ERA
EDUCATIONALRESEARCH
ASSOCIATION

Re-imagining graduate supervision

Nicole Roberts and Danielle Watson

Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics, The University of the West Indies, St Augustine

Graduate supervision at the University of the West Indies (UWI), St Augustine Campus has primarily been fashioned after conventional apprenticeship models. Within this framework, supervisors function as founts of disciplinary knowledge and wisdom, made available to 'disciples' in need of hands-on guidance in order to ensure eventual ascension to the guarded ranks of academics. The 'charismatic authority' with which supervision has traditionally been conducted was in part the result of controlled disciplinary borders and a sense of sole propriety over the supervisee and the research . Pedagogical advancements and shifts in student ideologies, however, have forced academics to reconceptualise the practice of supervision. Literature on supervision best practice highlights the need for a (re) definition of the relationship between supervisor and supervisee as it is believed to underscore what can be loosely described as successful supervision. In this paper we present the reflections of a graduate research supervisor geared toward reflecting on her experiences across various stages of the supervisory relationship as well as improving her students' supervisory experience. We examine how her interpretation of students' perspectives and their stated expectations are conceptualised to inform/modify practice. The research is intended to provide an actionable option for graduate student supervision revision, while also providing a framework for continued dialogue aimed at improving graduate supervision at The UWI, St. Augustine.

Key words: graduate supervision, structured reflection, supervisor/supervisee relationships

Introduction

Graduate supervision is described in a multiplicity of ways inclusive of the process of aiding students to become members of an academic community, managing students and their research, and guiding students toward the completion of tasks outlined as part of the research process. While the existence of varied explanations points to conceptual ambiguity in its definition, there is a shared acknowledgement of graduate supervision as a process. However, what exactly the process entails varies among academics and underscores the uncertainty associated with the supervisory practice. For some, it is viewed from a standpoint of assisting students (Holdaway, Deblois & Winchester, 1995), for others a process of directing students

(Holdaway 1996), and yet for many a combination of assisting and directing the students (Aspland, T., Edwards, H., O'Leary, J., & Ryan, Y., 1999; Moses, 1984). In addition to challenges negotiating the academic dimensions of supervision, issues are constantly raised about institutional supervisory requirements.

At the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, research degrees are offered in many programmes, extending across the full range of the humanities, law, social sciences, agriculture, natural sciences, medical sciences and engineering; therefore, it is not surprising that there exists considerable variation in styles and manners of supervision. At the UWI, regulations require a graduate supervisor to either possess a degree at the equivalent level or to have considerable experience in the field (subject to approval by the School for Graduate Studies and Research). However, regulations do also indicate that a supervisor must have held higher or equivalent qualifications for a minimum of three years (The University of the West Indies, Board for Graduate Studies and Research, 2014).

Moreover, a supervisor may have an untold number of supervisees at any given point, which in turn would have implications for levels of supervision. On the other hand, it is important to note that graduate supervision is one of the key areas considered for academic staff promotion at the institution. At present in the Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics (DMLL), 17 of the 28 members of academic staff are able to supervise graduate students and there are a total of 68 registered post graduate students. However, supervisory responsibilities are not evenly distributed as a result of staff expertise and interest. This has resulted in one specific staff member supervising as many as 15 students at any given time in the past. Undeniably this led to issues impacting student satisfaction as well as queries regarding quality of supervision and the possible impeding of timely submission.

In the DMLL, the issue of graduate supervision has been brought to the forefront by members of academic staff from the standpoint of variations in practice. Dialogue with colleagues points to shared concerns and confusion about roles, responsibilities, expertise, inspiration and ownership. For persons with past supervisory experience, the major concerns were about balancing student schedules and progress with other academic and administrative responsibilities, assessing levels of intervention required as well as supervisory roles at different levels of the graduate experience. For inexperienced supervisors, the primary challenges were assessing the useful aspects of their past experience as a supervisee, and omitting the unsatisfactory supervisory practices. Overall, there is also the challenge of matching supervisors to supervisees owing to staff availability, expertise and supervisory loads. What remains unclear is what accounts for 'good supervision' at the departmental level, as there is no standardized guideline for supervisory practice and there is no documented, precise definition of the supervisor's role. Supervision is currently included as part of the academic workload and supervisors are required to meet with their students (however, the number and frequency of meetings remain fluid), provide two progress reports per annum (four if the student is on a scholarship), attend compulsory graduate seminars and the oral defence examination, as well as provide written consent/support for funding requests and

student progression. Outside of this, supervisors are left to individually determine exactly what their supervisory practice entails.

