



Building Community and Research Culture for Postgraduate Researchers

Courage Project – Final Report for Strand A Placement

James Craske

December 2019

Contents

Building Community and Research Culture for Postgraduate Researchers	1
Courage Project – Final Report for Strand A Placement.....	1
1. Background and Project Rationale	3
1.1 The Courage Project.....	3
2. Interventions for a Better Research Culture and Community.....	4
2.1 Rationale and Methodology	4
2.2 Research Culture Workshop.....	5
2.3 Publication Development Workshops.....	6
3. Findings and Discussion.....	8
3.1 Analysis.....	8
Theme 1: Research culture and community in theory and in practice.....	8
Theme 2: Vastly different experiences between Schools	9
Theme 3: The central role of supervisors.....	11
Theme 4: Researcher identity and transition	12
Reflection	13
4. Recommendations	15
References	17
Appendices.....	18
Appendix 1 - Publication Development Sessions.....	18
Appendix 2 - Research Culture Workshop.....	21

1. Background and Project Rationale

1.1 The Courage Project

The following report draws insights and lessons from the delivery of a pilot programme as part of my placement on UEA's Courage Wellbeing Project. My role in Strand A was to design, plan and implement a pilot project that could contribute to the development of research culture and community within the Faculty of Social Sciences. This report provides some context to the aims and scope of my pilot project, situating it in some existing literature around research culture and community in Higher Education, before providing some explanation about how the pilot was run and the research findings and insights it generated. Recommendations follow this.

The Courage Project was enabled by HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) Catalyst funding to provide initiatives that could identify and provide early intervention around mental health concerns (Watson and Turnpenny, 2019). Along with Strand A, the Courage Project also included strands focused on resilience training for postgraduate researchers, low commitment sports and fitness activities, developing associate tutor networks and supporting staff who supervise postgraduate researchers. In January 2019, a scoping review by the Project's leads provided a recommendation that postgraduates should lead initiatives to improve the PGR community.

Universities should facilitate the development of PGR community using a range of methods suited to specific contexts, which may include cohort training programmes and student led initiatives. Even if student led, some institutional support will be required, which again will depend on context. Opportunities for PGR students to meaningfully inform department or university wide initiatives need to be considered. Virtual communities can be complementary and connect PGRs at a broader level.

(Turnpenny and Watson 2019, 3)

My placement started with a plan to pilot sessions centred on publishing and improving our understanding of research culture and postgraduates' perspectives of it. My aim was to develop sessions not specifically focused on the thesis in order to foster connections between a wide pool of postgraduate researchers in separate Schools and Faculties. Going beyond the initial brief to focus on PGRs in just my Social Sciences Faculty, I decided I wanted to bring together a varied cohort of postgraduate researchers in order to gain their perspective on developing the essential and necessary skills for an academic career such as publishing. Over the course of my placement, I planned several interventions and data-generating activities that ended up focusing on themes of "research culture" and "rethinking

training and advice” for those trying to navigate the publication process. Appendices 1 and 2 show the session outlines.

2. Interventions for a Better Research Culture and Community

The piloted project was centred around two “interventions”, a Research Culture Workshop and a series of three Publication Development Sessions. The workshop was designed exclusively for postgraduate researchers, who were encouraged to be honest about the depth and state of their research community and culture in their Schools and Faculty. The publication development was designed to draw together staff and students. This meant I invited staff to share their experiences of publishing: their insights, successes and failures and how they dealt with this at different stages of their career.

2.1 Rationale and Methodology

The methodology was a combined research and practice-based intervention facilitated through a series of workshops. I focused on two areas during my time with Courage. The first was to run a workshop on the theme of research culture, asking for PGRs to comment on what they thought this entailed and how the postgraduate researcher was situated in this context. Ethics was obtained through the Student Union. During the session, which was audio recorded for data collection purposes, I provided prompts and activities to generate debate and discussion. I wanted to better understand how “community” was understood within faculties and between them – based on this I extended my interventions to all students regardless of faculty in order to facilitate sessions with students from across the university. The publication development workshops were designed to connect students with staff members, who have supervisory roles. Prior to running my publication development sessions, I wrote a blog piece setting out the rationale for the programme:

Traditionally, training and personal development are often discussed in terms of competition, “finding-the-edge”, catering to individual needs, and the importance of good strategy. The sessions in this programme will be guided by a different set of ethics, including honesty, the role that luck can play, contingency, group-focused, collaborative, and conducted with a flatter knowledge hierarchy (with PhDs and academics sharing their experiences).

