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#  Module 3RDM Overview: Research Design, Management and Supervision

M3 RDM provides an introduction to the research design, supervision and management aspects of participants’ work. PhD supervision and management of research assistants will be included, along with developing research proposals and dissemination of the outputs of research activities. Relevant policies, codes of practice, support processes and staff will be introduced.

Project-based participants focus on producing an output which allows them to develop their abilities in these areas. Eight workshops will be provided but participants will be able to substitute other courses according to their needs as reflected by their experience and role. Mentors within Schools will provide participants with advice and participants will also be supported by the PGCAP team as required.

**For further details of the PGCAP Programme please see your Programme Handbook.**

## 1.1 Aims and Learning Outcomes

**Aims**

The aim of this module is to support the development of research design, management and supervision skills.

**Learning Outcomes**

Having successfully completed the module, you should be able to:

1. Select research activities appropriate to support the institutional research standing in your discipline
2. Select research activities/outputs to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and to enhance its impact
3. Design a research proposal and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline
4. Develop strategies for managing a research project (and associated staff where appropriate)
5. Discuss appropriate strategies for supporting PhD students, which are informed by national and institutional policies and regulations
6. Critically reflect on your practice and development as a researcher
7. Compose and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing

**Transferable and Generic Skills**

(As our participants are experienced staff who will have already demonstrated a wide range of skills, the list below is included for the completeness of the module description.)

1. Organise and integrate your own learning with existing commitments, and produce work to deadlines.
2. Apply self-directed learning skills which are essential for learning with limited contact time
3. Apply your reflective skills outside of your discipline context
4. Display initiative and personal responsibility

**Professional values**

In addition the PGCAP Professional Values which underpin module 3RDM learning outcomes are:

1. A respect for individual learners and for their development and empowerment
2. A commitment to work with and learn from colleagues
3. The practising of equal opportunities
4. A commitment to continued reflection and evaluation, and consequent improvement of your own practice

## 1.2 Module sessions

All dates for module 3RDM can be found in the key **dates document**. Any changes to the dates of teaching sessions will be communicated via email.

The M3 RDM sessions available are listed below. All sessions are **optional.** However**,** two of the LOs may be formatively demonstrated through sessions. In order to complete M3 RDM, you should ensure that you will be able to demonstrate all the LOs, whether by attending the relevant sessions or through documenting your own experience. Participants can select other sessions from the CHEP CPD programme (see staffbook) or elsewhere, to support their development needs as appropriate. The order of the sessions is provisional, subject to the availability of tutors.

Session 1: Anatomy of a Funding Application

Session 2: Lifecycle of a Grant Application

Session 3: The Research Funding Landscape

Session 4: Digital Identity

Session 5: Open Access

Session 6: Research Project Management

Session 7: Embedding Impact into your Research

Session 8: Supervising Research Students

A brief description of these sessions is provided below. Further details will be provided at the start of each session.

**Session 1: Anatomy of a Funding Application**

This is a practical and analytical one day workshop in which participants dissect a funding opportunity to understand the main components of a successful bid and the content and processes involved, using a well-established methodology (BID4 P-C-O-T). They will have the opportunity to think about the different bid sections in relation to their own research idea/area. Participants should ideally already have an idea they would like to develop into a proposal.

**Session 2: Lifecycle of a Grant Application**

Presented by a very experienced and successful bid author who is also a widely respected bid evaluator/scorer, the session uses a case study approach to discuss the journey of a well-received grant application from its inception to funding, delivery and beyond, analysing a full, real, bid document set. In parallel, the workshop introduces and leads participants to apply a new methodology (Content Categories) for identifying, evaluating and sharing ideas most likely to register with peer reviewers and wider grant panel decision makers.

**Session 3: The Research Funding Landscape**

Presented by a member of RIS, the session overviews the main research funding bodies and their strategic priorities

**Session 4: Digital Identity**

It is important to build a digital identity for the project early on. Case examples are used as a basis for discussing participant’s knowledge of the topics and their application to their work.

