Department of Integrated Studies in Education

Doctoral Supervision Guidelines for Students & Supervisors

Supervision Guidelines for
Doctoral Students, Supervisors and Committee Members[i]

These guidelines should be regarded as something to help in the planning and conduct of graduate study. The purpose is to make expectations explicit between supervisors and doctoral students at an early stage. Clear expectations about the responsibilities of both parties are essential to a successful supervision relationship. If the research changes substantially, a new agreement should be drawn up. It is recommended that the supervisor and supervisee revisit and update expectations every 12 months coinciding with their annual progress report.

Part A: Minimum Expectations & Timelines

Minimum expectations[1]

Please note that specific expectations are outlined in greater detail throughout the document.

Supervisors
- ✓ uphold and transmit the highest professional standards of research and studentship
- ✓ provide guidance in all phases of the doctoral student's research
- ✓ meet with their doctoral students regularly (frequency to be agreed upon in PhD Supervision Letter of Understanding (see Appendix A))
- ✓ provide prompt feedback when work is submitted including drafts of the dissertation (frequency to be agreed upon in PhD Supervision Letter of Understanding (see Appendix A))
- ✓ clarify expectations regarding collaborative work, authorship, publication and conference presentations
- ✓ must be present for the candidacy paper defense as well as the oral dissertation defense
- ✓ develop a timeline for feedback and communication
- ✓ keep an open line of communication

Graduate Doctoral Students
- ✓ inform themselves of program requirements and deadlines
- ✓ work within program deadlines and agreed upon deadlines for candidacy papers etc.
- ✓ communicate regularly with the supervisor and committee
- ✓ submit annual progress reports to the supervisor and committee
- ✓ contact supervisor to schedule meetings
- ✓ initiate and update the Memorandum of Understanding once per year

Committee Members
- ✓ have a thorough knowledge of the dissertation, reflecting closeness to and knowledge of the doctoral students and the doctoral student's process second only to that of the supervisor(s).

---

[1] Adapted from the McGill GPS Policies and Guidelines on Student Advising and Supervision with input from the DISE faculty.

- read through the entire completed dissertation once and provide feedback once (after the doctoral student and supervisor(s) have gone through several rounds, and before a final pre-submission supervisory feedback round), or:
- read each chapter as drafts are done – this is particularly true for specialized areas such as methodology
- can be the internal examiner for the dissertation. This entails writing an evaluative report after the initial official dissertation submission for examination. Note: as internal examiner, you must be physically present for the oral defense.
- may be requested to be present as a member of the doctoral student's oral dissertation defense committee.

No-fault Termination

If either the doctoral student or supervisor cannot attend a scheduled meeting, each agrees to notify one another in advance. If either the doctoral student or supervisor will not be available for extended periods of time, the doctoral student or supervisor will notify the other ahead of time. The doctoral student and supervisor will discuss and attempt to resolve any conflicts as they arise. If, however, the doctoral student or supervisor needs to terminate the relationship for any reason, the doctoral student and supervisor agree to abide by one another's decision. If the doctoral student or supervisor decides to terminate the supervisory relationship, please meet with one of the Graduate Program Directors to obtain the *Request to Change Supervisor (MA or PhD) or Committee Member (PhD)* form (see Appendix H) to document the change.

Suggested Timeline for Completion

Please note, this timeline represents suggested milestones. Each doctoral student and supervisor should discuss and develop a plan appropriate the doctoral student's course of study.

	Fall	Winter	Summer
Year One	• EDEC 700 plus complementary and elective courses	• EDEC 702 plus complementary and elective courses • Select advisory committee	• Work on Candidacy Paper Plan • Submit a *Candidacy Paper Plan* to your advisory committee for approval (see handout on Candidacy Paper Process)
Year Two	• EDEC 703 plus remaining courses • Work on Candidacy Papers	• Remaining courses (if applicable) • Work on Candidacy Papers	• Candidacy Paper Defense (this may happen earlier depending on your amount of coursework)

Year Three	• Submit *Dissertation Proposal* to your advisory committee for approval
	• Submit Research Ethics application to McGill Research Ethics Board (REB)
	   o Plan for at least 3-4 months to complete the ethics approval process (not including time to draft the application).
	   o Note that School Boards often require additional ethics approval. Times vary per school board.
	• Data Collection[2] (if applicable)		

Year Four to Six	• Data Collection, Analysis, Writing Dissertation [3]
	• Receive feedback from supervisor
	• Receive feedback from advisory committee members
	• Initial submission of dissertation to GPS for examination
	• Internal and external examination reports of the dissertation
	• Oral defense (if dissertation passes the internal and external examination)
	• Final submission of the dissertation.
	   o Please consult the Graduate Program Coordinator to discuss deadlines for dissertation submission.
	   o We recommend that doctoral students aim to send the supervisor a first draft of the complete dissertation at least one year before the final submission of the dissertation (in some cases, the supervisor might recommend more or less time).		

