

HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-12-07 01:04:49

Student Email: 25240552@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25240552

Section: 12

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. Here is a concise summary of key points, strengths, and recommendations for your continued improvement:

Key Strengths:

- You clearly state your position supporting stronger legal protections for migrant workers.
- You successfully revised the thesis statement and topic sentences to be clearer and more grammatically correct.
- You followed a basic essay structure including introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion.
- Improvements in vocabulary and grammar are noticeable from the original to the revised essay.

Areas to Focus on Next:

Developing Content with Specific Evidence:

Add concrete examples, statistics, or logical explanations to support claims (e.g., cite impacts of legal protection on migrant worker well-being or economic benefits).

Grammar and Collocation Accuracy:

Work on remaining issues like “strictening” (should be “strengthening”), pluralization, article use (“the society” → “society”), and smoother phrasing.

Engage More Actively in Revision Process:

In future AI-assisted tasks, try to show your thinking and revisions in chat. Ask clarifying questions or explain why you accept/reject suggestions to deepen your learning and collaboration skills.

Ensure Topic Alignment:

Confirm the essay prompt you are responding to (migrant workers or climate change) to keep your ideas focused on the task.

Suggestions for Your Next Steps:

- Try drafting one body paragraph that includes a clear example or data point supporting your thesis, then revise it for grammar and vocabulary.
- Practice rewriting sentences with a checklist: *Is the subject-verb agreement correct? Are articles used properly? Are the word forms standard and idiomatic?*
- Use AI feedback iteratively, posting your revision attempts and asking for help with specific problems.

If you like, I can provide a corrected version of your revised essay with grammar fixes and smoother phrasing, or help you build a model paragraph that includes specific evidence you can adapt. Just let me know how you want to proceed!

Grading Result (Hidden from students)

The student has completed all three tasks: 1. Revised the thesis statement — completed (see evidence below). 2. Revised one of the topic sentences — completed (see evidence below). 3. Revised one of the body paragraphs — completed (see evidence below).

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: 17/25 - The essay presents a clear position (supporting stricter laws to protect migrant workers) and basic supporting ideas (human rights, health, economic benefits). Ideas are underdeveloped and repetitive with no concrete examples or evidence.
- Organization: 16/25 - A basic structure (intro, body paragraphs, conclusion) exists, but paragraph development and logical flow are weak; topic sentences are often unclear.
- Vocabulary: 15/25 - Limited range and repeated, sometimes incorrect word forms (e.g., "stricter the laws," "nature-born population"); few topic-specific terms used correctly.
- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 14/25 - Frequent grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that interfere with clarity (subject-verb agreement, word forms, articles, prepositions).
- **Original Essay Total: 62/100**

Evidence (original): - Thesis: "In my perspective, government should stricter the laws to safeguard their rights. Stricter the laws would be good for the individual and the society." - Topic sentence example: "To begin with, the migrant workers have human right as the nature-born population."

Revised Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 19/25 - The revised version clarifies the writer's stance and reiterates main reasons; some sentences are improved for clarity. However, ideas remain general and lack concrete evidence, examples, or development.
- Organization: 18/25 - Paragraph topic sentences are clearer and the sequence of arguments is easier to follow, but internal paragraph development remains repetitive and some transitions are awkward.
- Vocabulary: 17/25 - Noticeable improvements in word choice (e.g., "strengthen the law," "deserve equal human rights"), but vocabulary remains limited and some collocation/word-form issues persist (e.g., "strictening," inconsistent verb forms).
- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 17/25 - Several grammatical errors were corrected; sentence clarity improved in places. However, lingering errors remain (articles, pluralization, awkward phrasing) and some sentences still need smoothing.
- **Revised Essay Total: 71/100**

Evidence (revised): - Revised thesis: "From my perspective, the government should strengthen the law to safeguard their rights. Strengthening the law would be good for both individuals and the society." - Revised topic sentence (paragraph 1): "To begin with, migrant workers deserve equal human rights as the local population because they are also legal members of the workforce." - Revised paragraph 2 opener: "Beside that, when the government strengthen the law to safeguard the workload and rights of migrant workers, it can attract more professional workers come to the city."

Essay Improvement Analysis:

- Overall Improvement: +9 points

- Key Improvements Made:

- Thesis wording improved: "strengthen the law" replaces "stricter the laws," clarifying intent and grammatical form.
- Topic sentences were rewritten for clearer meaning (e.g., first body paragraph now says migrant workers "deserve equal human rights as the local population").
- Some grammar and vocabulary corrections increased clarity (fewer incomprehensible phrases, more standard terms like "strengthen" and "deserve").

- Missed Opportunities:

- Provide concrete evidence, examples, or statistics to support claims (e.g., studies, case examples, or hypothetical scenarios showing benefits of protection).
- Smooth transitions and reduce repetition (many sentences repeat the same claims without development).
- Correct remaining grammar and collocation issues (e.g., "Strictening" → "Strengthening", pluralization and article use, "migrant have" → "migrants have", and awkward phrasing such as "serve as normal, serve as the nature-born population").
- Align explicitly with the course prompt if the actual assignment is on climate change — the chat shows a possible mismatch which should be resolved.