The UWI has begun to take positive steps in the direction of addressing the issue of varied supervisory practices across the institution. A series of workshops were conceptualised to be offered to current and new supervisors. The workshops ran from February to April 2015 and sought to generally encourage streamlining of supervision offered to students, provide exposure to supervisory best practice literature and inculcate reflection about practices employed. This paper is somewhat the product of that workshop, in that it was attended by 6 DMLL supervisors, and 2 graduate students presented personal narratives on their supervisee experiences on the campus. There can be no doubt that personal narrative methodology can deepen understandings of the student-supervisor relationship. With this in mind, this paper acknowledges reflection as a tool to improve supervisory practice. It is premised on the assumption that the discerning of supervisory practices as effective or ineffective changes over time. Here, we present three layers of structured reflection – reflection on current practice, consideration of stated student realities, reconsideration and revision of practice – intended to encourage dialogue about graduate supervision. Stakeholder inclusion (Kalish & Stockley, 2009) is accepted as critical to a successful supervisor/supervisee relationship. This study is premised on the hypothesis that structured reflections can be used as a tool to facilitate improved supervisory practices at the graduate level. The paper therefore presents improved supervisory practices as dependant on input from all stakeholders, as well as conceptualization based on theoretical underpinning.

Literature Overview

Graduate supervision continues to be a popular area of contention within the academic realm. Discussions have focused on but have not been limited to topics inclusive of supervision as academic practice (Grant & Graham, 1999), the vagueness surrounding supervisory terrains (Holdaway, 1996), supervision as an unequal power-filled pedagogical relationship (Grant & Graham, 2006), and the obscure supervisor/supervisee relationship (Threadgold, 1995). Although scholars highlight the abstruseness (Acker 2001), elusivity (Henry & Weber, 2010) and mystery (Grant, 2005) surrounding supervisory practices, navigating the hidden graduate curricula continues to present challenges for supervisors and the process of graduate supervision remains one that is contested by all stakeholders. In part, the difficulty can be attributed to the fluidity of supervision as a concept underscored by individuals' values, morals, dogmas and assumptions. In the absence of formal training, supervisors credibility comes by virtue of having been supervised (Palmer, 2001), a reality which ignores varying conventions in graduate work across cultures and countries. Significant diversity in supervisory practices points to a potential risk at the individual and institutional level, and the need for implemented codes of operations or guidelines to govern supervisory practices. Where guidelines remain open to varied interpretations or fail to address all dimensions of supervisory

practices, it is the duty of 'responsible' academics to devise strategies to inform and assess practice. This paper points to the usefulness of structured reflections as such a tool.

Reflection and Supervisory Practice

Although supervisory practices reflect on the institution and are therefore seen as an institutional obligation, in this paper we focus on 'good' supervision as an individual responsibility. Therefore, reflection within the supervisory terrain points to a desire to self-manage and/or improve one's performance. Reflection on practice infers a necessary restructuring and reconceptualizing of graduate supervision (Mc Bride & Skau, 1995). It alludes to an acknowledgement of a need for continued professional development or where necessary, a willingness to conduct practice differently, while also acknowledging the importance/correlations between actions and outcomes (Green & Lee, 1995). For the graduate supervisor interested in improving practice, supervision should be considered primarily against the backdrop of students' expression of issues voicing contentment or discontent with the supervision process (Grant & Graham, 1999; Moses, 1984). Such considerations should include perspectives on personality, professional and organizational factors. Existing literature highlights the importance of supervisors considering how much or how little they know about their supervisees research areas, how their work ethics and personalities impact relations with supervisees, how many supervisees they are committed to and the practicality of these numbers, what commitments they have outside of supervision and the support measures in place to facilitate the process (Grant & Graham, 1999; Manathunga, 2005; Whittle, 1994). Reflecting on these areas not only allows for the identification of problematic elements, but also provides a context for discussing why problems exist and what can be done to address these problems (Boucher & Smyth, 2004; Graham, 1995). Reflection in this sense transcends usefulness as it is positioned as a necessary component of the supervision process.

