**Report Critique Form**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Desirable Elements** | **Yes or No** | **Comments** |
| 1. Does the **Summary** address the main Issues? Findings? Recommendations? |  |  |
| 1. Is the **selection of topic** explained in the **Background**?

Is the purpose of the investigation clear (**what** was investigated and **why**)? Is general information provided to put the investigation into context? |  |  |
| 1. Does the **Methodology** describe what **investigative techniques** were used?

Are the descriptions clear and quantified, while not revealing the identity of witnesses? |  |  |
| 1. Does the **Discussion** section lay out the facts in a logical order, and is it easy to follow?

Do subheadings divide it by topic? |  |  |
| 1. Does the **Discussion** avoid vague quantifiers and wiggle language?

Is every statement supported? Is the Discussion free from gaps?Is the information consistent?  |  |  |
| 1. Is each **finding** stated as aconclusion (showing cause and effect) or subjective value judgment?

Is each a finding and not just a fact?Is each a concise statement of a single idea?  Can it be traced back to facts in the Discussion section? |  |  |
| 1. **Recommendations –** Is each one **based on one or more findings** that identify a problem or shortcoming?
 |  |  |
| 1. Does each **Recommendation** clearly say **who** (which board or official) should do **what** specific action,and complete it by **when**?
 |  |  |
| 9. Is each **Recommendation** reasonable as to **cost**? Is the **time** for implementation reasonable (and never on or before the 90/60-day response due date)?  Is the Recommendation proportional to the problem? |  |  |
| 10. Is it clear whether the response is **required or invited**?Are the correct **respondents** (boards or local public officials) identified? Is the **time for response** indicated?  |  |  |
| 1. Is the tone of the report **objective** and **fair**?
 |  |  |