



UNIVERSITAS HAMZANWADI
FAKULTAS BAHASA SENI DAN HUMANIORA
PROGRAM STUDI PENDIDIKAN BAHASA INGGRIS

Kode Dokumen
PBI-25

SEMESTER LESSON PLAN

COURSE		COURSE CODE	COURSE GROUP	SKS		SEMESTER	DATE OF REVISION
Seminar on Thesis Proposal		PBI6757	Pendidikan (Akademik)	T=4	P=0	7	19 Februari 2025
Authorization		Developer of Semester Learning Plan		Coordinator of Course Group		Head of Study Program	
		(Dr. Yulia Agustina, M.Pd.)		ttd (Nama)		(M. Adib Nazri, M.Pd.)	
Lo9Learning Outcomes	Learning Outcomes of Study Program						
	Lo1	Demonstrates religious values, upholds humanitarian principles, morals, and academic ethics, and integrates Islamic values into linguistic, pedagogical, and professional practices grounded in social responsibility					
	Lo2	Applies critical, creative, systematic, and innovative thinking, along with nationalist values, in developing multimodality-based English language instruction to address 21st-century educational challenges.					
	Lo3	Able to use general and academic English equivalent to B2 CEFR level orally and in writing for academic and professional communication effectively, accurately, critically, and adaptively in multicultural and digital environments at local, regional, and global levels.					
	Lo5	Able to design, implement, evaluate, and develop adaptive, inclusive, and technology-based English language teaching based on pedagogical, psychological principles, and national quality standards.					
	Lo6	Able to identify, analyze, and solve issues related to quality, relevance, and access in English language education through responsible data-driven and research-based decision-making.					
	Lo7	Able to design and conduct research in English language education and produce systematic scientific reports in accordance with academic standards by utilizing information technology ethically.					
	Lo8	Able to collaborate, communicate effectively, demonstrate leadership, conduct self-reflection and self-evaluation, and take responsibility for individual and team performance in professional contexts.					

	Lo9	Able to integrate emerging educational technologies critically, creatively, and ethically to enhance the quality of English language teaching.
	Course Learning Outcomes	
	Clo1	The students are able to integrate academic ethics, Islamic values, and social responsibility in the design and presentation of research proposals to ensure integrity and humanitarian principles.
	Clo 2	The students are able to apply critical, systematic, and innovative thinking to synthesize relevant theories and previous research in English language education, addressing 21st-century educational challenges.
	Clo 3	The students are able to Demonstrate high-level academic English (equivalent to B2 CEFR) in writing a structured research proposal and defending it orally in a formal academic setting.
	Clo 4	The students are able to formulate research problems that aim to develop or evaluate adaptive, technology-based, or inclusive English language teaching models based on sound pedagogical principles.
	Clo 5	The students are able to Analyze contemporary issues in English education (quality, relevance, and access) to justify the urgency of the proposed research using a data-driven approach.
	Clo 6	The students are able to design a robust research methodology (quantitative, qualitative, or R&D) for English education by utilizing appropriate digital tools and information technology ethically.
	Clo 7	The students are able to demonstrate leadership, collaboration, and self-reflection skills during peer-review sessions and take responsibility for professional feedback.
	Clo 8	The students are able to critically and ethically integrate emerging educational technologies (e.g., AI tools, digital platforms) within the proposed research to enhance English language teaching quality.
	Final competency for each learning stage (Sub-CPMK)	
	Clo 1&5	(Lo1, Lo6) Students are able to analyze (C4) contemporary issues in ELT to identify research gaps and apply (C3) Islamic values and academic ethics in selecting a socially responsible research topic.
	Clo 2	(Lo2) Students are able to synthesize (C5) academic literature and previous research to build a critical, systematic, and innovative theoretical framework that addresses 21st-century educational challenges.
	Clo 8	(Lo9) Students are able to critically evaluate (C5) and integrate (C6) emerging educational technologies ethically as either a research tool or an intervention to enhance the quality of English teaching.
	Clo 4	(Lo5)Students are able to formulate (C6) an adaptive and inclusive research design, including instruments and data analysis techniques, based on sound pedagogical and psychological principles.
	Clo 6	(Lo7) Students are able to develop (C6) a complete and systematic scientific report (Research Proposal) using information technology and reference managers according to academic standards.

