

TRAINING ACTIVITY PLAN
 SUMMER 2023 EDITION

CHM804 – Seminar III

COURSE		PROFESSORS
Title	Pedagogical seminar	Members of the Monitoring Committee
Acronym	CHM 804	
Credits	3 credits	
Personal work	5 hours/week	
Session	Session 9 – PhD Chemistry	
Local	To be determined	
Schedule	To be determined with the monitoring committee	

Place of the course in the program	
Type of training activity	Mandatory
Prerequisite course	None
Concurrent course	None

CONTEXT

Securing funds is an integral part of the research process. To do so, it is necessary to convince a committee of evaluators of the relevance, importance and innovative character of a research project. The research project must be well situated in the field, the research hypotheses must be clearly identified and the importance of testing them explained. In addition to being relevant, the research proposal must be realistic with a clear presentation of the methodology, the risk management strategy associated with the research and a timeline for completion. Finally, the research proposal must present an analysis of the potential impact on science and society.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

Present and orally defend a research proposal before the student community and faculty. The pedagogical nature of the presentation must be evident.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

- Develop skills in preparing and defending a research proposal.
- Present a literature review supporting the research proposal statement (Objectives and Hypotheses).
- Clearly present the research hypotheses and their significance.
- Demonstrate the relevance of the proposed experimental approach.
- Clearly present the risk management strategy.
- Present a timeline of the proposed research with clear objectives.
- Present the expected results of the research work.
- Answer questions from the audience.

PLAN OF THE SUBJECT

Preparation of a presentation (PowerPoint) of 40 to 45 minutes.

Public oral presentation in defense of the research proposal.

Answer questions from the audience.

TEACHING METHODS

Interaction with supervisor, monitoring committee members and others in the preparation of the presentation. Opportunity for research teams to practice the presentation for advice and to improve the quality of the presentation.

EVALUATION

The activity is evaluated by members of the student's monitoring committee and by the graduate students present at the presentation. However, all faculty present may evaluate.

The evaluation consists of a question period open to the public. The evaluation criteria as well as the scale used by the professors and the students are presented below and available on the chemistry department intranet. The jury (professors) meets with the student at the end of the evaluation to comment on the presentation and to give some advice and recommendations.

Evaluation Criteria:

Form

Quality of the visual support, quality of the language, use of the time allotted /10

Content

Description of the state of the art and positioning of the project in relation to the literature* /20

Identification of the challenge, description of objectives, hypotheses, and originality* /15

Relevance and clarity of the methodology* /15

Risk analysis; demonstration of proposal feasibility, risk and priority management /10

Return on hypothesis, potential spin-offs and impact in the field /10

Answers to questions

Relevance and clarity of answers, mastery of concepts and theory /20

*** Comprehension will also be assessed during the question period**

What is plagiarism?

Paul Asselin, August 2019
Department of Chemistry, University of Sherbrooke

Plagiarism is the act of falsely attributing originality to a work.

The formal definition of plagiarism at the University is as follows:

Passing off or attempting to pass off as one's own, in an assessed production, the work of another person or passages or ideas taken from the work of another (this includes, but is not limited to, failing to acknowledge the source of a production, passage or idea, taken from the work of another) UdeS Academic Regulations, section 9.4.1, June 6, 2019 revision.

There is also self-plagiarism:

Submit, without prior authorization, the same production, in whole or in part, to more than one pedagogical activity or in the same pedagogical activity (particularly in the case of repetition) UdeS Academic Regulations, Article 9.4.1, revision of June 6, 2019.

Not to mention other similar offenses, including cheating:

Providing or obtaining any unauthorized assistance, whether group or individual, for a production being evaluated;

Copy, forge, or falsify a document for the evaluation of an educational activity;

Excerpts from the UdeS Academic Regulations, Section 9.4.1, June 6, 2019 revision.

How is plagiarism dealt with at UdeS?

As described in Chapter 9 of the UdeS Academic Regulations, when a case of plagiarism is suspected, the professor forwards the work and all relevant information to the faculty, which holds a disciplinary hearing to decide whether plagiarism has occurred. If plagiarism is proven, the faculty will determine the sanction to be applied. **A provisional sanction may be applied before the hearing.**

Penalties for plagiarism generally range from a grade of "0" on a specific question in an assignment to **expulsion from the University**. The severity of the sanction depends on the seriousness of the case and the number of repeat offenses. A notation of plagiarism will be noted on the academic record of the person(s) responsible. A notation of the plagiarism disciplinary hearing may be kept on file **even if the plagiarism charge is dismissed.**

What are my rights if I am charged?

The rights of a person accused of an academic offence are set out in Chapter 9 of the UdeS Academic Regulations. A person summoned to a disciplinary hearing has the right: to be informed of the charge and of the hearing, to be present accompanied and represented; to have access to the file, to defend oneself and to refute the charge; to undergo an impartial hearing; to have access to the written and motivated decision; to request a review of a decision, all within a reasonable time. **A person also has the right to confidentiality of his or her file.**

The UdeS Student Ombudsman is the independent recourse that ensures that the rights of students at the University are respected.

The class representatives and the student associations are also there to assert your rights with the professors.

How to avoid unpleasant surprises?

Original work should come from your own thinking about the topic at hand. Limit "copy and paste" and be sure to include the direct source when you do so. All references used but not directly cited should be in your bibliography.

Copy and paste => Cite-Contextualize! Paraphrase your sources. If you include a quote, then repeat it in your own words. This shows that there was thought put into it on your part.

In team work, all members are responsible for the entire work. It is your responsibility to review the final work with all your colleagues. If you submit the work by email, copy your colleagues.

Inter-team collaboration: In some courses, collaboration between different teams may be allowed or even encouraged. Remember that each assignment should be different. Discuss the concepts covered ("What did you talk about?") rather than the verbatim ("What did you write?"). **In all cases, check with your teacher and let him/her know! Also, keep a written record (e.g., email) of your exchanges with the professor on this subject.**

References and useful links

- University of Sherbrooke Academic Regulations, June 6, 2019 revision. <https://www.usherbrooke.ca/registraire/droits-et-responsabilites/reglement-des-etudes/>
- Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. December 2001. https://www.usherbrooke.ca/a-propos/fileadmin/sites/a-propos/documents/direction/documents_officiels/declaration.pdf
- [Plagiarism awareness and quiz](#)
- UdeS training support service: <https://www.usherbrooke.ca/ssf/>
- Student Ombudsman: <https://www.usherbrooke.ca/ombudsman/>
 - 819 821-7706 1 800 267-8337, ext. 67706
 - ombudsman@usherbrooke.ca