



**Day One of the Eighth Annual
History in Higher Education
Conference**

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, 11-13

April, 2006

Conference Report: Preparing Future Faculty in History, Classics and Archaeology

by Elaine Fulton

Introduction

Each year, the first day of the History in Higher Education Conference is dedicated to the examination of a subject that is of particular interest and concern to our disciplinary communities. This year the focus was on Preparing Future Faculty (PFF), 'ideas designed to promote expanded professional development of doctoral students who are preparing for an academic career'. The aim of the day was to learn more about how, in the USA and UK, through a wide range of activities, PFF programmes help postgraduates to prepare for their careers, and to identify ways in which the Subject Centre can help departments and disciplinary communities to develop PFF programmes.

To ensure that the views and needs of postgraduates were well represented, a number of free and reduced-fee conferences places were set aside for them.

Proceedings

The day began with two presentations as a means of introducing the theme of Preparing Future Faculty. The first of these, from David Pace of Indiana University, set the bar high as he laid out the contours of the scheme at his institution in the States:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~kirkwood/pff/aboutpff.htm>. The second paper, by Keith Trigwell, focused on similar developments in the UK by the Centre for Excellence in Preparing for Academic Practice based at the University of Oxford: see www.learning.ox.ac.uk.

With David and Keith's ideas in mind, the conference participants then broke into discussion groups (see appendix i). Uptake on the free and reduced-fee place scheme for postgraduates was sufficiently high that History, Classics and Archaeology postgraduates were able to form their own discussion groups, thereby providing an invaluable perspective on the needs of our own future faculty in the UK. For a personal perspective on the day's events from an archaeology postgraduate, see appendix ii.

Each discussion group tackled two main questions:

1) What would most help postgraduate students in preparing for (and in the early years of) an academic career?

2) To what extent does help, training and support need to be discipline-based?

Findings from each group were presented back to the conference in an after-lunch plenary session chaired by Jane Longmore of the University of Greenwich. Postgraduate discussion groups were given the lead in this session, and the points raised by them and more established staff provide a valuable snapshot of the current needs of UK postgraduates as they prepare for careers in academia.

Issues fall loosely into four broad categories:

1. Departmental engagement
2. Training
3. Career development
4. Communication

1. Departmental engagement

Comments on this subject varied, depending on participants' differing experiences of departmental engagement to date. It was felt that there should be some sort of national 'minimum standard' for postgraduates as a means of eradicating some existing bad practice and encouraging good practice. The idea mooted at last year's conference of a 'Postgraduate Charter' could play a part here, subject to some development of an existing sample version (see appendix iii).

Even in departments where substantial postgraduate provision is already made, it was widely felt that there was much more that could be done to include postgraduates in all aspects of departmental life. As well as acting as PGTAs, which many currently do, postgraduates could be given the opportunity to help design courses (including assessment), second-mark exams, and take part in the processes of course evaluation and feedback. At a broader level, postgraduates could also be encouraged to attend departmental meetings and sit in on presentations and other selection processes for the appointment of new staff.

2. Training

Again, responses here varied depending on individual experiences. Some postgraduates had received a degree of research training, and those who taught had usually attended some form of training for that. It was widely felt, however, that the training which existed was often inadequate. Teaching training was often generic; while some useful ideas could be gained from this, it was felt that the bulk of training should be predominantly discipline-specific. It was also felt that provision needed to be made for the fact that support is needed for new teachers long after the official training course ends, and as such access to resources like syllabus outlines and advice on practical issues (eg how long should one prepare for teaching a class; what are the main issues to cover in a class on a subject with which the

tutor is particularly familiar?) should be available throughout the year. In addition, much more could be done to inform postgraduates about the wide range of current issues in HE (eg QAA, RAE, Data Protection, disability awareness, e-learning) and on such matters as employment law, trade unions, salaries and pensions.

On the subject of research training, it was noted that while the purely 'intellectual' side of research is usually catered for by postgraduate supervisors, there is limited or haphazard advice about the practicalities, such as finding additional funding, getting the best out of archival visits, dealing with copyright issues, etc.