	Clo 3	(Lo3) Students are able to produce (C6) a written proposal in accurate academic English (B2 CEFR level) and defend (C5) it orally with clarity and professional confidence.
	Clo 7	(Lo8) Students are able to demonstrate (C3) leadership and self-reflection by Collaborating (C2) in peer-review sessions and taking responsibility for revising the proposal based on professional feedback.
Course Description	This course prepares students to design a high-quality undergraduate research proposal in the field of English Language Education. Students will learn to identify research gaps, conduct critical literature reviews, and develop robust methodologies that address 21st-century educational challenges. The course emphasizes the integration of Islamic values, academic ethics, and emerging technologies in research. Through independent study and peer-review seminars, students will produce a systematic research proposal (written in B2-level academic English) and defend it orally, demonstrating professional responsibility and readiness for their final thesis.	
Learning Materials	The course content is organized into several thematic modules to guide students through the research development process: 1. Foundations of ELT Research: Identifying research gaps, data-driven problem identification, and integrating Islamic values/academic ethics. 2. Literature Mapping & Synthesis: Techniques for critical review, synthesizing theories, and using digital mapping tools (e.g., VOSviewer, Connected Papers). 3. Research Designs in ELT: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Research & Development (R&D) frameworks for inclusive and adaptive teaching. 4. Technology Integration in Research: Using AI and emerging technologies for ELT interventions and data collection (ethical considerations). 5. Research Instruments & Data Analysis: Developing valid instruments and choosing appropriate statistical or thematic analysis methods. 6. Academic Writing for Proposals: Mastering the structure of a proposal, academic English (B2 level) nuances, and citation management. 7. Seminar & Defense Strategies: Presentation skills, responding to critical feedback, and professional self-reflection.	
References	Primary:	
	1. Creswell, J. W. (2018). <i>Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches</i>. SAGE. 2. Dörnyei, Z. (2007). <i>Research Methods in Applied Linguistics</i>. Oxford University Press. 3. Nunan, D., & Bailey, K. M. (2009). <i>Exploring Second Language Classroom Research</i>.	
	Supporting :	
	1. APA. (2020). <i>Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (7th Ed.)</i>. 2. Hyland, K. (2016). <i>Teaching and Researching Writing</i>. Routledge. 3. Relevant Open Access Journals (SINTA/Scopus indexed): For examples of systematic scientific reports.	

Lecturer		Dr. Yulia Agustina, M.Pd.					
Prerequisite		-					
Week	Sub-Learning Outcomes (Expected)	Assessment		Learning Experiences		References	Weight (%)
		Indicators	Criteria and Type of Evaluation	offline	online		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to analyze proposal anatomy and apply academic ethics.	1.Ability to analyze proposal anatomy. 2.Ability to apply academic ethics.	Criteria: Compliance with institutional guidelines & APA 7th style. Type: Case Study	Offline: ecture & Ethics workshop.	-	Creswell (2018); Univ. Handbook	5 %
2	By the end of the lesson students are expected to operate reference managers and identify 21st-century ELT issues.	1. Ability to operate reference managers 2. Ability to identify 21st-century ELT issues.	Crit: Completeness of metadata & relevance. Type: Practical Performance.	-	Online: Virtual Lab & Database Exploration	Mendeley/Zotero Manuals; Digital Databases	5 %
3	By the end of the lesson students are expected to be able to formulate	1. Ability to identify between Clear "Ideal" vs "Reality" in ELT.	Crit: Logical coherence & data-driven arguments.	Offline: Writing Workshop (Face-to-Face).	-	Creswell (2018)	5 %

