

COMPLETE COMMON APP REVIEW

Shared Common App + One School | Demonstration Report

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICANT: TAYLOR ROWAN • FALL 2026

Prepared by Admissions Narrative | Example of detailed strategic written feedback

IMPORTANT: THIS IS A FICTIONAL DEMONSTRATION. Taylor Rowan, the school, every achievement, every activity, every essay, every comment, and all reported application details were invented for this public sample. This is not an anonymized real student or a real client outcome. The analysis style illustrates the kind of detailed thinking a personalized review can provide; actual feedback and length vary by application.

How to use this example: Start with the overall diagnosis and priority list. Then review the fictional draft materials alongside the commentary, concrete suggested revisions, and integrated final-check plan. The purpose is to show analytical depth, not to provide essays for copying.

1. APPLICATION SNAPSHOT & REVIEW BOUNDARIES

Field	Fictional submitted information
Applicant	Taylor Rowan · Grade 12 · Riverton High (invented school)
Proposed academic direction	Electrical engineering; interest in sound systems, accessible public-facing technology and practical design
Sample college	Westhaven University (invented institution); all program names and prompts below are fictional
Reviewed materials	Shared Common App, 10 activities, 5 honors, personal statement, Additional Information, first-choice major and two supplements for Westhaven
Not provided	Verified transcript, recommendations, official testing reports, counselor context, school-specific admissions data
Review scope	Editorial judgment, application coherence, Activities revisions, strategy for essays, and priorities. No line-by-line ghostwriting and no admissions prediction.

Snapshot assessment: The applicant has credible technical work and substantial responsibilities. The application’s current weakness is not a lack of achievement; it is that the most valuable evidence is diluted by repeated claims about being a “problem solver,” while the most human and distinctive details sit below the surface.

2. THE OVERALL READ: WHAT AN ADMISSIONS READER MAY REMEMBER

First impression

I see a student who notices small technical failures, stays to finish unglamorous work, and takes pride in making systems usable for other people. The theater soundboard, weekend garden-center job, and

community audio workshops are unusually complementary. Together, they suggest practical judgment rather than a generic STEM résumé.

The missed opportunity

The drafts tell me three times that Taylor likes engineering because it solves problems. They tell me much less about the particular problems Taylor chooses, the people who rely on the solutions, or the tradeoffs Taylor makes when there is no elegant fix. The application has an interesting identity. It just has not named it accurately yet.

Current implied message: I enjoy technology and use it to help my community.

Stronger, evidence-based message: I pay attention to how technical choices affect the person waiting at the other end, from a performer relying on a microphone to a customer trying to find the right item.

Do not force: Every activity to become an engineering activity. The paid work, music practice, and family routine make Taylor more credible and dimensional. Keep them.

3. MY MOST IMPORTANT RECOMMENDATIONS AT A GLANCE

Priority	Decision	Why it matters	Immediate action
1 · High	REWORK personal-statement middle	The turning point is summarized instead of demonstrated.	Add one specific decision under time pressure and its visible consequence.
2 · High	REORDER Activities	The paid job and student-led audio workshops are buried.	Move sustained responsibility and authentic initiative upward.
3 · High	REWRITE Why Major	Repeats Common App essay and relies on broad interests.	Show one intellectual question and how the major helps investigate it.
4 · Medium	REBUILD community supplement	Lists activities rather than answering how Taylor will contribute.	Anchor in one repeatable behavior Taylor brings to groups.
5 · Medium	CLARIFY Additional Information	Reads partly like another accomplishment essay.	Keep only the scheduling context a reader needs.
6 · Medium	FACT-CHECK claims	Several metrics and job titles need confirmation.	Verify counts, hours, ownership, dates and organizational naming.

4. THE BIGGEST THING I NOTICED ACROSS THE APPLICATION

The personal statement, Why Major response, and community essay all use nearly the same internal arc: “something broke, I solved it, and I learned engineering is about people.” It is a worthwhile idea, but repeated three times it begins to feel manufactured. A strong application does not require three variations of the same lesson.

