

HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-12-07 13:24:14

Student Email: 25261320@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25261320

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

Thank you for sharing the full training assessment and chat history.

Summary of the key issues: - The student repeatedly used placeholders ("bla bla bla ...", "let's pretend we have revised..."), avoiding actually revising the thesis, topic sentences, or body paragraphs. - The assistant gave clear, focused guidance and stepwise scaffolding but could not move forward without concrete text from the student. - The student did not engage in the iterative revision process, refused to provide actual rewrites, and attempted to skip steps. - The revised essay is incomplete and shows no substantive improvement; grammar and vocabulary issues remain unaddressed. - The human-AI conversation shows low critical evaluation and little refining process.

Recommendations for Moving Forward with This Student

1. Set Clear Requirements for Submission

Before further interaction, require the student to submit a fully revised thesis statement that:

2. Clearly states their extent of agreement

3. Previews two main reasons using parallel structure

4. Uses confident, academic language without hedging

Without this, it's impossible to proceed effectively.

Emphasize the Importance of Concrete Revisions

Explain to the student that placeholders do not allow for targeted feedback and that iterative improvement depends on sharing full revised sentences.

Use More Specific, Short Tasks

Rather than asking open-ended, "revise thesis" tasks that the student avoids, try:

"Please rewrite just one sentence to replace: 'I partly agree with this idea because...' with a confident thesis that previews two reasons. Paste only that sentence."

This limits cognitive load and may reduce evasion.

Include Reflective, Metacognitive Prompts

Ask the student to explain in their own words why they chose a phrasing or whether they think the revised thesis answers the question. This may foster engagement and critical thinking.

Provide Example Revisions and Ask for Adaptation

Give a strong model revision sentence and ask:

"How would you change this to fit your ideas better? Please paste your adapted sentence."

Track and Reward Compliance

Acknowledge when the student provides concrete text. If they continue using placeholders, remind them gently but firmly that progress requires follow-through.

Next Steps If Engaging Again

Here is a sample prompt you can send the student that combines encouragement with a hard requirement:

Dear [Student],

To help you improve your essay meaningfully, we need to work through structured revisions step by step. Please provide a fully revised thesis statement—not placeholders—and paste it here. Your revised thesis should:

- *Clearly state how much you agree or disagree with the statement;*
- *Preview the two reasons you will discuss in your essay, using parallel structure;*
- *Use confident, formal academic language without phrases like "I think" or "maybe."*

Here is an example thesis you could adapt:

"I partly agree that individual actions alone cannot solve climate change because (1) collective citizen pressure can compel governments to adopt stronger environmental policies, and (2) individual lifestyle choices influence market demand and encourage sustainability."

Please copy, adapt, or rewrite this and paste only your thesis sentence below.

Once we have your thesis, we can move on to improving your topic sentences and paragraphs.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Providing such a prompt sets a clear expectation and model, making it harder to evade tasks with placeholders.

Final Thought

The assistant’s strong scaffolding and patience are commendable. The main barrier is the student’s lack of engagement and avoidance of producing actual text revisions. Overcoming this requires setting firm, clear, and scaffolded instructions that require concrete submissions to progress. This will enable a more fruitful human-AI collaboration and better writing outcomes.

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 takes a clear stance (“I partly agree”) and develops two relevant ideas (influencing government; personal green choices). Examples (protest, voting, consumer pressure) support the claims, but development is sometimes general and lacks

specific evidence or concrete data.

- Organization: 20/25 - Standard essay structure (intro, two body paragraphs, conclusion) is present and logical. Transitions and paragraph cohesion are adequate but occasionally awkward (e.g., unclear sentence linking: "But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action, so is not always working well.").

- Vocabulary: 18/25 - Vocabulary is appropriate and understandable but limited and repetitive (frequent simple phrases: "very serious," "help fight," "small changes"). More precise, topic-specific terms and varied phrasing would strengthen the essay.

- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 17/25 - Several grammar and sentence-level issues reduce clarity (subject-verb agreement, missing articles, informal phrasing and sentence fragments: "so is not always working well"; "so this is problem."). Sentences are mostly simple; some complex ideas need clearer syntax.

- **Original Essay Total: 76/100**

Evidence (original): thesis phrase — "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." Body example — "if lots of people buy from green companies, businesses will try to be more sustainable to make more profit."