Supervision and The UWI

In keeping with current pedagogical and institutional shifts, The UWI's initiatives geared towards the restructuring of graduate supervision include staff training, record keeping and student dialogue committees. These measures are described as necessary to 'regulate' codes of practice (Green & Lee, 1995) and supervisors' accountability (Morgan & Ryan, 2003). Despite these clear indications of changes to the conceptualization of supervisory practices at the institutional level, the calculation of supervision as part of the teaching workload suggests its procedural treatment and a kind of ambiguity regarding how exactly it should be dealt with as actual academic practice. This in part suggests the consideration and adaptation of two contesting purviews of supervisory practice; either as a negotiated process (Acker, Hill & Black, 1994) or one underscored by technical rationality (O'Rourke, 1997). Supervision as a negotiated process is responsive to shifting realities –

student circumstances, research interests or a lack thereof, project changes etc. – informed by "uncertainty, uniqueness and value conflict" (Acker, Hill & Black 1994, p. 484). Supervision as technical rationality, however, emphasises the training of the graduate student to occupy a space within academia. O'Rourke (1997) describes this process as follows:

> …an interpersonally focused process within an institutional framework extending over time whereby an academic researcher assumes responsibility for directing an orderly, co-operatively planned and executed series of activities which will nurture: (a) the intellectual expertise of a student with a view to assisting the student to successfully complete a research project and submit a thesis for a higher degree and (b) socialisation to allow that student to make an active contribution to his/her discipline (p. 32).

Both positions focus on student advancement. There is also an acknowledgement of power, not just from the standpoint of domination and subordination but power as a negotiated construct. Our goal is to aid student empowerment by acknowledging students' voices and incorporating them to alter and ultimately to improve supervisory practices.

Research Design and Methodology

A qualitative approach to data collection and analysis was employed for the study. As previously stated, the study points to the practicality of incorporating structured reflections as a tool to improve graduate supervision. Data to facilitate these structured reflections – reflection on current practice, consideration of stated student realities, reconsideration and revision of practice – were derived from the documented reflections of a graduate supervisor (person of interest) and feedback on record from graduate students pertaining specifically to their supervisor/ supervisee experience. Collected data from supervisor and supervisees were thematically amassed, paralleled, discussed and reflected upon to determine the extent to which supervisory practices could be improved by adapting structured revisions as a required component of supervisory practice: Additionally, areas in need of revision, discontinuation or reconceptualization were identified. The study held that interrogating why individuals do what they do against a backdrop of what is expected of them can positively impact their performance as well as desired outcome.

The participants

Study participants included one graduate supervisor and two graduate students. The graduate supervisor previously supervised 14 graduate students over a period of 15 years. She also served in an administrative capacity where she was privy to students' disclosure of information about their supervisor/supervisee experiences.

Both graduate students were previous graduates of taught Masters programmes at The UWI as well as current research students at the institution. These students also served in situations resulting in the collection of student perspectives about graduate supervision at the institution, one as a researcher and the other as a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) student representative on the university's Staff Student Liaison Committee. All participants agreed to the use of their perspectives for inclusion in this study. This ensured no ethical standards were breached in the sharing of their perspectives on supervisor practices at UWI as part of this study. Perspectives from the supervisor were extracted from her notes made during the workshop and from her responses to specific open ended questions pertaining to her supervision of graduate students. Graduate student perspectives were extracted from the Microsoft PowerPoint slides of the two graduate students' presentations made during the workshop. These were supplemented by notes taken by the graduate supervisor. The notes documented the students' responses to questions from supervisors present during the workshop. The questions elicited information about the students' experiences as supervisees.

