

# HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-11-24 20:11:15

Student Email: 25273213@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25273213

Section: 8

## 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

Thank you for sharing the detailed assessment and chat history. It's clear the student made strong progress revising their essay draft—especially improving grammar, organization, vocabulary, and developing a clearer, balanced thesis and topic sentences. However, the major issue remains the misalignment with the assignment prompt about climate change, which the student did not resolve in chat or revision.

Here's a concise summary you can use to finalize your evaluation or feedback to the student:

### Summary of Student Performance and Interaction

- The student successfully completed all revision steps: thesis statement, topic sentence, and one body paragraph revision.
- The revised essay shows substantial improvement in clarity, organization, vocabulary, and grammar compared to the original draft.
- The thesis improved into a nuanced, balanced claim, and paragraphs show better unity and logical progression.
- Despite these strengths, the essay content is still off-task, focusing on migrants' rights rather than addressing whether individuals or governments should act on climate change.
- The student did not clarify or adjust this key task mismatch in the chat or revision process.
- Evidence is presented (e.g., Croatia example) but lacks specific citations or detailed explanation.
- The chat history reveals limited iterative dialogue; the student accepted the assistant's plan without documented critical evaluation or multiple rounds of revision through chat.
- Recommendations for future work include focusing first on task alignment, documenting revision rationale in chat, and strengthening evidence with sources.

If you require, I can help draft a feedback message to the student or a summary note for your records. Just let me know!

# Grading Result (Hidden from students)

The student has completed the three revision tasks: - Revised the thesis statement: Yes (present in the revised essay). - Revised one of the topic sentences: Yes (clear topic sentence(s) in revised paragraphs). - Revised one body paragraph: Yes (paragraphs in the revised essay show expanded, clarified content).

## 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: 12/25 - The draft expresses a clear concern about migrants' rights but is poorly developed and contains many unclear claims. It also fails to address the course prompt (climate-change/individual vs. government action), which reduces task relevance. Example: "I think government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right."
  - Organization: 13/25 - Paragraphing is repetitive and lacks clear topic sentences and logical progression. Many sentences restate the same point without new support.
  - Vocabulary: 12/25 - Limited range and incorrect usages (e.g., "relaxing time," "big lower"); frequent awkward word forms and possessive errors.
  - Grammar: 10/25 - Frequent grammatical errors affecting clarity (subject-verb agreement, possessives, article use, word order). Example: "they need to work for a long time, but gain little pay" and "migrants right" (should be "migrants' rights").
- Original Essay Total: 47/100

##### Revised Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 20/25 - The revised essay now offers a clear, nuanced thesis: "Governments must enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants' rights, but these protections should not come at the expense of the native-born population." It develops the idea with reasoning and an example (Croatia). However, it still does not address the course prompt about climate change, which remains a major task mismatch.

- Organization: 21/25 - Paragraphs are reorganized with clearer topic sentences and logical progression (e.g., paragraph on migrants' exploitation, paragraph on the Croatia example, concluding paragraph on equity). Flow is much improved.

- Vocabulary: 20/25 - Word choice is clearer and more precise than the original, using terms like "equity," "exploitation," and "social tensions." Some phrasing could be tightened for academic precision.

- Grammar: 21/25 - Major grammatical problems from the original are corrected; sentence structures are varied and mostly accurate. A few stylistic tweaks could still improve concision.

- **Revised Essay Total: 82/100**

#### **Essay Improvement Analysis:**

- **Overall Improvement: +35 points**

- **Key Improvements Made:**

- Thesis was substantially revised into a clearer, more nuanced claim that frames a balanced policy stance (quoted: "Governments must enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants' rights, but these protections should not come at the expense of the native-born population.").

- Topic sentences and paragraph structure were developed (example topic sentence: "Migrants frequently face significant challenges, including long working hours for low pay compared to native-born workers.").

- Grammar, vocabulary, and overall readability were significantly improved—sentences are clearer and academic tone is stronger.

- **Missed Opportunities:**

- Task relevance: The revised essay still does not answer the course prompt about individual vs. government/corporate action in addressing climate change. This is a major omission given the assignment context noted in the chat.

- Evidence and sourcing: The Croatia example is presented without citation or specific statistics; adding data, sources, or clearer explanation would strengthen the argument.

- Argument balance and clarity: The recommendation that governments "must first ensure that the fundamental rights of its native-born citizens are firmly protected" could be refined to avoid implying a zero-sum framing; more nuanced policy reasoning and evidence would help.

## HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

### Chat History Analysis:

- **Total Exchanges:** 6 (assistant intro; user posted original draft; assistant diagnostic and plan; user listing steps; assistant repeated diagnostic/ask for priorities). Note: The chat shows an initial diagnostic and a revision plan but few iterative revision turns.
- **Conversation Quality:** The assistant provided a solid diagnostic and a clear stepwise revision plan. The student acknowledged steps but did not engage in extensive back-and-forth in the chat history provided. The revised essay appears outside the chat, indicating the student revised offline rather than through multiple documented AI-assisted iterations.

### Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5 - The chat history contains a helpful assistant diagnosis and plan but is short (6 turns) and lacks extended, in-depth questioning or multi-level exploration. Evidence: assistant provided rubric-based feedback and suggested priorities, but the student did not engage in a long exchange to deepen the revisions.
- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 2/5 - The student did not document critical evaluation or selective acceptance/rejection of specific AI suggestions in the chat. The chat shows the student accepting the step plan rather than weighing alternatives or giving evidence-based reasons for choices.
- **Refining Process:** 2/5 - The chat shows a plan for Step 1–3, but the conversation lacks multiple iterative cycles in which the student and AI refine text together. The final revised essay exists, but the chat does not document staged revisions or critical checkpoints.
- **Human-AI Interaction Total:** 6/15

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

### Strengths Demonstrated:

- Clear improvement of thesis and paragraph-level organization: the revised thesis and topic sentences demonstrate better control of argument structure (evidence: revised thesis quoted above; topic sentence quoted above).

- Improved grammar and clarity: many sentence-level errors from the original were resolved, improving readability and tone.
- Ability to complete revisions independently: the student produced a substantially improved draft, indicating they can apply feedback (even if many edits were done outside the chat).

#### **Areas for Improvement:**

- Address the assignment prompt explicitly: revise content to answer the specified task (e.g., climate-change prompt) or clearly state if the assignment was different. Recommendation: if the intended prompt was about climate action, the student must reframe their thesis and evidence to that topic.
- Strengthen evidence and sourcing: provide citations or concrete statistics when using country-level examples (e.g., Croatia unemployment claim), and explain data more precisely.
- Increase documented iterative engagement with the AI: show in the chat how suggestions were tested, accepted, or modified (quotes or brief rationale for accepting/rejecting AI edits).

#### **AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:**

- Context Provision: Needs Improvement - The student did not clarify whether this migrants-rights essay was intended for the climate-change prompt; the assistant noted the mismatch but the student did not explicitly resolve it in the chat.
- Strategic Planning: Good - The student accepted and followed a clear revision plan (Step 1–5) and produced an improved draft.
- Critical Evaluation: Needs Improvement - The chat shows little evidence of the student evaluating AI suggestions with reasons; mostly acceptance of the assistant's plan without documented critique.
- Independent Editing: Good - The student implemented changes and produced a stronger revised essay, showing independent application of revision strategies.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

1. Ensure task alignment first: explicitly confirm the assignment prompt with the AI at the start. If the prompt was about climate change, refocus the thesis and evidence accordingly.

2. Document the revision iterations in the chat: for each major change (thesis, topic sentence, paragraph), paste before/after text and give a short reason for accepting or rejecting AI suggestions—this will improve your demonstrated critical engagement.

3. Strengthen evidence use: when citing country examples or statistics, include source references and explain the data's relevance. Ask the AI to suggest reputable sources and help integrate citations.

## INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student produced a clear, readable revised draft with much stronger organization and grammar; however, the essay still appears misaligned with the course prompt (the chat assistant flagged this concern early). Please confirm whether the grade should reflect the migrants-rights topic as submitted or whether the student should resubmit a version addressing the climate-change assignment.
- The chat history lacks documented iterative revision steps; if instructor assessment requires evidence of AI collaboration cycles, ask the student to resubmit a short chat log or commentary describing which AI suggestions were applied and why.

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

Current Mode:assessment

## Complete Conversation

### Assistant:

Original:

I think government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right. In many cases, we can see the migrants they need to work for a long time, but gain little pay, compared to native-born population. And because of global internation development, this world creates more migrants, and many migrants will lose their right in another country. When they lose the pay and relaxing time, maybe there will also come up with racist. So, in my opinion, I think government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right.