	background via gap analysis.	2. Ability to formulate background via gap analysis.	Type: Draft Submission				
4	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to develop Research Questions & Objectives.	1. Ability to make Precision and feasibility of questions.	Crit: Alignment between problem and goals. Type: Peer Review	Small Group Discussion.	-	Dörnyei (2007)	5%
5	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to synthesize theoretical foundations (Chapter 2).	1. Ability to evaluate theoretical framework not summary 2. Ability to synthesize theoretical foundations (Chapter 2).	Crit: Critical synthesis & B2 academic tone Type: Written Summary	-	Collaborative Writing	Hyland (2016); Open Access Journals	5%
6	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to evaluate studies & construct Framework.	1. Ability to make relevance of reseach (Ch 2). 2. Ability to make construct framework	Crit: Visual clarity & theoretical flow.	Framework Presentation	Online: Canva design session.	Creswell (2018)	5%

			Type: Concept Map & Narrative.				
7	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to critically evaluate ethical tech	1. Ability to justify for AI/Digital tools in research.	Crit: Ethical awareness & pedagogical logic. Type: Reflective Journal	-	Asynchronous Case Study	Open Access Journals (SINTA/Scopus)	5%
8	Midterm Test (Completion of Chapter 1 & 2 drafts) 15%						
9	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to select & justify Research Design.	1. Ability to Identify design research method 2. Ability select & justify Research Design	Crit: Methodological rigor & justification. Type: Presentation.	Methodological Seminar	-	Creswell (2018); Nunan & Bailey (2009)	5%
10	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to design participants & sampling.	1. Ability to design participants & sampling	Crit: Feasibility and representativeness.. Type: Method Draft	-	Virtual Consultation	Dörnyei (2007)	7%

11	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to Develop and Validate Research Instruments	1. Ability to develop Research Instruments 2. Ability to Validate Research Instruments	Crit: Construct validity & reliability logic. Type: Instrument Draft	Pilot-testing Simulation	-	Nunan & Bailey (2009)	5%
12	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to be able to make plan data analysis procedures.	1. Ability to make a plan data analysis procedures 2. Ability to make an analysis Procedures	Crit: Consistency with chosen design. Type: Narrative Plan	-	Online: Video Tutorial	Dörnyei (2007); Creswell (2018)	5%
13	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to demonstrate B2 English & Paraphrasing..	1. Ability to use of urnitin < 20%; Accurate academic tone.	Cri: Linguistic accuracy & integrity. Type: Similarity Check	-	Online: Digital Editing Session	APA (2020)	5%
14	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to simulate proposal defense.	1. Ability to Simulate proposal defense.	Crit: Clarity of speech & content mastery.	Mock Defense	-	Seminar Rubric	10 %

		2. Ability to use Effective visual aids; Professionalism.	Type: Performance				
15	By the end of the lesson, the students are expected to perform self-reflection on feedback.	1. Ability to perform self-reflection on feedback	Crit: Depth of reflection & improvement. Type: Revision Log	Final Coaching	-	Peer Feedback Forms	5%
16	FINAL EXAM (UAS)	Production of Full Draft & Final Defense.	Crit: Professionalism & critical thinking. Type: Product & Performance	Formal Seminar	-	All Primary Refs	15%
Total							100%

STUDENTS' ASSIGNMENT PLAN

Component	Description	Weight
Daily Assignments	Weekly drafts, Peer-reviews, Reference Management, & Revision Logs.	40%
Mid-Term (UTS)	Submission of Integrated Draft (Chapter 1 & 2).	30%
Final Exam (UAS)	Final Written Proposal (Chapters 1-3) & Oral Defense.	30%
Total		100%

1. Daily Assignments (Formative Assessment)

Evaluated throughout the semester based on weekly progress and participation.

