

**Hyperlink to the draft under review:** [Jackson's QRG](#)

**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.**

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:

First off, the format of the Quick Reference guide made it easy to read without causing you to lose your place in endless walls of text. There are many gaps, bulleted lists, and subheadings to divide the key points of the story. In addition, this QRG has a instanced, such as the reference to Khan Academy, that make it a bit more relatable to the to the reader, which in turn grabs more of your attention. The use of links in this QRG, also gives the reader a means of somewhat interacting with the QRG that in turn resulted in greater interest for the reader, or well for me atleast. I think that a possible improvement would be to use more of these relatable moments.

## 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: 7

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 explains the controversy really well by saying. It traces its origins back into the 1960s, talks about why it matters (because math test scores are dropping), and about what people are saying in regards to. Secondly, this topic is connected to the writer's field of study, which is mathematics. Thirdly, it also examines the various groups at play, such as the government, various academic organization, and math related sites, such as Khan Academy.**

## 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:   2  

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:

**First off the writer clearly seems into this topic. This is evident in his use of strong words such as using emerge instead of came out. Revamped instead or improved. The author also has a lot of block quotes and links which suggest that he did extensive research and therefore meant that he had higher credibility. The author also went above and beyond to not only include what the stakeholders did to try to influence the New Math policy, but also included how other groups stepped in to continue the work once the original movement had failed. This was done with the MathLand example, and various books that were published pertaining to the topic.**

### Context

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

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 genre:   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:

**There was lots of white space between sections which made it easy to read which is how a QRG should be. There was also 4 images that relate to what the author was talking about. Nonetheless, I feel like there should be more images and possibly a few graphs to show how the math test scores have been dropping throughout the year.**

### Other comments?

I feel like there needs to be more of a background on the stakeholders present in the controversy. For example, we exactly does the government care that the math test scores were dropping