---

[2] The process of data collection may only begin once the Doctoral Advisory Committee has approved the Dissertation proposal and the student has received the REB certificate approving the research)

[3] Discuss exact timeline with supervisor

Part B: Doctoral Supervision Roles and Responsibilities

Supervisor's Role and Responsibilities

1. Application/Admission

   To be considered for admission to the PhD program, applicants must secure the collaboration of a prospective supervisor (Note: applicants are not guaranteed admission to the program by virtue of having a prospective supervisor). If contacted, the supervisors will request a CV, transcript and draft proposal. Based on the submitted documents, the prospective supervisor will assist the applicant by providing feedback on the proposal required for admission to the program. A research proposal allows the applicant to demonstrate the prerequisites for admission to the program, namely, an awareness of current research in an area suitable for doctoral research and the ability to write a research proposal. It is understood nevertheless that the research proposal will evolve to varying degrees during the program. The admission proposal should be a maximum of 5 pages double spaced (1-inch margins, 12 point font) and should clearly include:

   a. Discussion of the research trends relevant to proposed research
   b. Main research questions
   c. Suggestions for how proposed research will be conducted
   d. Conclusion
   e. Selected bibliography of relevant works.

   Once the doctoral student has been accepted into the program, the supervisor and doctoral student will meet prior to the beginning of the first term to determine the doctoral student's coursework and clarify expectations *(see Appendix A).*

   If a student cannot secure a supervisor prior to admission, they should contact one of the Graduate Program Directors for assistance.

2. Regular Meetings

   During all phases of the PhD program, the supervisor must meet with the doctoral student regularly, provide prompt feedback when work is submitted (including drafts of the dissertation), and uphold the highest professional standards of research and studentship. Please Appendix F for a template that can be used to set meeting agendas.

3. Annual Progress Report

   The supervisor will coordinate an annual meeting between themselves, the doctoral student and committee members to discuss and assess the doctoral student's progress. During this meeting, the supervisor will help to facilitate goals for achievement for the upcoming academic year. The supervisor will, in consultation with the doctoral student and committee members, assess the doctoral student's progress, obtain the signatures of each party and submit the Progress Report to the Graduate Program Director. Please note: TWO (2) unsatisfactory progress reports may result in being withdrawn from the doctoral program.

4. Support/Funding

   Full-time doctoral students are required to apply for FRQSC & SSHRC scholarships each year that they are eligible and do not already hold substantial external funding. A complete list of funding opportunities is

available on the [DISE website](). Supervisors are expected to complete evaluations and/or letters of reference in support of a doctoral student's candidacy for awards. For more information about writing successful reference letters, please go to https://www.mcgill.ca/gps/staff/graduate/reference-letters. In DISE, supervisors are encouraged to hire doctoral students as research assistants (RAs) or provide research stipends if they have the funds to do so.

Supervisors are also encouraged to support doctoral students to develop a publication record when possible. Guidelines for authorship are available in Appendix D.

5. Doctoral Advisory Committee

In consultation with the doctoral student, the supervisor will coordinate the establishment of a Doctoral Advisory Committee before the end of the doctoral student's second term. The Doctoral Advisory Committee will consist of two other faculty members whose research interests are best aligned with the doctoral student's proposed research. Faculty members of the Doctoral Advisory Committee may be internal or external to DISE and the doctoral student's program. If a doctoral student has two faculty members co-supervising, only one internal or external Doctoral Advisory Committee is required.

