Introduction

As a JCU academic staff member or adjunct you can undertake the role of Chair or Independent Academic if you are registered as a JCU Advisor* (Note: Advisor Mentors and Primary advisors can be Chairs and Independent Academics; Secondary advisors with limited supervisory experience can be Independent Academics) and have viewed a short professional development video. Once you have viewed the video email s.gasson@jcu.edu.au to confirm you have viewed the video and raise any questions. We will then email to confirm your new status has been recorded on the HDR Advisor database.

Coordinator HDR Advisor Development (susan.g

or

grs@jcu.edu.au)

Contained in this document:

1. Introduction
2. Appendix One – HDR Supervision Procedure extract defining the requirements of Independent Academic and Candidature Committee
3. Appendix Two – HDR Milestone and reporting procedure extract confirming role of Independent Academic and Candidature Committee at each milestone.
4. Appendix Three – Optional reading

* The application for advisor registration, procedure and requirements can be found here

Candidature Committee:

Pre-Completion Milestone

4.11

Candidature Committee:

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 provided by super- visors and examiners. After presenting the results of this study, we reflect on how our research into supervisor and examiner feedback has shaped our current practice as supervisors and examiners of HDR students.

Theoretical background

Goals of, and roles in, doctoral education

An expected

Candidature Committee:

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 (t)-10.3 (a)1ID 5 BDC -0.00bu dav oo0.006 Tc -0.042 Tw -30.8 (r)5.7 (s ()-16.5thi f0I3.5 (e)21.8

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; it more properly belongs tosection 5 of Chapter two.* • *This section is not mentioned in your overview.*
	content	• *More discussion is needed about the validity, limitations andaffordances of a case study approach to rercuf*

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 =

Table 3. Distribution of Vera's feedback on draft 1 according to speech functions (raw scoresand percentage).

Function	In-text feedback (N = 191)	Overall feedback (N = 98)
referential	91 = 47.7%	39 = 39.8%
directive	65 = 34%	15 = 15.3%
expressive	35 = 18.3%	44 = 44.9%

Table 4. Distribution of Vera's feedback on draft 2 according to speech functions (raw scoresand percentage).

Function	In-text feedback 2 (N = 192)	Overall feedback 2 (N = 59)
referential	124 = 64.6%	17 = 28.8%
directive	32 = 16.7%	12 = 20.3%
expressive	36 = 18.7%	30 = 50.8%

Table 5. Distribution of E3's feedback according to speech functions and subcategories (rawscores and percentage).

Function	Overall feedback (N = 61)	
referential	21 = 34.4%	
		Raw scores
	editorial	2
	organisation	1
	content	18
directive	14 = 23%	
		Raw scores
	suggestion	5
	question	5
	instruction	4
expressive	26 = 42.7%	
		Raw scores
	praise	

In the following, we first present the supervisee's (Vijay Kumar) reflection on hisexperience of the feedback received and the impact it has had on his current practice. Subsequently, we also show how one supervisor's (Elke Stracke) reflection hasshaped her own practice through critical analysis and subsequent adaptation.

Reflection by supervisee (Vijay Kumar)

Self-reflection shows that expressive feedback (praise, criticism, opinion) played a major role in Vijay's SRL process; so much so that it continues to influence his current practices as an academic.

Praise

Vijay felt that the large amount of expressive feedback (praise) provided by the supervisors and examiners meant that he had gained membership into an academic community. To him, the supervisors' use of praise indicated that he was slowly becoming an effective writer. Moreover, such comments from his supervisors provided a sense of security to him: 'The draft is a considerable improvement onthe last one. I am pleased to see that you have very successfully addressed mostof the concerns.' The supervisors' use of praise provided him with the confidence during his developmental stage as an academic towards gaining membership into a scholarly community. Vijay also felt that his own peers in the doctoral journey(his supervisors) had been successful in scaffolding him into a community of practice.

On the other hand, Vijay viewed the examiners' use of praise as summative judgement that indicated that he had become an expert in his specialised field of research. He felt that external experts in his area had opened the gates for him to be a peer. Among the praise which strongly motivated Vijay was: 'The results of the study are

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. *d7 e 6*