



Review Guide: Course Audit

Professor Friend • ENG 2020 • Fall 2023

Reviewer:

Author:

1. INTRODUCTION

Guideline	Rating	Commentary
How audience-appropriate is the letter? Does it sound like this author is talking to Friend? Does the author assume the reader has been in class the whole semester?	0 1 2 3 4	
How is the paper organized? Is it narrative-driven (first we did this, then we did that—which is bad), or is it argument-driven (here’s evidence supporting a central claim—which is good)?		Narr. / Arg.
How well are the letter’s exigence and purpose described? You should understand what prompted the author to review the course outcomes and make a claim about their success achieving them.	0 1 2 3 4	

2. STYLE + SUPPORT

Guideline	Commentary
How confident is the author? Do they <i>know</i> they’ve achieved the outcomes, or do they sound uncertain/hopeful that they <i>might</i> have?	
How sophisticated is the language? (Do they sound like a rising Junior?) How well-integrated are quotes? How varied is the vocabulary?	
How convinced were you to accept the author’s claims about their learning this semester? Where should the argument be strengthened?	

3. OVERALL

Guideline	Commentary
Discuss the details: How appropriate is the grammar? How professional/readable is the formatting?	
Bonus: Does the author use a metaphor to help explain their learning or experience in the course? If so, how well does it work? (Did it help you understand, was it taken too far, or was it too silly/weak to be helpful?)	
What impressed you most about this document?	
What needs the author’s attention most urgently?	



Review Guide: Course Audit

Professor Friend • ENG 2020 • Fall 2023

Reviewer:

Author:

1. INTRODUCTION

Guideline	Rating	Commentary
How audience-appropriate is the letter? Does it sound like this author is talking to Friend? Does the author assume the reader has been in class the whole semester?	0 1 2 3 4	
How is the paper organized? Is it narrative-driven (first we did this, then we did that—which is bad), or is it argument-driven (here’s evidence supporting a central claim—which is good)?		Narr. / Arg.
How well are the letter’s exigence and purpose described? You should understand what prompted the author to review the course outcomes and make a claim about their success achieving them.	0 1 2 3 4	

2. STYLE + SUPPORT

Guideline	Commentary
How confident is the author? Do they <i>know</i> they’ve achieved the outcomes, or do they sound uncertain/hopeful that they <i>might</i> have?	
How sophisticated is the language? (Do they sound like a rising Junior?) How well-integrated are quotes? How varied is the vocabulary?	
How convinced were you to accept the author’s claims about their learning this semester? Where should the argument be strengthened?	

3. OVERALL

Guideline	Commentary
Discuss the details: How appropriate is the grammar? How professional/readable is the formatting?	
Bonus: Does the author use a metaphor to help explain their learning or experience in the course? If so, how well does it work? (Did it help you understand, was it taken too far, or was it too silly/weak to be helpful?)	
What impressed you most about this document?	
What needs the author’s attention most urgently?	