

HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-11-22 17:42:18

Student Email: 25261673@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25261673

Section: 53

Course Information and Student Background

Course Information: Course: LANG 0036 - English for Academic Purposes Level: Intermediate to Advanced Focus: Academic writing and critical thinking Assessment: Essay writing with rubric-based evaluation

Student Background: Academic Level: University student Language: English as additional language Goals: Improve academic writing skills Challenges: Structure, vocabulary, critical analysis

Rubric:

Assessment Task: Writing (20%) Part 1: Point-of-view Essay (10%)

Criteria: Content and Ideas 1 (Limited): Ideas are irrelevant or minimally related to the topic. Lacks awareness of the issue concerned. No clear viewpoint. 2 (Basic): Ideas are somewhat related but vague. Minimal awareness of the issue concerned. Viewpoint unclear. 3 (Developing): Ideas are relevant but basic. Some awareness of the issue concerned. Viewpoint present but weakly developed. 4 (Proficient): Ideas are relevant and solid. Good awareness of the issue concerned. Clear viewpoint with some depth. 5 (Excellent): Ideas are insightful and highly relevant. Strong awareness of the issue concerned. Well-developed, compelling viewpoint.

Criteria: Organisation and Logical Progression 1 (Limited): No clear structure. Ideas are disjointed with no development or progression. 2 (Basic): Basic structure with unclear paragraphing. Ideas are listed with little development. 3 (Developing): Clear structure with some paragraphing. Ideas are developed but lack depth or logical flow. 4 (Proficient): Well-organized with clear paragraphs. Ideas are developed logically with good flow and support. 5 (Excellent): Highly organized with effective paragraphing. Ideas are thoroughly developed with seamless, logical progression.

Criteria: Vocabulary 1 (Limited): Vocabulary is limited, repetitive, or inaccurate. Lacks topic-specific terms. 2 (Basic): Basic vocabulary with some repetition. Minimal use of topic-specific terms. 3 (Developing): Adequate vocabulary with some variety. Includes some topic-specific terms but with occasional errors. 4 (Proficient): Varied and precise vocabulary. Effective use of topic-specific terms. Minor errors. 5 (Excellent): Rich, precise vocabulary. Masterful use of topic-specific terms. Almost error-free and sophisticated.

Criteria: Grammar and Sentence Structure 1 (Limited): Frequent grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are incomplete or confusing. 2 (Basic): Several grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are simple and often flawed. 3 (Developing): Some grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are mostly correct but lack variety. 4 (Proficient): Minor grammatical and spelling errors. Sentences are varied and mostly accurate. 5 (Excellent): Virtually error-free grammar and spelling. Sentences are complex, varied, and accurately constructed.

Part 2: AI-Assisted Review Skills (10%) A. In-Depth Conversation with AI 1 (Limited): No exchanges or chat history; no questions asked. 2 (Basic): Sparse conversation; one or two simple questions. 3 (Developing): Adequate exchanges; some relevant questions. 4 (Proficient): Robust interaction; detailed, relevant questions across levels. 5 (Excellent): Extensive, well-documented chat history; insightful, multi-level questioning.

B. Critical Review of AI Suggestions 1 (Limited): All AI suggestions accepted blindly. 2 (Basic): Most accepted; little analysis. 3 (Developing): Some evaluated; partial justification. 4 (Proficient): Most critically reviewed with clear justification. 5 (Excellent): All evaluated thoroughly with strong, evidence-based reasoning.

C. Refining Process 1 (Limited): No revisions made. 2 (Basic): Minimal revisions; no iteration. 3 (Developing): Some revisions with limited iteration. 4 (Proficient): Clear iterative process with multiple revisions. 5 (Excellent): Extensive refinement with iterative improvements.

Contribution Analysis

Here is a detailed training assessment report based on the chat history and essay drafts you provided:

TRAINING ASSESSMENT REPORT

STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Course: LANG 0036 - Enhancing English through Global Citizenship

Module: AI for Revising Essays

ESSAY WRITING ASSESSMENT

Original Essay Scores:

- **Content and Ideas (21/25):** The original essay expresses a reasonably clear stance—that individuals partly matter in climate change action via influencing government and personal lifestyle choices. The ideas are relevant and connected but remain general and lack specific, cited evidence or fully developed examples.
- **Organization (21/25):** The essay follows a standard four-paragraph structure with a logical flow. However, some clarity issues and weak transitions slightly reduce the coherence and impact.
- **Vocabulary (18/25):** Appropriate but somewhat limited vocabulary; occasional imprecise or colloquial phrasing detracts from the academic register expected at this level.
- **Grammar (15/25):** Frequent grammatical errors, including incorrect verb forms and sentence constructions, impact clarity and fluency.
- **Overall Original Essay Total:** 75/100

