Author:

Reviewer:

VER .			
		1. Pr	ESENTATION
Guideline	Rat	ing	Commentary
How well does this document achieve its intended purpose—to provide insight into a DC's functions?	0 1 2	3 4	
How clearly does the author express their thinking?	0 1 2	3 4	
How well does the author refer to readings, discussions, and/or theories from class? How well do they emcee?	so	ources	
Consider the document's length. Does it "feel" short, long, or just right? What, if anything, should be added/removed?	short / loi	ng / right	
How genuine, serious, and intelligent does the text sound? How much do you trust the author?	0 1 2	3 4	
How much fun did the author have when writing this paper? What evidence points to that conclusion?	0 1 2	3 4	
2. DC Identification			
Guideline Rating Commentary			
How convinced are you that the o 1 2 3 4 group is (or isn't) a DC?			
Characteristics—Highlight or circle these terms, showing the author where they discussed each one: goals, intercommunication, feedback, genre, lexis, expertise			
Genre: What document type does the DC use, and how well do you understand its role?	Interconni	iumeation	i, reedback, gerre, rexis, expertise
Lexis: What special terms does the DC use, and what do those words mean?			
3. Above and Beyond			
Guideline	Rating	Comme	entary
How engaged were you in this analoysis? What part(s) felt relatable or piqued your interest?	1 2 3 4		
How accommodating to outsiders o is the description? What part(s) made you feel lost or confused?	1 2 3 4		
What insight(s) about the DC did o the author provide? Did the DC seem worthy of study/discussion?	1 2 3 4		
4. Overall			
Guideline Commentary			
How compelling is the title? How proper mar? How professional/readable is the How effective/appropriate/prevalent is the perlinks, graphics, color, etc.?	formatting	?	
How is this analysis better than just a cl list from Swales?	haracteristi	c	
What impressed you most about this do	cument?		
What needs the author's attention most	urgently?		