

Example: Generate Your Own Feedback

Course: Political Science

Level: Undergraduate

Set-Up

The prompts were integrated into an essay assignment, with the following deadlines (each with one week between them):

1. First draft: students submit this for peer review.
2. Peer review: each student reviews two or three first submissions from others and provides feedback using the grading rubric and/or other feedback criteria.
3. Feedback report: each student submits a “feedback report” that is graded by the instructor for completion (not content). In this report, they process the peer feedback alongside two other sources of feedback into actionable steps to improve their work. The other sources of feedback are based on a comparison of their work against specific comparators or reference points:
 4. How does your essay compare to the two sample essays provided by the instructor?
 5. How does your essay compare to an essay generated by an online AI, such as ChatGPT or Bard?
6. Final submission, graded by the instructor for content (against the rubric provided before the assignment).

C. Short essays (40%). This is an individual essay (max. 1000 words, excluding footnotes and bibliography).

The essay question is: Explain how history would have developed in a different way due to a change onto a different path that took place more than 50 years ago, i.e., 1973 or before. This “alternative paths” essay is anchored in the past, i.e., introducing a change in the past and then tracking how it affects events up to today.

Advice:

- Answer the prompt!
- Narrow your analysis to a country or smaller unit to make it easier for yourself.
- Use your analysis to understand how our current situation was affected by the change that DID happen and then to imagine how our situation would be different if something DIFFERENT happened.
- You need to have a (simple) model that captures the change or inertia.
- Your alternative path needs to be plausible.

After the first submission, you will generate your own feedback by (i) comparing your work to an essay written by ChatGPT/Bing or other AI; and (ii) getting peer feedback. It will not be read by the professor; he will only grade your feedback report. The grading rubrics for the essay and feedback report are included in the appendix; these will be used for grading the feedback report (10%) and your second essay (30%).

Feedback report essay (10%)							
	4	3	2	1	0		
Depth of reflection Demonstrates a profound understanding of personal strengths and areas for improvement. Draws intricate connections between their work, the AI essay/blog, and peer feedback.						Offers superficial or no reflection on their work with little to no connection to the AI essay/blog and peer feedback.	1/3
Specificity of feedback Lists specific examples from both their essay and the AI essay/blog and incorporates detailed points from peer feedback. Feedback is well-organised and written clearly.						Lacks specificity in feedback and may omit details from either essay/blog or peer feedback.	1/3
Actionable insights Offers clear, actionable steps for future improvements, rooted in insights from the comparison and peer feedback.						Provides little to no actionable insights for improvement.	1/3

Results

Below are paraphrased excerpts from the students' Feedback Report:

“Generally, the essay's structure appeared sound, yet it lacked a comprehensive conclusion at the time of submission. Feedback from peers noted this, suggesting that the introduction should clearly lay out the argument's structure and include a conclusion. This observation is pertinent as the essay's introduction failed to provide readers with a clearly stated roadmap or order of arguments. Additionally, ChatGPT noted the need for a clear thesis statement, with the recommendation that it should succinctly outline the main argument or central message, serving as a guide for both the writer and the reader throughout the essay. Moving forward, I will ensure to craft a clearer thesis statement and roadmap for forthcoming essays”

“Honestly, in terms of style, I’m surprised to admit that Chat's writing style surpasses mine. Here are some pointers from the comparison that I could utilize to enhance my essay and prevent my readers from nodding off: avoid digressions; keep paragraphs succinct; and integrate my own voice more.”

“Another aspect of the feedback I received from peers proposed removing the counterpoints in my initial argument. According to my peer, the rationale behind this suggestion was the constraint of the word limit, which doesn't afford sufficient space to thoroughly elucidate the counterpoints and provide adequate responses. I agree with this assessment and personally found that my counterarguments lacked depth. Therefore, I believe that augmenting my argument with additional evidence or course concepts would be more beneficial than including superficial counterpoints.”