**Session 5: Open Access**

Open Access refers to online research outputs that are free of restrictions on access and limited/no restrictions on use. Planning the dissemination and use of Open Access resources is important to establish early on in the project. Case examples are used as a basis for discussing participant’s knowledge of the topics and their application to their work.

**Session 6: Research Project Management**

This session provides an overview of all aspects of research project management. An experienced research project manager will use a case study as a basis for exploring the complexities and considerations of project management.

**Session 7: Embedding Impact into Your Research**

Planning for and demonstrating Impact are fast becoming prerequisites for securing research funding. This session looks at the University’s plans to deliver greater impact from our research and enterprise activities and the contribution individual researchers can make. Topics covered will include current thinking on the Impact Agenda, the importance of Pathways to Impact statements, and an overview of REF.

**Session 8: Supervising Research Students**

One of the most rewarding and, in some cases, demanding academic roles is that of research supervisor. The changing nature of the PhD and the increasing focus on training for students and supervisors makes this a timely workshop. In this workshop participants will be able to consider how to translate policies and guidance statements in terms of their own supervisory practice. Guidance on the copyright and intellectual property right issues associated with the submission of e-theses will also be discussed.

## 1.3 Mentoring

In this module the role of the mentor is to provide support for the development of your research and research supervision activities, following Schools and institutional guidelines. It is anticipated that you will have already been allocated a senior colleague who fulfils this or a similar role. This individual may be different to your mentor for PGCAP modules 1 and 2, but it may be more appropriate for their guidance to extend to M3 RDM. We expect PGCAP participants to explicitly discuss their M3 RDM requirements with their PGCAP mentor/senior colleague(s) as appropriate, to determine who will act in the mentor capacity for M3 RDM. As with modules 1 and 2, this individual will not normally be your line manager.

The main part of the assessment for M3 RDM is carried out by discipline specialists within a participant’s School. We normally expect the M3 RDM mentor to provide feedback to participants on the development of outputs for their assessment, to support participants to organise their assessment activities and, where appropriate, to provide feedback on the development of outputs for assessment.

Where possible, the roles of mentor and assessor should be separated, but we appreciate that in some cases the mentoring role may be part of a dynamic developmental process in which the two roles overlap.

## 1.4 Assessment

### 1.4.1 Overview

####

#### Part 1 Research Report/Publication/Research Proposal/Other

For this assignment you are required to:

1. Identify a journal to which you are going to submit a publication **or** a funding body to which you are going to apply for funding your research proposal. (Other possibilities are acceptable but please confirm with your PGCAP mentor and the PGCAP Programme Leader)
2. Write the required document according to the guidelines provided, supported by appendices as appropriate. This will normally be of around **5000 words**, but should reflect the requirements for the output you are producing
3. Submit your document for review by your School Research Board or equivalent external peer-reviewing body
4. Modify your document in the light of the feedback you receive to create a final form ready for your presentation.

Part 2 Presentation of Research Report/Publication
Presentation, maximum 15 mins and 5 mins for questions.

For this assignment you are required to:

Present the artefact you chose for Part 1 to your school’s Research Board or present it to an external conference. During the presentation you should focus on

1. *Publication:* key ideas, position with regards to the literature, outline of research carried out, findings and ideas for future work
2. *Proposal:* the design, implementation, goals, outputs, how the proposal criteria are met, position with regards to institutional goals and evaluation.

Write an **abstract** (about 200 words) of your presentation which you circulate to your peer group and to the PGCAP administrator, to be submitted **2 weeks** in advance of the presentation.

Part 3 Participant Reflection on own practice and development (500 words maximum, assessed by the PGCAP team)

Write a brief reflection against each LO about how you developed as an academic professional through this experience, how it has informed your future work and identify any development activities which you will be following up. (This could include a list of workshops to attend and/or other development activities).

**Assessment Criteria**

Assessment is on a **pass/fail** basis at M-level (level 7 FHEQ).
Templates can be found in Appendix A and marking criteria in Table 1.