Significantly, there was some doubt cast on the value in every case of a formal PFF programme; indeed, this was voiced particularly by the postgraduates themselves. There was concern that it could detract too much from research time; there was also a worry that were the programme very specifically geared towards academia, it could make it difficult for the postgraduate to seek work in areas outside HE should they later change their mind about their career path or simply be unable to find academic work. A perceived rigidity of formal PFF programmes was also a concern, and the postgraduates emphasised in particular the need for flexibility. Not every postgraduate will know from day one of their PhD that they want to pursue a career in academia; nor would all necessarily want to follow a programme throughout their doctorate, but perhaps restrict it to a more concentrated effort over one year. There was greater enthusiasm for the creation and provision for a set of resources and model schemes (eg work shadowing – see below) that could be used by the individual and his or her department as appropriate. It was further suggested that emphasis should be placed on transferable skills rather than geared exclusively at 'academic' activities, leading to the creation of postgraduate career or skill portfolios.

3. Career development

This elicited a range of ideas. One especially popular proposal was the need for some form of 'work shadowing' opportunity for postgraduates, where they could shadow full-time staff at their own institutions or in other institutions. Similar to this was the idea of 'swapping', where postgraduates who wished to gain experience of academia in a Higher Education environment different from their own could do so for a set period. For example, a postgraduate currently working in an Oxbridge environment would benefit greatly from seeing how research, teaching and admin are approached at a redbrick or post-1992 institution. In particular, this would be of benefit when applying for jobs at HE institutions different from their own. Related to this was the suggestion that greater discipline-specific advice would be welcomed on the practicalities of applying for jobs, such as help with writing cvs, preparing job presentations, and dealing with interviews.

On the broader topic of career planning, it was noted that advice on what to publish, when to publish it and how to publish would also be greatly welcomed by postgraduates, particularly in view of the high regard now placed on publications by appointment committees. It was suggested that this type of advice should be available right from the start of a PhD- not at the end when, arguably, it's often too late. In a similar vein, it was suggested that postgraduates would benefit from additional ways to make their proficiency in teaching recognised, as another way of enhancing their prospects in the academic job market. One possibility raised was to make the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme open to PGTAs as well as full-time HE teachers; another was to enable postgraduates to get more involved in Subject Centre activities.

Lastly, it was also pointed out that not all postgraduates will want to continue to a career in academia; and all should at least be aware of the full range of alternative options. As such, far greater levels of career advice could be offered to postgraduates, perhaps with workshops to meet people in different careers. It was also noted that some postgraduates would like some experience of working in 'public history' eg archives and museums, and that this is not always easy to arrange without institutional support.

4. Communication

The main response to this issue was simply 'More, please!' It was recognised that there are some excellent postgraduate initiatives and resources available (eg. History Lab, relevant SNAS resources, UK Grad), but that postgraduates don't know where to find them. In addition, those who offer such resources often don't seem to realise that there are others seeking to provide a similar service, and fail to work together. Particular ignorance seems to surround what the Subject Centre itself does, and especially the role of the Regional Networks. None of this is helped by the fact that the postgraduate population is one that changes from year to year as degrees are completed; this means that successful postgraduates tend to disappear into employment, academic and otherwise, taking all their hard-won experience and knowledge with them. This points clearly to the need for a permanent platform and home for such resources and advice that will be available to all postgraduates wherever they are and at whatever stage in their career path they find themselves.

Three specific points were also raised in this context. Firstly, availability of advice and resources should also be made available (and perhaps particularly available) to postdoctoral students. In the present job market, it is rare for a postgraduate to walk straight into an academic post, and many face the prospect of at least one or two difficult 'in-between' years of short-term contract teaching and endless job applications and interviews. Support for this group is particularly important. Secondly, it was pointed out that some sort of formal 'brokering' or advertising scheme for PGTA teaching vacancies would be very helpful. At present, postgraduates tend to teach only in their own departments, and word of vacancies is too often word-of-mouth. Lastly, it was noted that information on the international academic scene should also be more effectively communicated to postgraduates.

At this stage, focus groups were then created, each addressing one of the above points raised in the plenary session. Results were fed back in a roundtable discussion chaired by Christopher Rowe of the University of Durham, and again, postgraduate participants were enabled to take the lead in the discussion.

On the issue of **departmental engagement**, it was felt that idea of the Postgraduate Charter should indeed be revisited. There was greater caution expressed over the possibility of postgraduates taking a much fuller role in certain activities, such as exam marking and course design. This is sometimes prohibited under departmental regulations. But it was recognised that departments could certainly do more to support all aspects of their postgraduates development.

