

## Course evaluation

### Doctoral Supervision in Practice, summer 2018

#### Intended learning outcomes:

During the course, you have the opportunity to develop:

- a reflective and mature role as supervisor.
- insight into the various roles involved in a tutoring situation.
- your knowledge of research supervision as a process and its phases.
- knowledge about the importance of ethnicity and gender in the supervisory situation.
- experience and increased knowledge of dialogue as a tool in the supervisory situation.
- preparedness for conflict and problems that can occur in a supervisory situation.
- your knowledge and understanding of ethics in research supervision.

#### What have you learned from the course?

- Group discussions and exchange with people from other faculty areas/disciplines have given good insights into how (differently and alike) things work elsewhere.
- The auscultation at another faculty and the supervisory dialogue exercise gave valuable real-life experiences. The meta-reflection afterwards gave interesting insights.
- The sections on the individual study plan and rules and regulations (including the rules quiz) was very useful insights about the legal framework and your responsibilities as a supervisor. Also good to know how one can access this information.
- Valuable to learn about which services the university library can provide and about data management, open access policies and e-publishing.

#### What can be improved and why?

- Bring in some more professional guests, for instance a lawyer to talk about rules and regulations.
- Some of the practical exercises (for instance the privilege walk and the role play on conflict management) were really silly and should be taken off the course.
- The course readings should be more precisely chosen. There was too much to read.
- The assignments should be shorter/fewer.
- Recruitment of doctoral candidates should be more emphasized and discussed, since recruitment is important but can be very difficult.
- The English version of the course should be offered twice a year.

## Course leader comments

All in all, the course has run quite smoothly. We had problems getting professional guest speakers for some of the sessions and had to do them ourselves which isn't optimal. We also agree that the course readings could be more precisely chosen, and the dividing into smaller groups for the literature seminar needs some work. Doing the course in English twice a year and in Swedish once a year is also an idea worth pondering, since the international groups more often bring a much broader range of experience into the course, which would benefit Swedish speaking participants as well. It also makes it easier for our non-Swedish speaking participants to make up for the odd missed session.