Revised Essay Scores:

- **Content and Ideas (14/25):** The submitted revision is incomplete, with placeholders ("bla bla bla") and notes to revise, resulting in a greatly reduced substantive content score. The thesis and first body paragraph are not actually revised.
- **Organization (15/25):** The overall structure is visible but fragmented due to placeholders and incomplete revision work, so coherence and flow suffer.
- **Vocabulary (14/25):** No concrete improvement; placeholders and unrevised sections mean repetition of limited vocabulary continues.
- **Grammar (14/25):** Persistent errors remain, and no demonstrable sentence-level corrections were made.
- **Overall Revised Essay Total:** 57/100

Essay Improvement Analysis:

- **Change in Score:** -18 points
- **Key Improvements:** None substantive; no evidence of completed revision steps.
- **Missed Opportunities:**
 - Rewriting the thesis into a clear, previewing statement without hedging.
 - Creating specific, linked topic sentences reflecting revised thesis.
 - Correcting grammar and diction at sentence level.
 - Adding concrete examples and developing arguments beyond generalities.

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

Chat History Summary:

- **Total Exchanges:** 7
- **Pattern:** The AI assistant provided structured, stepwise revision guidance (thesis revision, topic sentences, paragraph revision).
- **Student Engagement:** Minimal, often responding with "let's pretend we have revised..." rather than actual revised text, indicating low follow-through.

Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5 — The dialog was short; the student did not produce multi-level inquiry or extended revisions.
- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 2/5 — The student did not critically evaluate or question suggestions, just deferred by pretending revisions were done.
- **Refining Process:** 2/5 — No actual revision cycles were completed or submitted; placeholders remain instead of text.
- **Overall Human-AI Interaction:** 6/15

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Strengths:

- The original essay shows understanding of key ideas and macro-structure (thesis, two main points, conclusion).
- The student engaged to some degree with AI prompts, demonstrating awareness of revision steps.
- The AI assistant provided well-structured, pedagogically sound guidance.

Areas for Improvement:

- **Revision Follow-through:** Student needs to produce and submit concrete revisions instead of placeholders or hypothetical responses.
- **Grammar and Diction:** Careful editing is needed to address common errors and raise formality.
- **Evidence and Development:** Adding specific examples or referenced brief cases will make arguments more credible.
- **Engagement in Collaborative Editing:** Actively use, critique, and refine AI suggestions rather than deferring or pretending edits.

AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- **Context Provision:** Needs improvement — no final draft revisions or targeted goals submitted.
- **Strategic Planning:** Needs improvement — did not enact a staged revision plan collaboratively designed by the assistant.
- **Critical Evaluation:** Needs improvement — no critique or justification of AI feedback observed.
- **Independent Editing:** Needs improvement — unchanged errors and placeholders show lack of revision applied.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. **Complete Revision Steps:** Submit your revised thesis statement, then topic sentences, then fully revised body paragraphs — work in stages as guided.
2. **Focus on Sentence-Level Editing:** Address grammatical issues including verb tense, article use, and eliminate hedging. Avoid colloquial phrases to improve register.
3. **Use AI as an Iterative Partner:** Submit drafts for feedback, accept or reject suggestions with explanations, then produce improved revisions and resubmit for further review.
4. **Add Concrete Support:** Support your claims with specific examples, data, or brief references to increase essay credibility and depth.

INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- Student grasps the essay's main ideas and organization but did not complete the guided revision tasks.
- The AI assistant's scaffolding was detailed and appropriate, but the student's repeated "pretend" responses indicate superficial engagement.
- For assessment purposes, consider requiring concrete deliverables for each revision step to document actual progress and effective AI collaboration.

If you would like, I can help draft example revisions, or provide detailed editing suggestions step-by-step to support completing the revisions concretely. Just let me know!

Grading Result (Hidden from students)

not finished

STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Course: LANG 0036 - Enhancing English through Global Citizenship

Module: AI for Revising Essays

ESSAY WRITING ASSESSMENT

Original Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 21/25 - The essay presents a clear, relevant stance ("I partly agree with this idea... citizens can still influence the government ... personal green lifestyle choices ... still have a role to play.") and supports it with two main lines of argument (political influence; personal lifestyle/market pressure). Examples (protests, voting, consumer choices) are adequate but general; development is reasonable but lacks specific, cited evidence.
- Organization: 21/25 - Standard essay structure (introduction, two body paragraphs, conclusion) with logical progression from influence on government to individual actions. Some paragraph-level clarity issues and weak transitions (e.g., "But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little...") reduce coherence slightly.

