|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Review Area** | **Score** | **Comments** |
| Readability, including transitions, headings, etc. | 3 | The headings were a bit confusing because they did not reflect the areas suggested in the syllabus. I found the formatting of the review distracting, and the sections were not as flowing as they could have been. |
| Adherence to graduate level writing standards | 4 | The writing was appropriate for the graduate level, but I found it to be different between sections. For instance, the sections towards the end were written in a more professional way, and the beginning two sections were a bit juvenile in style. |
| Adherence to APA writing standards, including citations | 4 | The citations for the most part did not strike me as incorrect. I only found a few instance where I wondered if they were mis-cited. In the “Physical and Mental Health” section, the in text page citation of “(493)” I believe should be “(p.493)”. |
| Areas that didn’t make sense or had to be reread | 4 | I had to reread the first two sections because they did not seem relevant to career counseling. I struggled to find the relationship between the passages and it’s usefulness in career development.  I thought it was insightful to include statistics on the prevalence of careers in sports. I also thought it was useful to talk about role models in the steroids sections. |
| In reading this review, it is clear how the information would be used to build a workshop? What goals, objectives, or interventions might you expect to see in the workshop? | 3 | I understood the section on alternate careers with student athletes clearly and found your mention of using the Holland Code very useful. This was the only example of an intervention that I found. |
| Using the Granello (2001) article, locate this article within Bloom’s taxonomy? What evidence do you have to show this? How could you help the group reach a higher level? | 4 | This review would fit into the analysis section of Bloom’s Taxonomy. It was readable and clearly showed the authors’ knowledge of the subject matter, but did not use much critical thinking. |