Research Process

The graduate supervisors' workshop is an offering of the School of Graduate Studies and Research of The University of the West Indies, with support from the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) at the institution, and is intended to develop competence in areas deemed relevant to the supervision process as well as aspects of quality assurance. It was also intended to establish parity of supervision from the student perspective. As part of the workshop, supervisors, experienced and inexperienced, are encouraged to share their assumptions or realities about the supervisory experience and they are also exposed to the assumptions and realities about the supervisory experience from the student standpoint. This study is the outcome of the supervisor having attended the workshop and implementing what was understood as necessary parts of the supervisory process. Over the 6 week period of the workshop, different concepts pertaining to graduate supervision were introduced and workshop participants invited to interrogate their practice. The workshop focused primarily on five areas. These areas were graduate supervision and overview, UWI supervision regulations and procedures, student centred research supervision, responsible and ethical supervisory conduct and the impact and influence of the supervisor. Two graduate students were invited to the fourth session and asked to share information about their experiences as graduate students at the UWI. Workshop participants were invited to ask these students questions to clarify statements made as well as to gain further insight into their experiences as supervisees. The individual supervisor's documented interrogation of practice and the students' dialogue provided the data for this study.

Data Collection and Analysis

In keeping with qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis, a descriptive analysis approach was utilized (Creswell, 2013). Data were collected and grouped under three specific headings – pre workshop position, students' perspectives and post workshop position. The 'pre workshop' category documented direct quotes reflecting the perspectives of the graduate supervisor before having attended the workshop. Within this category, quotations providing information relating to what was done before and during supervision, as well as intended strategies for use were documented. The 'students' perspective' category documented direct quotes reflecting the standpoints of the graduate students based on their experiences, the shared experiences of their peers and their expectations as students. The 'post workshop position' category documented direct quotes reflecting the perspectives of the graduate supervisor upon completion of the workshop. Here, we documented the supervisor's interpretation of the students' perspectives and identified intended modifications to her practice based on her interpretation of the students' experience. Information within these three categories was grouped based on recurrent themes discussed within the workshop. These themes also emerged frequently within the literature on graduate supervision. Each theme - administrative processes, individual roles, research content, research timelines and blurred areas - accounted for a critical dimension of the supervisor/supervisee experience and informed the placement of collected data into the respective categories. 'Administrative processes' category accounted for all positions relating to a facet of administration. All information relating to the role of the supervisor or supervisee was placed in the 'Individual roles' section. The 'research content' category highlighted all information pertaining to the research topic and ideas relating specifically to research content. Information pertaining to set deadlines and established timeframes for communication was grouped under the heading 'research timeline'. All other information pertaining to or affecting the supervisor/ supervisee relationship that did not align with any of the other categories were grouped under the heading 'blurred areas'. See Table 1 in the Appendix 1 which includes the direct quotations from the structured reflections, which are captured in the narrative which follows.

Administrative processes

Reflection on administrative processes involved in graduate supervision resulted in consideration being given to several aspects, which may have been previously overlooked by the supervisor. The supervisor's pre-workshop position demonstrated an acknowledgement of institutional requirements pertaining to graduate supervision and an awareness of the fact that students would need help in this area. She also expressed a preparedness, where necessary, to assist from the student's initial assignment as her supervisee to final submission. After having considered the students' position on required administrative documents, red tape and institutional stipulations concerning seminars and presentations, the supervisor

altered or somewhat expanded her position on the administrative processes and her responsibilities therein. Her position on supervisors being knowledgeable moved from an idea of assumed individual responsibility to a mandated function. Her awareness also shifted as it related to the level of support students needed as she highlighted the need to assist students with recognizing university timelines as an integral part of the administrative process.

