**Reviewer’s Checklist – Summary 2 – Rough Draft Date of Review: 01/21/2022**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s Name: Aidan Hopper** | **SUMMARY AUTHOR’S NAME: Jaewon Heo** | |
| **+/-** | **Component** | **Reviewer’s Comments:** | **Codes:** for 1-8 |
| + | 1. Double spaced | Yes looks good. | 0 |
| + | 1. Document has a title | Has title. | 0 |
| - | 1. Original title and author are included | Does not include title of original document in title. | 13 |
| / | 1. Author indicates that this is a summary. | Indicates a summary in the title but not author. | 19 |
| + | 1. Has a clear, accurate overall thesis statement; is in 1st paragraph. | Second sentence is thesis statement. | 0 |
| - | 1. Sections are clearly noted; how many? All have headings? | Does not indicate sections and has no headings. | 30 |
| + | 1. Written in third person | No third person language. | 0 |
| + | 1. Discussion included? Has a heading? | Discussion has heading but is not very clear. |  |
| - | 1. Each section has a topic statement | Paragraphs don’t have very much structure. | |
| + | 1. Personal opinions not included | No personal opinions in summary. | |
| - | 1. There is a conclusion | No conclusion. | |
| + | 1. ALL parts of the original document are covered? What’s missing? | All parts are covered. | |
| + | 1. Coherent, logical flow with transitions | Needs more structure in paragraphs, also needs better transitions. | |
| - | 1. Sentence structure is varied and correct. | Very odd sentence structure in parts of the document. | |
| / | 1. Spelling; verbiage | Spelling is mostly ok, but needs some work. | |
| + | 1. Where could the author improve: | Grammar and structure are the two most glaring issues. | |
| - | * 1. Grammar | Needs a lot of work on grammar. | |
| - | * 1. Being Concise? Wordy? | Sometimes wordy | |
| - | * 1. Clarity | Not very clear due to the lack of structure. | |
| + | 1. Sentence fragments | Ok on this. | |
| + | 1. Parallelism | Ok on this. Correctly uses parrelism on lists of items. | |
| + | 1. Commas, colons, semicolons, and other punctuation | This is fine. | |
| + | 1. No quotes | Uses quotes but its for specific terms, not from another author. I think this is fine but you should check just in case. | |

**KEY: (these go in the column on the far left)**

**+**  = good as it is; maybe slight changes / = needs more work **-** = needs more attention value: 9 pts