Exercise C Peer Critique

Progress Reports

Your Name: Author’s Name:

Progress Report Critique

I. Format

A. Look at the progress report’s **format**. Is it in memo or letter-like format?

B. Look at the progress report’s **subject heading**. It should note *both* the type of report and focus of the report. (ex. FALL 2008 PROGRESS REPORT ON SOUTH DECK COMPLETION) Offer suggestions so that the text’s subject is clear.

C. Look at the text’s **overall presentation**. Does the author use **headings** and **highlighting** (i.e., bolding, italics, subheadings, etc.) for clarity and easy access to each area of her/his report? Offer suggestions on ways the author might more effectively present the document.

D. Review the text’s **introduction.**

1. Does the introduction contain a **purpose statement** that explains the reason for crafting this document?

If not, note ways in which the author might make this clear.

2. Does the author use the introduction to answer efficiently the questions within a **journalist’s**

**question model**? (i.e., Who? What? Where? When Why? Note: How? is always answered within the

body/discussion of a text.) Overall, does the introduction provide enough specifics that a lay

person/peer can see the objectives of this document? Offer suggestions for improvement.

3. Is a personnel or product section required?

E. Review the text’s **discussion/body**.

1. Discuss how the author elected to **organize** the information. Progress reports often work effectively if the general framework reflects three or four main body items: Work completed, Work remaining/In progress, and Problems encountered. Within each of these categories you would then use further subheadings for additional clarity.

2. Further, note whether or not the author needs to include additional or less **highlighting**

**techniques** for further clarity and accessibility to the presented ideas.

3. Comment on the **quality of information** presented: is all of it necessary? Are important, key bits of information missing? Is the report too ambiguous? Discuss what additional information might assist readers—and what information might be removed due to its irrelevance.

4. Note the author’s use of **jargon and acronyms**—are they defined clearly? Note here what must be

further clarified and what is unnecessarily defined.

5. **Graphics (graph or table)**. Discuss how the graphic(s) compliments the body’s content. If a graphic simply repeats the written content, note this and *explain why.* Also, note whether or not the graphic is introduced in the text, numbered and named, and whether or not the author provides a follow-up comment after the graphic.

6. Is there additional information in the report that would be more easily accessible with a **graphic**? Explain.

F. Review the text’s **conclusion/recommendations**.

1. Does the conclusion sum up what the author has achieved during this reporting period and provide a target completion date?

2. Does the recommendation suggest a next step or a “fix” for any problems encountered?

3. Does anything appear to be **missing**? Does anything appear to be **inaccurate** or **hard to believe**? Note

this information here and explain what more would be necessary in order for a lay reader/peer to

understand the author’s claims.

G. Any additional comments? Is this too long? Short? Dense? “Fluffy”? Please explain.

H. Compliment the author on at least one aspect of her/his progress report.