

## Alternative Evaluation Strategies

Alternative	Pros e.g.	Cons e.g.
<b>1. Awards</b>		
Postgraduate Student Association or University awards for supervision (where the supervisor is nominated by students/peers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opinions of the 'consumers'</li> <li>More-or-less uninfluenced by formal processes</li> <li>Confidentiality protected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process used may be erratic and inconsistent depending on how nominations are made</li> <li>Good supervisors with few students or students unaware of the opportunity to nominate may not be recognised.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Testimonials</b>		
From current/past students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opinions of the 'consumers'</li> <li>More-or-less uninfluenced by formal processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Testimonials might not be regarded as reliable as they can be seen to be open to explicit or implicit pressure from supervisors</li> </ul>
<b>3. Focus groups</b>		
Conducted by an independent group e.g. the Learning and Teaching Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reliable in skilled hands when the students are confident that the person involved can be trusted not to write or say anything which might disturb the working relationship with the supervisor</li> <li>May be useful in remedying problems which are discovered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More time consuming to set up than a simple questionnaire</li> <li>Finding a suitable facilitator could overload those with the skills</li> </ul>
<b>4. Peer evaluation</b>		
Inviting a peer to conduct a focus group with your candidates and then, with their agreement, report to you major strengths and areas of concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity for collegial interaction</li> <li>Confidentiality can be protected if handled carefully with candidates</li> <li>Supervisors can sometimes get the 'real' picture if the colleague is skilled at talking with students and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More work than simple questionnaires</li> <li>Must be set up carefully so all parties understand exactly what each peer is to evaluate</li> </ul>
<b>5. Metrics</b>		
Number of publications, progression times and completion rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appears to be objective</li> <li>Easy to determine and report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some supervisors, because of their 'style', can end up with candidates who have difficulties elsewhere hence their 'record' might look 'worse' than someone who has been unable to supervise such students</li> <li>Some disciplines and topics lend themselves more easily to publication during candidature</li> </ul>