(Craske, 2019)

This statement was not used to suggest that competitive training is unimportant, or that PPD sessions do not already incorporate elements of the ethic that I outline. Tackling publishing during my PhD and talking to postgraduate students throughout our doctoral programme, it had become clear, however, that provision for honest discussions about the realities of

publishing as a postgraduate researcher was mixed. Moreover, other than informal conversations, there was not a forum in place for PGRs to come together to discuss pressures related to publishing, including rejections, “the underbelly of publishing”, time pressures, negotiation, and failures. The publication development workshops sought to fill this gap, generate data about PGRs perceptions and an attempt to trial a way of bringing together a wide pool of people.

2.2 Research Culture Workshop

The two-hour research culture workshop was set up as a part-focus group, part-workshop. I used a series of activities and prompts to facilitate a discussion and debate about what research culture meant for PGRs. The workshop involved six people including myself and was represented by postdoctoral researchers in SSF, HUM and SCI. Each participant was given £10 their time, provided refreshments and offered a chance to have further conversations over lunch.

Problematising the lack of clarity about research culture

The idea for this workshop came from my own lack of clarity around what “community” and “research culture” actually meant. The Courage Project brief set out aims for Strand A to improve both of these elements within the university, but I felt that some foundation for how PGRs interpreted this would be valuable and might open up avenues to explore in the future. The question of research culture has received little attention in the social sciences and humanities. Reviewing the literature, the sciences have started to work through what a “good” research culture looks like for its profession. Much of this has been spearheaded by the *Royal Society* which refers to the ‘behaviours, values, expectations, attitudes and norms of our research communities’ (Royal Society, 2019). This is a useful starting point with some tangible elements to work with. It does, however, leave contextual data at the door, especially in its discussion of the way institutions reshape these tangible elements.

Outside the Sciences, it is possible to point to texts such as Mikhail Epstein’s *The Transformative Humanities*, which describes how the Humanities currently cuts itself from a ‘practical branch that would correspond to the role of technologies in relation to the natural sciences and politics in relation to the social sciences’ (2012, 283). Continuing to not engage with others (practice-based creatives or other disciplines) means it is ‘doomed to stagnation’ or overly focused on the past (2012, 284). The connection between disciplines was something I wanted to establish, albeit at the level of conversation about the types of practices and experiences doctoral students encounter. Thinking about why I had not mixed with doctoral students in other disciplines was a motivating factor for extending my intervention to all PGRs.

On research community, work between the University of Glasgow and QAA Scotland provides a view from students and staff (QAA Scotland, 2017a) as well as policy and practice (QAA Scotland, 2017b). Across focus groups and interviews, the report drew attention to the importance of institutions 'encouraging activity at all levels (institution-wide, graduate school, subject area, student-centred), of all types (training, pastoral support, special interest) to meet postgraduate researchers' varied and changing needs throughout their PhD experience' (QAA Scotland, 2017a, 13).

Appendix 2 shows the outline for the session, which was broken into three parts:

- 1) Discussion about how "research community" and "research culture" is communicated on the university's website, using extracts from the way various faculties communicate research community and culture.
- 2) Discussion about how postgraduate researchers fit into or navigate "research communities" and "research culture" within UEA.
- 3) Discussion about how "research community" and "research culture" might be improved broadly (and for PGRs), using the prompt of the Royal Society's "Museum of Extraordinary objects¹". To think about the PGR community more broadly. How might PGRs discuss their work outside of their own Schools?

