

# HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-11-24 22:53:55

Student Email: 25260995@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25260995

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 essay drafts and chat history 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 Evaluation:**

- **Content and Ideas:** 20/25 – The essay presents a largely coherent, balanced view. It identifies two key mechanisms (citizens influencing government; personal green choices). However, arguments are somewhat general and lack strong examples or data to deepen the analysis.
- **Organization:** 20/25 – Clear structure with introduction, two body paragraphs, and conclusion. Logical progression from government influence to individual action, but transitions and linking sentences lack polish and clarity.
- **Vocabulary:** 18/25 – Vocabulary is adequate but tends to be simple and repetitive (e.g., "people," "sometimes," "maybe"). Limited use of topic-specific/academic terms.
- **Grammar and Sentence Structure:** 16/25 – Frequent errors and informal phrases reduce clarity. Errors sometimes obscure meaning (e.g., "the government maybe just listen a little," "so nothing happen").
- **Total:** 74/100

**Revised Essay Evaluation:**

- **Content and Ideas:** 18/25 – The revision retains original content without substantive change. Crucially, the thesis remains a placeholder phrase, and topic sentences contain "bla bla" placeholders, showing no meaningful content improvement.
- **Organization:** 16/25 – Structural integrity is disrupted by placeholders; intended revisions are incomplete, weakening coherence and flow.
- **Vocabulary:** 15/25 – Placeholders and unrevised repetitive language reduce lexical variety and appropriateness.
- **Grammar and Sentence Structure:** 14/25 – Grammar issues persist. Placeholders reduce readability and professional tone.
- **Total:** 63/100

**Improvement Summary:**

- Overall, the revised essay score declined by 11 points, indicating no meaningful progress.

- The student did not submit the requested concrete revisions (revised thesis, topic sentences, paragraph edits). Instead, placeholders were used.
- This prevented the assistant from providing effective revision feedback or iterative improvement.

---

## Human-AI Interaction Assessment

### Chat History Highlights (9 exchanges):

- The assistant provided detailed, stepwise revision guidance: clear instructions and templates for rewriting thesis and topic sentences, prompts for paragraph revision.
- The student repeatedly responded with placeholders like "let's pretend we have revised..." or "bla bla bla," rather than submitting actual revised text.
- This pattern blocked iterative feedback cycles and deeper engagement.

### Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5

Multiple messages occurred, but exchanges lacked substantive revised drafts or textual engagement, limiting depth.

- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 1/5

No evidence the student evaluated AI feedback with acceptance, modification, or rejection. Responses lacked critique or reflection.

- **Refining Process:** 1/5

No meaningful iterative editing or refinement cycles took place; the assistant requested drafts and received placeholders.

- **Total:** 4/15

---

## Overall Performance Summary

### Strengths:

- Initiated use of AI assistant and selected paragraph to revise.
- Original essay has a clear, balanced stance on the issue with reasonably organized structure.
- AI assistant provided scaffolded, actionable feedback to support student growth.

### Areas for Development:

- Produce concrete revision submissions when prompted—avoid placeholders.
- Engage critically with AI suggestions, indicating which changes are accepted/rejected and why.
- Follow a focused stepwise editing process: revise thesis, then topic sentence, then paragraph text, with multiple iterations.
- Address grammar and sentence clarity proactively.
- Use lexical variety and more precise academic vocabulary.

---

## AI Collaboration Skills Assessment

- **Context Provision:** Needs Improvement — student did not provide revised theses or complete drafts for AI to work with.
- **Strategic Planning:** Needs Improvement — student did not follow assistant's recommended stepwise plan or submit in-progress drafts.

- **Critical Evaluation:** Needs Improvement — no evidence of acceptance or critique of AI suggestions.

- **Independent Editing:** Needs Improvement — revisions were essentially absent.

---

## Recommendations for Future Development

1. **Complete Required Revisions:** Submit a revised thesis statement using AI-provided templates; rewrite at least one topic sentence; fully revise a body paragraph by correcting grammar and enhancing clarity and support. Avoid placeholders.
2. **Engage Critically with AI Feedback:** For each AI suggestion, write a short rationale explaining why you accept, modify, or reject it. This improves reflective learning and makes collaboration more productive.
3. **Use Iterative Revision Cycles:** Paste drafts for AI review, request targeted feedback, apply edits, and resubmit for further refinement at least 2-3 times.
4. **Focus on Mechanics:** Systematically address common grammatical errors and refine sentence structures.
5. **Reflect on Changes:** After revisions, write a brief note explaining what changed and why, demonstrating critical engagement.

