**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Bhawandeep Kambo, Technical Knockouts’ Team Member

**From:** Editha Tomaszewski, Technical Knockouts’ Team Member/Peer Reviewer, *E.T.*

**Date:** July 20, 2016

**Subject:** *Peer Review of Formal Report Draft.*

I had a chance to review your Formal Report Draft “*Proposal for the implementation of a one software re-imaging solution for all software testing machines and devices at SMART Technologies”.* Below you will find the summary of my recommendations that may be valuable for you to include in your final copy. Please have a look.

**Content**

Generally, the report is logically laid out with key headings to guide the reader. Each section is relevant to the reader, there is an organized progression, however, the flow could be better and some adjustments are needed, such as:

Your ***Introduction*** says that “the focus of this report will be on manual testing” after which two paragraphs down you state that “the purpose of this report will be to assess the feasibility of having a single software solution throughout the company and finding which software solution works the best”. Please revise either the focus or the purpose of the report to make it clear and specific on what is to come in the report.

I would also suggest that you revise the ***Recommendation and Conclusion*** portion. The suggested recommendations are great. Still, having subheadings of each recommendation would make the section clearer and easier for the audience to follow through.

Adding subheadings to the body of your report would be useful as well, in terms of indicating the results of the survey for each program. For example, when you discuss the FOG solution, you can add a subheading such as:

**“Results for the FOG Server**

The last solution is the FOG server. This is a software solution based on grabbing images from the CLOUD, or a network attached storage system rather than from a USB or hard disk. This is the newest of all four solutions and is also very versatile. This solution does need the device to be plugged into an Ethernet port specific to the FOG server connection. The downside of this software would be that only 20% of the company currently uses it and therefore implementing it would be a bigger overhaul than the other two largely used solutions”.

This will allow the reader to follow through much easier.

It was a little hard to precisely identify which part of your report was the most informative. The content of the main section, the body of the report with the heading “***Collected Data and Results***”, provided really good information. The flow could be smoother but I still benefited from the description of the software solutions used throughout the company. However, the person that the report is intended for, Warren Barkley is the Chief Technology Officer working for the firm and he would most likely be familiar with any technical forms used. Keeping that in mind, I think many sections contain too many details and explain obvious facts to someone in his position. As an example I am referring to the “***Collected Data and the Results***” section where you clarify information on software solutions “used throughout the company”. If you try to place yourself in his position, explaining some of the details may be way too excessive and completely unnecessary without really focusing on the intended purpose of your report.

**Organization**

Overall, there is evidence of organization within the report draft with relevant headings. It focused on the key areas of that needed to be addresses and what the results showed in terms of using specific software for the company. Subheadings are needed for a more convenient and clear explanation.

The sections of the report can be better connected to one another by providing a brief summary for the collected data and results. Right now, it feels a little out of place since there is no summary or transitioning sentences to show the relationship in the report.

* **The Tone**

The tone of the report is objective rather than subjective. It discusses the results in the same way you would see it in a research report. Generally, most of the passages written are easy to understand. However, I could not identify the “***you-approach***” used in your draft. Please refer back to the previous sections of this block to specifically address your reader, Warren Barkley, and to see the purpose of your report from his perspective.

* **The Design**

There are no graphics and no visuals in the report. Perhaps showing the results from your surveys or comparing the main software solutions graphically would be an idea?

With respect to the design, I found it rather hard to follow. The reason for that is partially the fact that during the posting the content of the draft has shifted therefore, the pages do not align.

At the bottom of the title page there are few lines of the text from the next page already. The other pages have similar layout meaning that some parts from one section go on to the next page. Please be more careful when submitting your final report as the shift of text makes the design less visually appealing/attractive.

* **The Layout/Spacing**

The information on the title page should be centered and the size of the font for the title of your report adjusted as it appears in the textbook. Please check Chapter 22, page 539 for the specifics.

Additionally, the layout and spacing have not been adjusted properly. Perhaps the intention is to fill in the information later on? In this case leaving a note for the reviewer would clarify it. Otherwise, there is just too much white space left among the sections. Not sure if that is as a result of the text shifting or simply not the best design? This is something that should be controlled before submitting your final report. Please refer to the text, Chapter 22, pages 539-549 for a specific example.

* **No Subheadings**

There are no subheadings and some of the headings could be separated, i.e.: Collected Data and Results could have two separate sections, one for the “Collected Data” and one for the “Results”. The same idea could be applied to the last section “Recommendation and Conclusion”. Your “Recommendations” should appear before the “Conclusion” which contains your final thoughts and sums up your main argument.

* **The length of the report and the choice of words**

This aspect of your report is only partially met for the proposed 12-15 pages. As you write more, please avoid repetitive words by deciding on synonyms and be sure to check your spelling, grammar, and punctuation.

**Final Impression**

The review of your draft has not been an easy task for me, though an enjoyable one, for sure. It is a good start to a formal report. However, even with the best intentions and an open mind, I think that certain sections are in need of improvement. By doing the revisions and integrating the necessary corrections your report will be more professional appealing, very valuable and appreciated.

Bhawandeep, thank you for the opportunity to peer review your report and provide you with my suggestions. I hope you will find them useful. If you have any questions about this feedback I can be contacted at ept583@gmail.com

Thank you.