A wide-ranging discussion emanated from prompts. These themes and insights are discussed in Chapter Three, *Findings and Discussion*.

2.3 Publication Development Workshops

The second component of my pilot project was three sessions set around the theme of publishing whilst a postgraduate researcher. This was designed to be an inclusive programme, where PGRs at all stages would be able to share their experiences or listen about the experiences of the publishing process. Each session would have at least one academic to share their experiences or answer questions. Although my expressions of interest form returned 40 students and staff members, there was a disappointingly low turnout on overall numbers. Three academics and two students attended across two sessions. Rather than a focus group as first planned, the final session ended up being a 1:1 interview with a student from SSF who discussed her experiences of academic publishing after finishing her thesis.

¹ These comprise of a series of artworks that 'provoke imaginative thought' and which are 'underpinned by a narrative around one theme; from team science to research integrity' (Royal Society, Museum of Extraordinary Objects, 2019).

Pitching collaborative training sessions

As noted earlier, this series of workshops was designed to provide a forum for PGRs, to be honest about their concerns and experiences of publishing. A great number of PGRs will attempt to publish during their doctoral students. I wanted to take the opportunity to create a supportive environment where “community” might converge on sharing experiences. The session was set up to allow for around two-hours for discussion, facilitated by me. The room was booked out for the afternoon so that PGRs who wanted to spend some time writing and sharing their ideas could do so.

It seems to me that PGR students really need to have more interaction people with some experience of publication and rejection, so that they can offer a realistic picture of the process, with its drawbacks, quirks and also good sides (there happen to be some of those, too).

(HUM lecturer who participated in a publishing development session)

As noted earlier, the publication sessions were advertised in a blog post and I visited PGR space in as many Schools as I could. A note was left to be included in research bulletins in each School. Around 40 people signed an expression of interest form.

Appendix 1 shows the outlines of the three sessions making up the programme:

- 1) Session 1: a forum where PGRs can discuss “publication pressures”, where PGRs could discuss their perceptions, expectations and anxieties around the publishing process.
- 2) Session 2: a forum where PGRs could discuss the ins and outs of the peer review process, including how to deal with rejections, the current perceived practices and expectations around peer-review process for PGRs, across disciplines. I shared a review comments of the first paper I tried to publish. Other participants were invited to bring along their own, including staff members.
- 3) A focus group tying together themes brought up during the previous two sessions. Because of low turnout, this ended up becoming an interview of around an hour long.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1 Analysis

Over the course of the pilot programme, several themes emerged from both the publication development sessions and research culture workshop. Some early ideas were sparked during the informal discussion, others became clearer during my research culture workshops, focus group and interview. Data were coded and thematically organised. This analysis develops four themes that encapsulate the majority of the ideas that were discussed. These include: “the lack of clarity about research community and culture”; “different needs between schools”, “researcher identity and transition”, and “the central role of supervisors”. Given this was a pilot programme, the themes *indicate* potential pathways for further reflection by the university, the PGR community, training directors and those carrying forward the Courage Programme. More generally, there is a basis for considering particular sessions (through the way they are organised and their content) can foster connections with students across Schools and Faculties, as well as provide an important insight into the lived experiences of PGRs.

Theme 1: Research culture and community in theory and in practice

In the research culture workshop, we began by working through how university departments pitch notions of research culture and community on their UEA pages. There was a feeling that much of what universities and departments were saying about notions of research culture. There was a tendency for PGRs to feel that outputs equalled productivity, though this was more pronounced in the Sciences. One SSF student noted how she had come to the realisation that constantly producing did not just mean outputs and writing:

There is a culture that you have to be constantly producing. But you can't be producing all the time. (Participant 4, SSF)

Other participants talked about the need to get away from labs and desks in order to think clearly about their research. This theme was prominent and the expectations students had about whether it was possible came up in discussions about supervisors and how Schools approached research culture.

Theme 1: Research culture and community in theory and in practice at UEA

Definitions of research culture and community appear on most department websites (appendix 3). By and large, the focus group thought that these were often generalised and did not represent the experience “on the ground” .:

[referring to a SCI discipline] “You could just apply it to anywhere... there’s nothing specific in it. Just generic words.”

