

HKBU LANG 0036 Learning Session Report

Generated: 2025-11-10 11:46:05

Student Email: 25000000@life.hkbu.edu.hk

Student Number: 25000000

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: AcademicLevel: 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

It appears that the student did not engage in meaningful revision or provide substantive content during the chat interactions. Instead of producing rewritten sentences or improved paragraphs, they continuously responded with placeholders or instructions to “pretend” the revisions were made, such as “let’s pretend we have revised…” and “bla bla bla.” The AI assistant provided detailed guidance at each step—offering feedback on the thesis statement, topic sentences, and body paragraph revision; prompting for rewritten text; encouraging the use of clearer, more precise language; suggesting transitions; and asking for specific examples and improvements.

However, the student failed to capitalize on these instructions: - They did not rewrite or improve the thesis statement, only pretending to do so. - They did not revise topic sentences or provide improved drafts. - For body paragraph revision, they avoided any real effort, replying only with “bla bla bla” placeholders. - They did not engage in follow-up dialogue or ask clarifying questions. - There was no evidence of critical evaluation or reflection on AI feedback or suggestions.

Because the student did not perform actual revisions or critical engagement during the session, the assessment rightly concludes that their performance is insufficient in actual writing development and AI collaboration skills.

Summary: The conversation shows that while the AI provided tailored, step-by-step scaffolding to support essay revision, the student treated the interaction as a procedural simulation rather than an authentic revision exercise. No meaningful content was generated or refined, and no substantive editing took place. The instructional goals—for improving writing clarity, cohesion, vocabulary precision, and grammar—were not met due to lack of real student input.

If you want, I can help generate examples of substantive student revisions or suggest how to encourage active participation in future AI-assisted writing sessions. Would you like me to provide that?

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: 20/25 - The essay clearly addresses the role of individuals in climate change action, showing awareness of government, corporate, and personal responsibilities. Points are moderately developed and relevant, but some explanations require further depth.
- Organization: 19/25 - The essay follows a standard structure (introduction, body paragraphs, conclusion). Paragraphs are logically sequenced, but some transitions and topic sentences could be stronger for clarity and cohesion.
- Vocabulary: 18/25 - Vocabulary is mostly appropriate, with some topic-specific terms (e.g., "green lifestyle choices," "carbon emissions"), but several vague or informal expressions ("normal people," "just want to do what is easy") limit precision.
- Grammar: 17/25 - Sentence structure is generally clear, but errors in verb form, agreement, and phrasing ("so nothing happen," "maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action") occasionally reduce clarity.
- **Original Essay Total: 74/100**

Revised Essay Scores:

Note: The revised essay is incomplete and contains placeholders ("bla bla bla ... (revise thesis statement here)"). There is no evidence of substantive revision—only sections marked for revision or procedural notes.

- Content and Ideas: 10/25 - The essay draft does not yet include any real revisions or new content. Main argument structure remains unclear due to placeholders.
- Organization: 11/25 - Structural signals ("revised topic sentence bla bla bla") indicate intent to revise but lack actual organization or logical flow.
- Vocabulary: 11/25 - No new vocabulary or improved precision; placeholder text dominates.
- Grammar: 12/25 - No meaningful sentence structure or error correction present; placeholders only.
- **Revised Essay Total: 44/100**

Essay Improvement Analysis:

- **Overall Improvement: -30 points**
- **Key Improvements Made:**
- None; only procedural placeholders provided.

- **Missed Opportunities:**

- Revision of thesis, topic sentence, and body paragraph are not present—no substantive content revision.

- No vocabulary or grammar development.

- No evidence of stronger organization or idea development.

HUMAN-AI INTERACTION ASSESSMENT

Chat History Analysis:

- **Total Exchanges:** 12 (6 from user, 6 from AI)

- **Conversation Quality:** The student engaged with the AI to outline the required revision steps, such as thesis and topic sentence revision. However, all student responses were placeholders ("let's pretend," "bla bla bla"); there was no substantive dialogue, critical questioning, or actual content shared.

Interaction Scores:

- **In-Depth Conversation:** 2/5 - Basic procedural exchanges. Student responded to prompts by indicating intent to "pretend" to revise, without actually doing the task or asking follow-up questions.