6. Candidacy Paper Plan (CPP)

The supervisor will help to facilitate the development of the doctoral student's candidacy paper plan (5-10 double-spaced pages, including bibliography). The purpose of the Candidacy Paper Plan is to clarify the shape, scope, and approach of the doctoral student's Candidacy Papers. As a part of the Candidacy Papers Plan process, Advisory Committees will discuss and approve the Candidacy Papers Plan prior to the doctoral student embarking on the writing of the Candidacy Papers. Generally, the Candidacy Paper Plan should outline:
a. The doctoral student's research interests that have led to the pursuit of doctoral work, providing the necessary context for what the doctoral student is interested in studying and why.
b. The literature (theory, research, methodology, method) the doctoral student would like to explore. The purpose of the review is to usefully situate and guide the development of the doctoral student's research interests.
c. The questions that will guide the reading and writing for the Candidacy Papers.
d. An initial bibliography for the Candidacy Papers.
e. The specific format the Candidacy Papers are to take, given the nature of the doctoral student's work and background.

7. Candidacy Papers (including oral examination)

The supervisor will coordinate the Candidacy Papers by establishing, in consultation with the Doctoral Advisory Committee and the doctoral student, (a) the examination questions (see separate document titled [Policy and Regulations for the PhD Candidacy Papers](); (b) any feedback on initial drafts of each candidacy paper; and (c) the time and date of the oral examination. Upon receiving confirmation of the time and date from the supervisor, the Graduate Program Coordinator will book a room for the oral examination. Please note that the DISE has a repository housing examples of candidacy papers completed by DISE doctoral students (contact the Graduate Program Coordinator to obtain examples).

8. Candidacy Paper Oral Examination

Once the candidacy papers are complete, as part of the Candidacy Paper Oral Examination, the doctoral student will present their candidacy papers to their Doctoral Advisory Committee. Note that this presentation may be public or private according to the student's preference. Following a 20-25 minute presentation, members of the doctoral committee will pose questions to and/or share insights with the

doctoral student to help them identify and clarify aspects of the candidacy papers that will help to inform their dissertation proposal and guide their proposed research. At the conclusion of the session, the doctoral student will be asked to exit the session so the Doctoral Advisory Committee can discuss and determine the result. Results include PASS, CONDITIONAL PASS, or FAIL. The oral examination should last approximately two hours.

If the doctoral student is successful, they may move on to their dissertation proposal and research ethics application. At this time, the student may identify themselves as a PhD/Doctoral *candidate*. Supervisors must complete, including signatures from all committee members, and submit the ***Candidacy Paper Completion form*** (see Appendix G) to the Graduate Program Coordinator to be included in the students record.

9. Dissertation Proposal

The Doctoral Advisory Committee must approve the doctoral student's final dissertation proposal (see separate document titled Dissertation Proposal Guidelines). Supervisors must complete, including signatures from all committee members, and submit the ***Doctoral Dissertation Proposal form*** (see Appendix H) to the Graduate Program Coordinator to be included in the students record. Please note that DISE has a repository housing examples of dissertation proposals completed by DISE doctoral students.

10. Research Ethics Board (REB)

Doctoral students must submit a Research Ethics Board Application to the appropriate McGill Research Ethics Board for approval before undertaking research involving human participants. Both the doctoral student and the supervisor must have completed the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 (TCPS2) online tutorial **before** the application can be reviewed. The ethical review process may take at least 3-4 months after the application is initially submitted. Students must take into account time for drafting and revising their application prior to submission. Supervisors must provide feedback on the application prior to submission.

11. Dissertation

The supervisor will ensure that the doctoral student provides the Doctoral Advisory Committee members with copies of the penultimate draft of the dissertation in a coordinated manner at least 12 weeks prior to the planned initial submission for examination to the Thesis Office. Feedback on the penultimate draft of the dissertation should be returned to the doctoral student within 8 weeks to allow 4 weeks for revisions based on committee feedback. The supervisor and Doctoral Advisory Committee will make recommendations for revisions within 4-6 weeks of receiving the penultimate draft to allow the doctoral students adequate time to make revisions prior to final submission.

Information about preparation of a thesis can be found here. Information about thesis submission can be found here.

12. Oral Dissertation Defence[4]

The supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the doctoral student has met all other academic requirements for successful completion of the doctoral degree. Supervisors should meet with the Graduate Program Coordinator to ensure all requirements have been met. In consultation with the Graduate Program Coordinator, the supervisor is responsible for arranging a mutually convenient time for the Oral Dissertation Defence and booking a suitable room. The Graduate Program Coordinator will make

---

[4] During the pandemic, oral defences have been held online, with slightly different procedures.

an announcement to the Faculty of Education indicating the date and time for the Oral Dissertation Defence.

