

## Final Proposal and Presentation (33%)

Students will give a brief presentation (following up from their flash talk) before writing a research proposal that contains an overview of the relevant literature pertaining to their chosen research topic, as well as proposing research questions, methodology, and discussing potential outcomes and implications of the research. Students are expected to integrate feedback from mid-semester assessments (flash talk and mind map). You are welcome to come to office hours or ask for feedback between the final presentation and the proposal.

**Disclaimer:** If you use ChatGPT (or similar programs) for anything related to this assessment – you must provide an appendix disclosing this that provides any prompts and explanation of what you had it do. We must be able to see which ideas were your own. You are expected to have read all materials you include and reference, and you are responsible for the accuracy of all information.

### Presentation (8%)

Presentations should be brief (~5 minutes, with a maximum of 6 minutes). The goal of this presentation is to give a more concrete pitch of “this is what I am going to do”. We are looking for overall clarity and specificity with respect to your project.

We will be looking for a specific research question and for you to state your proposed methodology in a brief but clear manner that refines your earlier ideas. Your presentation should include a quick acknowledgement of how you used peer feedback to inform this version of your proposed project. Finally, you must discuss what concrete results or outcome you might expect (and what this might mean for the big picture/how they interpret the results).

Slides should be submitted on Canvas before you present. For this presentation, there will be no questions.

Some tips:

- Stating the research question and methods should be no more than 50% of your presentation.
- The research question should be a narrow and concise statement that is testable within the COGS 402 timeframe (or longer if you give a different timeline).

### Proposal (25%)

Proposals will be maximum 8 pages double spaced and in 12-point font. This page limit does not include tables, charts, graphics, or other figures.<sup>1</sup> You will also include a reference list and bibliography, as well as a reflection. The reference list/bibliography and reflection do not count toward page limit.

---

<sup>1</sup> If the text itself is clearly beyond 8 pages by more than a few lines after accounting for any figures/tables, we will stop reading at the point that would be 8 pages and there will be a minor deduction.

All three components should be submitted in a single file in PDF, DOC, or DOCX format.<sup>2</sup> Submissions consisting of URLs will not be accepted for the proposal. *(We must be able to directly download all proposal files from Canvas.)*

Citations and references should be in a standard reference format. *(I strongly prefer APA or MLA, but I will accept whichever citation style is the main choice in your area.)*

### *Proposal (19%)*

Your proposal should include the following:

- Background (in sufficient detail to motivate the RQ/hypothesis)
- Research Q/Hypothesis
- Proposed Methods<sup>3</sup>
- Expected Results/Interpretation of Results
- Brief Description of a Planned or Ideal Lab and/or Supervisor for the Project
- Significance/Contributions

Your proposal should be written in language that is accessible for a non-expert academic, *particularly* in the background section. Proposed lab/supervisor do not have to be one you have talked to or confirmed; we are looking for you to identify a reasonable supervisor/lab at UBC that could be a good match and motivate this choice.

### *Reflection (5%)*

In addition to the proposal, you will include a write-up discussing the feedback you received over the term and how it shaped your final proposal. This will include formal feedback from peers, TA, or instructor. Include (copy-paste) the feedback along with your reflection.

Summarise any big picture feedback (things that have bigger consequences or were recurring themes across feedback). Then, address which feedback you chose to implement (and why), as well as which you chose to set aside.

You do not need to motivate your choice for minor suggestions, but we expect discussion of at least five more substantial suggestions that include discussion of how you used and implemented the feedback or a well-motivated explanation for why you chose to set it aside. *(You must implement/explain at least two substantial suggestions. Do not worry about disagreeing with the person giving the feedback, just ensure you provide a good argument.)*

### *Bibliography (1%)*

In addition to your reference list (works cited in proposal), provide additional references that are not cited in your proposal will support your project. This includes papers that you may eventually need to read and literature related to your topic (e.g., in a competing framework or from a different perspective). You do not need to read everything in this list; we will be evaluating this with respect to titles and how you have

---

<sup>2</sup> If you would like to submit in another file format, please let me know before the due date.

