

Task 1: Presentation of Research Proposal

DUE: Term 1 Week 6 2022

Outcomes

You will be assessed on:

Outcomes

- **SE-1** refines and applies the Working Scientifically processes in relation to scientific research
- **SE-3** interrogates relevant and valid peer-reviewed scientific research to develop a scientific research question, hypothesis, proposal and plan
- **SE-5** analyses and applies the processes used in reliable and valid scientific research to solve complex scientific problems and inform further research
- **SE-6** analyses and reports on a contemporary issue or an application of science informed by primary or secondary-sourced data, or both, in relation to relevant publicly available data sets
- **SE-7** communicates analysis of an argument or conclusion incorporating appropriate scientific language and referencing techniques in a scientific report

Content (Section 1 of the Scientific Research Portfolio pg 18-19 of NESA Syllabus)

- an action plan with milestones and a timeframe for each stage of the Scientific Research Project
- summaries and annotated extracts of peer-reviewed scientific research and statements of applicability to the Scientific Research Project
- a developing reference list using correct formatting from the chosen format
- a concept map or alternative strategy for generating ideas for the scientific research, including references to literature and justification for their selection
- a refined and justified scientific research question
- a refined and justified scientific hypothesis.

Task

This task requires students to present their research proposal for 5-15 minutes in a similar manner to a scientific conference and submit a written version of their proposal.

The presentation and written submission should include:

- an introduction to your research proposal
- research aims and questions
- review of literature
- proposed methodology and analysis
- timeline
- a question and answer session.

Submission:

- Students will be required to submit a research question to your teacher by week 6.
- Students who have their research question not approved in the first round will have to resubmit their question week 9 in the second round.
- Students will be required to present your proposal to the class. You will be given written feedback by your peers.
- Students will be required to submit a written version of their proposal. This is not marked.

Helpful Websites:

1. <https://www.monash.edu/rlo/graduate-research-writing/write-the-thesis/writing-a-research-proposal>
2. <https://www.westernsydney.edu.au/future/study/how-to-apply/higher-degree-research-candidates/how-to-write-a-research-proposal.html>
3. <https://www.uts.edu.au/research-and-teaching/research-degrees/applying-uts/prepare-your-documents/writing-research>
4. <https://sydney.edu.au/campus-life/student-news/2017/05/30/how-to-write-a-research-proposal-for-a-strong-phd-application.html>
5. <https://international.curtin.edu.au/research-students/writing-research-proposal/>

Submission of Research Question

Due Week 2 Term 1 2019

Name: _____ Roll Call: _____

Round Research Question:

Approved

Rejected

Comments:

Second Round Research Question

Approved

Rejected

Comments:

Marking guidelines

Criteria	E(1)	D(2)	C(3)	B(4)	A(5)
<i>Introduction</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces the problem or area of interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces the problem or area of interest. Describes the relevance of the topic to the researcher and field of knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces the problem or area of interest. Describes the relevance of the topic to the researcher and field of knowledge. Convinces the reader of the importance of the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces the problem or area of interest. Explains the relevance of the topic to the researcher and field of knowledge. Convinces the reader of the importance of the research. Identifies the theoretical and practical significance of the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces the problem or area of interest. Explains the relevance of the topic to the researcher and field of knowledge. Convinces the reader of the importance of the research. Identifies the theoretical and practical significance of the research. Speculates on implications of anticipated findings.
<i>Research aims and questions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate, with lack of clarity and concision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rudimentary formulation of research aim; attempt at formulation of question/s; may lack clarity and/or concision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally appropriate, clear and concise framing of the research aim and questions. Hypothesis is stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly appropriate, clear and concise framing of the research aim and questions. Hypothesis is stated and can be tested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceptionally appropriate, clear and concise framing of the research aim and questions Hypothesis is clearly stated and can be adequately tested.
<i>Review of Literature</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature review lacks comprehensive coverage of relevant material The purpose of the study is not clearly described There is no connection between the material reviewed and the purpose of the study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature review is relatively comprehensive and describes some relevant material The purpose of the study is described, but not as clearly as it might be There is some attempt to connect the material reviewed with the purpose of the study Summarises concisely 3-5 literature items (what, when, where, how). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature review is relatively comprehensive and describes some relevant material The purpose of the study is described. There is a good attempt to connect the material reviewed with the purpose of the study Summarises concisely 5-10 literature items (what, when, where, how). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature review is comprehensive and describes most relevant material The purpose of the study is adequately described There is a good attempt to connect the material reviewed with the purpose of the study Summarises concisely 5-10 literature items (what, when, where, how). Identifies the gaps, problems and issues unresolved by the literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The literature review is very comprehensive and describes relevant material The purpose of the study is clearly described There is an excellent connection between the material reviewed and the purpose of the study Summarises concisely 5-10 literature items (what, when, where, how). Identifies the gaps, problems and issues unresolved by the literature.

Criteria	E(1)	D(2)	C(3)	B(4)	A(5)
<i>Methodology and Analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected methodology does not satisfactorily address the identified research problem Inadequate and/or illogical proposal of analysis with little or no demonstration of critical thinking and/or engagement with sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology goes some way towards addressing the identified research problem Rudimentary proposal of analysis with some deficiencies of logic; passable demonstration of critical thinking; some engagement with sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound methodology for addressing the identified research problem Justifies the methodology in relation to the research topic or problem. Proposal of analysis demonstrated sound logic and some degree of critical thinking and engagement with sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good methodology for addressing the identified research problem Justifies the methodology in relation to the research topic or problem. Highly effective proposal of analysis demonstrating a strong grasp of logical, critical thinking and engagement with sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent methodology for addressing the identified research problem Justifies the methodology in relation to the research topic or problem. Exceptional proposal of analysis demonstrating an excellent grasp of logic, critical thinking and engagement with sources
<i>Timeline</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequately developed timeline that does not reflect the necessary tasks or timelines for their completion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rudimentary timeline Incorporates some necessary tasks for project completion but with less detail and/or unrealistic timeframes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thoughtful and realistic timeline Incorporates most necessary tasks for project completion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly thoughtful and realistic timeline Incorporates almost all necessary tasks for project completion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceptionally thoughtful and realistic timeline Incorporates all necessary tasks for project completion
<i>Communication</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student shows no use of presentation skills, such as eye contact, voice and palm cards. No engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student demonstrates limited use of presentation skills, such as eye contact, voice and palm cards. Little engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student demonstrates some use of presentation skills, such as eye contact, voice and palm cards. Some engagement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student demonstrates effective use of presentation skills, such as eye contact, voice and palm cards leading to an engaging presentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student demonstrates a highly confident use of presentation skills, such as eye contact, voice and palm cards leading to a highly engaging presentation.
TOTAL					/30
Comments					