Component	Current internal shape	What it should add instead
-----------	------------------------	----------------------------

Personal statement	Broken microphone → determined repair → “engineering is empathy.”	A particular habit of mind under pressure, including one mistake or compromise.
Why Major	I like circuits → I build things → engineering helps people.	A real engineering question, an experiment, and the next tool Taylor wants to learn.
Community essay	I worked with groups → I help everyone feel heard.	A small, repeatable practice Taylor brings to new communities.
Activities	A list of technical nouns and scale claims.	Evidence of responsibility, growth, outcomes and nontechnical commitments.

Another pattern: Taylor often uses abstract summary immediately after a strong physical detail. When the draft says the theater manager could finally hear the first line of the show without static, I understand the impact. The added sentence “I realized that technology connects all of us” gives me less, not more.

The application does not need a more impressive project. It needs better editorial choices about what to explain and what to trust the reader to notice.

5. WHAT EACH COMPONENT SHOULD LEAVE WITH THE READER

Section	Distinct takeaway	Evidence needed
Personal statement	Someone who keeps listening when an easy technical fix fails.	The diagnostic process, one failed attempt, and what Taylor changed.
Activities	A reliable contributor who builds, teaches, works and follows through.	Specific duties, sustained time, verified outcomes and sensible ordering.
Why Engineering	An intellectually curious builder who wants stronger theory and design methods.	One concrete technical question + school-specific resources, fact-checked before submission.
Community supplement	A thoughtful peer who creates practical ways for people to participate.	An actual workshop design decision and a grounded campus contribution.
Additional Information	Accurate context for competing obligations and opportunity access.	Brief scheduling facts, not a fifth essay.

Portfolio check: If a trusted reader describes the personal statement, Why Major, and community essay using the same sentence, the application is repeating itself. The three pieces should sound like the same person, but reveal three different things.

6. BEFORE REVISING: QUESTIONS I WOULD ASK TAYLOR

Before rewriting polished sentences, I would conduct a short self-interview. Specific answers are more valuable than adjectives. These are example questions that show the information I would seek from a real student:

- At the rehearsal with the microphone problem, what did you check first, and why? What did you assume incorrectly?
- What exactly did the stage manager or performer need, and how did you learn that? If you cannot recall precise dialogue, do not invent it.
- What did you choose not to fix because time was short? What tradeoff did you make?
- Which audio-workshop activity failed with younger students? How did you modify the instructions next time?
- What is the least glamorous task you perform in your paid job, and why do coworkers trust you with it?
- What is one engineering question you do not yet know how to answer? What data would you need to test an idea?
- Which extracurricular detail feels ordinary to you but is something friends or coworkers regularly rely on?
- Which sentence in your current draft sounds like something an adult would write, rather than how you would naturally explain what happened?

I would ask Taylor to answer in a voice note before attempting another draft. The goal is to retrieve genuine sequence, reasoning, and uncertainty. In a real review, the factual specifics must come from the student.

7. LINES AND DETAILS WORTH PROTECTING

FROM THE FICTIONAL PERSONAL STATEMENT

“The left speaker crackled only when the second actor crossed the stage.”

This is a strong opening-level detail because it makes a technical problem specific and observable. Keep it if accurate to the fictional case. It is more distinctive than announcing an interest in engineering.

FROM THE FICTIONAL PERSONAL STATEMENT

“The cable looked perfect until I bent it beside the connector.”

The tactile diagnosis shows method and patience. Keep the action rather than replacing it with “I persevered.”

FROM THE FICTIONAL COMMUNITY RESPONSE

“I put the circuit diagrams away and asked everyone to record a sound they liked.”

This reveals an actual pedagogical adjustment. It deserves more space than a statement about inclusive leadership.

FROM THE FICTIONAL ACTIVITIES INVENTORY

“Closed the garden center each Saturday; reconciled damaged stock and coached two new hires.”

Paid work and consistent trust from an employer add texture. Do not bury it below a one-week engineering event simply because the event sounds more prestigious.

