Peer Critique for Assignment One: The Feasibility Report

Your Name: Author’s Name:

I. Format

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

B. Look at the feasibility report’s **subject heading**. It should note *both* the type of report and focus of the report. (ex. FEASIBILITY REPORT ON FORMAL REPORT TOPICS) Offer suggestions so that there’s a clear text subject.

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

and who prompted the author to write 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. Feasibility reports typically break a “problem” into two parts: **criteria** for evaluation and an **analysis**

where the author comparatively discusses the pros and cons of a candidate. Note

whether or not the author uses this format and offer suggestions for improvement.

2. Discuss the **criteria** the author elected to use in order to support her/his recommendation and whether

or not the **criteria** are effective or relevant. 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. Discuss the **order** in which the criteria are presented. Does there appear to be an order to the criteria

selected? Alphabetical? Most important to “least” important? Subjective to objective?

4. Comment on the **quality of information** presented: Discuss the information’s necessity. Are

important, key bits of information missing and, as a result, is the report too ambiguous? Discuss what

additional information might assist readers—and what information might be removed due to its

irrelevance.

5. 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.

1. Does the author use additional **graphics or a table beyond the required comparative table**? If so,

are they necessary? Discuss how the graphic(s) compliments the body’s content. If a graphic is not

necessary, note this and *explain why.*

7. When the author uses the required comparative **table (required)** to illustrate criteria comparison

a. Is the table effectively **labeled**?

b. Is the table effectively **presented** so readers understand what is being analyzed and how?

c. Does the table use **parallelism** so that the presentation of criteria here parallels the criteria

discussion within the first half of the feasibility report’s discussion/body?

d. If the author uses **highlighting** in the table, is it effective? Is it necessary? Is it too fancy?

F. Review the text’s **conclusions** and **recommendations**. The report often ends with a conclusion paragraph followed by a recommendation paragraph that contains the “call the action.”

1. Does the conclusion paragraph summarize the report’s conclusions and state which option is the best choice?
2. Is there a **clear, specific and relevant recommendation (or “call to action”)** that explains the “benefit” of assenting to this proposal? Does this recommendation and explanation appear “valid”?

Any other comments? Grammar/punctuation issues? Clarity? Conciseness?