Assignment Two Peer Critique

Academic 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? Any issues with the formatting?

B. Look at the progress report’s **subject heading**. It should note *both* the type of report and focus of the report. (ex. FALL 2010 PROGRESS REPORT ON ASSOCIATE OF SCIENCE, OPTION TWO, DEGREE 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. Are headings & subheadings consistent?

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.

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

1. Discuss how the author elected to **organize** the information within each section (Chronologically? Topically? Geographically? Compare/Contrast? Importance?, etc.) and whether or not this type of **organization** is effective. Further, note whether or not the author needs to include additional or less **highlighting techniques** for further clarity and accessibility to the presented ideas. Remember: Progress reports work effectively if the general framework reflects three or four main body items: Work completed, Work remaining/in progress, and Problems/obstacles encountered. Within each of these categories, you would then use further subheadings for additional clarity.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Note the **specifics** within the author’s text. Instead of simply stating “ten of fifteen Humanities credits

have been satisfied to date,” are the specific courses also noted? Further, also note where the author

gets too specific.

1. Does the author use **graphics**? Discuss how the graphic(s) complements the body’s content. If a graphic is not necessary, note this and *explain why.*

6. Is there information that would be more easily accessible with a **graphic**, such as a **table**? Explain.

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

1. Discuss the way that the author explains the “value” of evaluating and analyzing degree/certification

requirements. Is it effective? Is the target completion date clear?

2. Does the conclusion contain a **clear, specific and feasible plan of action** that outlines what further

actions must be taken to complete degree/certification requirements--and what research remains?

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. MLA: are there at least two sources (one primary and one secondary) quoted or referenced in the report? Is there a works cited list?

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