Similar assent was given to the concerns raised over existing provision for postgraduate **training** and **career development**, with particular recognition of the role that the Subject

Centre and departments could play in this. The value of discipline-specific training was also noted. On **communication**, a range of suggestions were made to enhance information-sharing between postgraduates, their departments and the Subject Centre. Effective utilisation of a section of the Subject Centre website was the main point raised, to include up-to-date information and resources on all the issues already noted. In view of the wide range of relevant materials already available, but currently scattered across dozens of different web locations, the importance of a Subject Centre-hosted 'one-stop' website for all postgraduate and postdoc needs is all the greater. It was further suggested that links to existing resources could be rated by History postgraduates, and could perhaps be supplemented by some type of message board or at least regularly-updated FAQ section. There was also support for the production of some printed literature to publicise the network, and perhaps also regular circulation of an e-bulletin.

The event ended with the postgraduate participants breaking back into their subject-groups for a networking session in which some practical plans could be made. This was chaired by Richard Williams of the University of Durham for Classics, Karina Croucher of the University of Liverpool for Archaeology, and Elaine Fulton of the University of Birmingham for History. Those who attended the History meeting are listed on appendix iv.

Results

Clearly, there is a great deal to do in order to improve the development opportunities for postgraduates. Yet there are also many positive signs. Elements of support are already available through such bodies as diverse as the History Lab and UK Grad, and the excellent level of participation by the postgraduates themselves in this conference alone testifies to their insight and enthusiasm. What has particularly emerged from this conference, however, is the need for one body to act as a conduit for all of the postgraduate initiatives and issues that require support. It is also apparent that greatest benefit would come from a discipline-specific body that can offer advice directed specifically at postgraduates in History. The History Subject Centre therefore has an obvious and important role to play. Their recent appointment of a National Postgraduate Co-Ordinator (Elaine Fulton, University of Birmingham) means that there will be one person who can act as this crucial link between the Subject Centre and Postgraduates and Postdocs in History.

Though it may later be subject to some refinements, for now the role of the National Postgraduate Co-Ordinator will be as follows:

1. Representing the needs of history postgraduates at all levels of the disciplinary community: departmental, regional and national. As such, the role of the national co-ordinator is one that will be primarily responsive to postgraduate concerns and initiatives whilst also anticipating need and instigating developments where possible.
2. Introducing issues to postgraduates in which the Subject Centre and profession is particularly involved at present, including widening participation, transition to university, student progression and retention, employability, and e-learning. This will include encouraging the participation of postgraduates and postdocs in History Subject Centre Regional Network activities.
3. Encouraging greater departmental engagement with and provision for the needs of their postgraduates. This is to be achieved in part through the promotion of a Postgraduate Charter, and through the creation where appropriate of a postgraduate 'work shadowing' system either within departments or between departments in different types of HE institution.
4. Enhancing current opportunities for postgraduate and postdoctoral training in the research and teaching of History. This will include the promotion of current pedagogical theory and practice relevant to the teaching and learning of History; the creation, provision and signposting of helpful teaching and learning resources; and means whereby postgraduate teaching proficiency can receive greater recognition. It will also include practical advice on research and finding the balance and relationship between research and teaching. A survey into existing postgraduate training provision may also be conducted. At a later date aspects of this may develop into a more formal 'Preparing Future Faculty' programme.
5. Assisting with postgraduate and postdoctoral career planning and development, including the creation of academic cvs, dealing with interviews for academic posts, conference participation and publication of research. This will also include enhancing postgraduate awareness of the key issues faced by academics (eg. RAE, QAA, data protection, employment law), and of the range of job opportunities beyond an academic career.
6. Acting as a clear and comprehensive medium of communication between History postgraduates and any agencies and resources that could benefit their development. It will draw particular attention to job vacancies for PGAs, and try to offer information on the international academic community of historians. This will be

primarily achieved through the development and maintenance of a Subject Centre-linked website, though email and some printed materials will also be employed.

