The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)

UG Course Syllabus

[Course Title] : English Communication I for Information Hub Programs

[Course Code]: DLED 3020

[No. of Credits]: 3

[Any pre-/co-requisites] [(Academic English for University Studies) AND (Advanced Academic English for University Studies)]

Name: Yue LI

Email: yueli@hkust-gz.edu.cn

Office Hours: Please email to book an appointment

Room: W4-534

Course Description

The course provides students with exposure to and practice in using English within the specific fields of Artificial Intelligence, Computer Media Arts, Internet of Things, Data Science. The course aims to encourage students to develop their abilities as thoughtful communication strategists, to communicate effectively, appropriately and confidently in relevant academic and professional contexts, and to use language to express critically the wider social implications of their fields on topics relevant to all INFH students.

Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

By the end of this course, students should be able to:

ILO1. Use English accurately, appropriately and confidently for a given academic or professional context in speaking and writing.

ILO2. Support claims with appropriate evidence and properly acknowledge sources.

ILO3. Identify the needs and concerns of relevant academic and professional audiences and choose effective strategies to address those needs and concerns in speaking and in writing.

ILO4. Express critically their understanding of issues and developments in their study area of their major.

Assessment and Grading

This course will be assessed using criterion-referencing and grades will not be assigned using a curve. Detailed grading rubrics are provided in the syllabus, outlining the criteria used for evaluation.

Assessments:

Assessment Task	Contribution to Overall Course grade (%)	Due Week
Presentation: Addressing Non-specialist Stakeholders	20%	Week 4[x]
Presentation: Addressing AI & Data Science Scholars	20%	Week 5[x]
Paper Critique (After Class)	20%	Week 9[x]
Essay Writing (In Class)	30%	Week 13[x]
Course Participation	10%	Throughout the Term

[x] The exact date will be provided on Canvas for each assessment task separately.

Mapping of Course ILOs to Assessment Tasks

Assessment Tasks	Mapped ILOs	Explanation
Presentation: Addressing Non-specialist Stakeholders	ILO1, ILO2, ILO3, ILO4	In the presentation (duration: 3-4 minutes), each student should introduce one specific technological product deriving from AI & Data Science research, in the (hypothetical) capacity of the product developer. The product **will be determined by the instructor and clarified on Canvas in Week 4**. The presentation should serve two types of audiences (public transportation officials and managers of car manufacturers). Each student should also answer a question from each audience type in a Q & A session. Addressing two distinct audience types encourages them to adapt explanations for different professional contexts, a key skill for AI & Data Science experts in their real-world environments.
Presentation: Addressing AI & Data Science Peers	ILO1, ILO2, ILO3, ILO4	In the presentation (duration: 3-4 minutes), each student should introduce one specific technological product deriving from AI & Data Science research, in the (hypothetical) capacity of the product developer. The product **will be determined by the instructor and clarified on Canvas in Week 4**. Students are expected to speak in the (hypothetical) capacity of the system developer. The presentation is expected to serve

		mainly AI & Data Science scholars.
Paper Critique (After Class)	ILO1, ILO2, ILO4	Students are asked to critique a research paper (**will be shown on Canvas in Week 7**) by commenting on its research contextualization and implications. The word limit of the critique is minimally 800 (excluding references, footnotes, endnotes and the title). By focusing on contextualization, students will learn how to situate a study within its broader academic and practical landscape, while attention to implications will train them to assess the significance and limitations of research findings.
Essay Writing (In Class)	ILO1, ILO2, ILO4	In the essay writing test (duration: 1 hour), students need to analyze the data trends of a line chart, and discuss two given contrasting views that interpret the chart. The essay has a minimum word limit of 350. This task assesses students' ability to interpret quantitative evidence. students are also encouraged to recognize bias and evaluate the validity of competing claims
Course Participation	ILO1, ILO2, ILO3, ILO4	Course participation is crucial for students to master the content of the course, therefore corresponding to ILO1-ILO4. Students are assessed on lesson attendance, active participation in lesson activities, completion of assignments, and other demonstrated effort to develop communication skills throughout the course.

Grading Rubrics

	Presentation: Addressing Non-specialist Stakeholders	Presentation: Addressing AI & Data Science Peers	Paper Critique (After Class)	Essay Writing (In Class)	Course Participation
A. Excellent	Adapts message expertly for two distinct professional audiences (clear, concise, persuasive). Uses accurate technical explanation with minimal jargon; responses to Q&A show depth and flexibility.	Presents product with clarity, precision, and depth. Technical aspects are explained convincingly and critically to peers.	Provides a highly critical, well-structured analysis of contextualization and implications. Arguments are nuanced, insightful, and supported with excellent use of evidence and sources.	Essay clearly describes trends, integrates chart & table data with accuracy, and discusses both views critically. Argument is coherent, balanced, and supported with precise evidence. Proposes well-defined and feasible follow-up actions.	Attends regularly, contributes thoughtfully, engages actively in discussions/activities, and consistently demonstrates initiative to extend learning.
B. Good	Message is well-adapted for two audiences with only minor lapses in clarity. Jargon is mostly explained; Q&A handled adequately with some depth.	Product presented with clarity and reasonable depth. Some minor issues in technical explanation or audience adaptation, but overall effective.	Provides a structured critique with relevant points on contextualization and implications. Analysis is mostly critical, though depth and integration of evidence could be stronger.	Essay describes data trends clearly with minor gaps or oversights. Both views discussed with some critical insight, though argument may lack balance or depth at points. Proposes relevant follow-up actions, though some may be underdeveloped.	Attends regularly, participates constructively, and contributes ideas, though sometimes less actively or with limited initiative.
C. Satisfactory	Addresses both audiences, but explanations may be too general or uneven in clarity. Some difficulty in simplifying	Presentation communicates the product, but technical explanation may be overly descriptive or lack sufficient depth for peer audience.	Provides a descriptive critique with limited critical analysis. Points on contextualization and implications may be underdeveloped.	Essay describes main trends but with occasional inaccuracy or lack of detail. Discussion of both views is	Attends most lessons, contributes when prompted, completes tasks with minimal initiative; participation is consistent but not proactive.