8. ACTIVITIES LIST: ORDER, DEPTH AND WRITING

A. My recommended order, 1 through 10

Order	Fictional activity	Why here
1	Theater sound lead, 3 years	Deep responsibility, specialized craft, direct relevance and sustained leadership.
2	Garden center paid job, 2 years	Consistent time commitment, trust, accountability and non-school contribution.
3	Community audio workshops, 18 months	Self-initiated teaching and iterative design; strongest evidence of outward impact.
4	Independent cafeteria acoustics project	Intellectual exploration, observation and data collection; quantify accurately.
5	Community radio production	Creative collaboration and technical craft beyond school.
6	Bass guitar / small ensemble	Long-term independent practice, a human dimension to technical interest.
7	Family meal planning and sibling pickup	Meaningful time and household responsibility, if honestly described.
8	School badminton team	Long-term camaraderie and physical commitment; not everything must be academic.
9	Student newspaper illustration	Expression and cross-disciplinary creativity.
10	Neighborhood trail sign repair days	Modest but genuine participation; keep scale proportionate.

Order changes explained: I would move the paid garden-center job to #2, ahead of the independent acoustics project. The job is less obviously connected to engineering, but it demonstrates repeated responsibility under outside supervision. I would move the community audio workshops ahead of the project because they show Taylor moving from personal interest to designing something that works for others. The extracurricular list should not imply that paid work and household responsibility are less valuable than academic projects.

B. Eight specific Activities description examples

1. Theater sound lead

CURRENT (illustrative): Helped with sound for plays and trained students.

STRONGER MODEL: Mixed live sound for 6 productions; built a labeled patch guide; trained 4 younger technicians to troubleshoot cues.

REVIEW NOTE: Verify 6 productions and 4 trainees; clarify whether Taylor independently authored the guide. Prefer verbs tied to work rather than a title-only claim.

2. Garden center associate

CURRENT (illustrative): Worked with customers and improved inventory.

STRONGER MODEL: Worked 12 hrs/week at garden center; handled weekend closing, damage log and register; helped onboard 2 coworkers.

REVIEW NOTE: Be careful with “improved inventory” unless there is evidence of a changed process. Paid reliability is the strength here.

3. Audio workshops

CURRENT (illustrative): Founded STEM workshops for local children.

STRONGER MODEL: Co-led monthly sound-making workshops; revised hands-on kits after feedback; supported 24 participants over 6 sessions.

REVIEW NOTE: “Founded” may overstate ownership if a librarian organized the series. Counts must be checked against attendance records.

4. Cafeteria acoustics project

CURRENT (illustrative): Conducted important research on school noise.

STRONGER MODEL: Mapped lunch-period sound levels at 18 locations; proposed small acoustic changes; presented findings to facilities staff.

REVIEW NOTE: “Research” can be accurate, but do not imply peer review or implemented changes without proof.

5. Community radio

CURRENT (illustrative): Produced content for community radio.

STRONGER MODEL: Edited 12 short interviews, balanced dialogue/music levels and coordinated release notes for monthly community radio segments.

REVIEW NOTE: Could move higher if work is intensive. Say what decisions Taylor owned.

6. Bass guitar

CURRENT (illustrative): Played bass and performed many times.

STRONGER MODEL: Practiced bass independently for 4 years; arranged parts for trio; performed at school and community events.

REVIEW NOTE: An expressive counterpoint. Verify “arranged” means Taylor actually wrote or adapted parts.

7. Family responsibility

CURRENT (illustrative): Helped family with chores.

STRONGER MODEL: Planned weekday meals and picked up younger sibling 3 afternoons/week while parent worked late.

REVIEW NOTE: List only if this is genuinely sustained. No need to manufacture adversity.

8. Badminton

CURRENT (illustrative): Played badminton on school team.

STRONGER MODEL: Practiced and competed for 3 seasons; helped run warmups for new players.

REVIEW NOTE: Keep if verified; concise is fine. Not every description needs impressive numerical impact.

For entries 9–10, the right goal is clarity, not inflation. Newspaper illustration should name the work and frequency. Trail sign repair should identify the specific volunteer task. A modest, accurate description is preferable to a grand title.