And even reading this... they’re talking about faculty without walls” but even within the School I feel we have walls up. Maybe it’s a space issue because we’re all on a separate corridor... there’s separate coffee mornings for each group... so I think you’re sort of encouraged to stick in your groups.

(Participant 1, SCI)

At times, PGRs did not necessarily feel that research culture captured the realities of what it meant to be doing a PhD. For instance, the system is heavily gravitated towards outputs and the Research Excellence Framework. Such an approach, however, does not take into account that some of the most beneficial activities that a PGR student can do is to deepen their subject knowledge, meet others in their field and be given the space experiment. Doing so, however, can be difficult in the current framework:

Something alluded to earlier that there are broader structural issues at play. Everything that happens within a research culture is reliant on...it’s about finding space within the university’s main ambition which is to be a maker of money... and that’s what the university has decided itself to be and therefore it doesn’t have to care about research output unless it’s sailable, marketable to make UEA home of the wonderful. You’ll see it constantly things about how an academic at UEA has made some sort of impact somewhere and that’s great because it’s promoting a research success at UEA... but ultimately it’s about promoting UEA and so you’re creating different incentives.

(Participant 2, HUM)

Theme 2: Vastly different PGR experiences and needs between Schools

I chose the topic of research culture because it sits universally across every discipline, but the way students in different faculties experienced research culture (including publishing practices) differed. This means that any university-wide intervention will need to provide bespoke approaches.

Theme 2: Vastly different PGR experiences and needs between Schools

One theme that arose from both publishing and research culture sessions was that student experience and needs differed vastly across Faculties and between Schools. There were many things that differed including practices around authorship in publishing, how research seminars were organised, and how students were able to structure their days, including whether it was even possible to partake in Courage activities.

Moreover, many students in HUM and SSF had talked about a need to find time to dedicate towards writing, whereas those in SCI talked about a protected time to read journals or have a “focused working group” when the expectation was that you would be expected to work solidly at your LAB. Some consensus formed during the Research Culture workshop that having protected spaces and time to get on with other tasks was an important step. Ideally, this would be done in groups in order to provide protection to multiple people.

The expectations about prioritising certain types of activities and having a space to do so was popular in one initiative set up by a PGR who wanted to have protected time to work on other things outside of lab work:

The writing group I set up was called a writing group for the first two sessions but then I thought I wasn't actually writing I was making a spreadsheet and I said can we call it a focused working group instead? So it officially got rebranded. And I think because of that we've got more people coming now. It's that space to just read.

(Participant 1, SCI)

That's why a group like that would be great because we have lab meetings you've got to be like “I did that that week and I did this and this and it's never just like... “well I sat down and had this idea and I made these connections”... automatically you should know that.

(Participant 3, SCI)

Asked whether an initiative that had been set up in one School to protect reading time could be rolled out further to other schools in SCI, there was some hesitancy:

It might be difficult with some PIs. I find that some PIs are a bit like well I didn't have it when I was a PhD – why should you? That type of thing.

(Participant 3, SCI)

Theme 3: The central role of supervisors

As noted in the earlier literature, supervisors play a key part in doctoral researchers' experience. The Courage Project has focused a lot around supervisors, developing training around mental wellbeing and how to support students effectively. I have sketched out some of the themes that arose during my sessions around the supervisors. Often supervisors were implicitly and explicitly discussed across the other themes too, including being identified as important in setting up research cultures (theme 1), their expectations of doctoral students (theme 2) and finally in theme 4 where they play a role in helping students transition through their studies.

Theme 3: The central role of supervisors

The role of supervisors was discussed at length during the research culture workshop and the throughout the publication development workshops. Though it may not come as a surprise supervisors are a central part of a doctoral researcher's experience. Participants talked generally about how such experiences were inconsistent:

One of the things I was thinking about is broadly it's quite inconsistent, some people have really good experiences, really good supervisors and feel supported and others won't... for various reasons. That might be done to your supervisor or your department or how you are or your subject.