Criteria	Excellent (86-100)	Good (71-85)	Fair (56-70)	Poor (<55)
Content Precision	Research problem is highly significant, supported by current data/literature with a sharp gap.	Problem is clear and supported by literature, but the gap is slightly generic.	Problem is identified, but supporting arguments are weak or outdated.	Problem is unclear with no theoretical or empirical foundation.
Academic Quality	Superior Academic English (B2); APA 7th citations are flawless.	Good English with minor errors; APA citations are consistent.	Frequent grammatical errors; APA format is inconsistent.	Difficult to understand; no adherence to academic standards.
Collaboration & Reflection	Provides deep, constructive	Provides relevant	Passive participation;	No participation in peer-review

Criteria	Excellent (86-100)	Good (71-85)	Fair (56-70)	Poor (<55)
	feedback to peers; shows significant improvement in revisions.	feedback; incorporates most suggestions into drafts.	gives only general comments to peers.	or group discussions.

a. Peer Feedback Checklist (For Week 4: Chapter 1)

Use this during small group discussions to evaluate Research Problems and Questions.

Aspect	Checklist Item	Yes/No	Comments/Suggestions
Urgency	Does the background clearly explain why this research is important now ?	[]	
Gap Analysis	Is there a clear "gap" identified (Difference between what is happening and what should happen)?	[]	
Research Questions	Are the questions focused, measurable, and start with "How" or "To what extent"?	[]	
Alignment	Do the Research Questions match the Research Objectives?	[]	
Language	Is the draft written in formal Academic English (avoiding slang/contractions)?	[]	

b. Revision Log Template (For Week 15: Final Review)

Mahasiswa uses this to document how they responded to feedback from peers and the lecturer.

Student Name: _____

Research Title: _____

Date	Source of Feedback (Lecturer/Peer)	Specific Feedback Received	Action Taken / Revision Made	Status (Done/Pending)
12/03	Peer (Group A)	"The theoretical synthesis in Chapter 2 is too brief."	Added three more relevant studies from Scopus journals.	Done
20/03	Lecturer	"The data analysis procedure in Chapter 3 lacks detail."	Expanded the step-by-step thematic analysis process.	Done
25/03	Turnitin Report	"Similarity index is 25% (too high)."	Re-paraphrased the definitions in Chapter 2.	Done

2. Midterm (UTS) Proposal evaluation (Chapter 1 & 2 Draft 30%)

Focuses on the logical flow of the introduction and the depth of the literature review.

Scoring Rubric (UTS):

Component	Assessment Indicators	Max Score
Chapter 1 (Intro)	Quality of Gap Analysis, clarity of Research Questions, and urgency of the study.	40
Chapter 2 (Lit-Review)	Depth of synthesis (connecting theories) and clarity of the Conceptual Framework diagram.	40
Academic Integrity	Similarity report (Turnitin) < 20% and use of high-quality SINTA/Scopus indexed sources.	20

3. Final Examination (UAS): Final Proposal & Oral Defense (30%)

Assignment: Submission of a complete Full Draft (Chapters 1, 2, and 3) and References.

Scoring Rubric (UAS):

This is the final "Gatekeeping" assessment before students proceed to their actual thesis.

Part A: Written Final Proposal (50% of UAS Grade)

- a. Methodological Rigor (Chapter 3): Appropriateness of the research design, validity of instruments, and logic of data analysis procedures.
- b. Coherence: Consistency between the Title, Problem, Theory, and Method.

Part B: Oral Defense Performance (50% of UAS Grade)

Assessment Aspect	Performance Description	Max Score
Presentation Skills	Professional visual aids; fluent B2-level delivery; clear and confident posture.	30
Mastery of Content	Deep understanding of the research topic; ability to justify methodological choices critically.	40
Response to Questions	Ability to defend the proposal with logical reasoning while remaining open to professional feedback.	30

Grading Scale Recommendation

- a. A (86 - 100): Exceptional work; ready for immediate research.
- b. B (71 - 85): Proficient work; needs minor revisions before starting research.
- c. C (56 - 70): Minimal passing grade; requires significant revision and re-consultation.
- d. D/E (< 55): Failed; student must retake the course or redo the proposal from scratch.