- Vocabulary: 18/25 - Vocabulary is appropriate and understandable but limited and sometimes imprecise ("people don't care and just want to do what is easy," "is not always working well"). Repetition and colloquial phrasing weaken register expected at this level.

- Grammar: 15/25 - Noticeable grammatical errors and non-native constructions that affect clarity in places: "maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action," "nothing happen," "so this is problem," "so it not really enough." Sentences are mostly simple; errors are frequent enough to require correction.

- **Original Essay Total: 75/100**

Revised Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 14/25 - The revised submission contains placeholders ("bla bla bla ...", "revise the rest of body paragraph #1 ...") and explicit notes to revise, so the substantive content is incomplete. The original arguments appear partially retained in later paragraphs, but the central thesis and first paragraph are not actually revised.

- Organization: 15/25 - The structure is fragmented by placeholders and revision notes. While the original organizational plan remains visible, the revised draft is not a finished, coherent version.

- Vocabulary: 14/25 - The same limited vocabulary and colloquial expressions remain in the unrevised sections; placeholders prevent demonstration of improved word choice.

- Grammar: 14/25 - Grammatical issues from the original persist; the incomplete nature of the revision prevents demonstration of corrected sentence-level errors.

- **Revised Essay Total: 57/100**

Essay Improvement Analysis:

- **Overall Improvement: -18 points**

- **Key Improvements Made:**

- None substantive: the student indicated intent to revise but left placeholders rather than producing concrete revisions.

- **Missed Opportunities:**

- Revise thesis into a concise, previewing sentence as the assistant guided (e.g., remove hedging and state two clear reasons).

- Replace placeholder topic sentence(s) with specific, linked claims (e.g., link paragraph claim directly to the thesis: "To support my view that individuals matter, collective civic actions pressure governments to change policy.").
- Edit sentence-level grammar and diction (fix verb forms, articles, and colloquial phrasing) and add concrete evidence/examples to strengthen content.

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

Chat History Analysis:

Total Exchanges: 7 messages (assistant and user turns)

Evidence: The chat shows sustained assistant guidance (multiple detailed prompts) but limited substantive input from the student. The student repeatedly replied with "let's pretend we have revised..." or pasted the original thesis without producing actual revisions.

Conversation Quality: The AI assistant provided structured, pedagogically sound guidance (stepwise instructions, mini-templates, explicit checks). The student's engagement was superficial: they acknowledged guidance but did not produce revised artifacts, repeatedly asking to "pretend" revisions had been made rather than performing them.

Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5 - Justification: The chat length is short (7 turns) and the student's contributions are minimal. The assistant posed in-depth, multi-step prompts, but the student did not follow through with substantive, multi-level questions or extended exchanges. Evidence: user replies such as "let's pretend we have revised the thesis statement and move on bla bla bla ..." and "let's pretend we have revised the thesis statement and move on bla bla bla ..." show low engagement.
- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 2/5 - Justification: The student did not critically evaluate or accept/reject suggestions with reasons. Instead they deferred by asking to "pretend" the thesis was revised. There is no evidence of the student justifying changes or explaining choices.
- **Refining Process:** 2/5 - Justification: The student did not complete iterative revision cycles. The assistant requested a revised thesis and topic sentences and provided templates and next steps, but the student did not submit actual revised versions or implement the assistant's suggestions. Evidence: the revised essay uses placeholders ("revise the rest of body paragraph #1 ...") rather than edited text.
- **Human-AI Interaction Total:** 6/15

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Strengths Demonstrated:

- The student's original draft demonstrates clear awareness of the essay question and reasonable macro-structure (intro, two body paragraphs, conclusion) with two relevant supporting ideas.
- The student engaged with the AI assistant to some degree by pasting the original thesis and responding to prompts, indicating awareness of the revision process.
- The AI assistant provided high-quality, structured guidance (templates, explicit steps), which is a strong platform for improvement.

Areas for Improvement:

- Follow-through: Produce actual revised text instead of placeholders—revise the thesis, topic sentences, and full body paragraphs.
- Editing: Address sentence-level grammar and diction errors (verb forms, articles, collocations).
- Evidence and development: Add concrete examples, data, or brief referenced cases to support claims more convincingly.
- Engagement with AI: Use the assistant's templates to produce drafts, then critique and iterate (accept/reject suggestions with reasons).

AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- **Context Provision:** Needs Improvement - Evidence: The student provided the original essay but did not provide a finalized revised thesis or concrete revision goals beyond "pretend." This limited the assistant's ability to support targeted edits.
- **Strategic Planning:** Needs Improvement - Evidence: The assistant outlined a clear plan (thesis revision → topic sentence → paragraph revision), but the student did not enact this plan or produce staged deliverables.
- **Critical Evaluation:** Needs Improvement - Evidence: The chat lacks instances where the student evaluated or justified AI suggestions; the student accepted a hypothetical revised thesis rather than assessing or choosing among options.
- **Independent Editing:** Needs Improvement - Evidence: The revised essay contains placeholders rather than student-driven edits; independent application of advice was not demonstrated.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. Complete the concrete revision steps the assistant requested: write and paste a revised thesis that cleanly previews two reasons; then write a revised topic sentence for one paragraph; then paste the fully revised paragraph for feedback. Do these steps one at a time.
2. Focus on sentence-level editing: correct verb forms and articles (e.g., “nothing happened,” “the government may listen a little,” “this is a problem”), reduce hedging in thesis (remove “I believe/I also think”), and raise register by avoiding colloquial “bla bla” or informal phrasing.
3. Use the AI as an iterative partner: produce a draft revision, ask for targeted feedback, accept or reject suggestions with reasons, then submit a second revision. Track each change and annotate why you accepted or changed a suggestion to demonstrate critical engagement.

INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student understands the central ideas and structure required but did not complete the requested revisions. The chat shows the assistant provided clear, scaffolded instructions, but the student repeatedly deferred by saying “pretend,” leaving the task incomplete.
- For grading or formative feedback, consider requiring the student to submit the three concrete revisions the assistant asked for (revised thesis, revised topic sentence, revised body paragraph) as separate deliverables to document iterative progress and AI-collaboration skills.

■■■ Student Feedback ■ Rating: 0/5 ■ Comment: No additional comment provided.

Current Mode:training

Complete Conversation

Assistant:

Original:

Climate change is a very serious problem in the world today, and many people argue that the actions of individuals do not matter much compared to what governments and big companies can do. I partly agree with this idea because I believe citizens can still influence the government, which is very important, but at the same time, I also think that personal green lifestyle choices, while less impactful, still have a role to play.

The most important way individuals can help fight climate change is by influencing the government and politicians. When many citizens demand better environmental laws, governments are more likely to act. For example, if people protest or vote for leaders who care about the environment, it can push the government to ban pollution or invest in clean energy. In some countries, people have joined together and forced their leaders to make new rules about plastic or cutting carbon emissions. This shows that public opinion and pressure from normal people can have a big effect, even if individuals alone do not have much power. But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action, so is not always working well. Also, sometimes people want change but they don't know how to tell the politicians, so nothing happen.

On the other hand, individuals can also make small changes in their own lives, like recycling, using less water, or choosing to walk instead of drive. These actions are not as powerful as government policies, but they still matter. If many people try to live in a greener way, it can create a good example for others and send a message to companies that customers want eco-friendly products. For instance, if lots of people buy from green companies, businesses will try to be more sustainable to make more profit. But also, sometimes people don't care and just want to do what is easy,

so this is problem. Or maybe only a few people do green things but most people don't change, so it not really enough to help the climate problem.

In conclusion, while individual actions alone may not solve climate change, they are not completely useless. The most important thing is that citizens can influence governments to make strong decisions for the environment. At the same time, personal green habits can also help, even if they are less effective. In my opinion, everyone—governments, companies, and individuals—needs to work together to fight this problem.

Revised:

Climate change is a very serious problem in the world today, and many people argue that the actions of individuals do not matter much compared to what governments and big companies can do. bla bla bla ...

revised topic sentence bla bla bla ... When many citizens demand better environmental laws, governments are more likely to act.

revise the rest of body paragraph #1 ...

revised topic sentence bla bla bla ... These actions are not as powerful as government policies, but they still matter. If many people try to live in a greener way, it can create a good example for others and send a message to companies that customers want eco-friendly products. For instance, lots of people buy from green companies, businesses will try to be more sustainable to make more profit. But also, sometimes people don't care and just want to do what is easy, so this is problem. Or maybe only a few people do green things but most people don't change, so it not really enough to help the climate problem.

In conclusion, while individual actions alone may not solve climate change, they are not completely useless. The most important thing is that citizens can influence governments to make strong decisions for the environment. At the same time, personal green habits can also help, even if they are less effective. In my opinion, everyone—governments, companies, and individuals—needs to work together to fight this problem.