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

Chat History Analysis:

- Total Exchanges: 3 messages (assistant intro; user: "Let's revise the thesis statement"; assistant: diagnostic and plan).

- Conversation Quality: The assistant provided a clear revision plan and diagnostic feedback. The student engaged minimally (one short instruction) and did not show iterative negotiation or explicit acceptance/rejection of suggestions. The chat does not show multiple revision cycles or critical evaluation by the student.

Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5 - The chat contains only three messages. The assistant's messages are detailed, but the student's participation is minimal and there is not an extensive back-and-forth. Evidence: after the assistant's plan, the student's single reply was "Let's revise the thesis statement" and then no further detailed exchanges are shown.
- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 1/5 - There is no evidence the student critically evaluated AI suggestions in the chat (no discussion of accepting/rejecting alternatives or justifying choices). The student did not ask follow-up probing questions or indicate why they chose particular revisions.
- **Refining Process:** 2/5 - The assistant outlined a three-step iterative process and produced diagnostic feedback, but the chat shows no clear multi-step iteration by the student. The student produced a revised essay (outside of visible iterative chat steps), which suggests some independent revision took place, but the collaborative refining process in chat was minimal.
- **Human-AI Interaction Total:** 5/15

Evidence from chat: - Assistant set goals and steps: "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..." - Student: "Let's revise the thesis statement" — minimal engagement beyond initiating the task. - Assistant provided diagnostic feedback and asked the student to choose priorities, but the student's later responses or choices are not shown.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Strengths Demonstrated:

- Clear stance: The student consistently communicates a clear central claim (supporting stronger legal protections for migrant workers). Evidence: both originals and revised thesis assert that government action is needed.
- Willingness to revise: The student produced a revised essay that shows measurable improvements in word choice and clearer topic sentences.
- Basic essay structure present: The student maintains an introduction, at least two body paragraphs, and a conclusion.

Areas for Improvement:

- Provide evidence and develop ideas: Add concrete examples, data, or reasoning to move from assertions to persuasive support.

- Improve grammar and collocations: Correct remaining errors (e.g., "Strictening" → "Strengthening"; pluralization; article use; verb forms).
- Increase active engagement with the AI during revision: show iterative steps, accept/reject AI suggestions explicitly, and ask clarifying questions.

AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- **Context Provision:** Needs Improvement - The student did not clarify whether the essay topic was supposed to match a climate-change prompt; chat shows assistant flagged a mismatch but the student did not respond.
- **Strategic Planning:** Developing - The assistant provided a clear plan and the student followed it to produce revisions, but the student did not co-design the plan or prioritize goals in chat.
- **Critical Evaluation:** Needs Improvement - There is little evidence the student evaluated AI suggestions or justified revision choices in the chat.
- **Independent Editing:** Developing - The student independently produced a revised essay with improvements, but still relies on simple rewrites and has not fully self-corrected remaining issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. Add specific evidence and develop reasoning: For each claim (human-rights protection, public health benefits, attraction of professionals), add an example, statistic, or a logical chain explaining how the policy leads to the outcome.
2. Proofread for grammar and collocations: Focus on common problems visible in both drafts — verb forms, pluralization, article use, and idiomatic phrases (e.g., "strengthen laws," "migrant workers," "local population").
3. Engage more actively in the AI-assisted revision process: show revision iterations in the chat, respond to AI diagnostic questions, and explicitly accept or revise AI suggestions with reasons. Ask targeted questions (e.g., "Is this thesis stronger? Which sentence needs more evidence?").

INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student did complete the three specified revision tasks (thesis, one topic sentence, and one body paragraph). Evidence: revised thesis and improved topic sentences are visible in the revised essay.

- However, the student's chat engagement was minimal. For grading or formative assessment of AI-collaboration skills, encourage the student to document the revision steps in the chat (e.g., show attempted rephrasings, discuss choices, and accept/reject suggestions).

- Clarify assignment prompt alignment: the assistant noted a possible mismatch between a climate-change course prompt and the essay topic on migrant workers. The instructor should confirm whether the student's essay topic is acceptable or if they need to reframe to meet course requirements.

If you would like, I can: - Provide a corrected version of the revised essay with grammar fixes and smoother phrasing while preserving the student's ideas, or - Show a model paragraph with evidence examples that the student could use to deepen the argument.

■■■ Student Feedback ■ Rating: 4/5 ■ Comment: Good

Current Mode:assessment

Complete Conversation

Assistant:

Original:

Nowadays, many people would like to choose to migrant to other continents. However migrant workers face exploitation due to weak regulation, enduring long hours and unfair pay. In my perspective, government should stricter the laws to safeguard their rights. Stricter the laws would be good for the individual and the society.