(Participant 4, SSF)

A good supervisor can open doors to important formative experiences such as chatting to invited speakers or helping PGRs to navigate the informal parts of a research career. A number of participants felt this was not 'not something held up as a standard of good practice' more broadly and this perhaps explained the inconsistencies in experience:

When you're building a research culture you're still relying on people buying into it. Living up to their side of the bargain which is to be proactive in doing the "research culture things". I've been quite fortunate that my supervisor used to run a seminar series which... one of the most rewarding experiences was in getting a speaker for a research seminar and then having dinner afterwards... he's brought in lots of really interesting people and then got me to go and meet them... and these people are then asking about my PhD and that's when you start to feel you're being taken seriously as a colleague. Obviously, that's not something everyone gets.

(Participant 2, HUM)

In the publishing session, participants admitted that they had not really had enough conversations about publishing with their supervisors. There were many reasons for this including because some felt their supervisor was very focused on just the thesis or because supervisors were not working in the PGR's field:

My supervisor didn't have the expertise in my field. Though she was highly supportive but I didn't feel I knew where to start with where to publish.

(Interviewee, SSF publishing session)

The QAA Scotland (2017a) report places an important emphasis on the 'vital role played by supervisors in the creation, functioning and maintenance of the research community' (4). This has been discussed by Duke and Denicolo who have written about the role of supervisors in 'the creation of inclusive and supportive research communities within universities that incorporate all stages of researcher development and encourage interdisciplinary networks' (2017,3).

Theme 4: Researcher identity and transition

In many ways, PGRs find themselves awkwardly placed in the institution. Throughout my sessions, there was a feeling that PGRs felt out of place in the university. I asked students how they felt they fitted into the institutional hierarchy and what things had been important in their development. Once again, supervisors were discussed at length as well as other factors such as access to space and what made PGRs feel valued. A similar finding appears in the work by QAA Scotland when it refers to responses by PGRs that lack of office space or poor supervisory relationships meant that they did not feel like 'full participants' (2017a, 13).

On the one hand, postgraduate researchers they are part of the system that puts great weight into research excellence framework and a focus on outputs (inevitably this impacts staff behaviours) but this may not accurately capture the best environment for PGRs to develop their craft. In theme 1, I pointed to how some participants felt the research culture of their departments meant they felt alienated during coffee mornings, which were often focused around sharing outputs, and not necessarily ideas. It might be true that other members of staff also feel that the current system does not adequately represent their own expectations of the ideal university culture but the needs of being a doctoral student within this system is particularly pertinent when PGRs often find themselves traversing both student and staff identities, as well needing an adequate space to build up their knowledge and the space to fail.

Theme 4: Researcher identity and transition

The theme of “researcher identity” and transition was linked to provision in the school, including supervisory relationships, contingent on whether a PGR was coming back to study after several years having had a previous career, as well as other factors such as whether a PGR felt they had the opportunities to develop a rounded experience, or being funded.

There was an overriding feeling amongst participants in the research culture workshop that researcher development was too easily connected to “suffering”. This was implicit in some SCI participants saying that they felt PIs would not be willing to grant them space to do other activities because they had not had those opportunities themselves. One SSF Participant had recently been to the doctors for stress and had received the reply: “well you are a PhD student”—the assumption here being that having a hard time was some sort of ‘rite of passage’

Another prominent theme that has already been dealt with in detail in Andrea James’ (Strand A for HUM) Courage Report. Even beyond the HUM Faculty, space was brought up as an essential element that criss-crossed between these themes including the way physical space could act as a boundary for colleagues across the university (or in some case the same building) might interact. It was a theme that radiated across disciplines, from the fight to get room space in HUM to SCI students appreciating the importance of having a lab bench meaning that others could put ‘name to faces’, help which might help with ‘networking’ (Participant 3, SCI). One student noted how the library had transformed her working day by providing her with a space that meant she saw ‘the same people’ each day, and because it was not until her second year until she was given an allocated desk space (Participant 5, SSF). Adequate space was equated with a ‘level of respectability’ (Participant, 2, HUM).