The Oral Dissertation Defence consists of a 20-minute presentation by the doctoral candidate, followed by a question period when members of the Oral Defence Committee pose questions to the doctoral student. Generally, each member of the committee poses 1-2 questions in round one and 1 question in round two. Each member of the committee has approximately 10 minutes in each round. A third round of questions may be considered as needed. After the question round has concluded, members of the audience may pose additional questions. At the conclusion of the question session, the doctoral candidate and members of the audience are asked to exit the defence room so the Oral Defence Committee can discuss and determine the result. After deliberation, the doctoral candidate is invited back into the room and given the result.

The supervisor is responsible for overseeing revisions required by the oral defense committee and then attesting to these revisions by accepting the final version in Minerva (final eThesis Submission Form.

More information about Oral Dissertation Defences can be found [here](#).

Graduate Student Academic Intervention

If the graduate student is not meeting expectations, the supervisor should meet with the Graduate Program Director to determine and plan for improvement.

McGill Graduate Studies Failure Policy

Grounds for withdrawal from PhD program: There are 4 ways, summarized as follows:

1. [PhD Comprehensives Policy](#) (In DISE, we refer to these are the Candidacy Papers). In the event that the student is judged to have failed the comprehensive, units must allow, without prejudice, one repeat of the comprehensive (in whole or in part) within a minimum of four (4) months and a maximum of six (6) months. A first failure is recorded as HH. Student can repeat one time. A second failure is an F and the student will be withdrawn from the University.
2. [Failure Policy.](#) – Two courses (automatic withdrawal); Two unsatisfactory progress reports (GPD can recommend withdrawal); One course and one unsatisfactory progress report (GPD can recommend withdrawal)
3. [Thesis Examination or Oral Defense Failure.](#) – Essentially, students have the option to revise and resubmit, or revise and re-do the oral defense, or both. This depends on the outcome of the oral defense.
4. Disciplinary case that leads to withdrawal.

Doctoral Advisory Committee Member's Roles & Responsibilities

Under the guidance of the supervisor, the doctoral student should establish a tutorial relationship with each member of the Doctoral Advisory Committee. The doctoral student is responsible for maintaining contact with committee members in order to ensure their facilitative role in the doctoral student's doctoral program. The responsibilities of committee members are normally as follows:

1. Committee members will participate in discussing and approving the candidate's candidacy examination questions.
2. Committee members will read the candidate's papers comprising the comprehensive examination and will normally provide written commentary to be returned to the doctoral student after the oral examination. Committee members will ask the candidate questions at the oral examination and then assist in the overall pass/fail evaluation of the candidate's performance on the written and oral components of the comprehensive examination.
3. Committee members will read the doctoral student's final dissertation proposal and provide feedback.
4. The doctoral student will provide each Doctoral Advisory Committee member with the dissertation at least 12 weeks prior to the initial submission to the Thesis Office. Doctoral Advisory Committee members will read the dissertation and provide feedback to the doctoral student within 6-8 weeks of receiving it.

Oral Defense Committees' Roles & Responsibilities

Upon receipt of the PhD Oral Defense Form from the Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Office, the Graduate Program Coordinator will ask the supervisor to identify, in consultation with the doctoral student, members of the oral defense committee and then to make initial contact with them to confirm their willingness and availability to participate. Upon receiving names of oral defense committee members from the supervisor, the Program Coordinator will proceed to make arrangements for the oral defense examination in coordination with the Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Office.

All members of the Oral Dissertation Defence committee must sign the Defence Form indicating the final result. The Pro-Dean then submits the signed form to the Thesis Office.

Information about composition of the oral defence committee can be found here.

Appendix A[5]:

Department of Integrated Studies in Education
PhD Supervision Letter of Understanding
**Updated July, 2021*

*The primary goal of a PhD is for the student to become an independent researcher; as such, the supervisory relationship will change over time. Setting mutual expectations between a supervisor and supervisee, and revisiting those regularly (e.g., annually), is essential to ensuring the success of a graduate student. **All PhD students at McGill are required to complete a Supervision Letter of Understanding in their first year.***

The following questions are intended to provide clarity for the expectations between doctoral students, supervisors and committee members and to form the basis of understanding. You are not required to address every question. Instead, you are encouraged to address each question when and if it applies to the relationship as well as the nature of the intended research.