All learning outcomes and relevant professional values must be demonstrated to at least a threshold standard to pass. Participants must also fulfil all requirements of the assignment instructions.

## General guidelines

**Citation of Literature**

In all summative assignments you are expected to use relevant literature to support and explore your arguments. Work that does not include appropriate references and referencing methods will therefore be referred.

You are welcome to use the referencing style that you are most familiar with. The recommended method of referencing is the [Harvard referencing style](http://library.soton.ac.uk/sash/referencing) (click on the hyperlink for useful advice and guidance on using this referencing system).

**All written submissions must**

* be no smaller than a size 11 legible font (e.g. Lucida Sans), 1.5 line spacing
* must comply with the word count (+/-10%)
* be submitted electronically by email to the PGCAP administrator by the deadline
* include an academic integrity declaration
* be anonymised (i.e. please remove all student and staff names, except your own)

**Marking**

**The marking for this module will not be anonymous**. The project based nature of the assessment, involving staff from the PGCAP team, who may consult with staff from participants Schools, makes it impossible to maintain anonymity. PGCAP cohorts are small in size, individuals or small numbers of participants come from a limited number of Schools, and the members of the PGCAP team are likely to have had discussions with individuals about their work. This approach is aligned with the Anonymous Marking Policy available from the University of Southampton Quality Handbook, [Policy and Procedures](https://cdn.southampton.ac.uk/assets/imported/transforms/content-block/UsefulDownloads_Download/FDB7C6BB26774F7688FAC7D6C17FF449/Anonymous%20Marking%20Policy.pdf#_ga=2.241738310.530038309.1536758266-931554478.1525178316) section.

### Assessment deadlines

Please refer to the **dates emailed to you at the beginning of the module.** The assignment completion date will be approximately 2 semesters/8 months from your start date of M3 RDM.

**Assessment Criteria**

Assessment is on a **pass/fail** basis at M-level (level 7 FHEQ).
Templates can be found in Appendix A and marking criteria in Table 1.

All learning outcomes and relevant professional values must be demonstrated to at least a threshold standard to pass. Participants must also fulfil all requirements of the assignment instructions.

**The duration of the PGCAP Programme is 2 years.** Please note that **all three PGCAP modules must normally be completed** within two years of your registration for PGCAP module 1.

**Assessment Checklist RDM:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist** | **Included**  |
| Research artefact |  |
| Peer review of research artefact (evidence of the process) |  |
| Presentation in your School (**only**). Abstract (normally for the same artefact) and feedback from a mentor  |  |
| Presentation at a conference (**only**). Abstract and details of conference at which the presentation was delivered |  |
| Reflection against M3 RDM learning outcomes |  |

# Appendix A

## PGCAP Module 3RDM assessment templates

**NOTES (please read carefully):**

Research paper and research project proposals will normally meet the requirements for submission of the participant’s discipline. Criteria/guidelines for evaluation will be at the level of refereed academic journals of strong standing.

**Research Papers**
If a paper has been accepted by a journal for publication then the journal review process will **normally eliminate the need for internal review**, as long as the refereed journal is of high standing, although this is at the discretion of the School. Please attach a copy of the journal review/s and the paper’s bibliographical information.

**Research Paper presentation**
If a paper has been accepted for presentation at an established academic refereed conference, the conference review process will normally eliminate the need for internal review, although this is at the discretion of the School. Please attach a copy of any relevant documentation, such as the paper’s abstract, presentation and conference details, conference proceedings (if available) and any other evidence supporting this element of the assignment.

**Research Proposals**
If the proposal has been reviewed by the awarding body or research council, this will normally eliminate the need for internal review, although this is at the discretion of the School. Please attach a copy of the review of the proposal.

M3 RDM

Are you going to do M3RDM in your School or externally?

