**[For this assignment, we determined that we would focus on the feedback given by TAs to students on their project reports, and students’ response to that feedback.]**

**Student A1**

*Comment typology*

Total comments: 11

Writing focused: 2

Methods focused: 5

Content focused: 4

*Comment clarity/accuracy/relevance:*

All comments seemed clear, accurate, and relevant for this proposal. There was one comment that was slightly unclear due to wording: “We are more looking for the expecting format of how you are going to show…”. This comment, while relevant to the “Expected Results” section, is difficult to understand and can cause miscommunication.

*Comment efficacy:*

The writing and content issues identified by the TA in the proposal, were for the most part not addressed. Student A1 made no changes to requests for more background information in the introduction, nor to the formality of their research question.

Student A1 best addressed the comments about their methods section and sought to fix the issues in the final project. Student A1 gave specific analysis types (spatial, network, and demographic), and supported their choices with explanation for their choices as well as the geospatial tools necessary to complete their study.

**Student B1**

*Comment typology*

Total comments: 13

Writing focused: 3

Methods focused: 2

Content focused: 8

*Comment clarity/accuracy/relevance:*

The comments written by the TA are for the most part clear, accurate, and relevant to the project. A comment written “take care of grammar, some sentences are difficult to understand” points to a need to proofread and possibly rewrite some sentences but does not highlight specific examples to help the student identify and learn from their writing mistakes.

*Comment efficacy:*

A majority of the comments focus on issues with the content of the proposal, such as missing explanations and detailed information. These comments were not well addressed. Student B1 did, respond to requests for specific information such as the name of the project in the Toronto-Windsor corridor. The issues identified in the proposal were not fixed in the final submission.

The three comments about writing—one about the spelling of the Professor’s name, one seeking more citations, and the other about grammar in general for clarity—were largely ignored. No changes were made to the Professor’s name, and there are no apparent changes to the general comment on grammar and clarity. In general, there was no improvement in writing. There was little to no improvement with regards to the comments about methods. The explanation remains vague without answering the questions highlighted by the TA.

**Student B2**

*Comment typology*

Total comments: 11 (1 comment held feedback for both written and content focused issues)

Writing focused: 3

Methods focused: 3

Content focused: 5

*Comment clarity/accuracy/relevance:*

The comments written by the TA are for the most part clear, accurate, and relevant to the project.

*Comment efficacy:*

The issues identified in the proposal comments were largely not fixed in the final submission. The writing focused comments were partially addressed. Student B2 did include in-text citation in their final submission and made an effort to not use “I” or “we” in their assignment (only one instance). However, no changes were made to the title.

The methods issues identified in the proposal were partially fixed. Student B2 did provide more explanation about their methods, but did not write out their explanations in paragraphs, and continues to use full URLs regardless of the comments written on their proposal. In general, content issues were not fixed in the final submission. The explanations given are superficial and lack many of the details and explanation requested in the comments on the proposal.

**Student B3**

*Comment typology*

Total comments:10

Writing focused: 3

Methods focused: 5

Content focused:  2

*Comment clarity/accuracy/relevance:*

The comments written by the TA are for the most part clear, accurate, and relevant to the project.

*Comment efficacy:*

Student B3 did not respond to writing focused comments about in-text citations but did respond to comments about the formality of bullet point writing. Feedback about content requested specific details such as date, and naming conventions—question and table identified in the proposal were not present in the final submission.

In general, most of the comments referred to issues with the method. Although student B3 made an effort to expand on their methods and respond to comments asking for clarification such as “what numerical data do you have?”, their final submission lacked clarity on data collected and processed, and the explanation of their method did not directly line up with the topic of the assignment.

**Student C1**

*Comment typology*

Total comments: 9

Writing focused:  3

Methods focused:  3

Content focused:  3

*Comment clarity/accuracy/relevance:*

The comments written by the TA are for the most part clear, accurate, and relevant to the project.

*Comment efficacy:*

Student C1 for the most part addressed comments about their writing to include in-text citations, use specific language in their title, and avoid the use of “I” and “we” (“I” was used once). Comments that were content focused were moderately addressed, such as to include literature to support statements by including 2 citations, and introductory content was moved to more appropriate sections. Methods focused comments about data selection and processing tools were not addressed.

**Student C2**

*Comment typology*

Total comments: 11

Writing focused: 3

Methods focused: 5

Content focused: 3

*Comment clarity/accuracy/relevance:*

The comments written by the TA are for the most part clear, accurate, and relevant to the project.

*Comment efficacy:*

Student C2 addressed some of the comments that were writing focused such as including section titles. However, the student did not respond to comments about including in-text citations, and there was little improvement in grammar and clarity of statements. Comments about issues in content were for the most part not addressed, but the format and explanations offered did differ from the proposal. Finally, the comments about issues with methods were partially addressed. Data and analysis were presented and described in the final submission but lacked detailed explanation as requested in comments in the proposal.

Overall Observations:

In general, there was a slight improvement in the quality of work between the final submission and the proposal. Of the six proposals observed, there were a total of 65 comments made, of which 25 referred to issues in content, 23 referred to issues with methods, and 17 referred to issues with writing. Although many of the issues identified were not addressed by the students in their final submission, the TA’s comments were mostly clear, accurate, and relevant to the assignment. The comments were often suggestive of areas that students could improve with further reflection and research.

The issues highlighted for content asked students to clarify their objectives, give more details in their introduction and expected results, as well as further explain the connections between variables. In general, students did not directly address these comments. While they expanded their work, they often did not include enough detail, or connect ideas.

The comments that were methods focused often addressed questions of data specificity and analysis. Comments often asked where students would find data, which data they specifically hoped to use, and how the data related to their questions. Other comments asked how students intended to analyze their specific data and explain their choice of analysis. While students presented more detailed data and explanation of their analysis in the final submission, they did not respond directly to the comments made in the proposals and often submitted methods sections that required further explanation and clarity.

Finally, comments that focused on writing issues mostly asked for in-text citations/references, and requests for proofreading for grammar and sentence clarity. Students mostly responded to the request for in-text citations. However, the in-text citations were often few and not properly formatted. There was little to no improvement in the final submission with regards to grammar and clarity of language. In part, this may be due to the general nature of the comments, as students may not have known which sentences specifically required improvement, how to improve them, and what grammar errors needed correction.