of PhDs.

6.- Bibliography

Bøgelund, P. (2015). How supervisors perceive PhD supervision – And how they practice it. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 10*, 39-55. http://ijds.org/Volume10/IJDSv10p039-055Bogelund0714.pdf

Cornér, S., Löfström, E. & Pyhältö, K. (2017). The Relationships between doctoral students' perceptions of supervision and burnout. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 12*. DOI: 12. 091-106. 10.28945/3754

Davis, D. (2019). Students' perceptions of supervisory qualities: What do students want? What do they believe they receive? *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 14*, 431-464. https://doi.org/10.28945/4361

Devos, C., Van der Linden, N., Boudrenghien, G., Azzi, A., Frenay, M., Galand, B., & Klein, O. (2015). Doctoral supervision in the light of the three types of support promoted in self-determination theory. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 10*, 438-464. http://ijds.org/Volume10/IJDSv10p439-464Devos1858.pdf

Dollinger, M., ed. (2019). *Getting the most out of your doctorate: The importance of supervision, networking and becoming a global academic*. Emerald Publishing.

Duke, D. C., & Denicolo, P. M. (2017). What supervisors and universities can do to enhance doctoral student experience (and how they can help themselves). *FEMS microbiology letters*, *364*(9). DOI:10.1093/femsle/fnx090

Fillery-Travis, A., Maguire, K., Pizzolatti, N., Robinson, L., Lowley, A., Stel, N., Mans, P., van Wijk, J., Prodi, E., Sprerotti, F., Dobrinski, C., Peacock, J., Taylor, R., Vitale, T., & Lee, A. (2017). *A handbook for supervisors of modern doctorate candidates*. SuperProfDoc. https://superprofdoc.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/SuperProfDoc-handbook-2017.pdf

Guccione, K. (2018). *Trust Me! Building and breaking professional trust in doctoral student-supervisor relationships.* Report prepared for The Leadership Foundation. London. https://www.lfhe.ac.uk/en/components/publication.cfm/SDP2016Sheffield

Gurr, G. M. (2001). Negotiating the «Rackety Bridge»—a dynamic model for aligning supervisory style with research student development. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *20*(1), 81-92.

Helfer, F., & Drew, S. (2019). Students' perceptions of doctoral supervision: A study in an engineering program in Australia. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 14*, 499-524. https://doi.org/10.28945/4368

Hutchinson, S., Lawrence, H., & Filipović-Carter, D. (2014). *Enhancing the doctoral experience: A guide for supervisors and their international students*. Gower/Ashgate.

Johansen, B. T., Olsen, R. M., Øverby, N. C., Garred, R., & Enoksen, E. (2019). Team supervision of doctoral students: A qualitative inquiry. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 14,* 69-84. https://doi.org/10.28945/4177

Jones, M. (2013) Issues in Doctoral Studies - Forty years of journal discussion: Where have we been and where are we going? *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 8*, 83-104. http://ijds.org/Volume8/IJDSv8p083-104JonesFT129.pdf

Kumar, V., & Kaur, A. (2019). Supervisory practices for intrinsic motivation of doctoral students: A self-determination theory perspective. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 14*, 581-595. https://doi.org/10.28945/4415

McAlpine, L., & Amundsen, C. (2011) *Doctoral Education: Research-Based Strategies for Doctoral Students, Supervisors and Administrators.* Amsterdam: Springer.

McAlpine, L., & McKinnon, M. (2013). Supervision – the most variable of variables: Student perspectives. *Studies in Continuing Education, 35*, 265-280. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2012.746227

McAlpine, L., & Amundsen, C. (2016*). Post PhD Career Trajectories: Intentions, Decision-Making and Life Aspirations.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Pivot.

