City University of Hong Kong
Course Syllabus

offered by the Department of English
with effect from Semester A 2017 / 2018

Part I   **Course Overview**

Course Title: English for Academic Research and Publication in Science and Engineering

Course Code: EN8013

Course Duration: One semester (13 weeks, 3 hrs/week)

Credit Units: 3

Level: R8

Medium of Instruction: English

Medium of Assessment: English

Prerequisites:
(Course Code and Title)   Nil

Precursors:
(Course Code and Title)   Nil

Equivalent Courses:
(Course Code and Title)   Nil

Exclusive Courses:
(Course Code and Title)   Nil

Part II   Course Details

1.   Abstract

The course aims to provide students of science and engineering with the language skills and strategies necessary for the production of a variety of spoken and written scholarly texts which include conference paper proposals, presentations, research proposals, theses and research publications in international-refereed journals.

2.   Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

No.	CILOs#	Weighting* (if applicable)	Discovery-enriched curriculum related learning outcomes (please tick where appropriate)		
			A1	*A2*	*A3*
1	describe the generic formats of a variety of spoken and written research texts (e.g., conference paper proposals, presentations, research proposals, theses and research articles) and adapt the formats in order to organize their research writing effectively;	10%	✓	✓	✓
2	describe and present in coherent fashion the essential types of information needed in the key sections of the research texts described in CILO 1;	30%	✓	✓	✓
3	describe and employ various linguistic conventions and strategies of citation needed to create well-integrated, meaningful prose and to establish their own authorial voices when drawing on others' work in written research texts;	25%	✓	✓	✓
4	describe and apply various linguistic resources and rhetorical strategies necessary for converting parts of their theses into manuscripts for publication in international refereed journals;	20%	✓	✓	✓
5	describe and employ various linguistic resources and rhetorical strategies needed in delivering effective presentations at international conferences and seminars.	15%	✓	✓	✓
	If weighting is assigned to CILOs, they should add up to 100%.	100%			

A1:   Attitude
Develop an attitude of discovery/innovation/creativity, as demonstrated by students possessing a strong sense of curiosity, asking questions actively, challenging assumptions or engaging in inquiry together with teachers.
A2:   Ability
Develop the ability/skill needed to discover/innovate/create, as demonstrated by students possessing critical thinking skills to assess ideas, acquiring research skills, synthesizing knowledge across disciplines or applying academic knowledge to self-life problems.
A3:   *Accomplishments*
Demonstrate accomplishment of discovery/innovation/creativity through producing /constructing creative works/new artefacts, effective solutions to real-life problems or new processes.

3. Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)

TLA	Brief Description	CILO No.					Hours/week (if applicable)
		1	2	3	4	5	
Lecture	Teacher-fronted presentation of material	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tutorial	Language tasks and activities Small group discussions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

4. Assessment Tasks/Activities (ATs)

Assessment Tasks/Activities	CILO No.					Weighting*	Remarks
	1	2	3	4	5		
Continuous Assessment: 100%							
1. *Producing a research text* Students will be asked to produce one substantial piece of research writing aimed for a qualifying examination (e.g., one part of a qualifying report, one chapter of a thesis, etc.) or a draft of a manuscript aimed for publication in an international refereed journal.	✓	✓	✓	✓		70%	
2. *Delivering an oral presentation* Students will be asked to write the proposal of a conference paper and deliver an oral presentation of the paper to their colleagues.					✓	30%	
* The weightings should add up to 100%.						100%	

5. Assessment Rubrics

Students are required to obtain a passing grade in the two assessed tasks stated in Section 4 (Assessment Activities and Tasks).

Producing a research text

Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
P	*Content* • The writing carries the essential ideas expected of the genre/genre-part that the writing represents. • The ideas are communicated clearly, effectively and succinctly. *Use of citations* • Extensive reading is evident as reflected by the number of sources cited. • Cited ideas are in general meaningfully engaged and are well-synthesized. • Authorial voice is evident. • Sources of cited ideas are properly documented and formatted. *Development of arguments* • Arguments are well-supported and well-developed. *Organization and format* • The writing is effectively sectioned. • Ideas within and across sections are well-connected. *Language* • The writing displays an appropriate mastery of the English language the scholarly register. • No plagiarism is detected.
F	*Content* • The piece is on the whole incomplete and many essential ideas are missing. • Ideas are vaguely communicated. *Use of citations* • The piece carries very few citations. • Cited ideas do not cohere and the purposes of citing them are mostly unclear. • Authorial voice is in general lacking. • Sources of cited ideas are inadequately documented and/or poorly formatted. *Development of arguments* • Arguments are poorly supported or under-developed. *Organization and format* • Sectioning is ineffectively done. • Continuity of ideas within/across sections is lacking. *Language* • The writing displays a poor command of the English language and the scholarly register. • Plagiarism is detected.

Delivering an oral presentation

Grade	Grading criteria in relation to CILOs
P	*Content* • The presentation carries essential ideas expected of a paper presented at a conference. *Organization and format* • The presentation is effectively organized. • Ideas are well-connected. *Handling the Q/A time* • The presenter is confident and displays an appropriate command of the pragmatic skills / strategies when handling questions from the audience. *Language* • The ideas are communicated clearly, effectively and succinctly. • The presenter displays an appropriate mastery of spoken English and the scholarly register typical of conference presentations. *Use of visuals* • Visuals are appropriately designed and effectively presented. *Assertiveness and eye contact* • The presenter is assertive, relaxed and natural throughout. • The presenter maintains natural /sufficient eye contact with the audience.
F	*Content* • Many essential ideas expected of a paper presented at a conference are missing. *Organization and format* • The presentation is poorly organized. • Ideas are mostly unconnected. • There is a general lack of signposts. *Handling the Q/A time* • The presenter is nervous and displays a poor command of pragmatic skills / strategies when handling questions from the audience. *Language* • The speech of the presenter is mostly unintelligible. • The presenter displays a poor command of spoken English and the scholarly register typical of conference presentations. *Use of visuals* • Visuals are inappropriately designed and poorly presented. *Assertiveness and eye contact* • The presenter is nervous and unassertive throughout. • The presenter maintains very little eye contact with the audience. •

Part III   Other Information (more details can be provided separately in the teaching plan)

1.   Keyword Syllabus

Authorial voice, citation conventions, citation strategies, paper proposals, conferences, presentations, research articles, thesis formats, thesis writing, writing for publication.

2.   Reading List
2.1   Compulsory Readings

1.	Artemeva, N. (2000). Revising a research article: Dialogic negotiation. In P. Dias & A. Paré (eds.), *Transitions: Writing in academic and workplace settings* (pp.74-87). Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press Inc.
2.	Belcher, D. 2007. Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, no. 1: 1–22.
3.	Casanave, C. & Vandrick, S. (eds.) (2003). *Writing for scholarly publication: Behind the scenes in language education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.
4.	Flowerdew, J. & Dudley-Evans, T. (2002). Genre analysis of editorial letters to international journal contributors. *Applied Linguistics*, *23, 4, 463-489.*
5.	Ridley, D. (2008). The literature review: A step-by-Step guide for students. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
6.	Swales, J.M. & Feak, C. (2000). English in today's research world. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
7.	Weissberg, R. & Buker, S. (1990). Writing up research: Experimental research report writing for students of English. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.
8.	Williams, H.C. 2004. How to reply to referees' comments when submitting manuscripts for publication. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology, 51, no.1:79-83.

2.2   Additional Readings

1.	On-line theses available at the CityU library website
2.	Concordancing tool: AntConc (http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html)
3.	Licensed EAP corpus: MICASE