<sup>3</sup> See below (under tips) for an example of the kind of methods and results you may describe if your project is more theory-based.

anticipated what kind of literature may be relevant or important at various stages of the project.

Some Tips for the Proposal:

- All figures that you do not make should have a citation (with a page number if it comes from a paper or book).
- If you use something that generates citations for you (e.g., Google Scholar), make sure that the references are formatted correctly.
- If you are citing something that another person has cited (i.e., not looking at the original source yourself), make sure you use a secondary citation (see your chosen citation style guide for further explanation).
- Page numbers are needed for direct quotes or very specific information taken from a paper (e.g., statistics or very specific claims).
- Feel free to look at my example SSHRC proposal (which Laura discussed in class) to get a sense of how you could structure and frame the background of the proposal for a non-expert academic audience.
  - SSHRC's wording: "Write your proposal in clear, plain language. Avoid discipline-specific jargon, acronyms and highly technical terms when writing your program of work."
- For both the presentation and proposal: If your project is more theoretical (not experimental) – the methods and anticipated outcomes may be different in nature, but you should still have specificity in them. Ask me in office hours if you are unsure.
  - For example: My dissertation is in phonological theory.
    - **Methods:** I use a methodology that involves a survey of the literature on 23 Salish languages using primary fieldwork, archival sources, and published material. I code each type of reduplication across these sources on several dimensions (meaning, position, shape, and form). I then apply and refine a particular set of theoretical assumptions (e.g., Prosodic Morphology, GNLA) to provide detailed case studies of two languages with supplementary follow-up elicitation to test predictions. I then evaluate whether the theoretical framework resulting from my analyses can extend to the remaining of the 23 languages. The scope of your project is obviously smaller than this, but any of these steps could be described in more detail for the proposal to provide adequate specificity in a methodology.
    - **Possible Results:** If my theoretical approach is correct, I expect all observed variation to be along a handful of dimensions including underlying form, constraint ranking, and morpheme-to-strata mapping. If there are types of reduplication that do not fit that, such as those that motivate a segmental template or BRCT approach, this will challenge my proposal that reduplication is fission motivated by a need to repair prosodic structure (*and so on...*)

## Proposal: Rubric

	0-2.25 (range)	2.5-3.5 (range)	3.75-4.5 (range)	4.75-5
<b>Background (5 points)</b>	<p>Relevance of background literature is unclear; background may be confusing, rushed, or incomplete.</p> <p>Only minimal discussion of background literature is present.</p> <p>Background does not clearly identify a gap nor motivate the proposed project.</p>	<p>Relevance of background literature is clear; some discussion may be confusing or misleading.</p> <p>An adequate number of sources are given.</p> <p>Background identifies a <i>broad</i> gap and weakly motivates the proposed project.</p>	<p>Relevance of background literature is clear; ideas are organised and connected.</p> <p>Number of sources meets expectations.</p> <p>Background identifies a gap and sufficiently motivates the proposed project.</p>	<p>Relevance of background literature is very clear; ideas are organised and connected.</p> <p>Number of sources are given meets or exceeds expectations; proposal reflects a good understanding of the literature.</p> <p>Background identifies a gap and strongly motivates the proposed project.</p>

	0.25 (each)	0.5 (each)	0.75 (each)	1 (each)
<b>Research Question/ Hypothesis (3 points)</b>	<p>A. Vague or no research question(s).</p> <p>B. No hypothesis (or appropriate and/or equivalent direction, where applicable).</p> <p>C. Research question and hypothesis not appropriately motivated by background literature.</p>	<p>A. Research question(s) vague – if multiple questions, they may only be loosely linked.</p> <p>B. Vague or no hypothesis (or appropriate and/or equivalent direction, where applicable).</p> <p>C. Research question and hypothesis weakly motivated by background literature.</p>	<p>A. Adequate and specific research question(s) – connections are apparent.</p> <p>B. Appropriate hypothesis (or appropriate and/or equivalent direction, where applicable).</p> <p>C. Research question and hypothesis adequately motivated by background literature.</p>	<p>A. Strong, specific, and clear research question(s) – connections are apparent.</p> <p>B. Clear hypothesis (or appropriate and/or equivalent direction, where applicable).</p> <p>C. Research question and hypothesis are strongly motivated by background literature.</p>

	0.5	1	1.5	2
<b>Methodology (2 point)</b>	Methodology does not seem to match proposed project or too vague to connect back to the research question.	A possible methodology is described with appropriate details about how the research question might be asked. (Methodology may less practical.)	A possible methodology is worked out in good detail with discussion of approach, how the research question could be answered, participants and design (if relevant), and any additional information.	Proposed methodology exceeds expectations and includes good detail with discussion of approach, how the research question could be answered, participants and design (if relevant), and any additional information.