In my school

Externally

Provide evidence from:

1. External peer-review processes
2. Conference presentation/s (abstract, proceedings, conference details, etc.)

Find a mentor in your School

Ask your mentor to fill out the Feedback Form for Internal Review (Appendix A)

**Your M3 submission MUST contain the following cover sheet. Please ensure that you have completed it before you submit the documents required for M3 RDM. Submissions without the cover sheet will be rejected.**

**COVER SHEET (RDM)**

(In organizing the documents for your submission, it is ADVISABLE to follow the structure provided in the coversheet)

**Name of PGCAP participant:**

|  |
| --- |
| **PART 1. Research Artefact****Title and brief (1 sentence) description of your research artefact:****Have you submitted evidence of the peer-review process? YES/NO****Was the review process internal (i.e. in your School) or external?** |

|  |
| --- |
| **PART 2. Presentation****Title of Presentation and Date:****Presentation Abstract (please copy and paste your presentation abstract here):** **External presentations (only). Conference details:****Internal presentations (only). Have you enclosed your mentor’s feedback** (form on p. 11)**? YES/NO** |

|  |
| --- |
| **PART 3. Participant’s reflection** **Have you submitted the reflection in the template provided? YES/NO** |

**Signature (electronic acceptable) of PGCAP participant**

**Date**

### **Part 1. Research Report/Publication/Research Proposal/Other**

M3 RDM External: if you plan to provide evidence of a reviewing process conducted externally, please append all the relevant documents at the end of your chosen artefact whether a research proposal or a journal article or other.

M3 RDM Internal: if you have completed the M3 RDM assignment in your School, please ask your mentor to provide feedback on the review process by completing the Form for Internal Review (below). This consists of two different parts through which your mentor will give you feedback about your research artefact and research presentation, respectively and as applicable. Should either the research review process or the presentation conducted in your School please ask your mentor to record feedback on the relevant part of the form below.

**Feedback Form for Internal Review**

**Name of PGCAP participant:**

**Title of Research Report/Publication/Research Proposal/Other:**

| **Marking / Feedback against LOs table** |
| --- |
| **Please indicate Pass or Refer and provide brief comments against each of the LOs below.** (This can be expanded on in the general feedback below) |
| **Module 3RDM Learning Outcomes:**By the end of the module participants should be able to: | **\*Pass orRefer**  | **Feedback** |
| 1. Select research activities appropriate to appropriate to support the institutional research standing in your discipline
 |  |  |
| 1. Select research activities/ outputs to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework and to enhance its impact
 |  |  |
| 1. Design a research proposal(s) and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline
 |  |  |
| 1. Compose and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing
 |  |  |
| **\*Please see Table 1 (below) for indicative grading criteria** |
| **Overall Result** |  |
| **General Feedback**(typically 200 word maximum, e.g. strengths, areas for development, gaps and areas for concern. If required, corrections, associated guidance and timeline for resubmission) |

**Name and signature(s) of Reviewer**(s)**: Date:**

**Role(s) in School:**

### **Part 2. Presentation assessment**

(to be completed by your School mentor if your Module3 RDM assignment is conducted internally in your School)

**Name of PGCAP participant:**

**Title of Presentation and Date:**

|  |
| --- |
| **[Should meet LO7:** Compose and communicate ideas effectively, both **orally** and in writing]**Feedback** (typically 200 word maximum, e.g. strengths, areas for development, gaps and areas of concern/for development). |
|  |
| **Result:** Pass/Refer |

**Name and signature of Reviewer**(s)**: Date:**

**Role in School:**

### Part 3. Participant Reflection (500 words maximum, assessed by the PGCAP team)

**Note**: please write your critical reflection in the template provided below. This template will help you to evidence each LO for Module3 RDM. In the box next to each LO write a brief reflection about how you have developed as an academic researcher. If you have attended Module 3RDM sessions, please reflect on how these are going to influence your academic practice in research.