C. Important Activities formatting checks

- Confirm the word and character limits in the actual application fields. The models above illustrate substance; they are not guaranteed to fit every field as written.
- Reconcile positions, dates and weekly hours. Activities should not imply two full-time commitments occurred during the same school weeks.
- Use current verbs only for activities genuinely ongoing, and past tense for completed programs.
- Keep activity category, role title and organization names consistent with supplement drafts and any recommender descriptions.
- Do not make one activity sound as though it single-handedly transformed a school. State the student’s individual contribution.

9. HONORS & ACADEMIC CONTEXT

Suggested order	Illustrative honor	What to verify
1	Regional Young Designers Showcase · Finalist	Selectivity, grade, event name, what was actually judged.
2	District Technical Theater Citation	Whether this is an individual or production-team distinction.
3	School Academic Distinction · Grade 11	Criterion and award scope; avoid generic honor titles.
4	County Visual Arts Exhibition · Selected Work	Whether formally juried and what work was shown.
5	School Service Recognition	Award basis and whether it overlaps unnecessarily with Activities.

These awards are fictional. In a real review, I would not rank awards purely by how impressive their titles sound. I would weigh selectivity, external validation, scope, recency and alignment, then fact-check all descriptions. Avoid using additional narrative space for an award if the same achievement is already apparent in Activities.

Academic context: Without the verified transcript, course availability, testing and school profile, I cannot judge whether the academic choices are optimally rigorous. The application must be evaluated in the

context of opportunities actually offered by the school; I would not infer that a missing advanced course was available.

10. PERSONAL STATEMENT: FULL FICTIONAL DRAFT & STRATEGIC REVIEW

Fictional draft created only for this sample. Prompt framing: a meaningful experience that reveals character. The narrative and all details below were invented; no student's actual personal statement is reproduced.

A. Submitted sample draft

The left speaker crackled only when the second actor crossed the stage. We had forty minutes until the audience arrived, and the director kept asking whether the microphone was fixed. From the sound booth, I watched the actor trace the same path three times while the speaker hissed in exactly the same place. I had spent the afternoon arranging sound effects, but suddenly every cue on my carefully color-coded list felt irrelevant.

At first, I treated the problem like a checklist. I changed the battery, retaped the microphone pack, and restarted the receiver. Each time the actor stood still, the sound was clean. Each time she crossed the taped mark, the crackle returned. I wondered if the receiver had a blind spot. I drew a tiny map of the stage and wrote down the places where the noise appeared. The pattern was too precise to ignore.

When I crawled beneath the stage to inspect the cables, I found a connector that looked intact. It passed a quick sound test. But when I bent the cable beside the connector, the same jagged noise jumped through my headset. I felt satisfied for approximately three seconds, until I realized the replacement cable was locked in a storage room and no one knew where the key was.

I wanted to be the person with a clever fix. Instead, I had to tell the stage manager we could not use that microphone for opening night. The actor looked disappointed. I was embarrassed that, after two years on crew, I had diagnosed the issue without solving it. I suggested switching one scene to a handheld microphone and moving a quiet cue earlier so the actor could exchange it backstage. The stage manager adjusted the blocking, the performer practiced the change, and the show opened without the crackle.

When the audience applauded, nobody knew how many people had changed their plans to keep one scene working. I did not tell them. I had learned the importance of engineering, teamwork, empathy, communication, and resilience. This experience taught me that technology is not only about circuits. It is about people, and I want to keep using engineering to help others.

Since that night, I have carried a small notebook to rehearsals. Most pages are not brilliant ideas. They are diagrams of cable paths, labels for unreliable adapters, and lists of what failed after we thought a problem was finished. I like that the notebook is messy. It reminds me that a good system does not announce itself: it lets other people do their work.

Illustrative draft word count: 425 words. Recheck within the application after editing.

B. My assessment

Recommendation: KEEP the core incident and rewrite selectively. This is a stronger foundation than an essay organized around general fascination with technology. The opportunity is to make the student's choice under constraint, not the broken speaker, the center of the narrative.

