Molly Blair

**Quality of Insights drawn from Interview/ Survey**

23/25

* You made some excellent discoveries in your interviews. You presented the results of the interview in a way that easy to follow. You also did a great job synthesizing the results from your three interviews. The only real issue was that you interviewed folks that weren’t really in the field as closely as I would have liked.

**Quality of insights drawn from corpus analysis**

22/25

* Overall, your insights were interesting and you make some good points. However, I would have liked to see a deeper level of analysis with some of your findings (e.g., looking more closely at clusters and collocates)

**Writing Quality**

15/15

* Nothing to comment on here. Solid writing and written in a way that was clear and concise.

**Visual Design**

9/10

* It was fine; however, the shades of blue may not have fit in the IMRaD genre.

**Genre**

8.5/10

- For the most part, you did a nice job navigating the genre of IMRaD. However, some of the introduction and reflection were not necessarily appropriate in an IMRaD report.

**Quality of Presentation**

Adam Holley

**Quality of Insights drawn from Interview/ Survey**

18/25

* Your results of your survey lacked the proper detail to really understand the distinct stories of each of your participants. You only briefly discuss three similarities among the participants. For instance, you don’t actually define what digital literacy meant for each of these three participants. I would have liked to see a much more detailed discussion of the survey results in the way you did with your corpus. Additionally, you didn’t really compare the results from your survey to the results in your corpus analysis or the readings.

**Quality of insights drawn from corpus analysis**

23/25

* You did a nice job on the corpus analysis—particularly the areas in which you examined groupings of tools. Your tables and charts were helpful in providing some background for what was happening in the corpus. Your argument that the results were likely biased based on the jobs placed in the corpus is an accurate observation.

**Writing Quality**

13/15

* Your writing has some areas for improvement. Watch for informal tone in some areas. Additionally, there were some typos/grammatical errors.

**Visual Design**

9/10

**Genre**

8/10

- For the most part, you did a nice job navigating the genre of IMRaD. However, you did combine some of the discussion into the results. Typically, discussing rationale or impications of results is reserved for the discussion section.

Rebecca Pope

**Quality of Insights drawn from Interview/ Survey**

20/25

* Your results of your survey lacked the proper detail to really understand the distinct stories of each of your participants. For example, you don’t really discuss the demographic characteristics of each participant and how that might influence the findings.

**Quality of insights drawn from corpus analysis**

22/25

* You did a nice job on the corpus analysis—particularly the areas in which you examined keywords and closely associated words. I liked the way that you used the survey results to guide some of your searches. I would, however, have liked to see a more organized presentation of your results with natural groupings for your findings. Perhaps tables/graphs would have also been helpful.

**Writing Quality**

13/15

* Your writing has some areas for improvement. Watch for informal tone in some areas. Additionally, there were some typos/grammatical errors.

**Visual Design**

8/10

- The report could/should have been written in Word or some other software with visual design capabilities.

**Genre**

8/10

* For the most part, you did a nice job navigating the genre of IMRaD. However, many of the sections lacked detail (mostly the method and the results). The methods section would have benefited greatly from more detail about the process for which you analyzed each data type. The results required a more detailed treatment (as stated previously).

**Presentation**

**8/15**

* **­**You did not seem prepared for the presentation. You did not have an organized method for discussing results and did not have a clear presentation of your results. I believe that you would greatly benefit from additional preparation for subsequent presentations.

Shridhar Rao

**Quality of Insights drawn from Interview/ Survey**

18/25

* Your results of your survey lacked the proper detail to really understand the distinct stories of each of your participants. For example, you don’t really discuss the demographic characteristics of each participant and how that might influence the findings. Additionally, simply providing a bulleted list of key findings isn’t appropriate for an IMRaD report. Instead, specific findings, quotations, and attributions to the participants is essential.

**Quality of insights drawn from corpus analysis**

19/25

* Again, you make interesting observations from the corpus, but none of them have enough detail. For instance, all of your key findings need actual frequencies attached to them. Without this information, it’s impossible to know how often these words actually occurred in the corpus. Additionally, it would have been good to provide a deeper analysis of the corpus (e.g., collocates, n-grams, phrases).

**Writing Quality**

12/15

* Your writing has some areas for improvement. There were some fundamental grammatical errors. However, a lot of your sentence constructions are overly wordy.

**Visual Design**

9/10

- The visual design was fine.

**Genre**

7/10

* There was a general lack of detail that an IMRaD report would contain (as stated previously). Additionally, you seem to have two sections of results (one labeled findings and one labeled results).

**Presentation**

**12/15**

**Kylie Vo**

**Quality of Insights drawn from Interview/ Survey**

23/25

- You did a nice job synthesizing the results from your survey. You provided adequate detail regarding the results, while at the same time providing a synthesis of the key findings. Some of your findings might be best presented in a table or other visual element (graph, chart)

**Quality of insights drawn from corpus analysis**

23/25

Your corpus analysis was a good start. However, I would have liked to see a deeper analysis in some ways. You did a nice job writing the results from the exercise that we did in class. However, I would have liked to see some additional analyses based on the results from our survey.

**Writing Quality**

10/15

* The overall structure of your writing was good. However, your writing needs some work in regards to grammar and punctuation.

**Visual Design**

9/10

- The visual design was fine.

**Genre**

9/10

* You seemed to navigate the IMRaD genre well.

**Presentation**

**Cristina Marban**

**Quality of Insights drawn from Interview/ Survey**

22/25

* Your survey results were very comprehensive, and your respondents had a lot of interesting things to say. However, you seemed to just present the results one by one without providing any additional synthesis (discussing ways in which results were similar or different).

**Quality of insights drawn from corpus analysis**

17/25

* Your corpus analysis seemed to lack the amount of detail necessary to draw any new insight. A deeper analysis of the corpus, along with a comparison to the survey results would have been helpful in establishing your argument.

**Writing Quality**

11/15

* Your writing was grammatically strong. However, there seemed to be a lack of cohesion between major ideas—particularly in your reporting of the survey results.

**Visual Design**

9/10

- The visual design was fine.

**Genre**

9/10

* You seemed to navigate the genre of IMRaD well.

**Presentation**