And in another way, maybe don't just migrants lose their right. Some country's' native-born population maybe also lose their rights. According to Croatia, the migrant's unemployment rate is big lower than native-born population unemployment rate. That means when migrants all have job, but some native-born people don't have job. That's not right. As a country, the government must safeguard native-born population right first. When all native-born population right is stable, and then, government need to safeguard migrant rights. Not safeguard migrants right first, but safeguard native-born population rights first. So, as I said, government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right but not give native-born population right to migrants. It's giving the same right as usual to native-born population, even enforce the right, and then enforce the right, and then enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants' rights. Native-born population right can't higher too much than migrants, and the migrants right can't higher than native-born population right and migrants right the same as possible as them can.

Revised:

Governments must enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants' rights, but these protections should not come at the expense of the native-born population. Achieving this balance is crucial for social stability and justice.

Migrants frequently face significant challenges, including long working hours for low pay compared to native-born workers. As global interconnectedness increases the number of people moving abroad, the risk of these individuals having their rights violated also grows. Such exploitation is not only unfair but can also fuel social tensions and racism, particularly if a society perceives that the system is unjust.

However, the solution cannot involve transferring rights from one group to another. A compelling example can be seen in Croatia, where statistics show the unemployment rate for migrants is significantly lower than for the native-born population. This situation can create a perception that migrants are securing all available jobs while native-born citizens are left behind. This is not a sustainable outcome. A government's primary responsibility is to protect the rights and ensure the economic stability of all its people, native and migrant alike.

Therefore, the goal of legislation should be equity, not a zero-sum game. The government must first ensure that the fundamental rights of its native-born citizens are firmly protected and stable. Once this foundation is secure, it can then effectively enforce stricter laws to guarantee that migrants receive the same level of protection. The objective is not to give native rights to migrants, nor to elevate migrant rights above others. Instead, it is to create a system where the rights of both groups are as equal as possible, ensuring fairness for everyone in society.

**Assistant:**

Hi there! ■ I'm your English writing coach, here to help you strengthen your essay through clear, focused revision. Before we dive in, we'll take a moment to set some goals together.

Here's how our session will work:

Negotiate your targets — We'll start by discussing what you want to improve most in your essay.

Get a quick diagnosis — I'll give you feedback on your essay based on key writing rubrics (like thesis, organization, evidence, and language).

Choose what to focus on — You'll decide which issues you'd like to work on first.

Then we'll move through a structured, three-step revision process:

Step 1: Revise your thesis statement.

Step 2: Choose one body paragraph and refine its topic sentence.

Step 3: Revise the rest of that paragraph for clarity and coherence.

My role is to guide you with questions, feedback, and examples—but you'll always lead the revisions yourself. ■

**You:**

I think government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right. In many cases, we can see the migrants they need to work for a long time, but gain little pay, compared to native-born population. And because of global internation development, this world creates more migrants, and many migrants will lose their right in another country. When they lose the pay and relaxing time, maybe there will also come up with racist. So, in my opinion, I think government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right.

And in another way, maybe don't just migrants lose their right. Some country's' native-born population maybe also lose their rights. According to Croatia, the migrant's unemployment rate is big lower than native-born population unemployment rate. That means when migrants all have job, but some native-born people don't have job. That's not right. As a country, the government must safeguard native-born population right first. When all native-born population right is stable, and then, government need to safeguard migrant rights. Not safeguard migrants right first, but safeguard native-born population rights first. So, as I said, government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right but not give native-born population right to migrants. It's giving the same right as usual to native-born population, even enforce the right, and then enforce the right, and then enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants' rights. Native-born population right can't higher too much than migrants, and the migrants right can't higher than native-born population right and migrants right the same as possible as them can.

**Assistant:**

Hi — I'm glad you shared this draft. Before we begin revising, let's agree what you want to work on and I'll give a quick diagnosis so you can choose priorities.

### 1) Quick check of your learning goals

- What do you want to improve most today? (Choose any: clarity, task/relevance, argument strength, structure/organization, topic sentences, evidence use, vocabulary, grammar/sentence variety.)
- Which 1–2 of those would you most like me to help you with in this session?