---

## Instructor Notes

- The core assignment required submission of three specific revision elements: a revised thesis, a topic sentence rewrite, and a revised body paragraph. These were not received in substantive form.
- Because of that, the AI assistant was limited to generic coaching without opportunities for concrete application or iterative refinement.
- Recommend requiring the student to resubmit the assignment with the three concrete elements and a short reflection explaining engagement with AI suggestions.

---

This concludes the assessment. Please advise if you would like support in preparing the resubmission guidelines or additional scaffolding materials.

## Grading Result (Hidden from students)

# 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: 20/25 - Good.** The essay presents a clear, balanced position (e.g., "I partly agree with this idea because I believe citizens can still influence the government..."), and gives relevant mechanisms (voting, protests, consumer pressure). However, arguments are general and lack deeper development, specific data, or stronger examples.
- **Organization: 20/25 - Good.** The draft has an identifiable introduction, two body paragraphs and a conclusion. Paragraph progression is logical (government influence → individual actions), but some sentences and transitions are awkward and a few idea-linking sentences are unclear.
- **Vocabulary: 18/25 - Satisfactory.** Vocabulary is adequate and appropriate for the task but repetitive and simple (e.g., repeated use of "people," "sometimes," "maybe"). Topic-specific terms are limited.
- **Grammar and Sentence Structure: 16/25 - Needs Improvement.** Frequent grammatical mistakes and informal constructions reduce clarity (examples: "But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little", "so nothing happen", "so it not really enough"). Sentence-level errors sometimes obscure meaning.
- **Original Essay Total: 74/100**

### Revised Essay Scores:

- **Content and Ideas: 18/25 - Satisfactory.** The revised file contains the original content but crucial elements were not actually revised: the thesis is a placeholder ("(revised thesis statement here)"), and topic sentences and paragraph edits are replaced with "bla bla" placeholders. No substantive content improvement is evident.

- Organization: 16/25 - Needs Improvement. Placeholders interrupt structure and coherence; the intended revisions were not completed so paragraph focus and logical progression were not strengthened.

- Vocabulary: 15/25 - Needs Improvement. Placeholders ("bla bla bla") and repeated original phrasing show no lexical improvement and introduce informal text that is inappropriate for the assignment.

- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 14/25 - Needs Improvement. Original grammar issues remain uncorrected; placeholder text also reduces readability.

- **Revised Essay Total: 63/100**

#### Essay Improvement Analysis:

- **Overall Improvement: -11 points** (74 → 63). In practical terms, no meaningful revision was completed.

- **Key Improvements Made:**

- None substantive — the student did not produce the requested rewritten thesis, topic sentence, or edited paragraph; the "revised" file contains placeholders rather than actual revisions.

- **Missed Opportunities:**

- Revise thesis to a clear, confident sentence that previews two supporting points (this was requested repeatedly in chat but not provided).

- Produce a strengthened topic sentence that links directly to the thesis and previews paragraph evidence.

- Edit body paragraph #1 for clarity, evidence, and grammar (the assistant provided stepwise guidance, but the student did not supply the edited paragraph).

## HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

#### Chat History Analysis:

- **Total Exchanges: 9 messages** (assistant and student back-and-forth). Conversation shows multiple assistant prompts with detailed guidance; the student repeatedly responded with placeholders ("let's pretend we have revised...", "bla bla bla ...") rather than providing concrete revisions.

- **Conversation Quality:** The assistant provided structured, actionable guidance (thesis templates, steps for revising topic sentences, prompts to paste revised text). The student did not follow through with actual revisions, preventing deeper iterative work.

#### Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5 - Basic. Although there were several messages (9 total), the exchanges are shallow because the student avoided providing the concrete revisions requested. The assistant attempted multi-level guidance, but the student's responses did not engage with that guidance meaningfully.

- Evidence: assistant asked repeatedly for "paste your revised thesis" and templates; user replied with "let's pretend we have revised..." or "bla bla bla", preventing substantive progress.

- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 1/5 - Limited. The student did not critically evaluate or discuss the assistant's revision suggestions. There is no evidence of acceptance/rejection with justification or of the student explaining preferences.