	technical concepts; Q&A handled at a basic level.			one-sided. Follow-up actions are mentioned but remain partially unclear.	
D. Marginal Pass	Explanation for one or both audiences is unclear or inappropriate; Overuse of jargon or vague simplifications. Q&A answers are incomplete or weak.	Presentation is difficult to follow; technical explanation is minimal, vague, or oversimplified.	Critique is superficial, fragmented, or mostly descriptive. Weak analysis of contextualization and implications, with little evidence or improper citation.	Essay attempts description but with inaccuracies, omissions, or confusion. Discussion of views is superficial, unbalanced, or weakly supported. Follow-up actions are mostly unclear.	Attendance irregular, participation minimal, little engagement beyond basic task completion.
F. Fail	Fails to adapt explanation to audiences; presentation lacks clarity and persuasiveness. Cannot respond meaningfully in the Q&A.	Presentation is incoherent, with major gaps in explanation. No ability to address peer audience.	Critique lacks structure, analysis, or evidence. No meaningful engagement with contextualization/implications; citation absent or incorrect.	Essay fails to describe trends, misrepresents data, or ignores one/both views. No critical engagement or structure. No meaningful follow-up actions proposed.	Rarely attends, does not participate in assignments, or makes no meaningful contribution to class learning.

Final Grade Descriptors:

Grades	Short Description	Elaboration on grading description
A	Excellent	The student demonstrates outstanding command of English in academic and professional contexts (ILO1). All claims are consistently supported with strong and well-integrated evidence, with accurate and appropriate source acknowledgment (ILO2). Written and oral work reflects a sophisticated awareness of audience needs and is logically structured, coherent, and persuasive (ILO3). Engagement with AI and data science issues shows critical depth, originality, and insight (ILO4). Active participation contributes meaningfully to the learning community.
B	Good	The student shows strong competence in English communication (ILO1), and provides generally accurate support for claims and mostly correct source acknowledgment (ILO2). Work is clear, coherent, and responsive to audience needs (ILO3). Understanding of AI and data science issues is sound and critical, though occasionally limited in depth or breadth (ILO4). Participation is regular and constructive.
C	Satisfactory	The student demonstrates adequate English ability for academic/professional contexts (ILO1). Some claims are supported with evidence, though inconsistently or without sufficient integration of sources (ILO2). Work addresses audience needs but may lack clarity, cohesion, or persuasiveness (ILO3). Understanding of AI and data science issues is present but surface-level or descriptive rather than critical (ILO4). Participation is consistent but lacks initiative.
D	Marginal Pass	The student shows basic but limited English competence for academic/professional use (ILO1). Evidence use is weak, inappropriate, or inconsistent, with frequent problems in source acknowledgment (ILO2). Audience needs are only partially addressed, and organization is often unclear (ILO3). Engagement with AI and data science issues is minimal, superficial, or fragmented (ILO4). Participation is minimal and does not significantly contribute to learning.
F	Fail	The student fails to demonstrate the required English competence for academic/professional contexts (ILO1). Claims are unsupported or unsourced, with little or no attempt at proper acknowledgment (ILO2). Work does not address audience needs and lacks clarity, structure, and coherence (ILO3). No meaningful understanding of AI and data science issues is evident (ILO4). Participation and effort are insufficient; the course learning outcomes are not achieved.

Weekly Schedule

Week	Main Topic
Week 1	Highlighting Research Contributions in Presentations
Week 2	Structuring a Speech Script Introducing your Product-based Study
Week 3	Handling a Q & A Session in Presentation
Week 4	Presentation Assessment Task: Addressing Non-specialist Stakeholders
Week 5	Presentation Assessment Task: Addressing AI & Data Science Scholars
Week 6	Writing Introduction in a Research Paper
Week 7	Writing a Literature Review in a Paper
Week 8	Talks by Info Hub PhD students
Week 9	Suggestions on Critique Writing
Week 10	Describing Data Trends & Discussing Contrasting Views
Week 11	Mock Test in Preparation for the Final Assessment Task
Week 12	One-to-one Feedback Sessions
Week 13	Final Assessment Task (Essay Writing)

Course AI Policy

Students are encouraged to use AI tools, such as ChatGPT, for research and learning purposes. However, AI tools must not be used to complete assessment tasks or assignments. All work submitted for grading must be the student's own, and proper citation of any sources, including AI-generated content, is required. Any violation of this policy, including plagiarism, will result in penalties as per the university's academic integrity guidelines.

Students must acknowledge any assistance in preparing work submitted for assessment. This includes use of automated writing tools or generative artificial intelligence. Acknowledgment must be written on the front of the work, or in a footnote or other reference. It must: state the name of the software or technology; and briefly describe the assistance. For example, whether it constituted editing or proof-reading, or details of how automated writing tools or generative artificial tools were used.

Communication and Feedback

Assessment marks for individual tasks will be released via Canvas within two weeks of submission. Feedback on assignments will be detailed and specific, highlighting strengths, areas for improvement, and suggestions for future work. Students are encouraged to reach out to the instructor within five working days of receiving feedback to discuss any questions or concerns.

Academic Integrity

Students are expected to adhere to the university's Academic Honor Code and maintain the highest standards of academic integrity. Plagiarism, cheating, and other forms of academic misconduct will result in penalties, including possible failure of the course. Students should refer to the university's regulations for a clear understanding of academic misconduct and how to avoid it.