- **Critical Review of AI Suggestions:** 1/5 - No evidence of evaluating, accepting, or rejecting AI suggestions. The student did not engage in critical analysis, instead skipping actual revision.

- **Refining Process:** 1/5 - No actual iterative revision or content refinement took place; only indications of what steps should be taken in theory.

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

OVERALL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Strengths Demonstrated:

- Student was able to identify the correct sections for revision (thesis, topic sentence, paragraph) and respond to procedural prompts.
- The chat shows willingness to participate in process-oriented steps, at least at the planning level.

Areas for Improvement:

- **Actual content revision is critical:** Placeholders are not acceptable for demonstrating revision skill.
- **Engage meaningfully with AI feedback:** Ask follow-up questions, clarify AI suggestions, and push for deeper learning.
- **Critical thinking and independence:** Evaluate the AI's recommendations and provide justification for acceptance or rejection.

AI Collaboration Skills Assessment:

- **Context Provision:** Needs Improvement – No substantial context, only process steps; no clear articulation of specific goals or needs.
- **Strategic Planning:** Needs Improvement – Outlined steps but did not execute them.
- **Critical Evaluation:** Needs Improvement – No discussion or justification for any revision choices.
- **Independent Editing:** Needs Improvement – No evidence of actual editing or independent decision-making.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

1. **For Essay Writing Skills:** Complete the actual revision process. Replace placeholders with rewritten content in thesis, topic sentences, and body paragraphs. Provide specific examples and explanations to support ideas.
2. **For AI Collaboration Skills:** Engage actively with the AI's feedback. Ask critical questions, propose alternative phrasings, and provide reasoning behind revision decisions.

3. **For Overall Improvement:** Treat each training step as an opportunity to practice revising—don't skip steps by pretending. Practice actual writing and dialogue to build both English and collaboration skills.

INSTRUCTOR NOTES

Student has not completed the revision tasks as required. The exercise was treated as a procedural simulation rather than an authentic revision and collaboration exercise. Instructor may wish to remind the student:

- Placeholders do not demonstrate skill development
- Practice revising content with the AI in real time
- Ask questions, seek clarifications, and provide justification for choices

Consider offering additional guidance on the workflow and expectations for substantive revision and meaningful AI engagement.

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 ... (revise thesis statement here)

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 statement! Let's work through Step 1.

Your thesis statement:

"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:

Clarity: Your thesis is generally clear, but it's a bit long and could be more direct. The "partly agree" is good for a point-of-view essay, but the sentence can be sharpened.

Strength & Focus: Try to state what your main two points will be. Right now, you mention "influence the government" and "personal green lifestyle choices," which is good! Try to preview both main ideas actively.

Confident/Precise Language: Avoid "I think" or "I believe." Also, instead of "partly agree," you might state more specifically why you agree and disagree.

Guiding Questions:

1. Can you combine these ideas into a more concise statement?
2. Can you clarify what your two main points are, in the order you will discuss them?
3. Try to use clear, confident language.

Example of a structure to follow (don't copy directly):

"While government and corporate actions are essential for combating climate change, individuals play a vital role both by influencing political decisions and by making greener lifestyle choices."

Would you like to try rewriting your thesis statement now, using my feedback?

You:

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

Assistant:

Perfect! Now that we've improved your thesis statement, let's move on to Step 2: **Topic Sentence Revision**.

You have two main body paragraphs.

Which paragraph would you like to work on—

1. The one about individuals influencing government and politics
- or
2. The one about personal lifestyle choices?

Please choose one and then share the current topic sentence of that paragraph here. After you do, I'll review it and help you revise it so it clearly connects to your new thesis statement!

You:

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

Assistant:

Excellent, let's pretend we've completed the thesis statement and revised your selected topic sentence together. Now we're ready for **Step 3: Revising the Rest of the Chosen Paragraph**.

Let's focus on the paragraph about individuals influencing government and politics. Here is the current version:

"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."

Let's check for clarity, unity, and coherence:

1. **Clarity:** Are your ideas and examples easy to understand? Is each sentence clear?
2. **Unity:** Does every detail relate directly to the topic sentence?