Obviously, this is a job for more than one person. The National Postgraduate Co-Ordinator will direct initiatives, but will meet further will all interested postgraduates and postdocs on 15 June 2006 at the University of Birmingham to form a committee. This will be a relatively large body of approximately 14-16 postgraduates and postdocs who will work in smaller teams on such aspects of the initiative as resource gathering and creation; research (eg collating email addresses of all History postgraduates in the UK, perhaps doing a survey of existing provision for postgraduate training in the UK); communication (eg advertising; website presentation, content and upkeep); and events (eg. postgraduate-only events; postgraduate and postdoc involvement in larger events such as Regional Network meetings and the annual History in HE conference). Aside from the fact that such a high level of postgraduate involvement will give this previously much-overlooked group a fresh voice at last, involvement in the committee will give members something valuable to add to their cvs. By having a large committee, no one member should ever feel so overwhelmed by work that their own research will suffer.

There will be two equally pressing needs after the committee has been elected. One of these will be to create a website along the lines discussed at the conference. The second will be to begin work on creating the wider body of the National Postgraduate and Postdoctoral History Network. The seeds for this were sown at the Oxford conference, but a membership in the hundreds is anticipated (and ideally, every History postgraduate and postdoc in the UK). To do this, work will be done over the summer to access relevant postgraduate email addresses and produce printed posters and or flyers to advertise the new network. This should be ready for release by mid-September 2006 and the start of a new academic year. Some funding has already been set aside by the Subject Centre for all of these activities. An annual report will also be produced.

Elaine Fulton

18.5.06

Appendix I: Preparing Future Faculty Discussion Groups, 11 April 2006

<p>History Postgraduate Group (<i>Old Library</i>) Elaine Fulton (<i>Birmingham</i>) Matthew Anderson (<i>Birmingham</i>) Kate Bradley (<i>IHR</i>) Antonio Cartalano (<i>Roehampton</i>) Anna French (<i>Birmingham</i>) Helen Glew (<i>IHR</i>) Drew Grey (<i>Northampton</i>) Catherine Haddon (<i>Queen Mary</i>) Katharine Lim (<i>Oxford</i>) Eleanor Love (<i>York</i>) Anne Manuel (<i>Bristol</i>) Joseph Maslen (<i>Manchester</i>) Kieran McGovern (<i>Birmingham</i>) Richard McKay (<i>Oxford</i>) Kayleigh Milden (<i>Exeter</i>) Henry Miller (<i>Queen Mary</i>) Katrina Navickas (<i>Oxford</i>) Mary Partridge (<i>Birmingham</i>) Lee Tattershall (<i>Queen Mary</i>) Rachael Vorberg-Rugh (<i>Oxford</i>) Louise Wannell (<i>York</i>) Emma Watson (<i>York</i>)</p>	<p>Archaeology Group (<i>Talbot Seminar 2</i>) Richard Thomas (<i>Leicester</i>) Margherita Carucci (<i>Nottingham</i>) Hannah Cobb (<i>Manchester</i>) Karina Croucher (<i>Liverpool</i>) James Morris (<i>Bournemouth</i>) Naomi Riddiford (<i>Royal Holloway</i>) Anthony Sinclair (<i>Liverpool</i>) Kate Welham (<i>Bournemouth</i>) Amanda Wintcher (<i>Durham</i>)</p> <p>Classics Group (<i>Talbot Seminar 1</i>) Richard Williams (<i>Durham</i>) Christopher Rowe (<i>Durham</i>) ADDITIONAL NAMES TO BE INCLUDED</p>	<p>History Group One (<i>Toynbee JCR</i>) Kate Day (<i>Edinburgh</i>) Roberta Anderson (<i>Bath Spa</i>) Graham Black (<i>Nottingham Trent</i>) Alasdair Blair (<i>Coventry</i>) Alan E. Booth (<i>Exeter</i>) Sean Brawley (<i>New South Wales</i>) David Clayton (<i>York</i>) Derek Harding (<i>Teesside</i>) Roger Lloyd-Jones (<i>Sheffield Hallam</i>) Gary Mills (<i>Nottingham</i>) Jonathan Pearson (<i>Durham</i>) Noelle Plack (<i>Newman College</i>) Stephanie Spencer (<i>Winchester</i>) Alice Walters (<i>Murray State</i>) Tony Webster (<i>Edge Hill</i>)</p>
<p>History Group Two</p>	<p>History Group Three</p>	