**Name of PGCAP participant:**

| **Module 3RDM Learning Outcomes**By the end of the module you should be able to: | **Critical reflection**In order to support your critical reflection provide evidence from your practice or from any sessions you attended demonstrating how you have achieved the LOs | **PGCAP marker’s comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Select research activities appropriate to support the institutional research standing in your discipline
 | *[This LO is partially demonstrated by attending PGCAP M3 RDM sessions no. 1, 3 and 7. Please* ***overwrite*** *the text in Italics and explain how the sessions you attended impacted (or will impact) on your development as a researcher]* |  |
| 1. Select research activities/ outputs to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework and to enhance its impact
 | *[This LO is partially demonstrated by attending PGCAP M3 RDM sessions no. 1, 3 and 7. Please overwrite the text in Italics and explain how the sessions you attended impacted (or will impact) on your development as a researcher]* |  |
| 1. Design a research proposal and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline
 | *[This LO is partially demonstrated by attending PGCAP M3 RDM sessions no. 1, 3 and 7. Please overwrite the text in Italics and explain how the sessions you attended impacted (or will impact) on your development as a researcher]* |  |
| 1. Develop strategies for managing a research project (and associated staff where appropriate)
 | *[This LO is partially demonstrated by attending PGCAP M3 RDM session no. 6. Please overwrite the text in Italics and explain how the session you attended impacted (or will impact) on your development as a researcher]* |  |
| 1. Discuss appropriate strategies for supporting PhD students, which are informed by national and institutional policies and regulations
 | *[This LO is partially demonstrated by attending PGCAP M3 RDM session no. 8. Please overwrite the text in Italics and explain how the sessions you attended impacted (or will impact) on your development as a researcher]*  |  |
| 1. Critically reflect on your practice and development as a researcher
 |  |  |
| 1. Compose and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Please identify and list any development activities which you will be following up. These will support your development as a researcher and may include workshops you plan to attend.**  |

### **Table 1**. Guideline Assessment Criteria for each Learning Outcome

**Assessment is on a Pass/Fail basis, marks where included are indicative. The criteria below are indicative to guide the assessors and aid your self-assessment**

| **LO\*** | **Refer** | **Masters Pass (50-60%)** | **Merit (60-70)** | **Distinction (70 +)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **1** | Little or no ability to select appropriate research activities Little or no knowledge of institutional research standing in your discipline | Moderate ability to select appropriate research activities Moderate knowledge of institutional research standing in your discipline | Good at selecting appropriate research activities Good knowledge of institutional research standing in your discipline | Excellent ability to select appropriate research activities Excellent knowledge of institutional research standing in your discipline |
| **2** | Little or no knowledge of research activities required to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework | Moderate knowledge of research activities required to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework | Good knowledge of research activities required to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework | Comprehensive knowledge of research activities required to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework |
| ~~3~~ | Inadequate ability to design a research proposal and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline  | Moderate ability to design a research proposal and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline  | Strong ability to design a research proposal and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline  | Excellent ability to design a research proposal and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline  |
| 4 | Inability to develop strategies for managing a research project and associated staff | Moderate ability to develop strategies for managing a research project and associated staff | Good ability to develop strategies for managing a research project and associated staff | Excellent ability to develop strategies for managing a research project and associated staff |
| 6 | Inability to reflect on your practice and development as a researcher | Moderate ability to reflect on your practice and development as a researcher | Good ability to reflect on your practice and development as a researcher | Excellent ability to reflect on your practice and development as a researcher |
| 7 | Inadequate ability to compose and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing  | Moderate ability to compose and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing  | Good at composing and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing  | Excellent ability to compose and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing  |

Learning Outcomes

1. Select research activities appropriate to support the institutional research standing in your discipline
2. Select research activities/ outputs to position your research for the Research Excellence Framework and to enhance its impact
3. Design a research proposal and outline of associated publications appropriate for your discipline
4. Develop strategies for managing a research project and associated staff
5. (Discuss appropriate strategies for supporting PhD students, which are informed by national and institutional policies and regulations, formatively assessed )
6. Critically reflect on your practice and development as a researcher
7. Compose and communicate ideas effectively, both orally and in writing