### 2) Short diagnostic feedback (based on rubric categories)

- Content & ideas (Relevance): Major concern — your essay talks about migrants' rights, but the assignment asks about whether individual actions matter versus governments/corporations in fighting climate change. Because of that mismatch, the essay won't meet the task. Strength: you do express a clear viewpoint about protecting rights. Level (rubric): roughly 1–2 for task relevance.
- Organisation & logical progression: Sentences repeat ideas and the paragraphs lack clear topic sentence → development is unclear and repetitive. Level: 2 (Basic).
- Vocabulary: Words are simple and sometimes used incorrectly (e.g., "relaxing time," "big lower"), and some word forms are wrong (singular/plural, possessives). Level: 2–3.
- Grammar & sentence structure: Many grammar issues (verb forms, articles, word order, punctuation), which make meaning unclear in places. Level: 2.

### 3) Specific examples to show problems (brief)

- Thesis: "I think government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right." — Grammar (need → needs, migrants right → migrants' rights) and also not answering the climate-change question.
- Repetition: The idea "government need to enforce stricter laws" is repeated multiple times without new support.
- Confusing sentence: "When they lose the pay and relaxing time, maybe there will also come up with racist." — unclear meaning and grammar.

### 4) Decide priorities (your choice)

Based on that diagnosis, which issues do you want to focus on in this session? Pick up to two priorities:

- A — Make the essay answer the climate-change prompt (task relevance + thesis)
- B — Strengthen the thesis so it clearly takes a position and previews main points
- C — Improve organization: a clear topic sentence for one paragraph and better paragraph unity
- D — Fix key grammar and word-choice problems in one paragraph
- E — Vocabulary precision and academic tone

Please tell me:

- a) Which 1–2 targets you choose (for example: A and B), and
- b) Did you intend to write about the climate-change prompt, or were you trying to write about migrants for a different assignment?

Once you confirm, we'll begin Step 1 (thesis revision). I'll ask you to share your intended thesis (or your position on the climate prompt if you haven't decided), then we'll work together to improve it. Would you like to pick the targets now?

**You:**

Step 1: Revise thesis statement

Step 2: Revise topic sentences

Step 3: Revise one body paragraph

Step 4 (optional): Revise the rest of the essay

Step 5: Submit the final draft

**Assistant:**

Hi — thanks for sharing your draft. I'll help you through a clear, step-by-step revision, but first let's agree targets and I'll give a short diagnosis so you can choose priorities.

### 1) Quick check of your learning goals

- What do you want to improve most today? Choose any: clarity, task/relevance, argument strength, structure/organization, topic sentences, evidence use, vocabulary, grammar/sentence variety.

- Which 1–2 of those should we focus on in this session?

2) Short diagnostic feedback (based on the rubric)

- Content & ideas (Relevance): Major issue — your essay is about migrants' rights, but the assignment asks whether individual actions matter compared with governments/corporations in fighting climate change. Because of that mismatch, the essay does not answer the task. Strength: you do express a viewpoint about protecting rights. Rubric estimate: ~1–2 for task relevance.
- Organisation & logical progression: Paragraphs repeat the same sentence and lack a clear topic sentence and logical progression. Ideas need clearer grouping and development. Rubric estimate: 2 (Basic).
- Vocabulary: Some simple vocabulary and incorrect word choices or forms (e.g., "relaxing time," "big lower"). Rubric estimate: 2–3.
- Grammar & sentence structure: Many grammar problems (subject-verb agreement, possessives, articles, word order) that make meaning unclear in places. Rubric estimate: 2.

3) A few specific examples to show the problems

- Thesis: "I think government need to enforce stricter laws to safeguard migrants right." — should be governments need; migrants' rights; also this does not answer the climate-change question.
- Repetition: The sentence about enforcing stricter laws is repeated several times without new reasons or evidence.
- Unclear sentence: "When they lose the pay and relaxing time, maybe there will also come up with racist." — unclear meaning and grammar.

4) Decide priorities (your choice)

Based on the diagnosis, please pick up to two targets for this session from these options:

- A — Make the essay answer the climate-change prompt (task relevance + thesis)
- B — Strengthen the thesis so it clearly takes a position and previews main points
- C — Improve organization: a clear topic sentence for one paragraph and paragraph unity
- D — Fix key grammar and word-choice problems in one paragraph
- E — Vocabulary precision and academic tone

And one quick question:

- Did you intend to write about the climate-change prompt, or were you writing this migrants' rights draft for a different assignment?

Please tell me:

- a) Which 1–2 targets you choose (for example: A and B), and
- b) Whether you intended to write about the climate-change prompt.

After you confirm, we'll begin Step 1: I'll ask you to share your intended thesis (or your position on the climate prompt if you don't have a formal thesis yet). Would you like to pick your targets now?