Revised Essay Scores:

- Content and Ideas: 14/25 - The revised essay is incomplete: the thesis is replaced by a placeholder ("bla bla bla ...(revised thesis statement here)") and topic-sentence markers ("revised the topic sentence bla bla bla ..."). Because the key elements intended to show revision are missing, the revised draft does not demonstrate substantive improvement in content or argument development.

- Organization: 14/25 - Structure remains recognizable but is disrupted by placeholders. The intended reorganizations or clearer previews are not present, so the logical progression is unclear in places.

- Vocabulary: 14/25 - The retained text from the original keeps the same limited vocabulary; placeholders and repeated "bla bla bla" indicate revisions were not completed, so no vocabulary enhancement is evident.

- Grammar and Sentence Structure: 14/25 - The parts of the revised draft that copy the original retain the same grammatical issues; placeholders prevent assessment of attempted corrections. Errors like "so is not always working well" remain in content included in the revised version.

- **Revised Essay Total: 56/100**

Evidence (revised): thesis placeholder — "bla bla bla ...(revised thesis statement here)"; topic-sentence placeholder — "revised the topic sentence bla bla bla ..."

Essay Improvement Analysis:

- **Overall Improvement: -20 points**

- **Key Improvements Made:**

- None substantive — the student did not provide concrete revisions to the thesis, topic sentence, or body paragraph despite prompts.

- **Missed Opportunities:**

- Revise thesis to a concise, confident statement that previews two clear reasons.

- Strengthen topic sentences to align tightly with the revised thesis and improve paragraph unity.

- Edit grammar and sentence structure for clarity; replace informal phrasings and fix agreement and article errors.

- Add specific evidence or examples (data, named policies, case studies) to support claims.

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

Chat History Analysis:

- **Total Exchanges: 13** (13 messages in the provided chat log)
- **Conversation Quality:** The assistant provided clear, scaffolded guidance focused on thesis revision and paragraph-level edits. The student repeatedly avoided providing actual revisions, using placeholders (e.g., “let’s pretend we have revised the thesis statement”, “bla bla bla …”) and requested to move on without completing required steps. This resulted in a shallow collaboration without concrete revision outcomes.

Representative chat evidence: - Student placeholder responses: “let’s pretend we have revised the thesis statement Enter bla bla bla ... left left left” and “let’s pretend we have revised the topic sentence and move on . bla bla bla …” - Assistant repeated prompts asking for the actual revised thesis: “Please paste your revised thesis statement so I can give focused feedback.”

Interaction Scores:

- In-Depth Conversation: 3/5 - The chat contains multiple messages (13) and repeated targeted prompts from the assistant. However, the student's responses were evasive and did not supply substantive content for deeper iterative work. This yields a developing level of depth rather than robust, multi-level engagement.

- Evidence: The assistant requested a thesis rewrite and provided templates and checklists, but the student never posted the actual revised thesis to move forward.

- Critical Review of AI Suggestions: 1/5 - The student did not demonstrate critical evaluation of AI suggestions. They did not accept, reject, or adapt specific AI feedback with reasoned justification; instead they used placeholders and attempted to skip steps.

- Evidence: After the assistant's clear guidance on thesis revision, the student replied with "let's pretend we have revised the thesis statement" instead of applying or critiquing the suggestions.

- Refining Process: 1/5 - There is no evidence of an iterative refining process. The assistant repeatedly prompted for a concrete revised thesis and topic sentence, but the student did not produce successive drafts or show iterative acceptance/rejection of feedback.

- Evidence: Multiple assistant messages requesting the revised thesis ("Please paste your revised thesis statement...") and the student's repeated avoidance indicate no meaningful revision cycle.

- **Human-AI Interaction Total: 5/15**

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Strengths Demonstrated:

- The original essay shows a clear position and basic argumentative structure (intro → two supporting paragraphs → conclusion).
- Evidence: "I partly agree..." and two body paragraphs focusing on government influence and personal lifestyle choices.
- The assistant provided strong, actionable guidance (templates, checklists, and explicit revision steps) that would support effective revision if followed.
- Evidence: assistant guidance: "Extent of agreement, because (1) ... and (2) ..." and checklist items for thesis quality.