Reflection

Overall these four themes captured a great deal of the ideas present in the data. It has by no means exhausted the data that was generated throughout the pilot project but it does provide some indication of the open dialogue that flowed between postgraduates regarding the theme of research culture in particular. Ultimately, the state of any research culture and community is contingent on individuals having the time and the motivation to continue with initiatives. These individuals include staff members as well as doctoral researchers. Too many examples were given where an initiative had been started but soon folded once it could no longer be driven forward because of time commitments or other incentives. In many ways, this is a lesson for those that have seen potential in the Courage Project and would like it to carry forward.

The research culture workshop provided an important space for participants to think about the current state of research culture in their Schools and disciplines. There were regular instances where researchers from different Schools remarked how they “hadn’t thought

about it like that”, or “you’ve had a different experience to me”. These comments highlight the virtue of working through “universal” aspects of what a doctoral researcher may do throughout their time at UEA but it points to how those tasks and activities are completed is often drastically different. During the workshop, others asked about how they might look to set up protected time and space to do activities they considered a part of the process of being a researcher. It also highlighted gulfs in expectation, including around having time away from the desk to do Courage activities, holiday, and authorship of journals. What one student might think as normal could strike another as not. Sharing these stories can be empowering in resetting expectations and working with their Schools to improve the research culture for themselves and their peer.

The publishing sessions had a disappointing turnout despite the initial expression of interest from PGRs. It did, however, set in motion discussion across academics in HUM and SSF about how supervisors should approach the subject and what guidance should be provided. One academic referred to the approach as “fruitful”. One of the attendees of the sessions expressed increased ‘awareness of the ethical issues related to publishing’, as this came up throughout.

4. Recommendations

My pilot project aimed to develop better clarity around the themes of “research community and culture”. It particularly sought to set up relevant workshop sessions that could draw from a variety of different PGRs. For instance, I ended up rejecting an earlier idea for a reading group. I had considered asking PGRs from different Schools to contribute a piece of reading that students from other Schools might find interesting. In the end, I felt this would be logistically difficult and instead focused on the PGR “experience” regarding publishing and research culture. I hoped that by curating these sessions, PGRs could get a sense of community—through sharing their stories and by spending time with peers they may not have met before. Moreover, adding a research collection dimension to the pilot meant I have been able to generate some insights and learnings. Once again, it is important to note that these recommendations are tentative, though add to the evidence-base of the Courage project as a whole where there are confluences between themes.

1. Continue to use a vehicle such as Courage to listen to PGRs.

The Courage project has garnered important trust with many from the PGR community. People were willing to be so open in both my focus groups and interview, in part, because they had heard about the work that Courage had done previously. It is telling, however, that in this public Report, none of my participants wanted to be identified by their School. This should be a wake-up call that things are not “alright” in some areas of the PGR experience, and this is confluent with a number of other strands.

2. On the themes of research culture and community, Schools will need bespoke approaches to solve the issues raised across the four themes in this report.

The research culture workshop and publishing sessions were designed to appeal to the widest pool of PGRs, however, it became clear that PGRs experience different challenges and different Schools will need to allow PGRs to tackle concerns such as “authorship on papers”, “spaces to read”, and “ensuring PGRs find an appropriate work/life balance”.

3. Put PGRs at the heart of developing solutions by offering them support and clarity about how they can raise issues and push through interventions and ideas.

There are mixed levels of buy-in from different Schools at committee levels, however, it would be valuable to find a vehicle to allow PGRs setting up groups to be supported where possible if they are informally tackling issues “on the ground”. Following on from this, the university may consider the benefit of inviting PGRs to share their best practice. It was clear from my conversations with PGRs that many PGRs already take on setting up groups. In many ways, these types of initiatives are what make up “research culture” for PGRs, not just the outputs of a department.

4. Where appropriate, future training sessions should also focus on the importance of sharing honest experiences about academic life and engagements such as publishing.