McAlpine, L., & Amundsen, C. (2018). *Identity-Trajectories of Early Career Researchers: Unpacking the Post PhD Experience.* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

McAlpine, L., Pyhältö, K., & Castelló, M. (2018) Building a more robust conception of early career researcher experience: what might we be overlooking?, *Studies in Continuing Education*, 40:2, 149-165. https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2017.1408582

Reguero, M., Carvajal, J. J., García, M. E., & Valverde, M. (2017). *Good practices in doctoral supervision.* Tarragona Think Tank. URV Publications. http://llibres.urv.cat/index.php/purv/catalog/download/294/329/741-1?inline=1

Roberts, L., Tinari, C. M., & Bandlow, R. (2019). An effective doctoral student mentor wears many hats and asks many questions. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 14*, 133-159. https://doi.org/10.28945/4195

Sverdlik, A., Hall, N. C., McAlpine, L., & Hubbard, K. (2018). Journeys of a PhD student and unaccompanied minors. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 13*, 361-388. https://doi.org/10.28945/4113

Tanggaard, L. and Wegener, C. (2016). *A survival kit for doctoral students and their supervisors: Traveling the landscape of research*. Sage.

Walsh, E. (2010). A model of research group microclimate: Environmental and cultural factors affecting the experiences of overseas research students in the UK. *Studies in Higher Education*, *35*, 545-560.

Selection of related publications

Ali, P. A., Watson, R., & Dhingra, K. (2016). Postgraduate research students' and their supervisors' attitudes towards supervision. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 11*, 227-241. http://www.informingscience.org/Publications/3541

Bagaka's, J. G., Badillo, N., Bransteter, I., & Rispinto, S. (2015). Exploring student success in a doctoral program: The power of mentorship and research engagement. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 10*, 323-342. http://ijds.org/Volume10/IJDSv10p323-342Bagaka1713.pdf

Barker, M. J. (2011) Racial context, currency and connections: Black doctoral student and white advisor perspectives on cross-race advising. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 48*(4), 387-400. DOI: 10.1080/14703297.2011.617092

Devos, C., Boudrenghien, G., Van der Linden, N., Frenay, M., Azzi, A., Galand, B., & Klein, O. (2016). Misfits between doctoral students and their supervisors: (How) Are they regulated? *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 11*, 467-486. http://www.informingscience.org/Publications/3621

Geesa, R. L., Lowery, K., & McConnell, K. (2018). Mentee perspectives of a first-year peer mentoring program for education doctoral (EdD) students. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 13*, 471-495. https://doi.org/10.28945/4148

Gjøtterud, S. M., & Ahmad, A. K. (2018). Transformative power of cross-cultural PhD supervision. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 13*, 441-456. https://doi.org/10.28945/4140

John, T. & Denicolo, P. (2013). Doctoral Education: A review of the literature monitoring the doctoral student experience in selected OECD countries (Mainly UK). *Springer Science Reviews, 1*. DOI: 10.1007/s40362-013-0011-x.

Joy, S., Liang, X., Bilimoria, D., & Perry, S. (2015). Doctoral advisor-advisee pairing in STEM fields: Selection criteria and impact of faculty, student and departmental factors. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 10*, 343- 363. http://ijds.org/Volume10/IJDSv10p343-363Joy0711.pdf

Marsh, H. W., Rowe, K. J., & Martin, A. (2002) PhD students' evaluations of research Supervision. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(3), 313-348. DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2002.11777151

Noy, S. & Ray, R. (2012) Graduate students' perceptions of their advisors: Is there systematic disadvantage in mentorship? *The Journal of Higher Education, 83* (6), 876-914. DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2012.11777273

Orellana, M. L., Darder, A., Pérez, A., & Salinas, J. (2016). Improving doctoral success by matching PhD students with supervisors. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 11,* 87-103. http://ijds.org/Volume11/IJDSv11p087-103Orellana1629.pdf

Posselt, J. (2018) Normalizing struggle: Dimensions of faculty support for doctoral students and implications for persistence and well-being. *The Journal of Higher Education, 89*(6), 988-1013. DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2018.1449080

Sefotho, M. M. (2018). Carving a career identity as PhD supervisor: A South African autoethnographic case study. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 13*, 539-555. https://doi.org/10.28945/4159

Taylor, R. T., Vitale, T., Tapoler, C., & Whaley, K. (2018) Desirable qualities of modern doctorate advisors in the USA: a view through the lenses of candidates, graduates, and academic advisors. *Studies in Higher Education, 43*(5), 854-866. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2018.1438104

Wisker, G.; Robinson, G., & Shacham, M. (2007). "Postgraduate research success: Communities of practice involving cohorts, guardian supervisors and online communities". *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *44*, 301-320.