Areas for Improvement:

- Student engagement with the AI: The student did not follow through on requested revisions, substituting placeholders instead of actual rewrites. Recommendation: respond to prompts with concrete text to enable iterative improvement.
- Revision completion: The thesis, topic sentence, and paragraph revisions were not supplied. Recommendation: supply actual revised sentences; use the assistant's templates and then refine those drafts collaboratively.
- Language accuracy and evidence: Improve grammar, sentence structure, and use more precise vocabulary; add specific examples or data to strengthen arguments.

AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- Context Provision: Needs Improvement - The student did not provide the revised thesis or explicit revision goals when requested; however the initial essay provided sufficient topical context. Evidence: assistant repeatedly asked for the revised thesis, which the student did not paste.
- Strategic Planning: Needs Improvement - The student did not follow the assistant's stepwise plan (thesis → topic sentence → paragraph revision) and tried to skip steps.
- Critical Evaluation: Needs Improvement - There is no evidence the student evaluated AI suggestions or justified choices.
- Independent Editing: Needs Improvement - The student did not produce independent, concrete revisions after feedback.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. Provide concrete revised text when asked (paste the new thesis sentence, revised topic sentence, or paragraph) so the AI can give targeted iterative feedback.
2. Use the assistant's templates and checklists but adapt them into full sentences; then ask for specific checks (clarity, grammar, previewing structure).
3. Focus revision cycles: propose a revision, receive feedback, revise again. Aim for at least 2–3 actual iterations per major element (thesis, topic sentences, paragraphs).
4. Prioritize fixing grammar and clarity issues (subject-verb agreement, articles, sentence fragments) and enrich vocabulary with more precise terms (e.g., "policy pressure," "consumer demand," "regulatory change," "carbon emissions").
5. Add concrete examples or brief citations (e.g., named policies, dates, or case studies) to strengthen content and ideas.

INSTRUCTOR NOTES

- The student did not complete the core revision tasks (thesis revision, topic sentence revision, body paragraph revision). The submission contains placeholders rather than actual revised content, and the chat history shows repeated assistant prompts that were not acted on.
- Recommend requiring the student to resubmit with concrete revisions of: (1) one clear, parallel-structured thesis statement; (2) one strengthened topic sentence; and (3) a fully revised body paragraph with corrected grammar and at least one specific example or detail.
- The assistant provided appropriate scaffolding and step-by-step guidance. The primary issue is the student's lack of engagement rather than the quality of AI support.

■■■■ 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)

revised the topic sentence bla bla bla ...When many citizens demand better environmental laws, governments are more likely to act. rest of the body paragraph #1 ...

revised the 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 — let's start with Step 1.

I see your current thesis at the end:

"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."

Feedback on clarity, strength, and focus

- Clarity: Your position is clear (you partly agree). Good.
- Strength: It's a bit wordy and hedged. Try to use more direct, confident language and avoid phrases like "I believe" or "I also think" in an academic essay.
- Focus/preview: The thesis mentions two ideas (influencing government; personal lifestyle choices) but it doesn't clearly preview how these points will be developed. Make the structure explicit: state your stance, then briefly indicate the two reasons you will discuss.

How to improve (concrete steps)

1. State the extent of your agreement clearly (e.g., partially/partly agree).
2. Immediately follow with two concise reasons that you will develop in the essay (use parallel structure).
3. Remove first-person hedges ("I believe", "I also think") or reduce them—use more academic phrasing.
4. Use precise, confident language (avoid "very" and vague phrases like "still have a role to play" — be specific about the role).

Quick skeleton to guide your rewrite (not a full sentence):

- [Extent of agreement] + because (1) individuals can influence government policy through collective action, and (2) individual consumer and lifestyle choices create social and market pressure.

Would you like to try rewriting your thesis now using that guidance? Paste your revised thesis and I'll give focused feedback until you're happy with it.

You:

let's pretend we have revised the thesis statement Enter bla bla bla ... left left left

Assistant:

Thanks — that placeholder ("Enter bla bla bla ... left left left") isn't a usable thesis yet, so let's tighten it up.

What's missing in this draft

- It's not a clear thesis: it gives no real stance or preview of the essay's structure.
- It doesn't answer the question (extent of agreement) with confident language.
- It doesn't preview the two main reasons you will develop (so organisation will be weak).