What is working: The problem is introduced quickly, we watch Taylor use observations to narrow it, and the failed ideal fix creates a believable decision point. The messy notebook at the end is more personal than any of the abstract lessons in paragraph five.

Central problem: Paragraph five converts a subtle, specific story into a list of moral nouns. It does not tell us anything new about Taylor. More importantly, it suggests that diagnosing a problem was a failure because Taylor could not produce the perfect repair, when the adaptive solution is the most interesting judgment call.

C. Paragraph-by-paragraph editorial notes

EXCERPT *“The left speaker crackled only when the second actor crossed the stage.”*

JENNY’S NOTE P1 · Opening. KEEP. Precise, concrete and readable. Consider shortening the sentence about the color-coded list if the setup drags. The opening earns attention through an observable mystery, not through manufactured drama.

EXCERPT *“Each time the actor stood still, the sound was clean.”*

JENNY’S NOTE P2 · False leads. KEEP the pattern; COMPRESS the checklist. The battery/receiver sequence matters only insofar as it shows Taylor moved from guesswork to testing a hypothesis.

EXCERPT *“the replacement cable was locked in a storage room”*

JENNY’S NOTE P3 · Diagnosis and constraint. PROTECT. This constraint makes the decision interesting. But specify why no alternative working cable was available, if that was actually the case in a real story.

EXCERPT *“I suggested switching one scene to a handheld microphone”*

JENNY’S NOTE P4 · Choice. EXPAND. How did Taylor decide this was the least disruptive option? What did Taylor tell the stage manager, and which risk was accepted? This is where judgment becomes visible.

EXCERPT *“engineering, teamwork, empathy, communication, and resilience”*

JENNY’S NOTE P5 · Lesson. CUT OR REPLACE. This is a summary of virtues that the previous paragraph already demonstrates. Do not tell the reader to admire the student.

EXCERPT *“Most pages are not brilliant ideas.”*

JENNY’S NOTE P6 · Notebook ending. KEEP, with a precise tie to how Taylor now works. The humility and mundane details make the voice believable. Avoid explaining the symbol a second time.

D. Two possible architectures

Structure	How it works	Tradeoff
Option A · Recommended	Problem at rehearsal → repeated failed tests → diagnosis + locked storage room → workable compromise → present-day notebook habit.	Keeps the event focused and allows Taylor’s judgment to carry the meaning.
Option B · If a stronger follow-up exists	Brief rehearsal scene → what Taylor changed in preparation over the next year → a small later instance where new systems prevented disruption.	Can show growth over time, but only if the second example is genuinely revealing rather than résumé filler.

I prefer Option A unless a later incident adds something that cannot be understood through this one. The essay is not required to become a two-event story to prove growth.

E. Illustrative writing-move example (not a replacement essay)

BEFORE

“I had learned the importance of engineering, teamwork, empathy, communication, and resilience.”

POSSIBLE MOVE

“By intermission I had stopped checking the soundboard and started checking whether the actor had enough time to swap microphones.”

Why the move is stronger: The example would make the new priority visible as a decision. But only use such a sentence in a real application if that is what actually happened. The point is the editorial principle, not the words.

F. Revision word plan

The fabricated draft is below 650 words. I would still remove roughly 45–65 words from the repetitive generalizations and early checklist, then spend approximately 25–45 words on the reasoning behind the microphone tradeoff. The goal is not to fill every available word; it is to use space where it reveals the person.

G. Questions the student must answer before revising

- What did you try that failed? Which attempt actually changed your diagnosis?
- Was the spare cable truly inaccessible, or were there other technical constraints?
- Why did the suggested microphone swap work for the performers? What did you give up?
- What was the stage manager’s real reaction? Do not reconstruct a cinematic quote.
- How did this change how you prepared for later performances?
- Would a close friend recognize the language in your conclusion as yours?

Reader snapshot: A technically curious student who can abandon the elegant fix, own a limitation, and improvise responsibly for the people depending on the system.

