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Can it make a difference in the face of conflicting drivers and pressures?
Training in isolation?

Piece in wider jigsaw?
What are we trying to achieve in terms of ‘making a difference’?
Making how much of a difference? Impact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment inputs:</th>
<th>Developing the infrastructure</th>
<th>Researchers participate in training and development</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. People:</td>
<td>Level 0 Foundations</td>
<td>Level 1 Reaction</td>
<td>Level 2 Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Funding</td>
<td>Developed training</td>
<td>Participant reaction</td>
<td>Attitude change, increased skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rugby Impact Framework model
Spotlight on Sheffield’s training of doctoral research students
Training all PGRs – ~4000 total / ~900 p.a.

- Core structure but devolved delivery to 5 Faculties (covering 40+ departments).
- Compulsory.
- Live since 2011.

**Desired learning outcomes** (DLOs) =

*Heightened awareness + understanding
*Awareness of consequences of actions - sensitivity
*Ability to make defensible arguments - reasoning

**Quality** = DLOs + efficient delivery of course
Training all PGRs

Core structure covering 5 Faculty versions:

1. Introductory session

2. Series of events in which PGRs discuss and reflect on relevant and real-life scenarios/case studies

3. Some form(s) of assessment

Completed in Year 1 of PhD

Led by academic, supported by PGRs & postdocs
Training all PGRs

- **Strengths & weaknesses of delivery model:**
  - Faculty-bespoke, relevant, securing buy-in.
  - Loss of control and consistency of quality.
  - Challenges of being compulsory.
- Some innovative, good practices in Faculties.
- Some problems developed over the years.
- Some lessons and solutions.
Examples of good practices
• The introductory ‘face to face’ session:
  - Recorded.
  - Participatory dimension.
  - Convey relevance, manage expectations & address sceptics.
  - Highlight key terms + topics + principles + responsibilities + your institution’s policies and expectations.
• Facilitated ‘face to face’ group discussions held a reasonable time after intro. session:
  - Relevant case studies.
  - Realistic case studies.
  - Real-life (better still Sheffield) case studies.
• Can be delivered back to back (attract p/t PGRs).
• Facilitated ‘face to face’ group discussions:
  *Facilitated by former participating PGR students and/or postdoctoral research staff*

Incentive: Practise teaching method & goes towards HEA accreditation.
Equity: Recruit facilitators from all departments.
Assuring quality: Fit for purpose preparatory support: Training + Information + Reduce burden.
• **Assessment:**

  Attendance throughout the module is required.

  + **Written assignment(s)** – e.g. a poster, a presentation, a one page reflective entry, a quiz
• **Flexibility within a framework:**
  - Timing, frequency and duration of sessions.
  - Content covered & case studies used & assessment method(s).
  - PGRs can opt to attend another Faculty’s version.
  - Faculties can do more than the minimum.
• **Efficiencies:**
  - Pre-arranged room bookings & mixing of groups.
  - All PGRs informed before they arrive at Sheffield.
  - All PGRs automatically registered & in calendars.
  - Creating presentations that have long shelf-life.
Some problems
• Some design problems:
  - Logistically challenging given the numbers.
  - Originally delivered across Years 1 & 2.
  - Insufficient recognition of workload.
  - Over-reliance on single academic to lead.
  - Seen as ‘top down’ by some departments.
  - Responsibility delegated to junior person.
  - Finding cohorts of facilitators p.a. can be hard.
  - Epigeum online course insufficiently integrated.
• Problem of inconsistency:
  - Intro. session not resonating with all disciplines.
  - Case studies not sufficiently realistic or real-life.
  - Not all facilitators facilitating effectively.
  - Some assessment methods less robust.
Some lessons & solutions
Some lessons:
- Need 2 academics to share module’s ownership.
- Need to invest enough to prepare the facilitators.
- Reduce burden on people supporting module.
- Professional services to contribute support in ways that bring economies of scale.
- Integrate the Epigeum online course as it reinforces Sheffield messages and complements non-Sheffield specific voices.
- Reduce the work associated with assessment.
• Some solutions:
  - Computer Services to do all room bookings.
  - R&I Services to generate more Sheffield-specific case studies.
  - Share good practices in preparing facilitators.
  - Promote benefits of Epigeum course.
  - Simplify and harmonise assessment methods.
What difference?

• **One Faculty:**
  27% strongly agreed & 56% agreed that course enabled development of knowledge and skills in ethical sensitivity.
  [questionnaire of ~100 participants in 2014/15 module]

• **One Faculty:**
  94% agreed training was useful in developing abilities in responsible conduct
  [survey of ~50 participants in 2014/15 module]

• **One Faculty:**
  “Having a wide variety of case studies was very effective in making me think about issues outside my research area”
What difference?

- No longitudinal follow up study of participants
- Influence of the Research Supervisor team
- Learning one thing, witnessing another
- Quality of the experience
- Individuals’ own values, beliefs, attitudes
Take home messages

• Training must be relevant & the relevance must be communicated directly.
• Training depends on academic buy-in.
• Must be efficient but not at expense of quality.
• Impact of training in a vacuum is debatable.
Thank You
Group discussion

1: Share approaches & ideas on training people in R.Integrity.

2. What works? Has impact?

[20 minutes]