REVISED PROPOSAL

Unless you received a 100 on your Proposal, you will be revising your Proposal. In professional realms, writers submitting a Proposal to a client or to a professional conference always revise that proposal before the final submission. You will do the same. How much revision you will need to do depends on your grade and your Writing Instructor’s comments. How you revise will depend on your Writing Instructors comments and on information and insights you are getting from your continued research. Here is a F.A.Q. to help you understand Proposal Revision requirements and strategies. Read the F.A.Q. as you would any aspect of any assignment: read it ALL; read it carefully; refer to it as you write.

Q. Do we get a “new” grade for our Revised Proposal?
A. Yes. Your Revised Proposal grade is not averaged with your first Proposal grade, and does not “replace” that first Proposal grade. Your Revised Proposal grade is the 2nd of 6 Conference Paper grades:
1. Proposal
2. Revised Proposal (submit with Annotated Bib.)
3. Annotated Bibliography (submit with Revised Proposal)
4. Annotated Outline
5. Conference Paper
6. Conference Paper Revision

Q. Which Writing Instructor should we contact with questions?
A. Contact the Writing Instructor whose name and email are at the top of your Proposal evaluation sheet. In most cases, this is your Writing Instructor for the rest of the semester. Do not contact the W.I. who comes to your 0012 class, unless his or her name and email are at the top of your Proposal eval. sheet.

Q. What should we concentrate on when revising?
A. As you revise your Proposal, give very careful attention to your Writing Instructor’s comments (including all Evaluation Abbreviations) and to the details within the sections and subsections of the Proposal evaluation sheet. These comments and details are there for your use. Use them! In your Revised Proposal, Your W.I. will be looking for evidence that you gave thorough attention to his or her highlights, checks, and comments on your original Proposal.

Q. Our Proposal is in the category “Paper Proposal Would Not Have Been Accepted for this Professional Conference. What do we have to do now? Do we need to rewrite the entire Proposal?
A. If your Proposal is in this category, you MUST contact your Writing Instructor by email no later than 10:00 a.m., Monday, January 23, you may contact your W.I. earlier than this—(the earlier, the better). Your Writing Instructor’s name and email are at the top of your Proposal eval. sheet. Your Writing Instructor will then let you know what your next step will be (for example, meeting with him or her, and/or further correspondence with him or her, and/or submitting a draft of your revised proposal before the Friday, Jan. 27 deadline). Note that if you your Proposal is in the “you MUST contact your Writing Instructor by email category,” and you do not contact your Writing Instructor by 10:00 a.m., Monday, January 23, or you do not follow-up on what your Writing Instructor then requires that you do, you will receive no credit for the Revised Proposal, even if you do submit one.

Q. Our Proposal is in the “Provisionally Accepted” category. Do we have to contact our Writing Instructor about revision?
A. No, you are not required to contact your Writing Instructor. However, you are encouraged to contact your W.I. with any questions about how to best proceed with a strong revision. The earlier you contact your W.I., the more time your W.I. will have to consider your questions and respond, and the more time you will have to carefully act on his or her input.

Q. Will the new/additional research we are doing (going from 6 sources to 8 sources) affect our revision?
A. Yes. You will be encountering new information, new details, further data, more accurate data, more extensive coverage of key research studies and/or a key example or application. Your continuing research will help you continue to refine your topic and its specificity. As you add sources (and perhaps also replace sources that are no longer relevant or useful), you come to know more about your topic. That increased knowledge/authority/information will show up in a strong revised Proposal.
Q. Should we revise/include the “Topic Area” section of our original Proposal document with our revised Proposal?
A. No. You are now finished with that “Topic Area” explanation/section of step 1 of the Conf. Paper. You will not include it in any further documents. However, if there is information from that section that is useful for your Revised Proposal, then you should include that information in it in your Revised Proposal.

Q. How do we format and submit our Revised Proposal?
A. Format instructions for the Revised Proposal and Annotated Bibliography will be posted to the Conference Information page. If the Format Instructions are not yet posted, they will be soon. Dr. Budny or your ENGR 0012 prof. will be giving you submission instructions.

**ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**SUBMIT: REVISED PROPOSAL (SEE P. 1) + ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, ONLINE, BY 8:00 P.M., FRIDAY, JANUARY 27**

**WHAT IS AN “ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY?”**
An annotated bibliography is a more detailed version of a regular list of sources or works consulted. “Annotating” each reference allows you to understand and communicate the usefulness of each of your sources. In your Annotated Bibliography, each source will be accompanied by a 60-70 word “annotation”—a brief summary of the source’s “type” and subject matter, and a brief description of how you plan to use that source in your paper.