<p>(Committee Room) Joanna Innes (Oxford) Charles Anderson <i>(Edinburgh)</i></p> <p>Jim Beach <i>(Northampton)</i></p> <p>Diane Drummond <i>(Leeds Trinity)</i></p> <p>Eric Evans <i>(Lancaster)</i></p> <p>John Graham <i>(Waikato)</i></p> <p>Richard Hawkins <i>(Wolverhampton)</i></p> <p>Paul Hyland <i>(Bath Spa)</i></p> <p>Natalie Mears <i>(Durham)</i></p> <p>Kirsty Murray <i>(Edinburgh)</i></p> <p>Steve Poole <i>(UWE)</i></p> <p>Mark Schneider <i>(Virginia Tech)</i></p> <p>Bengt Schüllerqvist <i>(Gävle)</i></p> <p>Silvia Sovic <i>(SAS, London)</i></p>	<p>(Deneke Common Room) Colin Brooks(Glasgow) <i>Alan Booth (Nottingham)</i> Jo Fox <i>(Durham)</i></p> <p>Jeanine Graham <i>(Waikato)</i></p> <p>Drew Gray <i>(Northampton)</i></p> <p>Stephen Ickringill <i>(Ulster)</i></p> <p>Camilla Leach <i>(Winchester)</i></p> <p>Cary Macmahon <i>(Glasgow)</i></p> <p>Ian Phillips <i>(Edge Hill)</i></p> <p>Jim Oberly <i>(Wisconsin)</i></p> <p>Graham Rogers <i>(Edge Hill)</i></p> <p>Phil Sheldrick <i>(Australian National)</i></p> <p>Geoff Timmins <i>(Central Lancashire)</i></p> <p>Alison Twells <i>(Sheffield Hallam)</i></p> <p>Keith Trigwell <i>(Oxford)</i></p>	<p>History Group Four (Talbot Hall) Andrew Foster (Chichester) Ronald Barr <i>(Chester)</i> Sonja Cameron <i>(Glasgow)</i></p> <p>Louise Curth <i>(Bath Spa)</i></p> <p>Jayne Gifford <i>(UWE)</i></p> <p>Sylvia Hilton <i>(Complutense de Madrid)</i></p> <p>Jane Longmore <i>(Greenwich)</i></p> <p>Carole Mallia <i>(Nottingham)</i></p> <p>David Nicholls <i>(Manchester Metropolitan)</i></p> <p>David Pace <i>(Indiana)</i></p> <p>Stuart Rawnsley <i>(Leeds Metropolitan)</i></p> <p>Jose Sanmartin <i>(Alicante)</i></p> <p>Claire Taylor <i>(Nottingham)</i></p> <p>Katharine Watson <i>(Birmingham)</i></p> <p>James Wisdom <i>(London)</i></p>
---	---	--

Appendix ii: A Personal Perspective on the PFF day

I've got to be honest, I was completely unaware of the higher education academy and the associated Subject Centers, as I got up in the early hours for the drive to Oxford. At the forefront of my mind was food; having experienced other Oxford conferences, I was looking forward to a nice spread which would beat the normal budget food PhD students have to live on. The day though did sound intriguing, 'preparing future faculty'. As with most PhD students I tend to be so engrossed in my topic, the thought 'what are you going to do afterwards' is normally only raised by inquisitive family and friends.

The day was kicked off by David Pace from Indiana University. He discussed the 'preparing future faculty program' (PFF) which had been developed at Indiana University. The program was split into two main sections, research and teaching. The research aspect consisted of workshops and courses concerning all aspects of research such as methodologies, grant writing and publishing. The teaching aspect of the program was wide ranging. It included an introduction to pedagogic material, and workshops on different aspects of teaching, from planning a course to teaching in a religious college.

As the talk progressed it became apparent that this conference was much more relevant than I first realised. Although many of the research aspects of the program David was discussing were covered by similar courses at my own university, the training giving in teaching was at a completely different level. The next paper by Keith Trigwell from the

Centre for Excellence in Preparing for Academic Practice at the University of Oxford emphasised this thought further.

Keith explained that the centre was set up to support the quest for excellence in learning, teaching, and research at the University. This is achieved through a number of methods but primarily a 4 stage development process. Stage 1 (preparation for learning and teaching at Oxford) and stage 2 (development and teaching) are for graduate students and contract research staff with little teaching experience. The next two stages are for new academic staff; stage 3 (Developing Academic Practice at Oxford) and stage 4 (Postgraduate Diploma in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education). Currently, graduate students do not do stages 3 and 4, but might do so in the future. New members of academic staff are also given a mentor to help with their teaching.