How to fix it (short, concrete guidance)

- Decide the exact extent of your agreement (e.g., partially agree).
- Use confident, academic phrasing (avoid "I think," "maybe," or filler).
- Briefly preview the two main points you will develop (use parallel structure).

Quick template to follow (fill the blanks — not a full sentence from me):

- [Extent of agreement], because (1) [collective individual action can pressure governments into stronger policies], and (2) [individual consumer and lifestyle choices create social and market pressure that encourages greener practices].

Would you like to try rewriting your thesis now using that template? Paste your revised thesis and I'll give focused feedback until you're happy with it.

You:

et's pretend we have revised the thesis statement

Assistant:

Great — thanks for working on that. Please paste your revised thesis statement so I can give focused feedback.

Before you paste, use this quick checklist to judge it:

- Does it clearly state the extent of your agreement (e.g., partially/partly agree)?
- Does it preview the two main reasons you will develop (parallel structure)?
- Is the language confident and concise (no "I think," "maybe," or hedges)?
- Does it directly answer the essay question?

Paste your revision when ready. I'll comment on clarity, strength, and focus and ask you to revise again if needed. Once you're happy with it, we'll move to Step 2.

You:

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

Assistant:

Thanks — let's keep this focused and short.

Step 1 quick check (thesis)

- Have you pasted the revised thesis yet? Please either paste it now or confirm you're happy with a clear, confident thesis that: (a) says you partly agree, and (b) previews the two reasons (individuals pressure governments; individual consumer/lifestyle choices create social/market pressure).
- I can't move on until you confirm the revised thesis. Would you like to paste or confirm?

Step 2 — pick a paragraph

- Which body paragraph would you like to work on? Pick 1 (government influence) or 2 (personal lifestyle/consumer pressure).
- Here are the current topic sentences so you can choose quickly:
 - 1) "The most important way individuals can help fight climate change is by influencing the government and politicians."
 - 2) "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."

If you pick one, paste your current topic sentence (or confirm which of the two above you want to revise). I'll give targeted feedback on how well it connects to the thesis and suggest precise ways to strengthen it (brief templates and key words to include).

Would you like to pick paragraph 1 or 2 now?

You:

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

Assistant:

Thanks — I'm ready to help, but first we must finish Step 1 (thesis) before moving on. Please paste your current revised thesis statement.

Quick, focused feedback on your earlier thesis (brief):

- Strengths: your position (partial agreement) is clear.
- What to improve: it's wordy and hedged (remove "I believe," "I also think"); make the extent of agreement explicit and preview the two main reasons in parallel form.

Helpful skeleton to guide your rewrite (not a full sentence — fill the blanks):

- [Extent of agreement], because (1) [collective individual action can pressure governments into stronger climate policies], and (2) [individual consumer and lifestyle choices create social and market pressure for greener practices].

Checklist — before we move to Step 2, confirm your revised thesis:

- Does it clearly state the extent of your agreement?
- Does it preview two main reasons in parallel?
- Is the language confident and concise (no hedging phrases)?

Please paste your revised thesis or confirm it meets the checklist. Once you're satisfied, tell me which body paragraph you want to work on (1 = government influence, 2 = personal lifestyle/consumer pressure) and we'll revise that topic sentence next. Would you like to paste the thesis now?

You:

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

Assistant:

Thanks — I'm glad you're ready to work on paragraph 1. Before we revise the paragraph, we must finish Step 1: the thesis. I can't move on until you paste a revised thesis that answers the essay question and previews your two main points.

Quick reminder of what the thesis must do:

- State the extent of your agreement (e.g., partly/partially agree).
- Preview the two reasons you will develop (parallel structure).
- Use confident, concise language (no "I think," "maybe," or hedges).

Fill this short template (not a full sentence from me) and paste your version:

- [Extent of agreement], because (1) [collective individual action can pressure governments into stronger climate policies], and (2) [individual consumer and lifestyle choices create social and market pressure for greener practices].

Checklist before you paste:

- Does it clearly state how much you agree?
- Does it preview the two main reasons in parallel?
- Is the language confident and concise?

Please paste your revised thesis now. Once you confirm you're happy with it, we'll move to Step 2 and revise the topic sentence for body paragraph 1. Would you like to paste the thesis now?