11. SCHOOL SUPPLEMENT #1: WHY THIS MAJOR?

Fictional Westhaven University prompt: “Why do you want to study the major you selected, and how have your experiences prepared you?” 200-word limit. The institution, resources and prompt are invented examples.

A. Submitted fictional response

I have been interested in electrical engineering since I built a radio with my grandfather. I love solving problems and creating technology that improves lives. In high school I became the sound lead for our theater, mapped the acoustics of the cafeteria, and volunteered at community audio workshops. These experiences taught me the power of innovation.

At Westhaven University, I would study electrical engineering and take courses in circuits and signals. I am particularly excited about the Human-Centered Systems Lab and the Community Prototype Studio, where I hope to collaborate with professors and make a difference. My goal is to develop devices that are useful to everyone.

I would bring curiosity, teamwork, and persistence to Westhaven. Its interdisciplinary environment would help me develop the technical skills to pursue my dreams of becoming an engineer.

Illustrative response word count: 134 words.

B. Diagnosis: good topic, insufficient intellectual specificity

KEEP the subject, REWRITE the center. The draft lists three impressive activities but does not reveal a technical question. “I love solving problems” and “technology that improves lives” could introduce many different majors. The theater experience already anchors the personal statement; repeating it here without introducing a new technical idea wastes limited space.

EXCERPT *“I have been interested in electrical engineering since I built a radio with my grandfather.”*

JENNY’S NOTE This may be true in our invented case, but it is a familiar opening and adds little specificity. Lead with the question the student now wants to answer, perhaps how a signal can be clear in one physical position and distorted in another.

EXCERPT *“courses in circuits and signals”*

JENNY’S NOTE Too general to show school fit. If this were a real college, verify a specific curriculum pathway and connect it to an actual learning objective rather than name-dropping a course.

EXCERPT *“Human-Centered Systems Lab and the Community Prototype Studio”*

JENNY’S NOTE These are FICTIONAL resources created for this sample. For a real application, verify every named lab, course, professor, and undergraduate access rule. Do not imply guaranteed participation.

C. Recommended revision architecture

1. Open with one testable question raised by the student’s own work: for example, what signal-processing or room-design choices can improve spoken-word clarity without simply increasing volume?
2. Name one experiment already tried, including an unexpected observation or limitation. This is intellectual evidence, not a résumé recap.
3. Explain which engineering methods are missing from the student’s current toolkit, such as more formal circuit modeling, measurements, or system design.
4. Connect those learning needs to verified opportunities at the chosen school, with no more than one or two precise references.
5. End with a plausible direction, not a promise to invent universally useful technology.

Revision questions: What did the cafeteria sound map actually reveal? Was it measurement noise, crowd distribution, speaker placement, or another variable? What did Taylor try next? Which methods would a college course make possible? A persuasive major essay is an argument for further learning, not a second claim that engineering is good.

Reader snapshot: A student curious about measurable acoustic behavior and eager to acquire rigorous tools to test design choices.

12. SCHOOL SUPPLEMENT #2: COMMUNITY & CONTRIBUTION

Fictional Westhaven University prompt: “Describe a community you have contributed to and what you might bring to ours.” 200-word limit.

A. Submitted fictional response

At my school and in the neighborhood, I have always cared about inclusion. As theater sound lead, I trained younger students and made sure everyone had a voice. I also worked at a garden center and helped community members with technology. I believe leadership means listening and working together.

At a library sound workshop, I noticed some middle school students were overwhelmed by our circuits lesson. I put the diagrams away and asked everyone to record a sound they liked. One student recorded the squeak of a cart wheel, and another recorded a door latch. Then we used those recordings to build a short audio collage. More students joined the conversation when the project became about something they could hear and recognize.

At Westhaven, I will bring this same collaborative spirit to student clubs and service programs. I want to help other students feel included, share my skills, and make a positive difference on campus.

Illustrative response word count: 155 words.

B. Diagnosis: the middle is stronger than the beginning and ending

This response has a convincing example, but buries it under a generic introduction and an unspecific promise about campus life. The library workshop already shows contribution through a concrete teaching decision. I would open there, then explain how Taylor designs an environment that makes it easier for different people to participate.