*Before responding to these questions, we encourage you to see the **DISE PhD Supervision Guidelines** and McGill's Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies Supervision website. For information about Graduate Regulations at McGill, including protocols for who to contact when a student needs support, please click here.*

ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS TO ADDRESS IN YEAR 1

1. **Communication: How will the supervisor and student communicate with one another?**
   Consider the type of communication that will be used (e.g., email, text, TEAMS, phone), speed of response, when to expect/not expect responses (e.g., holidays, weekends), etiquette for communication (e.g., it is not okay to send 10 short emails in the span of a day before receiving a response), appropriate content for communication, and how to reach one another in cases of emergency or lack of response.

2. **Supervisory Meetings: How will supervisory meetings be scheduled and run?**
   Consider frequency of meetings, focus of meetings, support provided by supervisor during meetings, expectations for preparation for meetings (e.g., student will present a written progress report, writing, and/or agenda in advance), expectations for follow-up to meetings (e.g., student will present a written summary or a follow up email), and who will be in charge of scheduling meetings (including missed meetings). (Regular contact (meetings or emails) is important. We suggest supervisors and full-time students have a formal meeting, irrespective of the number of informal meetings, at least once per term.)

3. **Writing and Feedback (General): What expectations do we have for writing and feedback?**
   Consider plans for publication/presentations/dissemination (including plans for co-authorship), norms around order of authorship (see Appendix C in the DISE PhD Supervision Guidelines), expected timeframe to receive feedback (including what to do if feedback is not received in that timeframe), expectations for intellectual ownership of ideas (e.g., how to avoid one person feeling that the other has appropriated their ideas), what additional writing support the student should seek out (e.g., GRAPHOS, DISE writing courses), and expected time

---

[5] A word document version can be found on the DISE PhD website.

needed for additional writing support.

4. **Scholarship Funding & Employment: What is the vision for the student's funding and employment?**
Consider sources of funding (scholarships, RA-ships, TA-ships, course lecturer positions, other employment on or off campus), time spent on employment, and expectations for student and supervisor in securing funding (including support that supervisors will provide for scholarship applications). *Note that all PhD students receiving departmental funding are required to apply for the SSHRC and FRQSC each year they are eligible, if they do not already hold a large external scholarship.*

(for Full Time students only) Note that it is university policy that full time students should <u>not</u> work full time. If the doctoral student takes on substantial employment, they are required to fulfil all of the same requirements, deadlines, and expectations as other PhD students. Full time students should expect to work on their doctoral coursework and research a minimum of 40 hours per week. **If the student is taking on employment, how will they ensure that they are able to maintain satisfactory progress towards their degree?**

5. **Other Resources Available: What resources will be available to the student?**
Consider what resources will be available (e.g., office space, data collection equipment, funding for conference travel), when they will be available, and how the student can access.

6. **Expectations for Additional Learning: What additional opportunities should the student seek out?**
Consider participation in research groups, teaching, seminars or workshops (e.g., scholarship funding workshops, SKILLSETS, Graphos), departmental activities (e.g., oral defense presentations, DISE talks and/or public research presentations), student groups (e.g., EGSS, PGSS), and academic/non-academic leadership.

7. **Other: Is there any other information that the supervisor or student should know?**

OPTIONAL QUESTIONS TO ADDRESS IN YEAR 1 (OR REVISIT AT A LATER DATE)

1. **Expected Progress towards Major Milestones: What is the approximate timeline for completing milestones?**
Consider when the student should start and finish working on Candidacy Papers, Research Ethics Board training, Research Ethics Board application, Dissertation Proposal, data collection, analysis, writing of dissertation. See suggested timeline in PhD Supervision Guidelines.

2. **Writing and Feedback (Specific Milestones): What expectations do we have for writing and feedback for specific milestones?**
Consider number of rounds of feedback for Candidacy Papers/Dissertation Proposal/Dissertation, dates for submission of first drafts, and what kind of feedback to expect.

3. **Funding for Data Collection: Are there financial resources available to support costs of the**

doctoral research and data collection?

We understand the above shared expectations and will revisit them as needed.

Names	Signature	Date Confirmed
Student		
Supervisor		
Co-supervisor (if applicable)		

Please upload to myProgress for approval by your Graduate Program Director.

Appendix B:
SSHRC Proposal Template

While several formats exist, this is one potential format to follow.

Section 1: Problem (2-3 paragraphs)
- Highlight the main social issue/problem (cite relevant research to provide backing to claims))
- Detail what research suggests about this problem
- Highlight the gap/need in the research literature (how your research is NEW) and why this gap is important to fill

→ This should collectively build an argument to motivate your research objectives/questions.