This already takes place in some current PPD sessions. Informal training sessions could be rolled out in Schools if there is no current provision.

The broader principles for PGR provision and the role of the future role of the Courage Project

Short and medium-term outcomes of the monitoring report for the Courage Project refers to the ability to have 'self-sustaining PGR support communities'. There are broader recommendations that I make based on my overall experience working within the Courage Programme over the course of eight months and anecdotally

Schools and Faculty should continue supporting the idea that PGRs might be given some remunerated buy-out for their time to develop interventions/workshops. Having the space to develop well-crafted examples of fostering research community and culture is important to ensure its success and longevity.

Designing workshops or sessions to foster research culture and community

Through a process of discussion with training coordinators and students, it became clear that successful interventions across Schools and Faculties would garner the most interest if they avoided narrow topics. The best way to design workshops is to provide a topic where there is both a universal experience (such as publishing and questions of research) as well as something where there are divergences between schools. I was taken back by the number of times PGRs said "I've never thought about it like that" or "your PhD experience really is rather different to mine".

Specifically, on the publishing session, which garnered around 35 expressions of interest but was poorly attended, any future iteration might consider splitting the session between an external speaker (which might bring prestige) and a follow-up conversation organised around sharing honest experiences and

The sessions were initially planned for April, however, the circumstances of my placement meant that it was delivered early September when the campus is quiet. That said, the Courage Project more generally wanted to tackle the point that the UEA campus often "shuts down" once the undergraduate cohort has left for summer.

References

- Craske, J. 2019. Improving PGR Research Culture at UEA. Lakeside Blog. <https://www.uea.su/blogs/blog/lakesideview/>
- Duke, D C. and Denicolo, P M. 2017 What supervisors and universities can do to enhance doctoral student experience (and how they can help themselves). *Microbiology Letters*, 364 (9) pp. 1-7.
- Epstein, M. 2012. *The Transformative Humanities: A Manifesto*. London. Bloomsbury.
- James, A. 2019. *Courage Wellbeing Project Strand A HUM Report*.
- QAA Scotland. 2017a. Building a Research Community – Student and Staff Views. 14th August 2017. Available at: [https://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/en/focus-on/the-postgraduate-research-\(pgr\)-student-experience/building-a-research-community-for-pgrs](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/en/focus-on/the-postgraduate-research-(pgr)-student-experience/building-a-research-community-for-pgrs)
- QAA Scotland. 2017b. Building a Research Community – Examples of Policy and Practice. 14th August 2017. Available at: [https://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/en/focus-on/the-postgraduate-research-\(pgr\)-student-experience/building-a-research-community-for-pgrs](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/en/focus-on/the-postgraduate-research-(pgr)-student-experience/building-a-research-community-for-pgrs)
- Royal Society. 2019. Research Culture. Available at: <https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/projects/research-culture/> accessed: 22nd December 2019
- Royal Society. 2019. Museum of Extraordinary Object. Available at: <https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/projects/research-culture/changing-expectations/museum-of-extraordinary-objects/> accessed: 22nd December 2019
- Watson, D & Turnpenny, J. 2019. *Supporting the Mental Health and Wellbeing of Postgraduate Research Students: A Rapid Review*.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Publication Development Sessions

	Session Content	People/Comments
1	<p><u>Monday 09th September 10:00 – 12:00</u></p> <p>8</p> <p>“Publication Pressures” – this two-hour session will provide a supportive, open and inclusive environment to discuss the current perceived practices and expectations around publishing for PGRs, and across disciplines. This session focuses on the broad theme “publication pressures” and invites PGRs and a small number of academic staff members to participate.</p> <p>1) a space is offered to discuss the perceptions, expectations and anxieties around the publishing process.</p> <p>Some anticipated themes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - why is there such a thing as “publication pressure”? Can we identify a publication culture? - the role of REF (research excellence framework) - has it always been like this? - who’s under pressure and why? – views from editors, peer-reviewers and authors. - the influence of material constraints. - how might we produce a better publication environment for PGRs at UEA/UoS? 	<p>Mid-morning refreshments provided.</p> <p>Publication development blog piece.</p>
	<p><u>Writing Session 13:00 – 17:00</u></p> <p>We will have dedicated space set aside to write in a group. There will be an opportunity to breakout and spend some time working in pairs or small groups to get feedback on your writing.</p>	