EXCERPT *“I put the diagrams away and asked everyone to record a sound they liked.”*

JENNY’S NOTE PROTECT this moment. It shows the student adjusting the way others access the activity. The strongest leadership evidence is the changed approach, not the phrase “I made sure everyone had a voice.”

EXCERPT *“More students joined the conversation”*

JENNY’S NOTE Quantify only if Taylor actually knows. If not, the observed behaviors, recordings and resulting audio collage are sufficient. Do not manufacture participation data.

EXCERPT *“student clubs and service programs”*

JENNY’S NOTE Too broad. Name an authentic contribution behavior Taylor can plausibly sustain, such as organizing approachable first-time build sessions. For a real college, confirm the named opportunities exist before using them.

C. Suggested shape, not a finished supplement

Open at the workshop decision; give the exact adjustment and one observed result; explain what it reveals about the way Taylor facilitates learning; conclude with one realistic practice Taylor would bring

to a campus maker community. This should not become another paragraph about loving engineering. The response is about how Taylor behaves around people.

Potential revision cut: Reduce the introductory list of theater, job and workshops by 35–45 words and spend that space describing why the original diagram-driven activity stalled and how Taylor knew the audio-first approach worked. The student should not copy the language in this report.

Reader snapshot: A peer who notices when a group activity is inaccessible and changes the entry point so more people can contribute.

13. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: CONTEXT, NOT ANOTHER ESSAY

Fictional text submitted by the applicant:

SAMPLE DRAFT

“I worked at the garden center throughout junior year and frequently had to miss after-school meetings. This taught me time management, teamwork and discipline. My family depends on my help at home, and I am proud that I balanced challenging classes with extracurricular activities. I have also made sound systems and community projects, which shows that I am deeply committed to engineering.”

Recommendation: REVISE for purpose. The final two sentences repeat qualities and activities already covered elsewhere. Additional Information is most useful when it helps an admissions reader understand material context that the rest of the application does not explain. It should not read like another mini-personal statement.

A cleaner factual framework

State the schedule and responsibility if meaningful and true: paid hours, sibling pickup frequency, and the practical effect on attending fixed-time meetings. If there was no meaningful impact on access or course choices, it may be better to leave this section blank. Do not add emotional weight artificially.

ILLUSTRATIVE CONCISE ALTERNATIVE

“During grades 11–12, I worked approximately 12 hours per week at a local garden center, usually including Saturday closing shifts. I also picked up my younger sibling three afternoons per week. These fixed commitments limited my availability for some after-school meetings, so I concentrated on activities with flexible rehearsal, weekend and project schedules.”

This is a model of specificity, not text to copy; every detail would need to match the student’s real circumstances. No hardship should be assumed or invented.

14. MAJOR CHOICE, SCHOOL FIT & CROSS-SECTION CONSISTENCY

Major selection

Electrical engineering is plausible given the sound production, acoustic mapping and technical workshop work. The application should still name an academic question beyond “I like building things.” It should explain why the major’s mathematical and physical foundations matter to the next questions Taylor wants to ask. This is not a recommendation to manufacture a career goal.

Consistency audit

Claim to verify	Where it appears	Review instruction
Theater role and tenure	Activities, personal statement, supplement	Check whether “sound lead” was an official role, the number of productions, and dates.
Audio workshops ownership	Activities, community supplement	Use “co-led,” “organized” or “facilitated” consistently with the actual role.
Cafeteria sound measurements	Activities, Why Major	Confirm methods, measurements and what was presented; never call unimplemented ideas “adopted.”
Paid hours and family duties	Activities, Additional Information	Confirm hours, timeline, and whether meeting limitations really occurred.
Westhaven resources	Why Major	Fictional in this demo. Real named opportunities must be independently verified.

Cross-section principle: The personal statement can reveal how Taylor decides; Activities can establish breadth and sustained responsibilities; the Why Major essay can reveal intellectual questions; and the community response can show teaching style. When those jobs are distinct, the same applicant becomes more memorable without a manufactured slogan.