Individual roles

Three roles were identified as critical to the supervisory process prior to the workshop. The supervisor saw her responsibilities inclusive of setting one or two hour monthly meetings with her students, indicating research timelines and calling meetings of the advisory committee. Upon consideration of students expressed need for clarity and flexibility of roles, as well as the functions of others indirectly involved in the research, the supervisor altered her position. The supervisor saw the students' interpretation of roles as an issue requiring extensive dialogue and personal flexibility on her part. First she identified a need to help students dealing with issues that fall outside of the supervisory mandate. She also became aware of students' difficulty understanding turnaround periods providing feedback and she saw the need to include advising students on strategies for revising their work as part of the supervisory process. Despite her initial position on establishing meeting schedules, she saw the need to somewhat revise her stance and make students aware that they had the option to also initiate meetings where they felt it was necessary. The expressed realities of students also resulted in her acknowledging the need to show a greater awareness of the humanness of students and understand how her responses might negatively affect them.

Research content

Much like the students, the supervisor saw research content as belonging to the student and identified herself as a facilitator for her students' research. Her part in developing research content was also believed to extend to limiting student deviation from the research in terms of initial reading materials. She also felt responsible for acknowledging topic areas outside of her specialization and encouraging students to engage members of the advisory committee for navigating such terrain. Upon students' statement of the need for assistance fine tuning their research and a stated need for dialogue with persons outside of their advisory committee, the supervisor further extended her position on the issue of research content. She saw a need to assist students with the formulation of a research plan, which she described as integral to the supervisor-student relationship. Her post workshop position also extended to encouraging her supervisee to seek additional assistance beyond the institution where further outside expertise is needed, and advising students on acquiring funding opportunities to assist which such related ventures. Her position as facilitator was extended to allow for a revised position on taking responsibility for the final student output.

Research timelines

Initial reflection on timelines resulted in the supervisor's identification of three key positions. She expressed adherence to fluid feedback timelines. She felt the need to insist on set target dates for seminars, chapter submissions, drafts and final thesis submission, and a required awareness of student time limits critical to her student's continuation through to completion such as (re)registration. Stated students realities pertaining to timelines proved very thought-provoking as students expressed desires to be a part of the timeline planning process directly contradicted her practice. She also had not given thought to the do-ability of intended tasks within her established timelines from the standpoint of her supervisees or the subjectivity of what counts as a reasonable amount of time for feedback. The need to clarify communication regularity or who initiates communication was overlooked as was the need to notify supervisees of change to established timelines. Her post-workshop position was premised on the need for the provision of clarity and student inclusion. While she maintained her position on the need for established timelines, she saw the need to revise her position on establishing timelines to include students as opposed to a supervisory directive. She also altered her position to inform students of their responsibility not that of the supervisor, to follow-up as this was previously overlooked. Ensuring students do not fall off the 'bandwagon' was stated as a responsibility of the supervisor, therefore follow-up allowances in this regard were now seen as part of her remit.

Blurred areas

Before the workshop, the supervisor identified student participation in the academic community as insufficient. Her responsibility in this regard was identified as highlighting the value of conference and workshop participation, while also encouraging student participation. This position aligned with the students' expression of required assistance in this area. The students further expressed a need to be guided about publishing work and the point at which it becomes a requirement. They also alluded to the importance of effective communication to the supervisor/supervisee relationship as they expressed the harmful effects of their supervisors' tone and having to cope with feelings of deflation after interactions with their supervisors. These revelations altered the supervisor's position not only to penetrating the academic community, but also to communicate with her supervisees in the future. She saw the need to include as part of her supervisory practice assistance for her students regarding conference presentations and article production. She also went beyond the stated student issues to include facilitating students with the navigation of blurred areas or where possible, highlighting avenues where such assistance could be received. This related to issues such as grant and funding opportunities, where a visit to the university's International Office could be factored into discussions about timeline mapping. She also altered her position to include the acceptance of primary responsibility for negotiating personality

differences and a conscious mindfulness of supervisor/supervisee communication and the possible misrepresentations of supervisory advice.