Assistant:

Welcome to the training mode of AI assistant. In this session, you are expected to revise the thesis statement to ensure it includes two main points that address the essay question.

Can you first locate the thesis statement in the draft?

You:

I partly agree with this idea because I believe citizens can still influence the government, which is very important, but at the same time, I also think that personal green lifestyle choices, while less impactful, still have a role to play.

Assistant:

Great — thanks for sharing your draft. To start Step 1, I want to confirm: is this your current thesis?

"I partly agree with this idea because I believe citizens can still influence the government, which is very important, but at the same time, I also think that personal green lifestyle choices, while less impactful, still have a role to play."

Brief feedback on clarity, strength, and focus

- Clarity: The idea is understandable — you say you partly agree and you name two reasons (political influence and personal choices). Good.
- Strength: It uses hedging and extra phrases ("I believe," "I also think," "while less impactful, still have a role"), which make it less confident and a little wordy.
- Focus/preview: It mentions two main points but doesn't clearly preview how the essay will develop them (e.g., influence on policy; consumer/behavioural impacts). A stronger thesis should state your stance clearly and briefly preview the two main lines of argument.

How to improve (do not write a whole sentence yet — use these elements to rebuild it)

- Start with a clear, confident stance (e.g., "I partly agree" or "I agree to some extent").
- Remove first-person fillers like "I believe" or "I also think."
- State the two main reasons as concise phrases to preview the essay (for example: political pressure on governments; collective consumer and lifestyle choices shaping markets and norms).

- Keep it short and direct: stance + because + two concise reasons.

A simple formula you can follow (fill in with your words):

- [Stance: partly agree] + because + [reason 1: how individuals influence government/policy] + and [reason 2: how collective personal choices affect companies/social norms].

Would you like to try rewriting the thesis now using that formula? Write your revised version and I'll give quick, focused feedback.

You:

let's pretend we have revised the thesis statement and move on bla bla bla ...

Assistant:

Great — assuming your thesis is now revised and you're happy with it, let's move to Step 2.

Which body paragraph would you like to work on: the first one about influencing government, or the second one about personal lifestyle/consumer choices? Please paste the current topic sentence you want to revise (or tell me which paragraph and I'll use the sentence from your draft).

Quick guidance on what I'll look for in the topic sentence

- Clear link to your (revised) thesis: the topic sentence should show how this paragraph supports your overall stance.
- Strong, confident phrasing (avoid weak hedges and wordiness).
- A concise preview of the paragraph's main idea (so the reader knows what to expect).

Helpful mini-templates (fill in with your own words — do not copy these as final sentences)

- For the government paragraph: "[Claim about individuals' political influence] because [how collective action leads to policy change or pressure]."
- For the lifestyle/consumer paragraph: "[Claim about individual behaviour] because [how many small actions add up or create market/social pressure]."

Would you like to try revising the topic sentence now? Paste your new version when you're ready and I'll give focused feedback on its connection to the thesis.

You:

let's pretend we have revised the thesis statement and move on bla bla bla ...

Assistant:

Great — let's continue. First, I need to confirm the revised thesis before we move on.

Step 1 — Thesis confirmation

- Please paste your revised thesis statement here (or type "pretend" only if you want us to imagine one).
- Quick reminder of what I'll check: it should state your clear stance, answer the question, and preview the two main reasons (e.g., political influence; collective consumer/lifestyle effects) in confident, concise language.

Once you paste the revised thesis and confirm you're happy with it, we'll move to Step 2.

Step 2 — Choose a paragraph and topic sentence

- Which paragraph would you like to work on: the first (influence on government) or the second (personal lifestyle/consumer choices)?
- Paste the current topic sentence for that paragraph (the one you want to revise).

Tips for improving the topic sentence (don't copy — use these to craft your version)

- Make the connection to the thesis explicit: begin by linking the paragraph's claim to your overall stance (e.g., "To support my view that individuals matter, ...").
- State a clear claim about what the paragraph will show (e.g., collective political pressure leads to policy change).
- Use strong, active verbs (influence, pressure, mobilize, shift) and avoid weak hedges like "maybe" or filler phrases like "I believe."
- Optionally preview the evidence you'll use (e.g., protests, voting, petitions) in a short phrase.

A short fill-in template you can use:

- "[Link to thesis], [claim about individuals' political role] because [brief cause/result]."

Would you like to try revising the topic sentence now? Paste your new version and I'll give focused feedback on its connection to the thesis.

(After you revise the topic sentence, we'll do Step 3 and revise the rest of that paragraph together.)