Introduction

As a

Appendix One - HDR Supervision Procedure extract defining the requirements of Independent Academic and Candidature Committee

Chair of
Candidature

Candidature Committee: Chair

Candidature Committee	A Candidature Committee is constituted to monitor the progress of an individual HDR candidate.
	A Doctoral Candidature Committee includes a Chair, Independent Academic and the Advisory Panel. At least one of the Chair and Independent Academic will have relevant expertise.
	A Masters of Philosophy (MPhil) Candidature Committee does not require an Independent Academic.
	A Candidature Committee is normally appointed in preparation for the Confirmation of Candidature Milestone and is appointed for the duration of candidature.

Candidature Committee: Chair

5.2 Chairs of Candidature Committees and Independent Academics must undertake appropriate professional development to be eligible to hold the status on the JCU Register of Advisors.

Appendix Two - HDR Milestone and Reporting Procedure extracts detailing Committee role at Confirmation, Mid-Candidature and Pre-Completion milestones

Confirmation

2.13 The Candidature Committee must meet to complete COC-Assessment Form and advise the candidate of the recommendation of the Confirmation of Candidature Milestone. The decision about the recommendation of the process will be made by the Chair of the Candidature Committee and, in the case of doctoral candidates, the Independent Academic. The Advisors and the candidate should not be present when this decision is made. The signatures of the candidate and the Advisors must be obtained subsequent to the decision having been explained to them, in acknowledgement that they have been advised of the recommendation. The Candidature Committee may recommend that the Confirmation of Candidature milestone be passed or failed. Not passing one or both of (RD7001/RM7001)and (RD7002/RM7002) constitutes a fail.

Mid-Candidature Review

3.8 One week before this meeting, the candidate must provide each member of their Candidature Committee with materials from clause 3.5.

3.9 If the candidate is delivering an oral presentation to the Candidature Committee, this presentation must be delivered in person or by live-feed and

Pre-Completion Milestone

4.11 One week before the seminar, the candidate must provide each member of their Candidature Committee with

Appendix Three - Reading for reference

Feedback **and** self-regula

an argument that one of the main goals of doctoral education is to enable SRL. We then provide a brief synthesis of literature on SRL, show how key features of SRL are linked to the aims of doctoral education, and emphasise the role of feedback at the heart of the supervisee's learning process. Next, we provide insights as to how we conducted a pragmatic analysis of written feedback pr (n)23.9 ((t)6.1 (ee)]TJ0 Tc 0 Tw (:)Tj11.537 0 Td( )Tj-0.002 Tc 0.002 Tw 0.2

transferability. SRL is an ongoing process; thus, self-regulated learners are moving, not standing or static. Boekaerts (1999) emphasises C2acw 21.524 0 Td(-)Tj-(-)Tj-()14 ( )2acw 21.52s30esse (o)2

had on our professional practice as supervisors and examiners of HDR students.

Methodology

Data collection and management

After gaining ethical approval for this project, we sought consent from the three supervisors and three examiners who commented on the thesis under investigation. The data for this study were eventually procured from two sources. The first source of data was from two supervisors, Vera and Jack (both pseudonyms),[1] in the form of in- text written feedback as well as overall feedback on three full drafts of a doctoral thesis. The in-text feedback consists of all comments written by one supervisor (Vera) in the text, mostly in the margin of the draft. This feedback can best be described as the supervisor's spontaneous thoughts, expressed as if she were having a dialogue with the supervisee. As the in-text feedback was completely transcribed, it yielded a comprehensive list of the supervisor's comments. The overall feedback is a letter-like text, in which the supervisors summarised their main concerns and offered more general feedback on the complete draft as well as on the individual chapters. The overall feedback was already available in electronic format. Due to the self- investigative nature of this paper, the researchers' reflections added to the analysis of the data available.

Besides the data from the supervisors (and self-reflection by the researchers), examiner reports constituted the second main source of data. In the university where this study was conducted (located in New Zealand), the supervisee was given the full version of all examiner reports. The examiners' reports, comprising reports from an international examiner (E1), a domestic examiner (E2) and a departmental examiner (E3), were transcribed word for word.

Table 1. Examples from supervisors' and examiners' feedback.

Main function	Subcategory	Examples
referential	editorial	• *p.22, mid-page, add 's' to 'cognitive tack'* • *use italics consistently*
	organisation	• *The brief comparison with inner circle native speakers strategies seems premature here; …*

In the next section, we provide a brief overview of the distribution of the speech functions in the data, followed by a discussion of the relationship between the supervisors' and examiners' comments based on their speech function(s) and the subsequent revisions by the supervisee.

Findings

If one first examines the distribution of feedback given with regard to the three main functions of speech, the dominance of referential feedback is evident. With one exception (E3), referential comments providing information rank first, followed by expressives, and then directives. Table 2 provides the raw figures and percentages for feedback from both supervisors and examiners.