- Evidence: no messages where the student comments on or critiques specific AI suggestions; user used placeholders instead of accepting/rejecting or modifying suggestions.

- **Refining Process:** 1/5 - Limited. There was no meaningful iterative revision cycle. The assistant repeatedly prompted for concrete drafts; the student did not supply revised drafts for subsequent refinement.

Evidence: assistant provided stepwise instructions and templates for a revised thesis and topic sentences; the user did not submit the revised items to iterate on.

**Human-AI Interaction Total: 4/15**

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

#### Strengths Demonstrated:

- The student initiated use of the AI assistant and selected a paragraph to work on (evidence: user message "ok let's revise the rest of the body paragraph #1").
- The original essay shows a coherent, balanced argument and awareness of two realistic mechanisms (policy influence and individual behavior).

- The assistant provided clear, scaffolded guidance (templates for a thesis, stepwise revision instructions) that would support revision if followed.

#### Areas for Improvement:

- Follow-through: produce actual revisions when prompted (revise thesis, topic sentence, and paragraph text) instead of placeholders.
- Engagement: respond to AI prompts with concrete text and critique AI suggestions (accept/reject with reasons) to enable iterative improvement.
- Mechanics and clarity: address grammar, sentence-level errors, and provide more specific examples/evidence to support claims.
- Use of AI: practice accepting AI suggestions selectively and explain choices to demonstrate critical evaluation.

#### AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- Context Provision: Needs Improvement - The student did not paste the revised thesis nor explicitly restate goals when asked; used placeholders instead of concrete input.
- Strategic Planning: Needs Improvement - The student did not follow the assistant's recommended stepwise plan (thesis → topic sentence → paragraph).
- Critical Evaluation: Needs Improvement - No evidence that the student evaluated AI suggestions; they neither accepted nor rejected them with rationale.
- Independent Editing: Needs Improvement - The student did not perform the requested independent revisions; most changes are absent.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. Immediately complete the three required revision tasks: post a revised thesis statement (use the assistant's template), a revised topic sentence for one body paragraph, and a fully revised version of that body paragraph. Submit these texts rather than placeholders.
2. Treat AI suggestions as drafts to be evaluated: for each AI suggestion, write one short sentence explaining why you accept, adapt, or reject it. This demonstrates critical engagement.



3. Use focused revision cycles: paste a draft, request targeted edits (thesis clarity, topic sentence, evidence, grammar), incorporate feedback, and paste the next version — aim for at least 2–3 concrete iterations.
4. Run grammar and clarity checks (ask the AI to mark specific error types and suggest fixes), and include a short reflection note in the chat describing what changed and why.

## INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student did not complete the core assignment tasks: revised thesis, revised topic sentence, revised body paragraph. The "revised" essay file contains placeholders instead of actual revisions.
- Because the student did not supply the requested revised texts, the AI could not perform the intended revision coaching or show evidence of iterative improvement and critical evaluation.
- Recommend requiring the student to resubmit with the three concrete revision elements and a brief chat log entry where the student explains (in 2–3 sentences) which AI suggestions they accepted or rejected and why.

■■■ 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 thesis statement here)

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

**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 — thank you for sharing your current thesis. Let's work on making it clearer, stronger, and more focused.

First, quick praise: your thesis shows a balanced view (you accept some responsibility for individuals while recognizing larger actors) — that's good for this question.

Feedback on clarity, strength, and focus

- Strengths: You give a clear position (partial agreement) and hint at two supporting ideas (influence on government; personal lifestyle choices).
- Problems to fix:
  - Hedging and weak language: phrases like "I partly agree," "I believe," and "I also think" reduce confidence. Use more direct, precise phrasing.
  - Lack of a clear extent and structure: "Partly agree" is vague. Say more exactly how far you agree (e.g., governments/corporations have the primary responsibility, while individuals play an important supporting role).
  - Missing preview detail: The thesis should briefly preview the main points you will develop (for example: influencing policy and consumer pressure/individual habits).
  - Wordiness/repetition: The sentence repeats ideas and could be tighter.

How to revise (a simple plan)

- Make your stance explicit about the extent of agreement (who has primary responsibility, who has supporting role).
- Preview the two main points you will use to support this stance (keep them short and specific).
- Use confident, academic language (avoid "I think," "maybe," "I believe").