Both opening papers emphasised that graduate students are leaving their universities not only with a PhD, but with a good level of knowledge and training in teaching their chosen subjects. Both also indicated that postgraduates with this level of training and experience in teaching, were finding it easier to find work after their PhDs, something I myself will have to be thinking about soon. Their papers made me realise that I not only required good research credentials if I wished to progress into an academic career, but I also required teaching experience and pedagogical knowledge.

After these well presented and thoughtful papers, the delegates split off into discussion groups for archaeology, history and classics. They were charged with discussing two main points:

- What would help postgraduate students in preparing for (and in the early years of) an academic career?
- To what extent does help, training and support need to be discipline-based?

Each group then reported back to the main body of the delegates after the lunch break. It is during these discussions that I realized how wide and varied postgraduate training was. Some received no training at all. Many delegates received research training in some form, but many received little or no training in teaching. A few got to take courses such as those discussed at the beginning. I was also struck that the wide variety applied to all institutions, whether FE colleges or traditional red brick universities. It was also of great relief to meet and hear from a number of postgraduate students and find they were having similar or worse problems regarding training.

The main comments received back from the discussion groups revolved around the first question posed. The suggestions given back were (and this is not an exhaustive list):

- Experience and training in teaching is of great importance (including, if possible, teaching in different institutions)
- Experience and training in developing a syllabus
- Training and experience of assessment setting and marking
- Experience in the organization of conferences which will help develop management skills
- Experience giving papers and involvement with the larger academic community

- The development of the Subject Centre web site as a resource for new academics, with reading lists, examples of syllabi, essay questions and advice from those who have gone through the process.

The second question, was in some ways harder to answer. The general consensus was that some training did require to be subject specific, and some didn't. For example, training in how to give a lecture, hold attention and deal with unruly students is not subject specific. But it was felt that other aspects of training such as syllabus development did require a subject specific approach.

From the group reports, four main themes developed:

- Careers
- Content and nature of PFF (preparing future faculty)
- Communications
- Departmental engagement

These four themes formed the discussion topics of the afternoon focus groups. The session I attended was a very lively and useful debate on departmental engagement, with a nice mix of post-graduate students, young lecturers and more experienced academics.

The first thing we discussed was that the real role of an academic involves administration, and not just teaching but the organization of syllabi, conferences, open days, setting and marking exams. But postgraduate students are often not integrated and the teaching they do is often ad hoc, with postgraduate students used when staff are ill/on leave/don't like the subject etc. They also often only teach their specialist subjects, where as academics are often required to teach outside their field of expertise.

Shadowing was discussed as a method to better integrate postgraduate students into the department and to give experience of academic administration. The idea quickly moved on from shadowing an individual for a period of time (which I could see causing great annoyance to some academics) to shadowing a task, such as setting the syllabus and associated assessment to the end marking. Some concerns were raised about the suitability of some students to teach, which is why we felt training and familiarity with pedagogic literature should be a requirement before postgraduate students could engage with teaching. Again the variation between different institutions was striking.

After a tea break (with very nice biscuits) the delegates reconvened to hear the findings of the focus groups. As the day was concerned with training future academics, the reports were given by postgraduate students who had attended the focus groups, myself included.

The comments received from the focus groups were wide ranging, all indicated that more structure is required in how postgraduates are trained and what they are trained in. The key points raised (in no particular order) by the focus groups were:

- A postgraduate charter would help define what training is required by postgraduates
- Shadowing tasks could help develop postgraduate students as academics and give them valuable experience
- A culture change is required within universities so that postgraduate students are not just used ad hoc for teaching and get more teaching opportunities
- Training in publication
- Forums for postgraduate communities to communicate

Teaching was a big issue with many postgraduates, especially those from red brick universities who were bereft of teaching opportunities. Some academics present indicated that teaching experience and knowledge is often a deciding factor when hiring new academic staff. This started a general debate concerning teaching and marking.

The point was raised whether postgraduates should be teaching first year undergraduates, as it could be argued that an experienced academic is required to develop the students as learners and enthuse them. This was not widely agreed upon and debated for some time, some argued that postgraduates, being closer in age to undergraduates can relate to them more easily, and a number of delegates raised the point that postgraduates get very good comments back from undergraduates concerning their teaching. Some academics also expressed concern regarding postgraduates helping with marking, with one lady commenting she will never use a postgraduate because to follow her marking requirements required great experience. This seemed to me ironic, as we were asking for marking experience to help us develop as academics, but she was suggesting we couldn't help with marking as we didn't have enough experience!

