Paradigm for Feasibility Reports

* 1. INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION.*A successful introduction contains three (3) key elements: a strong heading, “answers” to the reporter’s questions and a personnel/product map.*
  2. Heading.Prior to the introduction, include a heading that contains the following information:

Date:

To:

CC: (if applicable)

From:

SUBJECT: (TOPIC + FOCUS—WRITE THIS IN ALL CAPS)

* 1. Reporter’s Questions.Separate the reporter’s questions into two (2) sections: “Purpose” and “Problem.” Keeping future readers in mind, answer *all* the reporter’s questions as follows (see 1.2.1 and 1.2.2)

**1.2.1** Purpose.Answer the following question in one or two concise sentences:

*WHY? (THESIS)* Why are you writing this report? What

should this report accomplish? What will this research and

analysis provide? *What is the purpose of this document?*

**1.2.2** Problem.Within the “Problem” explanation, succinctly

answer the following questions *in complete sentences*:

***Who?*** Who initiated this research/requested this report?

***What?*** What issue/problem/change prompted this

investigation? (i.e., provide a “historical background” or

summary of the issue needing resolution)

***Where?*** Where will the organization implement this

recommendation?

***When?*** When did the initiator first “assign” this research?

(Also, if applicable, to complete the “historical background:”

When did this issue/problem first become an issue/problem?)

* 1. Personnel/Product Map. Provide a quick-reference guide to the personnel/products/ideas under analysis prior to the analytical discussion. Provide all contact information (i.e., representative, company name, phone number, email address, etc.) in columns. Use parallelism when crafting all entries. Introduce the personnel/product information with a brief topic sentence that explains what type of information follows.
  2. DISCUSSION INFORMATION/DOCUMENTATION.*Divide the comparative analysis into two distinct sections: “Criteria” and “Analysis.”*

***NOTE: Deliberate Format.*** *Each noted section serves a specific, analytical purpose. Without each section, an author risks her/his recommendation appearing non-feasible and/or non-credible. Do NOT combine these sections.*

**2.1.0** Criteria Discussion. Provide a heading to the “Criteria” discussion section. Provide a topic sentence that explains what type of information follows. Explain your criteria in the following two (2) ways:

***Criteria Label.*** Provide a one-to-two word “label” to the type of

research criteria (ex. Warranty, Cost, Accessibility, etc.)

***Criteria Justification.*** Explicitly explain, in one-to-two sentences *the*

*relevance* of this criterion in terms of the issue/problem at hand.

* 1. Analysis Discussion.Provide a heading to the “Analysis” discussion section. Provide a topic sentence that explains what type of information follows. Provide your analytical discussion in two (2) specific manners: a Product Analysis and a Comparative Table.

**2.1.1** Product/Subject Analysis.Using a format that parallels the criteria’s

organization AND the introductory personnel/product listings, explicitly discuss

your findings on each candidate. Discuss each criterion and provide “photographic

descriptions” and logistics (i.e., don’t say something is expensive—provide the

actual “cost”). Discuss each candidate as an individual entity—and do NOT

compare one candidate to another during this portion of the report.

**2.1.2 Comparative Table.** Craft a comparative table that numerically illustrates how

each candidate “rates” within the specified criteria. Provide a topic sentence that

clarifies how to interpret the table and rating scale *prior to the table*. Label and

title the table. Craft the numerical results so readers can interpret the rating

“totals” and begin to see which candidate you will recommend within the

conclusion.

* 1. **CONCLUDING INFORMATION.** *Provide two (2) headings to the concluding information: “Conclusion” and “Recommendation.”*
  2. **Conclusion.** The “Conclusion” section of the analysis provides a written discussion of the table’s findings and a written discussion of the comparative analysis, thus an author CANNOT skip this report section. Provide concessions and explain how the candidates cumulatively “rate” against one another. Be sure to allude briefly to all criteria referenced during research.
  3. **Recommendation.** Blatantly note your recommendation and explain what, specifically, brings you to your recommendation. Provide one additional sentence that explains how the recommended candidate will benefit the organization.