To begin with, the migrant workers have human right as the nature-born population. This is understandable that the government would like to protect the employment of the local people, and also protect the local market. However, migrant workers are the legal workers, they have human rights, they should serve as normal, serve as the nature-born population. The government should stricter the law, to protect their workload, to ensure their physical and mental health. After that, the migrant workers would work better. This is because the migrant have enough rest and salary. Therefore, government should stricter the law to fulfill migrant workers' human right and health.

Beside that, when the government stricter the law to safeguard their workload migrant worker rights, it can attract more professional migrant workers into the city. If the law of protection to the migrant worker is not good enough, it can ensure the local workers' employment rate. However, the high quality worker may not be enough, the market cannot be better. So, stricter the law can attract more high standard people come to work and serve the market in your country. In other perspective, stricten the law may less illegal migrant worker, and it is passively assist and protect the local worker too. So, stricten the law is good for the society.

Overall, no matter for the migrant workers or local workers on the market, government stricter the law to safeguard the migrant workers right is good for most people.

Revised:

Nowadays, many people would like to choose to migrant to other countries. However migrant workers face exploitation due to weak regulation, enduring long hours and unfair pay. From my perspective, the government should strengthen the law to safeguard their rights. Strictening the law would be good for both individuals and the society.

To begin with, migrant workers deserve equal human rights as the local population because they are also legal members of the workforce. This is understandable that the government would like to protect the employment of the local people, and also protect the local market. However, migrant

workers are the legal workers, they have human rights, they should serve as normal, serve as the nature-born population. The government should strengthen the law, to protect their workload, to ensure their physical and mental health. After that, the migrant workers would work better. This is because the migrant have enough rest and salary. Therefore, government should strengthen the law to fulfil migrant workers' human right and health.

Beside that, when the government strengthen the law to safeguard the workload and rights of migrant workers, it can attract more professional workers come to the city. If the law to protect the migrant workers is not good enough, the employment rate of local people may keep high, but the overall quality of workers may not be enough, and the market cannot develop better. Therefore, stricten the law can attract more high standard workers to serve the market in our country. In another perspective, strength the law may reduce illegal migrant workers, and it also indirectly protect the local worker too. So, stricten the law is good for the whole society.

Overall, no matter for the migrant workers or local workers on the market, government stricter the law to safeguard the migrant workers right is good for most people.

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:

Let's revise the thesis statement

Assistant:

Great — before we start revising the thesis, let's agree the aims and look quickly at the essay so I can give focused help.

1) Quick goal check (your turn)

- What is your main goal for this session? (Choose one or two): clarity of argument, stronger thesis, better paragraph structure, more precise vocabulary, fewer grammar errors, or something else?

- Do you want to keep the current topic (migrant workers and stricter laws) or do you need to rewrite the essay to respond to the course prompt about climate change? I noticed the prompt you gave (about individual actions vs governments/corporations on climate change) is different from your draft.

Tell me your choices (topic: keep/change, and 1–2 revision targets). Then I'll confirm and we'll move on.

2) Short diagnostic feedback (based on the draft)

Strengths

- You have a clear position: you support stricter government laws to protect migrant workers.
- The essay has a basic structure: introduction, body paragraphs, conclusion.
- The main ideas are repeated consistently (human rights, working conditions, economic benefits).

Areas to improve (mapped to the rubric)

- Content and Ideas: Major issue — the draft does not respond to the climate-change prompt that was given in the assignment. If the assignment really is about migrant workers, your ideas are relevant but remain general and under-developed. (Likely score: 2–3)
- Organisation and Logical Progression: Structure is basic. Paragraphs exist but topic sentences and logical flow need strengthening and clearer development. (Likely score: 2–3)
- Vocabulary: Limited and repetitive; some word choices are incorrect (e.g., “stricter the laws,” “nature-born population”). Use of topic-specific terms is weak. (Likely score: 2)
- Grammar and Sentence Structure: Frequent grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that make the meaning unclear in places. (Likely score: 1–2)
- Evidence & Development (not on rubric list but important): Claims are general — there are no concrete examples, statistics, or clear reasoning chains to support key claims.

3) Decide priorities (your turn)

Which of these would you like to focus on first when we revise the thesis?

- Aligning the essay to the correct prompt (very important if the climate-change prompt is the actual task)
- Making the thesis clearer and stronger (forceful language, preview of main points)
- Improving grammar and phrasing in the thesis
- Preparing to strengthen topic sentences and paragraph support later

Please confirm which one (or two) to prioritize. Also confirm whether you want to keep the migrant-worker topic or switch to the climate-change prompt. Once you confirm, we'll move to Step 1: thesis revision.

Step 1 preview (what I'll ask next)

- I'll ask you to paste the exact thesis you want to revise (you've already got one — “In my perspective, government should stricter the laws to safeguard their rights. Stricter the laws would be good for the individual and the society.”).
- I'll give targeted feedback and a short checklist of what a strong thesis needs.
- I'll give sentence stems and a brief model structure (not a full rewritten sentence) and then invite you to try rewriting the thesis yourself.

Would you like to confirm your priorities now so we can begin Step 1?