**HOW MANY SOURCES?**
- **Your Annotated Bibliography must have a minimum of 8 sources.** Some of these might be sources you also used for your original Proposal (you will now write a complete “annotation” for those sources). If there are sources you initially used that are no longer particularly useful, you would not include those in your minimum 8 sources. Keep in mind that 8 is a minimum. If 5 of your previous sources continue to be useful and you locate/read 4 more sources that will most likely be useful, you will have 9 annotated sources, and that is okay!
- Sources must be appropriate for a university-level paper to be submitted to and presented at a professional conference.
- At this point in your academic career and your research/writing experience, you should be looking at material from a variety of types of sources: books on your topic area; standard texts about your subject; articles from trade and scholarly journals; articles from appropriate magazines and newspapers; videos from appropriate sources; websites; lectures and texts from your math and science courses; talks, interviews or presentations from experts in your topic area.
  - While you are not required to have source material from all of these different types of sources, it is expected that you will not be getting all of your source information from, say, only corporate web sites or from only one or two general interest magazines.
- If you have questions about whether or not your sources for your Annotated Bib. are meeting the requirement of being “appropriate for a university-level a paper to be submitted to and presented at a professional conference,” contact your Writing Instructor.

**EFFECTIVE ANNOTATIONS**
- are **concise**; you need to pack a lot of substance into a very small package (60-70 words), so allow yourself the time to write rough drafts that you can then edit for clarity and concision
- represent the **whole source**; an effective annotation can only be created after you have read the source from beginning to end at least once
- clearly communicate the “type” or kind of source; **this does NOT mean** simply identifying the “physical” kind of source (for example, noting that a source is “an article,” “a book,” or “a website” is **not enough**).
  - an effective annotation will describe what makes this **type of source** appropriate for **this level** (university/professional/level conference paper) of paper
  - for example, if you are using [http://www.boeing.com](http://www.boeing.com) as a source, you must note that this is Boeing’s corporate website (merely stating that it is a “website” is **not useful**). You must also briefly comment on how/why information from the site is appropriate and useful (given that Boeing might include information that primarily puts the company in an exclusively positive light)
**Effective Annotations**

- communicate **what** a source says **AND how or why the information in that source is important and useful**; in other words, **you must clarify what a source is accomplishing or attempting to accomplish, not just “what the source is about” or “what it says”**
  - in addition to summarizing what the source “says,”—what it is “about”-- **you must also identify the argument, goal, or purpose of the source and its information**. Saying that an article is “about global positioning systems” does **not** clarify **how or why the information in that source is important and useful to the paper you are writing**.
  - for example, an annotation that explains, “this article argues for the ongoing widespread availability, to civilian consumers, of global satellite data and global positioning systems” is on the right track because this annotation clarifies the “argument” or intent of the source.
  - for example, an annotation that explains, “this chapter introduces the basic technology of global positioning systems,” is on the right track because this annotation clarifies the intent (“introduces the basic technology”) of the source.
- **Effective annotations communicate the relevance of a source to the authors’ project**: knowing how a source will be relevant/useful to your own work can help you zero in on the significant information in the source.
  - within each annotation, you must **clarify, at least briefly, how you plan to use each source in your paper**. Each annotation must clearly describe how the source will be useful to your paper. Which aspect of your topic does the source relate to? How will this source be valuable to the discussion of that aspect of your topic?
  - figuring out how you will potentially use a source takes time, but it will help you to read your sources with more purpose, write more focused annotations, and, ultimately, write a better paper.

**EXAMPLES OF GOOD AND BAD ANNOTATIONS**

**EXAMPLE OF A GOOD/EFFECTIVE ANNOTATION**


This article, from a professional, peer-reviewed journal specializing in auditory mechanisms, details recent findings on how electrical node interactions affect multichannel cochlear implant performance. The article describes how node placement and other factors can interfere with optimal performance, including voice recognition, of multichannel cochlear implants. Information from this article will help us clarify current cochlear implant problems and aid in our description of possible engineering solutions.

Notice that this effective annotation
- meets the word-count requirements (66 words)
- provides relevant information about the type of source (“professional, peer-reviewed journal specializing in auditory mechanisms”)
- clarifies the intent of the article (“details recent findings on how…”; “describes how node placement and other factors can interfere with optimal performance”)
- clarifies the authors’ potential plan for how they will use this source in the paper (“Information from this article will help us clarify…”)

From this annotation, readers know that the research in this article is relatively “recent,” and that it comes from a journal that is edited and used by professionals in the field of auditory mechanics. Readers know that the article is about particular kinds of problems with current multichannel cochlear implants, and know that the article gives some information about initiatives to resolve these problems. The authors of this annotation clarify/show that they know how the information in this article will be useful to their topic/Conference Paper.

**EXAMPLE OF A POORLY COMPOSED ANNOTATION:**


This article from the web talks about some problems with the mechanics of cochlear implants. People with implants sometimes have trouble hearing what other people are saying. This is called a speech recognition problem. This is a problem engineers will have to work on. We will talk about these issues in our paper.
Note the errors in format in the source information

Though this annotation meets the minimum word-count, note the lack of detail and clarity: what type of publication is “Hearing Res.?” What kinds of cochlear implant problems does the article detail? How much or how often is “sometimes?” Does the article specifically address “speech-recognition problems?” Does the article offer any information, relevant to engineering, about solutions to cochlear implant problems? What “issues” will the authors address in their Conference Paper, and how will this article help them address these “issues?”