

To: Alexis Jensen, English 301 Student

From: Wesley Berry, English 301 Student (WB)

Date: March 14, 2016

Subject: Peer review of *Analysis into the Implementation of a Successful Project Management System for a Hopscotch Project's Lifecycle and Software to Accompany it*

After reading your report rough draft, I am impressed with your ability analyze key points in a succinct, direct way. Your report is strong from idea conception to concluding recommendations, and I enjoyed walking through the analysis via your writing. More specific comments and suggestions follow below.

Content

The information was relevant and presented in a concise, easy-to-follow manner. Initial sections framed the problem well and provided all necessary contextual information, setting the stage for analysis to follow. The Scope section was exceptionally clear, underscoring what you wanted to do and how. Similarly, the first Conclusion section's inclusion of employee opinions and likely change-adoption rate seemed notably relevant and a very good point to make. Specifying your secondary sources might make this section even stronger, but overall it covers the content very well.

The data sections were also very thorough and stepping through the ramifications of each question provided insight into the data. Inserting survey quotes provided qualitative context to the quantitative data, effectively supplementing your key observations.

A couple points here: it might be worth expanding on how you "boiled down" the answers in the Survey Data section, just to increase clarity. Moreover, a little more explanation on the relevance of the "How would employee change how they work on a project" question might further elucidate your point. Finally, in the "Survey Recommendations" question, you mention caveats, but I'm a little unsure whether these caveats come from the survey or interviews?

Your second Conclusion section was also very strong and the recommendations were really well presented—specific, direct, and detailed. They addressed the main issues and gave trajectories for the future.

Organization

Format worked well and the project flowed relevantly between sections. Each section brought perspective to the report and none seemed superfluous or repetitive.

One thing to note here is you mention a Qualitative Observations section in the Table of Contents, but such a section does not appear in the body of the report. In my opinion, it does not seem needed, as you thread the qualitative observations well with the quantitative analysis, but worth noting the discrepancy.

Style

Your style is analytic and consistent and you move between points well. One suggestion here might be to try and minimize the passive voice in your writing (example: "...are apparent" in Purpose of Study). Using a more direct voice will make the piece flow smoother.

Additionally, omitting opinions will lend credence to your analysis. This only occurs once, but there is a sentence in the Methodology section about "...seeming wise" (second paragraph), which might be worth taking out.

Furthermore, the Scope of Inquiry section is all one sentence and while all the information is relevant, splitting it up might make the point flow better.

Design

Your use of charts was effective. Colors are always appreciated and the consistency across the graphs made them easy to follow.

Grammar and Spelling

Mostly good on this end. Just a few typos to note:

- In the Methodologies section, "employees current methodologies" should be "employee's..."
- Should SurveyGizmo and Taiga be capitalized?
- Also in the Methodologies section, "...currently lifecycle..."
- Under the section "How do employees currently keep track of tasks when working on a project?" second paragraph: "...how necessary it is for a project be successful..."
- The section title "How would employee change how they work on a project" needs a question mark.

Also a more general point here about sentence structure: I found your paragraphs which mixed short and long sentences to be most effective and easy to read. Similarly, be careful of run-ons throughout. For example: in the "Recommendation on how to improve project information management" section, you really mixed the sentence flavors well done in paragraph two, but paragraph 3 is a run-on sentence.

Final Remarks

Overall, I enjoyed your report and it seems like an issue you are well-equipped to tackle. Your writing is very clear and your voice and style are easy to follow. The organization and content were on-point and I was impressed by the detail of your analysis.

Perhaps another point to consider in your report as a perspective bonus would be whether there are any downsides to removing "organic" organization (does this

impose constraints on expression/time?). Is so, how are these mitigated or made “worth it” by the changes?

The report looks great and a little fine tuning and editing will make it that much stronger. Please let me know if you have any questions. Looks like Hopscotch is in the right hands!