Section 2: Research Objectives (~1 paragraph)
- Explain your overarching objective(s) and the specific questions you will investigate.

Section 3: Methodology (~2-3 paragraphs)
**Connect back to your research questions in this section.
- Describe your theoretical commitments are (2-3 sentences)
- Describe your methodological approach (2-3 sentences)
- Describe your setting, participants and recruitment of participants (be detailed)
- Describe the data you will collect, including the process of data collection and the duration/timeline for data collection (be detailed)
- Describe your methods of analysis

Section 4: Contributions (~1 paragraph)
- Describe what is NEW about your research
- Describe what your research will contribute to the research literature
- Describe what your research will contribute to practice and/or policy (be specific!)
- Describe in detail what the outcomes will be and how you will disseminate those outcomes to both academic and non-academic communities. Be as specific as possible!

Section 5: Background of the Researcher (~1 paragraph)
- Briefly describe your preparation for the project and your positionality (if applicable)
- Briefly describe the appropriateness of your supervisor and where you will study
- Briefly describe your timeline of what you will do from now until program completion.

Appendix C:
Common Elements of a Dissertation

This is an example of elements that can be included in a standard dissertation though format and style may vary. Consult with the supervisor for more information. See the Graduate and Postdoctoral Guidelines for Preparation of a Thesis for more details about what is required in a McGill thesis.

Traditional Dissertation

1. **Introduction**
   The primary purpose of the introduction is to provide the reader with an overview of the study itself and the influencing factors in its development. This section should briefly introduce the setting and methods used in the study and present the study purpose and hypothesis. The first two to three paragraphs of this section should focus on summarizing the nature of the dissertation, including the writer's motivation for choosing the topic. Next, the writer should discuss the significance of the topic in relation to the setting or the framework in which the study occurs. In addition, the writer should include an acknowledgement of the prior research or information upon which the study is based. The scope of the study should be presented, along with a general description of what the reader can expect in the remainder of the document. Finally, the introduction should end with a brief discussion of what the writer anticipated will be the value of the research project.

2. **Literature Review**
   The Literature Review provides the necessary background information to familiarize the reader with prior research. Three general types of literature reviews exist: the broad scan, the focused review, and the comprehensive critique.

3. **Theoretical or Conceptual Framework**
   A theoretical framework refers to the theory that a researcher chooses to guide them in their research. Thus, a theoretical framework is the application of a theory, or a set of concepts drawn from one and the same theory, to offer an explanation of an event, or shed some light on a particular phenomenon or research problem (Imenda, 2014). Thus, a conceptual framework may be defined as an end result of bringing together a number of related concepts to explain or predict a given event or give a broader understanding of the phenomenon of interest – or simply, of a research problem. The process of arriving at a conceptual framework is akin to an inductive process whereby small individual pieces (in this case, concepts) are joined together to tell a bigger map of possible relationships (Imenda, 2014).

   Sometimes the theoretical framework is combined with the literature review in one chapter to form the conceptual framework.

4. **Methodology**
   The fourth chapter of the dissertation is the Methodology and Methods, sometimes also referred to as the Study Design and Methodology. It is in this section that the writer describes the participant population, setting and procedures used in enough detail that others could replicate the study and verify its validity. This chapter often begins with a brief overview of the methodological approach used in the study. It should then provide specific information on the number of study participants, how they were chosen, and relevant demographic information. The writer may also present the rationale for the specific sample size used. Next, all data collection tools and instruments used in the study should be described and

justified. If such tools are described in detail elsewhere in the literature, the writer can indicate this along with a relevant reference. Actual surveys or questionnaires will not be presented here. Instead, the writer provides an overview and then inserts copies of the tools into the Appendix at the end of the paper. Finally, the chapter should include a comprehensive description and justification of analytic procedures and (when applicable) considerations for validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness.

5. **Results/Findings**

   The results portion presents the analyzed data without any accompanying interpretation. This section should include, where possible, a visual representation of the data, such as in charts, graphs, or tables. Each figure should have a brief description associated with it and clearly marked labels. The results of all statistical analyses should be presented, such that the reader has enough information to determine reliability, validity, and the statistical significance of the relationships among variables. This section should also be clearly organized by subheadings.