Woolderink, M., Putnik, K., van der Boom, H., & Klabbers, G. (2015). The voice of PhD candidates and PhD supervisors. A qualitative exploratory study amongst PhD candidates and supervisors to evaluate the relational aspects of PhD supervision in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 10*, 217-235. http://ijds.org/Volume10/IJDSv10p217-235Woolderink0852.pdf

Zhao, C. M., Golde, C. M., & McCormick, A. C. (2007). More than a signature: How advisor choice and advisor behaviour affect doctoral student satisfaction. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 31*, 263-281. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770701424983

Annex

TtT questionnaire sent to all Graduate SPIRIT partners in preparation for the "Training the Trainer" innovation tests:

Innovation Menu (IO3)

Name of your Graduate School:

Staff and Supervisors: **Innovation 1: Training the Trainer** **Assignment, 1st level:**	
1.-Graduate Schools please list the most important course offers related to "Supervision training" they themselves and/or their universities have (with course title) and briefly describe their content.	
2.-Triple I components: Is there a course component that focuses on *interculturality* or a dedicated course about intercultural awareness? Please explain, with course title, brief content and link.	
3.-Triple I components: Is there a course component that focuses on *interdisciplinarity* or a dedicated course about it? Please explain with brief details.	
4.-Triple I components: Is there a course component that focuses on *the employability of PhDs*? Please explain with brief details.	

5.-Is there a course component that focuses on *blended learning* or a dedicated course about online & offline learning? Please explain with brief details.	
6.-Please explain who is offering the courses you mention (Graduate School or institute/s at your university).	
7.-How many of the courses you describe are being offered per semester or year, how many participants does each course have on average?	
8.-Please describe the target audience. Are these course specifically aimed at PhD supervisors or at all interested academics?	
9.-Is there a legal provision for the courses? Do all new academic members of your university need to take a specific course on supervision in order to supervise PhD candidates?	
10.-How do the providers reach potential participants? Briefly explain the marketing/ communication strategies for these courses.	
11.-Is there a regular evaluation of the courses? What are the overall results, if available?	
12.-Are there any plans for expanding or changing the course offers in the future? If yes, are there any changes to structural organisations/ policies / regulations needed to enable these plans? Please give reasons.	

Assignment, 2nd level:

13.-Graduate Schools critically analyse their needs and challenges with regard to supervisor training. The analysis should be brief and no longer than 200 words.	
14.-Based on their needs, each GS will briefly describe a lecture, workshop, seminar or another format dedicated to "training the trainer" they will test and evaluate in 2019.	

Assignment, 3rd level:

The IO3 team will evaluate the responses and call for an online meeting with all GS. In the meeting, each GS will briefly share the course format about "training the trainer" they will test and evaluate. All GS discuss common grounds and shared needs with regard to "training the trainer" and exchange ideas about course contents and formats. Some GS might want to share online resources for a joint course. All GS will agree on approximate course dates and on evaluation deadlines.

Assignment, 4th level:

All GS will advertise the course at their institutions and recruit participants (academics and interested PhDs).

IO3 will elaborate evaluation formats to be agreed upon by all GS.

Evaluation at each GS:
  a. Graduate Spirit team members from each GS will participate in the course as participant-observers.
  b. All GS will evaluate the courses with questionnaires aimed at the course leaders and the participants.
  c. Interviews with the course leaders and the participants complement the evaluation.

All GS write an evaluation summary and submit the report to the IO3 team.

The IO3 team will evaluate all nine reports and collate the outstanding elements as an Innovation Menu for Graduate SPIRIT "Training the Trainer" courses.