Discussion

Structured reflection, as employed in the study, allowed for not only the documenting of useful information, but a process of engaging in thought-provoking activity critical to the interrogation of supervisory practice. Like Brew and Peseta's (2007) work, the study evidenced developmental changes to the supervisor's supervision practice. It also allowed for the provision of information about ways of structuring her practice to better guide students to research completion and possibly entry to the academic community. The reflective framework not only encouraged thought about action, but also the questioning of practices and the re-evaluation of their applicability. The first phase of the activity saw the supervisor encouraged to think about what she did with her students, what was done to prepare for interaction with them and what she saw as her part in their research. The second phase pushed her to make sense of their experiences; these in turn revealed her preparedness for such issues with her own students, her lack of preparedness to treat with identified realities, and the need to alter her stance based on the possibility of self-improvement. The final phase of the structured reflection depicted her personal shift based on her internalization of a need to so do. In some instances, her perspective was altered as a direct result of the stated students realities, while in other instances these expressed realities served as a motivator to include other facets not outlined by students, yet critical to student progress.

Reflection on administrative processes pertinent to graduate supervision revealed the amount of assistance required by students to facilitate the navigation of sometimes murky administrative terrain. What was also revealed is the need for maintained balance between supervisor domination and autonomy (Delamont, Parry & Atkinson, 1998). In the initial stages of the graduate programme, students appear to rely solely on the knowledge of their supervisors and expect to be told what to do. However, at later stages in the process, they seem to expect the freedom to initiate actions. What this revealed was the need for structured discussions about students' responsibility in the process of information acquisition as well as a formalized document reiterating administrative progression or the provision of information about where necessary information can be accessed. This would replace the initial sole dependence on supervisors as such measures foster transition to full independence and ensure adequate knowledge about procedural aspects. Positions pertaining to individual roles, research content and timelines revealed the need for structured dialogue between supervisors and supervisees. The research shows the dangers of taking for granted supervisors or supervisees knowledge about issues impacting the research process. Even at the risk of being repetitive, clarity must be sought/provided pertaining to all areas of concerns. The study points to the need for an established checklist to guide correspondence informed by input from both supervisors and supervisees.

Some of the issues raised under the heading of blurred areas, while not directly related to students' research, points to possible areas to be addressed at the institutional level. These include issues pertaining to conference presentations and publications, (both during the writing stage and immediately following the viva examination) which if taken on by the supervisor amounts to additional responsibilities. To further facilitate a shift away from the dependence on the supervisor, what was clearly revealed is the need for forums at the institutional level to improve the awareness of students of all available support measures. In addition to the need for increased awareness of these forums, students require assistance in re-adjusting their perspectives about conducting graduate research and their place as stakeholders within the institutional framework.

The study highlighted the need for clarity as to what exactly the supervision process entails and the ways of successfully negotiating the supervisory terrain. What was also interesting was students' lack of awareness of the differences between what was expected of their supervisors as opposed to what was *required* of supervisors as part of their institution's mandate. It was also interesting to note the supervisor's willingness to extend herself beyond the boundaries of her supervisory responsibilities where the shift was interpreted as critical to assisting the student's progress. This primarily involved administrative grey areas and post-research responsibilities which are normally seen as problematic in the context of graduate research and oftentimes push students into the wilderness experience. (Grant & Graham, 1999). In some instances, the students' perspectives highlighted the need for the provision of greater clarity concerning administrative processes relevant to their research progress at the institutional level. However, the extent to which this will take place is outside of the scope of this study.

Conclusion

The study supports the view that structured reflections at the graduate level can be used as a tool to facilitate improved supervisory practices. A useful context was created to reconsider supervisory practices, to give consideration to whether or not the variables informing those practices have changed and to evaluate the possible need for revision of practice based on not just student satisfaction with the processes, but shifting administrative, pedagogical, stakeholder and personal perspectives. The recasting of supervisory assumptions and experiences in a structured context encourages one to reconsider the ideologies informing prior understandings and rethink the array of alternative actions geared towards improving supervisees' supervision experiences.

While all of the issues highlighted by the graduate students are valid, some require further dialogue at the institutional level as they directly impact stakeholder satisfaction with supervisory practices. Clarity needs to be provided to ensure awareness of procedural and practical dimensions of graduate work, student entitlements and available resources at the departmental and institutional level. Preparatory workshops for supervisees can be considered as a forum to

action changes in relation to students' preparedness to engage in graduate work. We can assume that the idea of reflection on practice will be maintained even after completion of the study. Central to this belief is the documented change in the supervisor's approach towards the practice of graduate supervision and her demonstrated willingness to alter supervisory behaviours. Where structured reflections are accepted as a facet of the supervisory process, it presents an acceptance of the need for continued rethinking of practices, a strategy depictive of a desire to continually self-improve.