	Session Content	People/Comments
2	<p data-bbox="488 352 1010 416"><u>Monday 16th September 10:00 – 12:00</u> 7 and 8</p> <p data-bbox="488 459 1738 555">“Peer-review process” - this two-hour session will provide a supportive, open and inclusive environment to discuss the current perceived practices and expectations around the peer-review process for PGRs, and across disciplines.</p> <p data-bbox="488 595 1749 659">1) a space is offered to discuss the perceptions, expectations and anxieties around the publishing process, and peer-reviewing particularly.</p> <p data-bbox="488 699 931 722">Some anticipated themes include:</p> <ul data-bbox="488 762 1077 898" style="list-style-type: none"> - PGRs and academics sharing their reviews. - dealing with tough reviews. - a view from an editor. - being a peer-reviewer as a PGR. <p data-bbox="488 1018 902 1050"><u>Writing Session 13:00 – 17:00</u></p> <p data-bbox="488 1090 1727 1153">We will have dedicated space set aside to write in a group. There will be an opportunity to breakout and spend some time working in pairs or small groups to get feedback on your writing.</p>	<p data-bbox="1787 352 2119 416">Mid-morning refreshments provided.</p> <p data-bbox="1787 520 2040 616">Publication development blog piece.</p>

	Session Content	People/Comments
3	<p>23rd September 10:30 – 12:00 and 8</p> <p>Focus Group</p> <p>Where does your perception of the publication process come from? Have you had honest conversations about it? What sort of conversations would you like around publishing, and who can help you give that? Do you appreciate the protected structured time that having a group booking room provides? Would you like to see more peer-to-peer arrangements for activities that you doing outside of your PhD?</p>	<p>SU Bookable Rooms 7</p> <p>Voice recorded. Feeds into the final project report.</p> <p>Lunch and refreshments provided.</p> <p>Participants of the focus group are provided £10 for their time.</p>
	<p><u>Writing Session 13:00 – 17:00</u></p> <p>We will have dedicated space set aside to write in a group. There will be an opportunity to breakout and spend some time working in pairs or small groups to get feedback on your writing.</p>	

Appendix 2 - Research Culture Workshop

	Workshop Content	People/Comments
1	<p><u>02nd September 10:00 – 13:00</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">SU Bookable Room</p> <p>Workshop on Research Culture</p> <p>1. Introduction into what has been said about research culture say far. Rationale for workshop.</p> <p>a) Royal Society on research culture b) University of East Anglia statements</p> <p>2. UEA PGRs and research culture.</p> <p>a) What does “research culture mean to postgraduate students at UEA/and UoS? Discussion. Challenges, good/bad practices. How are postgraduate researchers understood within the institution?</p> <p>Do you feel there are enough opportunities to engage in research culture in your faculty? What are the barriers you face in your school and faculty? Focus on areas where research culture and wellbeing converge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process of research and recognition - questions around research identity - People and careers – is there the right support? - Dissemination and the public good – why do we do research and what sort of research culture should we expect? Different rationalities in the institution. <p>3. Scenarios and the Future: Imagining “ideal” research culture(s).</p> <p>Participatory session. Developing artefacts around research culture.</p> <p>What should an ideal research culture look like?</p> <p>a) Encyclopaedia of extraordinary objects (from Royal Society). b) “In Place of a Conclusion” in <i>The Transformative Humanities: A Manifesto</i> (Mikhail Epstein).</p>	<p>Audio-recorded session. Focus group embedded.</p> <p>Participants of the focus group are provided £10 for their time, or a share of the allocated pot if numbers are high.</p> <p>Mid-morning refreshments. Lunch provided after – 13:00</p> <p>Blog post to follow up.</p> <p>Feeds into the final project report.</p>