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**Rationale Text:** Our focus is on the evolving impact and implications of the Covid-19 pandemic on researcher education and the doctorate by means of theoretical reflections and with a view to practical courses of action, for the medium and into the long term. We draw wisdom from a series of five webinars, variously run or co-sponsored by SRHE and the Philosophy and Theory of Higher Education Society in 2020-2021. The series has explored and set the scene regarding the challenges, possibilities and prospects for the prosperity of researcher education. The pandemic lands on us all and affects ‘normal’ operations, initially through organisation and management, then having implications for curriculum and for teaching and learning (Silver 1998). Mindful of the ‘message systems’ of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation with respect to the classification and framing of educational knowledge (Bernstein 1971), this symposium follows on by asking important questions about the place of different epistemologies and cultures and pays close attention to supervisory and assessment practices. It asks not what is the point of a doctorate now but what could be the point of a new form of doctorate, that embraces the need for creativity, inclusivity and interdisciplinarity to meet constant change. Developing these and other themes further: Liezel Frick employs a framing principle of Hope, not in an imprecise and general sense but purposive especially in tackling unnecessarily unequal and otherwise unjust structural features and relations within the Academy, and then with re-imagining doctoral education within a more equalitarian and just ethos. Rosemary Deem develops similar themes of uncovering to a fine grained level the existing problems in doctoral education (the salient by-products of managerialism), which have been exacerbated by the Covid-19 pandemic. She goes on to consider solutions to address the situations of different players in the doctoral world, as well as to confront where organisational features work against such solutions. Soren Bengsten considers the future of the doctorate more in terms of how it may affect the world beyond the Academy, negotiating the ‘torn curriculum’ and then reflecting back on on how doctoral education can be effectively sustained, using the most problematic disciplinary area in relation to ‘impact’, i.e. the Humanities. Martin Gough, along with the co-chairs, Pam Denicolo, Julie Reeves and Richard Race, will introduce the session and co-ordinate discussion through a summary of overarching themes which emerge.
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Paper Abstract: The paper explores some effects of Covid 19 on doctoral education, from the rapid shift to remote supervision and examining, through closing campuses, to disruption of conferences and research networks and the impact of ‘working from home’ on doctoral researchers. It also considers what we don’t know so much about: how supervisors coped, the impact on part-time doctoral candidates, how online doctorates worked prior to Covid and how different HE systems responded to the pandemic. Furthermore, there are positive elements of online supervision and events (accessibility, flexibility). Some Covid doctoral issues like isolation and funding worries are not new concerns. The pandemic has reinforced existing pressures to rethink the doctorate and the paper proposes a way of looking at doctoral researchers, universities as organisations and the kinds of knowledge seen as acceptable in a doctorate, as a holistic approach to reshaping doctoral education for the post-pandemic world.
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Paper Abstract: At the Revitalising doctoral education – beyond global trauma PaTHES seminar, I argued that the notion of hope provided us with a pedagogical entry point to re-imagining doctoral education in a pandemic/post-pandemic world. I argued at the time that hope enabled us to re-imagine doctoral education in a global context, including notions of (global) citizenship and locality, epistemic injustice, research supervision as an inherently patriarchal and colonial
practice, the (de-)colonisation of research collaboration, and the threat of innovation to doctoral education.
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Paper Abstract: The paper critically explores and discusses various, and sometimes conflicting and unaligned, rationales behind the understanding of the societal impact of doctoral education and the PhD. These are rationales that are intersecting through educational policy and practice and threaten to create an educational and institutional state of entanglement and confusion — but arguably also new opportunities for rethinking and redesigning a more sustainable PhD. The current paper arises from the project ‘Research for impact — integrating research and societal impact in the humanities PhD’, which is a Sapere Aude research project funded by the Independent Research Fund Denmark (DFF). The project brings together junior and senior researchers from around the world to study how the cohesion between doctoral education and societal impact and value may be increased (Bengtsen et al, 2021).