

Your name: Nick Hernandez

Hyperlink to the draft under review: [Shauna's Podcast](#)

Audience

How effectively do you feel this draft is constructed and composed to be not just informative but FUN TO READ, LISTEN TO OR WATCH, on a scale of 1 to 10? Try to keep in mind the kind of reader the subject matter would attract.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
Totally Moderately Extremely
ineffective effective effective

If you give a score **higher than 5** and you cannot cite at least **THREE specific details** from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to **deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. If you give a score **lower than 5** and can cite **TWO specific things** the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you **an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. I **reserve the right** not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for audience: 8

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

This podcast draft did a very good job in being enjoyable and easy to listen to. The first aspect of the podcast that makes it effective for the audience is the smoothness of the speech with very little pauses or awkward breaks. The podcast does not sound as scripted and feels like a normal conversation occurring about the topic of vaccines and whether or not they can cause autism. Another factor that increases the enjoyableness of listening to this podcast was the use of outside sources like President Obama's statement on the use of vaccines.

Purpose

How effectively do you feel this draft achieves the purpose of the assignment, on a scale of 1 to 10?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
Totally Moderately Extremely
ineffective effective effective

If you give a score **higher than 5** and you cannot cite at least **THREE specific details** from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to **deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. If you give a score **lower than 5** and can cite **TWO specific things** the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you **an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. I **reserve the right** not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for purpose: 5

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

The podcast was efficient in explaining the controversy on a basic scale. The podcast however, became confusing when separating the different viewpoints of each stakeholder. I could not differentiate the different ideals and what specific parties across the country believe such as the government. The podcast will benefit greatly by giving specific evidence and events of this controversy such as scientific studies that either prove or disprove whether the measles vaccines can cause autism within vaccines.

Author

How effectively do you feel this draft establishes the author's credibility and unique voice?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
Totally Moderately Extremely
ineffective effective effective

If you give a score **higher than 5** and you cannot cite at least **THREE specific details** from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to **deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. If you give a score **lower than 5** and can cite **TWO specific things** the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you **an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. I **reserve the right** not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Your rating for author: 6

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

Through the author's podcast, they effectively utilize their voice to convey the controversy in an exciting and informative way. The author utilizes varying tones of voice, which keep the listener interested and entertained to the content. If the podcast were to be monotone and unexciting then the same controversy would not be understood and explained thoroughly to the listener. Additionally, the author's voice flows efficiently through all eight minutes of the podcast, making the audience comfortable and allows them to listen to the entirety of the podcast. Word choice and sentence structure aid the speaker in keeping the flow of the podcast and developing a unique voice.

How effectively do you feel this draft uses the genre conventions, research materials and background information to fulfill the assignment?

If you give a score **higher than 5** and you cannot cite at least **THREE** specific details from the draft to justify that score, I'm going to **deduct one point from YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. If you give a score **lower than 5** and can cite **TWO** specific things the writer needs to work on for this category, I'll award you **an extra point towards YOUR peer review grade** for Deadline 4. I **reserve the right** not to award points for under-explained or banal feedback.

Please explain the reason for your score in at least 3 to 5 clear sentences. Cite specific details from the rough draft to explain your score:

This draft uses the conventions of a podcast in multiple ways to achieve the goal of explaining the controversy. With the use of her voice and clips from outside sources, the author creates a podcast that is enjoyable and easy to listen to. Research materials are also present throughout the podcast when the author cites every stakeholder and source that she pulled her information from. These sources include the credibility of the speaker as she explains the modern controversy. Finally, the background information presented in the beginning of the podcast such as how this controversy came to fruition prepares the reader for the rest of the podcast and the different perspectives from each stockholders.

Other comments?

Overall, this podcast is a fantastic start and needs little editing to become very effective. With the use of audio editing such as transitions, and introductions, and more voice clips that further explain specific instances within the controversy. Finally, the podcast can benefit through a stronger conclusion and wrapping up the information.