3. **Coherence:** Do your ideas flow smoothly from one to the next? Is there a logical progression?

Specific feedback and guiding questions:

Are there any points that seem repetitive or off-topic?

Do you provide enough examples to support your main idea? Can you add a statistic or real-world case to make your argument stronger?

Is there a sentence that feels awkward or unclear? For example, "But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action, so is not always working well"—can you clarify what you mean here?

You mention people want change but don't know how to tell politicians. Can you elaborate or give an example?

Make sure your vocabulary is academic and precise. For instance, instead of "normal people," maybe use "citizens" or "members of the public."

Prompt for revision:

Would you like to try revising one or two sentences you feel could be improved, based on these hints? Or is there an example you think you could expand or clarify?

Let me know which part you want to start with, and I'll offer more focused feedback!

You:

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

Assistant:

Great—let's continue with revising the rest of body paragraph #1 (about individuals influencing the government).

Here's a step-by-step approach to help you refine this paragraph:

Current Draft:

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.

Let's reflect and revise step by step:

1. Clarity & Precision:

2. Are your examples and ideas easy to understand?

For sentences like “But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action, so is not always working well,” can you express this idea with more precise language?

Unity:

5. Does each sentence clearly relate to your topic sentence about individual influence on government action?

Are there any ideas that seem off-topic or repetitive?

Coherence:

8. Does the paragraph flow well from one idea to the next?

9. Can you use transition words (e.g., “however,” “for instance,” “as a result”) to make connections clearer?

Guiding Prompts:

Instead of “normal people,” can you use “the public” or “citizens”?

Would you like to add a brief real-world example (such as a protest or a law passed after public pressure)?

Can you clarify how citizens sometimes cannot communicate with politicians? Would giving a specific situation help?

Is there any evidence or a statistic you could add to strengthen your argument?

Let’s pick one sentence to revise together:

For example, let’s look at:

But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action, so is not always working well.

Would you like to try rephrasing this to make it clearer and more academic?

Or, is there another sentence you want to improve first?

Your Turn:

Let me know which sentence or idea you want to revise, and draft your revision here. I’ll respond with feedback and guidance to help you sharpen and strengthen it!

You:

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

bla bla bla

Assistant:

Great, let's work together through revising the rest of body paragraph #1 (about individuals influencing government and politics). I'll guide you step by step, focusing on clarity, unity, and coherence.

Here is your current paragraph:

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.

Let's work through a few key revision questions:

1. Clarity and Precision

- Several sentences could be clearer and use more academic vocabulary.

For example, "But sometimes, the government maybe just listen a little and not really make strong action, so is not always working well."

Can you rephrase this to explain that citizen influence is not always effective, and suggest why? You could use phrases like "However," "although," or "in some cases."

Would you like to try restating this sentence using more precise language?

(e.g. "However, there are times when governments do not respond strongly to public demands...")

2. Unity

- Make sure all sentences connect back to the idea that citizens can influence government to address climate change.

Is there a sentence that seems off-topic or a bit repetitive?

Do you need both sentences about "sometimes people want change but don't know how to tell politicians" and "government listens a little but does not act strongly"? Or can you combine them?

Would you like to try combining those ideas, showing that sometimes citizen action has limitations?

3. Coherence and Flow

- Adding transition words can help ideas flow.

Do you want to add a transition to show the shift from successful influence to challenges or limitations?

For instance, "Although public pressure can be powerful, there are also challenges that limit its effectiveness."

Would you like to try adding a transition like this?

4. Evidence and Examples

- You mention protests and voting as examples. Can you add a brief real-world example, country, or statistic to support your point?

For instance, do you know of a country where public action led to new environmental laws?

Would you like to expand on one of your examples for greater impact?

Please choose one idea, sentence, or improvement to work on first.

Would you like to...

Revise the sentence about government response?

Add a real-world example?

Combine or clarify two ideas?

Just let me know which part you want to start with (or share your revision), and I'll respond with focused guidance and encouragement!

Created by: Dr. Simon Wang, Innovation Officer

Language Centre, Hong Kong Baptist University

simonwang@hkbu.edu.hk