Unfortunately, the discussion ran out of time. At this point the postgraduate students participated in postgraduate networking within their individual disciplines and planned future activities with the subject centre staff. Within the combined archaeology and classics discussion we raised a number of points. The subject centre could build on its current web site, by having links to jobs, but also having bibliographies of different career paths by individuals who have 'been there done that'. The subject centre could also organize, or aid in organizing, a careers day for postgraduates. One aspect that all were agreed upon is that meeting other postgraduates is of great benefit. To this end the archaeology section of the subject discussed holding 'TAGon', with the subject center holding an event for postgraduates, regarding PFF, at the first day of the annual TAG (Theoretical Archaeology Group) conference.

All too soon the discussion had to draw to a close as the day was nearly over. I hadn't known what to expect from the day and I am mildly ashamed to say, I was surprised that I enjoyed it as much as I did. It was great to meet a wide variety of postgraduate students and to discuss the problems we all face. At my institution we are now working on implementing some of the ideas raised throughout the day. I had started the day knowing I wish to be an academic in the future, but now I know what tools I need to help achieve that goal.

There was a very good spread at lunch as well.

James Morris (2nd year PhD student), Bournemouth University

Appendix iii: Sample Charter



Entitlement Charter for Postgraduate/part-time staff teaching for the University of Chichester

Postgraduates routinely teach for the University of Chichester as a way of earning money, helping staff, gaining experience and fulfilling bursary requirements. We are governed by codes of practice that should ensure that if you were asked to teach for the University, you would be properly trained, not overworked, and suitably rewarded! What follows is therefore a statement of your entitlement in this regard, should you be asked to teach for the University.

- You will be inducted carefully into what is expected of you at departmental/subject level to ensure that guidance is as precise as possible;
- You will be offered the chance to undertake training through the university's approved teacher-training course for those new to HE – and this will be free;
- You will be offered opportunities to undertake any other staff development courses that strike you as appropriate, either for the best pursuit of your research, or for learning more about teaching and HE – this will include an invitation to the annual all-staff conference on Learning & Teaching;
- You will be entitled – as members of staff – to attend staff development courses mounted by the University of Southampton, which accredits this university for work with research degree students;
- You will be encouraged to reflect on these learning opportunities in your Personal Development Plan and to discuss career choices with your supervisors and others;
- You will not be expected to mark material or take full responsibility for a course unless you have been thoroughly trained to do so;
- You will be regarded as a full member of the staff team and as such will be invited to attend staff away days and staff meetings;

- You will be entitled to attend all programme boards at which matters relating to the courses on which you work might be discussed;
- You will be offered the support of an experienced mentor to whom you may go for advice about your teaching - totally separate from your research supervision – you should seek the advice of those staff who have been specifically promoted for Learning & Teaching;
- You will not be expected to teach for more than 6 hours a week (in accordance with the Code of Practice) unless by agreement with your supervisor because the teaching comes in short intensive bursts;
- You will be eligible to apply for financial support to attend staff development courses in relation to teaching, just as much as you should be able to apply for funds to support research expenses.

For further advice on any matter mentioned above, please contact the Director of Research, Dr Andrew Foster, the Research Office, or Phil Verrill, Head of the Centre for Learning & Teaching at the University of Chichester. Your advice on other matters you think should be included in the above charter would be most welcome.

April 2005 (revised April 2006)

Appendix iv: 'Founder Members' of National Postgraduate and Postdoctoral History Network

Matthew Anderson, University of Birmingham

Kate Bradley, IHR

Antonio Cartalano, Roehampton

Anna French, University of Birmingham

Jayne Gifford, University of West of England

Helen Glew, IHR

Drew Gray, University of Northampton

Katherine Lim, University of Oxford

Eleanor Love, University of York

Anne Manuel, University of Bristol

Joseph Maslen, University of Manchester

Kieran McGovern, University of Birmingham

Richard McKay, University of Oxford

Kayleigh Milden, University of Exeter

Henry Miller, Queen Mary

Mary Partridge, University of Birmingham

Louise Wannell, University of York

Emma Watson, University of York