The research points to the need for structured interrogation of supervisory practices on a greater scale as opposed to ad hoc interactions based on minimal preparation and experience. It provides a frame for use by other practitioners as a tool to improve their supervisees' supervision experiences and output. A limitation to introducing and incorporating such a strategy as part of practice is the stakeholder buy-in requirement. The reality of supervisors' failure to acknowledge possible shortcomings in their practices or their desire to maintain familiar practices restricts all possible dialogue on revising strategies used. The offering of supervision workshops, however, shows support for change at the institutional level and the initiation of much required dialogue, thus highlighting the criticality of re-imagining graduate supervision at the University of the West Indies, St Augustine.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Structured Reflections Data

Categories	Pre-workshop position	Students' perspectives	Post-workshop position
Administrative Process	- "be knowledgeable about institution's requirements regarding administrative processes" (application to graduation) - "be prepared to assist student with required processes" (for example, writing letter to SGSR to request specific service) - "assist my student with the submission red tape of paperwork"	- "the supervisor is expected to be knowledgeable about the administrative process and changes to the process" - "supervisors should advise on student readiness for seminars, conferences, presentations etc." - "supervisors should be aware of the documentation/reports required at the different stages of the research"	- "being knowledgeable about administrative processes pertaining to students should be part of the mandate for supervisors" - "students need assistance with recognizing university time allowances and supervisors roles in the administrative process"
Individual Roles	- "set up monthly meetings with the student (which could take an hour or two.) - responsible for indicating research timelines" - "set up/call meetings of the advisory committee"	- "there needs to be clearly established roles" - "where roles change, this also needs to be clarified" - "the supervisor is not expected to direct the research" - "clarity is required about advisory committee members and their input in the research process" - "the supervisor is expected to acknowledge the student's role as author and owner of the research"	- "students need assistance dealing with issues that fall outside of supervisory mandate" - "help students realize that the turnaround period takes time and help them understand their role in reviewing their work" - "there needs to show a greater awareness of the humanness of students and understand how responses may negatively affect them" - "make students aware that they can initiate meetings"
Research Content	- "the supervisor is a facilitator for the student research" - "the supervisor limits deviation from the research by the student in terms of reading material." - "if a topic area appears to be outside of my specialisation, send the student to another expert in the area" (advisory committee)	- "there needs to be clarity about whose work is being done" - "being told to read to a point of saturation is not a helpful starting point for a research student" - "strategies need to be developed to treat with content outside of supervisors specializations" - "supervisors need to acknowledge the need for informal outside input during the research process" - "students need help fine tuning the proposed research and possible approaches"	- "the research plan is integral to the supervisor-student relationship" (during research plan and post completion plan) - "the supervisor is a facilitator for all aspects of the research project" - "give student tips on field research/grant funding" - "students should be encouraged to seek additional assistance where outside expertise is needed" - "the supervisor needs to take some responsibility for final output"

Research Timelines	- "allow fluid feedback timelines" - "insist on and set target dates with student for seminars, chapter submissions, drafts and final thesis submission" - "be aware of student time limits" (for example for (re) registration)	- "a timeline should be established together to help students map out a course of study" - "guidance should be provided about the do-ability of intended tasks within the assumed timeframe" - "students should be clear on what counts as a reasonable amount of time for feedback" - "students should be clear on the regularity of communication and who initiates it" - "students should be notified of any changes in established timelines"	- "clear feedback timelines should be established" - "it is the supervisor's responsibility to inform not follow-up" - "the supervisor should ensure students do not fall off the bandwagon"
Blurred Areas	- "encourage student participation in conferences" - "emphasise the value of conference/workshop presentations"	- "there needs to be clarity about the point at which students begin attending conferences and who initiates it" - "there is a need for clarity about how one goes about publishing work and at what point is unclear" - "tone affects the relationship with my supervisor" - "meetings should not seem like a fight or leave me feeling totally deflated"	- "assist student to move from conference presentation to article" - "facilitate the navigation of blurred areas eg. specific services such as conference grant funding applications" - "negotiate personality differences" - "be more mindful of communication and possible misrepresentations of supervisory advice"

References

Acker, S. (2001). The hidden curriculum of dissertation advising. *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education, 61*-77.