As a second step, we looked at possible differences between the in-text feedback and overall feedback for drafts 1 and 2 provided by Vera. The analysis of draft 2 confirmed our earlier finding for draft 1 (Kumar & Stracke, 2007, p. 465), namely that the expressive function comes first in the overall feedback (draft 1: 44.9%; draft 2: 50.8%), as we can see in Tables 3 and 4.

TTeTc57-0.0213rTTTiin TTein TeiW66 (h)2.2 (en)26 (a)0.8 (n)26 (a)4aiehioa4]TJ Tw 6.6Tjpea4]1 wo17(

Table 2. Distribution of feedback according to speech functions (raw scores and percentage).

Function	Vera draft 1 (N = 289)	Vera draft 2 (N = 251)	Vera draft 3 (N = 191)	Jack draft 1 (N = 120)	Jack draft 2 (N = 61)	Examiner 1 (N = 55)	Examiner 2 (N = 171)	Examiner 3 (N =

Criticism

The supervisors and examiners were also critical towards Vijay's drafts.[2] Some of the critical comments are as follows: 'At no point, however, are comparisons or contrasts made between writing strategies. Your writing here is not (yet) as smooth as in the other parts'. One form of criticism was usually supported by suggestions to revise. 'The candidate has shown the ability to exercise critical and analytical judgment of the literature ... it is considered that a wider awareness of the literature relating to alterative theoretical perspectives should have been demonstrated.' Vijay welcomed these types of criticisms as they provided a clear sense of direction. While Vijay accepted the drawbacks of some aspects of his work, he was comfortable receiving guidance and advice from his supervisors and external experts in the field. He felt that the comments made were justifiable, since he was always provided a justification for his work and an alternative perspective by which to view it. This showed that, in terms of SRL, he had demonstrated a professional attitude when handling negative comments.

Besides providing critical comments and offering suggestions, there was also overt criticism. Initially he was devastated by these highly critical comments. Clearly there were methodological differences in the responses of examiners. One might be critical and another complimentary and comments like: 'This is reflected in the thesis failing to demonstrate the candidate's ability to exercise critical and analytical judgment of the literature ...', '... the thesis does not sufficiently explore, let alone discuss ...' or 'In this respect, the thesis does not seem to have much to contribute to the field' served to de-motivate the supervisee.

However, this was his initial reaction. This inconsistency in the examination reports proved to be the most rewarding experience for him. Even though he was de-motivated, upon reflection he found these comments the most challenging in his SRL processes. As suggested by Butler and Winne (1995), part of the SRL process involves setting goals for upgrading knowledge. Vijay, who viewed revision as a process of discovery, took negative criticisms as a challenge and an opportunity to discover new meanings in his thesis. By revising sections of the thesis, he was able to enhance his knowledge while strengthening his understanding of the qualitative research pertinent in his field. During this process of monitoring and adjusting his initial goals of strengthening his thesis, he was highly motivated. Attending to negative criticism provided a new and challenging perspective that he could incorporate into his thesis. He needed to read more and write more. This led to a juggling of ideas and, in the process, he increased his knowledge and became more competent with the research paradigms of his discipline.

Opinion

The supervisors and examiners provided positive and critical feedback by offering their own opinions. As an example, the supervisors wrote the following on drafts of the supervisee's thesis: 'Somewhat broad, I think, I feel that many of your sentences are not optimally constructed' or 'Assuming that the students were not stimulated to perform to their full potential, who/what is to blame?' The examiners also provided opinions: 'I also appreciated the extensive data and analyses'. Some of these opinions indicated a non-understanding of what the supervisee had written. From such opinions, Vijay deduced that he had provided insufficient information to enable his readers to understand his context; and he subsequently revisited what he had written. However, the opinions also showed an interest and curiosity, which indicated to Vijay that his research would be of value to an academic community. Thus, the opinions expressed by the supervisors and examiners also contributed to the facilitation of his development as an emerging scholar. As a result of these forms of feedback, he reworked the drafts by considering an audience who did not have the contextual information that he had. Those opinions that asked for more information stimulated essential modifications to subsequent drafts. He w214 Td9 -1.214 Td[(i)0.3j-0.pD04 Tc -0.018 Tw 0.214 0]TJ4(b)1 (y)]TJ-0.006 Tc 0.( )23.5 (A)-2.5 (s)12.

Boekaerts, M. (2002). Bringing about change in the classroom: Strengths and weaknesses of the self-regulated learning approach – EARLI Presidential Address, 2001. *Learning and Instruction, 12,* 589–604.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (Eds.) (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning.* London: Kogan Page.

Bourke, S., Hattie, J., & Anderson, J. (2004). Predicting examiner recommendations on Ph.D theses. *International Journal of Educational Research, 41,* 178–194.

Butler, D.L., & Winne, P.H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *d76 e*