Short fill-in template (use this to write your revised thesis)

- "[Degree of agreement], because [main reason 1] and [main reason 2]."

Or

- "Although [institutions] bear the primary responsibility for large-scale change, individuals are important because they [influence policy] and [influence markets/adopt sustainable habits]."

Would you like to try rewriting your thesis now using that guidance? Send your revised version, and we'll make sure you're satisfied before we move to choosing a body paragraph.

**You:**

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

**Assistant:**

Great — let's move to Step 2. Before we edit a topic sentence, please either:

- Paste your revised thesis here, or
- Briefly confirm its main claim and the two supporting points (for example: who has primary responsibility; then the two ways individuals help).

Then tell me which body paragraph you want to work on: paragraph 1 (influencing government) or paragraph 2 (personal lifestyle/consumer choices). Paste the paragraph's current topic sentence (or tell me you want to use the original one).

What I will do next:

- Give quick feedback on how well that topic sentence connects to your revised thesis.
- Suggest a clear, focused structure for a stronger topic sentence (I will not write a full sentence for you).
- Ask you to try revising the topic sentence, then we'll proceed to revise the rest of that paragraph.

Quick reminder of what to check in your topic sentence while you prepare:

- Does it clearly state a single main idea that supports the thesis?
- Does it show the relationship to the thesis (e.g., supporting role vs. primary responsibility)?
- Is the language confident and precise (avoid "I think," "maybe," weak modals)?
- Does it preview the paragraph's evidence or mechanism (e.g., collective voting, protests, consumer pressure, lifestyle change)?

Which paragraph will you choose, and can you share the revised thesis (or its main claim) and the topic sentence you want to improve?

**You:**

let's pretend we have revised the topic sentences and move on bla bla bla ...

**Assistant:**

Nice work so far — your original thesis already shows a balanced position, which is a strong start. Before we move on, I need you to share a revised thesis (we can't continue until you post it and we agree it's clear and strong).

Quick, focused feedback to use when you rewrite:

- Be specific about the extent of agreement (who has primary responsibility? who supports them?).
- Preview the two main points you will develop (e.g., how citizens influence policy; how individual consumer/behavioural changes matter).
- Use confident language (avoid "I think," "maybe," "partly"; say what you mean clearly).

Two short templates you can use to create your revised thesis (fill in the brackets):

- "[Extent of agreement], because [main reason 1] and [main reason 2]."
- "Although [governments and corporations] bear primary responsibility for large-scale change, individuals play a crucial supporting role by [influencing policy] and [shaping markets/adopting sustainable habits]."

Please try rewriting your thesis now and paste it here. Once you are satisfied and I confirm it, tell me which body paragraph you want to work on (paragraph 1: influencing government, or paragraph 2: individual behaviour/consumer choices) and paste that paragraph's current topic sentence. Then we'll revise the topic sentence together. Would you like to try your revised thesis now?

**You:**

ok let's revise the rest of the body paragraph #1

bla bla bla

**Assistant:**

Great — you've chosen paragraph 1. Before we revise that paragraph, we need to finish Step 1: revise your thesis. Please paste your revised thesis now (or, if you prefer, briefly confirm its main claim plus the two supporting points you will use). I can't move on until the thesis is confirmed.

Quick, focused feedback on your original thesis to help you rewrite:

- Strength: It shows a balanced position and hints at two supports (influencing government; personal habits).
- What to fix: remove hedging ("I partly agree," "I believe"); state the extent of agreement clearly (who has primary responsibility? who plays a supporting role?); preview the two main points precisely and briefly.

Two short templates to help you rewrite (fill the blanks):

- "[Degree of agreement], because [main reason 1] and [main reason 2]."
- "Although [governments and corporations] bear primary responsibility for large-scale change, individuals play a supporting role by [influencing policy] and [shaping markets/ adopting sustainable habits]."

Once you paste your revised thesis and confirm you're satisfied with it, paste the topic sentence you want to use for paragraph 1 (or tell me you want to keep the original: "The most important way individuals can help fight climate change is by influencing the government and politicians."). I will then:

- Give quick feedback on how well it connects to your revised thesis.
- Offer a brief frame to strengthen the topic sentence (I will not write the full sentence for you).
- Ask you to try revising the topic sentence before we revise the rest of that paragraph.

Would you like to paste your revised thesis now?