6. **Conclusion/Discussion**

   Here is where the writer sums up the entire project. This chapter (or chapters) should remind the reader of the initial problem statement, research questions or hypothesis and then relate that to the results from the study. The writer should then present contributions of the research to the field, implications for practice, limitations, and future directions for research. One caution when writing this chapter is not to merely reiterate the other portions of the dissertation. Instead, the writer should strive to leave a lasting impression upon the reader, conveying with the same passion that drove the research project the importance of the work completed.

Manuscript Style Dissertation[6]

As an alternative to the traditional thesis format, the thesis research may be presented as a collection of scholarly papers of which the student is the author or co-author; that is, it can include the text of two or more manuscripts, submitted or to be submitted for publication, and/or published articles reformatted according to the McGill requirements. Manuscripts for publication are frequently very concise documents. The thesis is expected to be a more detailed, scholarly work than manuscripts for publication in journals. A manuscript-based thesis will be judged by the examiners as a unified, logically-coherent document in the same way a traditional thesis is judged.

A manuscript-based thesis must:
- be presented with uniform font size, line spacing, and margin sizes (see thesis format);
- conform to all other requirements listed under Thesis Components above;
- contain additional text that connects the manuscripts in a logical progression from one chapter to the next, producing a cohesive, unitary focus, and documenting a single program of research - the manuscripts alone do not constitute the thesis;
- function as an integrated whole.

McGill specifies that there must be a minimum of 2 manuscripts for a manuscript dissertation. Publication or acceptance for publication of research results before presentation of the thesis in no way supersedes the University's evaluation and judgment of the work during the thesis examination process (i.e., it does not guarantee that the thesis will be found acceptable for the degree). The manuscripts do not need to be submitted.

---

[6] Retrieved from https://www.mcgill.ca/gps/thesis/thesis-guidelines/preparation

In the case of multiple-authored articles, the student must be the primary author. Multiple-authored articles cannot be used in more than one thesis. In the case of students who have worked collaboratively on projects, it may be preferable for both students to write a standard format thesis, identifying individual contributions.

For more information on manuscript-based theses can be found [here](#).

Appendix D:
Guidelines for Authorship

What is authorship and how is it determined[7]?

Authorship entails a public acknowledgment of scientific or professional contribution to a disseminated piece of information (see APA, 2002) and includes involvement in various tasks associated with the project (National Health and Medical Research council, 1997). As such, a number of interrelated factors are considered in determining authorship. The APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2002, Section 8.12) also addresses certain criteria for authorship by stating:

a) Authors take responsibility and credit, including authorship credit, only for work they have actually performed or to which they have contributed.
b) Principal authorship and other publication credits accurately reflect the relative scientific or professional contributions of the individuals involved, regardless of their relative status. Mere possession of an institutional position, such as Department Chair, does not justify authorship credit. Minor contributions to the research or to the writing for publication are appropriately acknowledged, such as in footnotes or in an introductory statement.
c) A student is usually listed as principal author on any multiple-authored article that is based primarily on the student's dissertation or dissertation. Faculty advisors discuss publication credit with students as early as feasible and throughout the research and publication process as appropriate.

Further information is available from the following sources:

International Committee of Medical Journal Authors:
http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html

PhD on track: Co-authorship
http://www.phdontrack.net/share-and-publish/co-authorship/

Intellectual Property Guidelines for Graduate Students & Supervisors, University of Toronto, School of Graduate Studies https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Intellectual-Property-Guidelines.aspx

---

[7] Taken from A graduate Student's Guide to Determining Authorship Credit and Authorship order, APA Science Student Council, 2006. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-paper.pdf

Appendix E:
Meeting Agenda Template

Week of:

Time:

Agenda for Supervisor Meeting

Meeting called by: Type of meeting:

Facilitator: Note taker:

Timekeeper:

Attendees:

Agenda

1. *Lit. Review*

2. *Conference submission*

3. *Paper for course X*

4. *Question about terminology*

5. *Scheduling committee meeting*

APPENDIX F[8]

Declaration of Supervisor (and co-supervisor, if applicable) (MA or PhD) and Committee Member(s) (PhD)

To confirm a supervisor (and co-supervisor, if applicable) and committee member(s) (PhD only), the student should submit the following completed form to the Graduate Program Coordinator. MA students should determine their supervisor by the end of their first year. Although PhD students enter the program with a supervisor, by the end of their first semester, they should determine whether they would like to remain with their current supervisor or switch to another supervisor. PhD students should declare their committee members by the end of their first year. A student may change supervisor and/or committee members at any time during the degree. In such cases, please consult the Request to Change Supervisor (MA or PhD) form and the Request to Change Committee Member (PhD) form. If you are adding a co-supervisor, please use this form.

