

SAMPLE SCHOLARLY ADVISORY BRIEF

DisserIQ Illustrative Sample Brief: Dissertation Committee Revision Strategy

ILLUSTRATIVE EXCERPT · NOT A CLIENT DELIVERABLE · DOCTORAL ADVISORY

What this sample demonstrates

[This fabricated example shows how a committee-feedback strategy can convert a dense set of comments into an intelligible revision path without displacing the scholar's judgment. It models interpretation, methodological reasoning, and practical sequencing for a doctoral researcher deciding what to address first and what requires clarification. The brief is instructional rather than evaluative. Its purpose is to make revision work deliberate, traceable, and manageable.]

Illustrative scholarly situation

[This scenario is fictional. A doctoral scholar has submitted a proposal for a qualitative study of how first-generation graduate students describe their use of peer mentoring during the first year. The feedback includes margin comments, meeting notes, and an email summary. Several comments ask the scholar to distinguish the practical concern from the research problem. Others ask how the stated phenomenological approach fits a question that asks about both experience and program effectiveness. A further note requests clearer participant boundaries and a defined role for the conceptual framework.]

[At first glance, the comments seem separate. In fact, they converge on a small number of foundational decisions. The feedback does not answer those decisions for the scholar. It identifies where rationale, question framing, approach, and study boundaries need reconsideration together.]

Diagnostic observations

Observation 1: Problem-to-purpose compression.

The practical value of peer mentoring is described more fully than the scholarly uncertainty the study will address. Methodologically, this matters because the purpose should follow an identifiable knowledge need, not the program's desirability. The scholar needs to decide what remains uncertain about participants' lived experience and why that uncertainty warrants inquiry.

Observation 2: Question-method tension.

The current question combines a phenomenological interest in meaning with an effectiveness-oriented term. This matters because phenomenology attends to how participants experience a phenomenon, while an effectiveness claim invokes a different evidentiary frame. The scholar should determine which inquiry is primary before revisiting the approach, rationale, and terminology.

Observation 3: Boundary ambiguity.

The draft refers variously to new graduate students, first-generation graduate students, and peer-mentoring participants without establishing which group defines the study. This is methodologically significant because participant boundaries shape the inquiry's relevance, the logic of selection, and the limits of the eventual discussion.

Observation 4: Framework role is under-specified.

The framework appears in the background but is not visibly connected to the question or interpretation of the phenomenon. Its methodological significance lies in coherence: the scholar should explain whether the framework sensitizes the inquiry, guides attention to particular dimensions of experience, or serves another defined role.

DISSERIQ / SCHOLAR-OWNED REVISION PATH

A disciplined next step, not a substitute for scholarship.

Revision pathway

Scholar-owned next step

1. **Make the foundational inquiry decision.** The scholar distinguishes the knowledge need from the program context and chooses whether the central inquiry concerns lived experience or another scholarly question. This decision anchors the revision path.
2. **Test downstream coherence.** With that decision stated, the scholar checks the purpose, central question, approach, framework role, and participant boundaries against it. Any element requiring different evidence or making a broader claim becomes a focused decision or clarification point for the committee.
3. **Document and sequence the response.** The scholar groups revision decisions beneath the foundational choices, records the rationale for each, and prepares concise notes showing how each documented comment was addressed.

Questions for the scholar

- 01 What precise scholarly uncertainty will the study address, apart from the value of peer mentoring as a practice?
- 02 Does the central question ask participants to describe an experience, judge an effect, or attempt both, and what does that choice require of the approach?
- 03 Which participant boundary is essential to the study's purpose, and which labels should therefore remain consistent across the relevant sections?

Academic-integrity boundary

This fictional brief illustrates developmental academic advisory support. The scholar remains the author and decision-maker for every research judgment, revision, claim, and communication. DisserIQ's role is to provide structured interpretation, methodology-aware questions, and planning tools that help the scholar work independently and prepare for informed discussion with the committee.

Engagement snapshot

Offer: Dissertation Committee Revision Strategy, \$ 395, delivered in 4 business days after complete materials are received. Example deliverables include:

1. **Committee Feedback Deconstruction Matrix** that groups documented comments by issue type, location, and required decision.
2. **Revision Priority Map** that separates foundational alignment work from local clarification, evidence, or presentation tasks.
3. **Scholar-Owned Revision Action Plan** that sequences decisions, dependencies, and checkpoints for the scholar's revision process.
4. **Committee Response Planning Notes** that prompt accurate, professional documentation of how the scholar addressed feedback.

READY FOR A FOCUSED, ETHICAL DOCTORAL ADVISORY CONVERSATION?

Visit praxisiqgroup.com/disseriq to take the research readiness assessment or schedule a consultation.