Acker, S., Hill, T., & Black, E. (1994). Thesis supervision in the social sciences: managed or negotiated?. *Higher Education, 28*(4), 483-498.

Aspland, T., Edwards, H., O'Leary, J., & Ryan, Y. (1999). Tracking new directions in the evaluation of postgraduate supervision. *Innovative Higher Education, 24*(2), 127-147.

Boucher, C., & Smyth, A. (2004). Up close and personal: reflections on our experience of supervising research candidates who are using personal reflective techniques. *Reflective Practice, 5*(3), 345-356.

Brew, A., & Peseta, T. (2004). Changing postgraduate supervision practice: A programme to encourage learning through reflection and feedback. *Innovations in Education and teaching International, 41*(1), 5-22.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. New York: Sage.

Delamont, S., Parry, O., & Atkinson, P. (1998). Creating a delicate balance: the doctoral supervisor's dilemmas. *Teaching in Higher Education, 3*(2), 157-172.

Graham, I. W. (1995). Reflective practice: using the action learning group mechanism. *Nurse Education Today, 15*(1), 28-32.

Grant, B. M. (2005). *The pedagogy of graduate supervision: Figuring the relations between supervisor and student* (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@ Auckland).

Grant, B., & Graham, A. (1999). Naming the game: Reconstructing graduate supervision. *Teaching in Higher Education, 4*(1), 77-89.

Green, B., & Lee, A. (1995). Theorising postgraduate pedagogy. *The Australian Universities' Review, 38*(2), 40.

Henry, M. A., & Weber, A. (2010). *Supervising student teachers: The professional way*. R&L Education: Indiana.

Holdaway, E. A. (1996). Current issues in graduate education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 18*(1), 59-74.

Holdaway, E., Deblois, C., & Winchester, I. (1995). Supervision of graduate students. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 25*(3), 1-29.

Kalish, A., & Stockley, D. (2009). Building scholarly communities: Supporting the scholarship of teaching and learning with learning communities. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal, 3*(1).

Manathunga, C. (2005). The development of research supervision: "Turning the light on a private space". *International Journal for Academic Development, 10*(1), 17-30.

McBride, M., & Skau, K. G. (1995). Trust, Empowerment, and Reflection: Essentials of Supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 10*(3), 262-77.

Morgan, W., & Ryan, M. (2003). Rendering an account: An open-state archive in postgraduate supervision. *Higher Education Research and Development, 22*(1), 77-90.

Moses, I. (1984). Supervision of higher degree students - problem areas and possible solutions. *Higher education research and development, 3*(2), 153-165.

O'Rourke, B. (1997). What is supervision? *Teaching Review*, 26-40.

Palmer, P. (2001). *The violence of our knowledge: On higher education and peace making.* Public lecture at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Retrieved from http://www.wisc.edu/provost/ccae/ccle/parker.html

The University of the West Indies, Board for Graduate Studies and Research (2014). *Regulations for Graduate Diplomas and Degrees.* Retrieved from:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B7ICHl2mGJhwai1Rd3B3bi1yREE

Threadgold, T. (1995). Pedagogy, psychoanalysis, feminism. *Australian Universities' Review, 38*(2), 46-48.

Watson, D. (2010). Teaching teachers to think: Reflective journaling as a strategy to enhance students' understanding and practice of academic writing. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning, 7*(12), 11.

Whittle, J. (1994). A model for the management of research degree supervision in a post-1987 university. *Quality in Postgraduate Education.* London: Kogan Page.

Yeatman, A. (1995). Making supervision relationships accountable: graduate student logs. *The Australian Universities' Review, 38*(2), 9.