	0.5	1	1.5	2
<b>Results – Expectations and Potential Interpretations (2 points: ~1 point for each)</b>	Potential results are too vague or do not seem reasonable given the proposed methodology. Very little interpretation provided.	Potential results lack specificity; does not consider any alternatives beyond the predicted outcome (based on hypothesis). Interpretation may be adequate, though it may be brief.	Potential results have some specificity; includes at least a brief mention of possible results beyond the outcome based on hypothesis. Results and interpretation are discussed with respect to research question.	Specific potential results are discussed with clear predictions or possibilities that follow from the proposed methodology; discussion is consistent and framed well with respect to the research question and background.

	0.25	0.5	1.5	2
<b>Potential/ Hypothetical Plan (1 point)</b>	Generic description of a potential supervisor or lab; may list several unrelated faculty members; choice of potential supervisor/labs not properly motivated.	May mention a handful of unrelated faculty members; some justification given for choice, though relevance to project may be quite broad.	Defines a specific lab or supervisor; adequate reasons are provided for choice; named lab/person has clear relevance for the project.	Defines a specific lab or supervisor; clear reasons are provided for choice; named lab/person has clear relevance for the project.

	0.5	1	1.5	2
<b>Significance and Contribution (2 points)</b>	Significance and contribution of the project are given... but are vague or too broad.	Significance and contribution of the project are given with some specificity... but may be weak or not convincing.	Significance and contribution of the project are given in sufficient detail.	Both potential significance and contribution of the project are clearly laid out and highlight importance.

	0.25 for each	0.5 for each	0.75 for each	1 for each
<b>Writing: General and Structure (3 points)</b>	<p>A. Writing would benefit from additional proofreading.</p> <p>B. Structure of proposal and argumentation is confusing or poorly laid out.</p> <p>C. All in-text citations have corresponding references. May be some minor errors.</p>	<p>A. Writing is adequate but has minor mistakes.</p> <p>B. Proposal has some structure (e.g., headings), though argumentation may be unclear at times.</p> <p>C. All in-text citations have corresponding references. May be some minor inconsistencies with chosen style guide.</p>	<p>A. Writing meets expectations; any typos are trivial and do not distract from meaning.</p> <p>B. Proposal has good structure, beyond just headings. Argumentation meets expectations but may have some minor issues.</p> <p>C. All in-text citations have corresponding references. Application of chosen style guide is consistent.</p>	<p>A. Writing has good flow, does not require further proofreading, and exceeds expectations.</p> <p>B. Proposal is structured in a thoughtful way that reflects the specific needs of the proposed project. Argumentation is clear and shows clear reasoning.</p> <p>C. All in-text citations have corresponding references. Application of chosen style guide is consistent. Anything that needs (or would benefit from) a supporting citation appears to have one.</p>

	0.5	1	1.5	2
<b>Writing: Audience (2 point)</b>	Writing is not appropriate for a general academic audience; many technical terms given without sufficient explanation.	Certain technical terms and concepts are described, but many require further explanation.	Writing is generally appropriate for a general academic audience, though a few terms may be unclear.	Writing is appropriate for a general academic audience. Technical terms and concepts are presented in clear manner.

Bibliography: Rubric

	0.25	0.5	0.75	1
Bibliography (1 points)	A bibliography is given with additional sources (any number); no organization or headings provided.	A bibliography is provided with at least 10 relevant sources sorted into at least 2 categories.	A bibliography is provided with at least 15 relevant sources sorted into at least 3 categories.	A bibliography is provided with at least 20 relevant sources sorted into at least 4 categories.