15. CROSS-APPLICATION FINISHING PASS

- Read the three essays consecutively. Circle every phrase equivalent to “engineering helps people,” “I solve problems,” “I am persistent,” or “leadership means listening.” Keep only the instances that do real explanatory work.
- Make sure personal-statement anecdotes and extracurricular descriptions agree on roles, timing, number of productions and level of individual ownership.
- Check that two essays do not spend their most valuable words explaining the exact same microphone incident. A short reference can be fine; a second full retelling is costly.
- Protect credible nontechnical details. The paid job, sibling duties, music practice and sport should remain visible. Do not compress the student into a manufactured STEM archetype.
- Confirm that Westhaven University is fictional in this public sample. A real review requires checking all claims about actual school resources against official materials.
- Check the Common App and institution-specific character/word counts after pasting final text. Limits can differ across fields; do not rely on this report’s approximate counts.
- Have a reader identify a different insight from each component: judgment, sustained responsibility, intellectual direction and community contribution.
- Remove any precise detail, dialogue or result that the student cannot independently verify or that was introduced during rewriting rather than remembered.

16. YOUR RECOMMENDED REVISION ORDER

FIRST · 30–45 minutes Verify core facts. Collect exact activities timing, production counts, workshop role, paid hours and scholarship/honors claims.

SECOND · 60–90 minutes Revise personal-statement paragraphs 4–5 so the technical compromise and student’s actual thinking become central. Read the new version aloud.

THIRD · 35–50 minutes Reorder the Activities list and rewrite the top six descriptions for responsibility, ownership and proof. Check character limits.

FOURTH · 40–60 minutes Rewrite Why Major around one technical question; research and verify the actual target university’s relevant undergraduate opportunities.

FIFTH · 30–45 minutes Cut generic opening and ending of community response; enlarge the specific workshop decision and grounded campus contribution.

SIXTH · 15–25 minutes Revise Additional Information only if meaningful factual context remains to communicate.

FINAL · 30 minutes Read application end to end, compare names/dates/claims, check word counts, proofread, and submit only after the student approves every assertion.

The changes I would prioritize if the deadline were tomorrow

If time is truly limited, I would not rebuild every essay. Fix personal statement paragraph five, move the paid job and community workshop up in Activities, remove repeated claims from Why Major, and verify all numerical claims. Those edits address the largest identified issues without introducing the avoidable risk of a last-minute complete rewrite.

17. ONE-PAGE EDITING CHECKLIST

Check	Status to confirm
Personal statement has one vivid decision, not just a lesson about values.	☐
Best evidence of impact/responsibility is visible in top Activities positions.	☐
Activities titles, hours, dates and outcomes are verifiable.	☐
Why Major names a genuine question and verified academic opportunity.	☐
Community essay explains a contribution, not just a value.	☐
Additional Information contains necessary context only.	☐
School-specific response details are accurate and current.	☐
Word/character limits checked in the live application.	☐
All writing remains the student’s own and all claims are	☐

accurate.

18. HOW THIS EXAMPLE RELATES TO THE REAL SERVICE

This sample demonstrates possible feedback formats: a synthesis of the whole application, ranked opportunities for improvement, Activities reordering and suggested language, essay-level diagnosis, selected line annotations, school-specific strategy, realistic revision plans, and an integrated cross-application consistency check.

Actual client reviews depend on the submitted materials and the purchased scope. The \$497 Common App Full Review includes the shared Common App plus one college's school-specific materials. It is a written review, not a live consultation, unlimited essay rewriting, or a guarantee of admission. Actual turnaround starts once complete review materials are received under the current service terms.

All reports and example essays in this demonstration are fully fictional. No real student stories, names, applications, admissions outcomes, or testimonials appear here. The fictional institution and program names are not real college recommendations.

Educational guidance only. Admission outcomes depend on institutional decision-making and many factors outside an advisor's control. Applicants must verify official application requirements, policies and deadlines and remain responsible for the accuracy of their submissions.