Training Dataset Overview

The GTA training dataset has scored and commented reports from six GTAs. We selected reports that illustrate a range of writing quality, and also the range and types of feedback that students receive as GTAs gain experience with reflective feedback.

**TA1 and TA2 are both early-career GTAs** with experience in a single course. Their comments on student reports are typical of lower-impact feedback. The remarks are accurate and reflects our requirements, but most provide very specific corrections without context or explanation, or directly copy-edit the text. There are very few questions for the author to reflect on, and no references to our Resource Guide.

**TA3 and TA4 are both mid-career GTAs** with experience in more than one course locally. TA3’s comments illustrate common hold-over problems we see. Overall, TA3 provides too many comments on individual mistakes and focuses more on details than on the overall product. TA3 often still gives copy-editing corrections. Even so TA3 is starting to use reflective feedback. For example, this GTA's graded version of report "R\_bmyC\_aALka.docx" contains this comment consisting of reflective questions:

*Can you be more specific? Peak of contraction? What are you measuring: the amplitude of contraction or the frequency that generated this peak?*

TA3's summary comment on this particular report also was very informative because it provided the student with very clear priorities for making revisions.

*Although the lab report meets all the basic criteria. It has many writing and technical flaws. It also has problems in the basic definitions necessary to understand the hypothesis of this experiment. The student confused the effect of the Acetylcholine esterase inhibitor with the effect of an antagonist of the channel. The observations in the results are vague and the figure was never referenced.*

TA4 also still provides specific points the student needs to correct but is incorporating coaching-oriented feedback regularly. Comments do not always provide instructions on how to make the corrections. Comments on larger errors include information about what is needed. This TA has started routinely affirming what the writer did well, so the student can build on it in the future.

**TA5 and TA6 are senior GTAs** with experience in multiple courses and at more than one institution. Their comments still include some specific copy-editing changes, but TA5 also regularly points out problems without providing specific solutions; this requires students think about the error then find solutions on their own in our Writing Guide or in other student support resources. TA5 provides more of their guidance in the form of questions. This TA also incorporates more confirmations of what student did well.

TA6 gives corrections in a more narrative style like what the student would hear in a face-to-face meeting. More extensive corrections include supporting explanation about the logic behind the requirement or prompts for students to think about as they make corrections. This GTA gives only a limited number of copy-editing corrections.

Interestingly, even the most experienced GTAs continue to write out instructions rather than refer students to our Writing Resource Guide.

Reports IDs and Assigned Scores by GTA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Assigned Score** | | | | | |
| **Report** | ***TA1*** | ***TA2*** | ***TA3*** | ***TA4*** | ***TA5*** | ***TA6*** |
| R\_bmyC\_aALka.docx | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| R\_bscm\_jygDg.docx | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| R\_bTvF\_sLBHm.docx | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| R\_BweD\_Qqyss.docx | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| R\_ciLD\_TZzab.docx | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| R\_cPGP\_tkSNh.docx | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| R\_cToZ\_jPtxn.docx | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| R\_DEDB\_lyKvt.docx | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| R\_EuAR\_NowDu.docx | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| R\_iJhn\_ZnEFc.docx | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| R\_Jecg\_asluj.docx | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| R\_jPis\_yvunv.docx | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| R\_Mtme\_WYXdw.docx | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| R\_NgDF\_XVATk.docx | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| R\_NLoM\_TDJvd.docx | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| R\_TprN\_ThNyx.docx | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| R\_TyHp\_xEMsq.docx | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| R\_vjJv\_KVRMl.docx | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| R\_vmpA\_upUte.docx | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| R\_YRGq\_jCPsr.docx | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |

Inter-rater agreement on report bins scores is a = 0.667 (Krippendorff's alpha, 6 raters, 20 items) BEFORE the GTAs discussed any disagreements in scores.