Student's name: _____   Student #: _____

Research Topic/Title: _____

Name	Contact Information Please include for non-McGill committee members or co-supervisors.	Signature By signing, you are in agreement	Date
Supervisor's name			
Co-supervisor's name (if applicable)			
FOR PHD ONLY			
Committee member's name (PhD only)			
Committee member's name (PhD only)			
Committee member's name (PhD only) (if applicable)			

Please upload to myProgress for approval by your Graduate Program Director.

---

[8] A fillable pdf of this form is available on the DISE website

APPENDIX G[9]
Candidacy Paper Completion

Doctoral Student's Name: _____   Student #: _____

FINAL GRADE (please check one)	PASS ☐	CONDITIONAL PASS ☐	FAIL ☐
	• Addresses questions adequately in a comprehensive manner and with depth • Reviews a breadth of literature • Literature is presented as a synthesis, not a summary • Critically engages with the literature (e.g., provides a sense of implications for the student going forward) • Has demonstrated knowledge in the area	• Does not fully meet the pass criteria • Paper must be revised and re-submitted to the committee for approval *** If a conditional pass is given, the student must submit this form, with signatures, to the Graduate Program Coordinator. The form must then be re-submitted once a pass is awarded.*	• Does not meet the pass criteria • Papers require extensive revisions and must be re-written • A new defense must be scheduled

Feedback (attach additional pages as needed):

Name of Committee Members	Signature	Date Confirmed
Supervisor		
Co-supervisor (if applicable)		
Committee Member		
Committee Member (if no co-supervisor)		

Please upload to myProgress for approval by your Graduate Program Director.

---

[9] A fillable pdf of this form is available on the DISE website

APPENDIX H[10]
Dissertation Proposal Completion

Doctoral Student's name: _____   Student #: _____

Dissertation Topic/Title:

_____

Comments:

Result:	☐ *PASSED*	☐ *NOT PASSED*

Name of Committee Members	Signature	Date Confirmed
Supervisor		
Co-supervisor (if applicable)		
Committee Member		
Committee Member (if no co-supervisor)		

Please upload to myProgress for approval by your Graduate Program Director.

---

10   A fillable pdf of this form is available on the DISE website

Request to Change Supervisor (MA or PhD)

There are times during a graduate degree when a change in supervisor is needed. Students and faculty should feel comfortable to suggest a change in supervision when the change will best support the student's progress towards the degree. To change a supervisor, please follow this process: The student wishing to change supervisor should have a confidential meeting with the graduate program director (GPD) to discuss reasons for the change and possible alternatives. If the student and GPD decide that a change in supervisor is necessary, the GPD will normally be responsible for first contacting the new supervisor and current supervisor. The student can/should then contact the current supervisor and new supervisor as appropriate. Communication with the new or current supervisor can be conducted over phone or email. This exact process will be determined with the GPD and will depend on the particular student's needs and circumstances. However, the GPD must be involved throughout the process (e.g., the student should not approach a potential new supervisor without first consulting the GPD). A supervisor may also put forth a request for a student to change supervisor by contacting the GPD. In such cases, a similar process to the above will be followed. For resources for conflict resolution, please contact the Ombudsperson: https://www.mcgill.ca/ombudsperson/ombudsperson.

Student's Name	Student's ID Number
Student's Signature	**Date**

What kind of change would you like to make?

- ☐ Add a co-supervisor
- ☐ Remove a co-supervisor (without adding a new one)
- ☐ Change my current supervisor
- ☐ Change my current co-supervisor

Reason for Request: *(Please note that you are not required to disclose confidential information.)*

Include the names and signatures of those individuals changing below.

Current Supervisor's Name	Current Supervisor's Signature	Date
New Supervisor's Name	**New Supervisor's Signature**	**Date**
Current Co-Supervisor's Name	**Current Co-Supervisor's Signature**	**Date**
New Co-Supervisor's Name	**New Co-Supervisor's Signature**	**Date**
New Co-Supervisor's Contact Information (if not from McGill)		

---

[11] A fillable pdf of this form is available on the DISE website

---

[i] Information contained in these Supervision Guidelines is subject to change. In the event of conflict, information from the Office of Graduate and Post-doctoral Studies will take precedence.