	Author:	Margaret Chmiel
	Date Evaluated:	09/20/2011 09:20:04 AM (EST)
Evaluation Results	**DRF template:**	EDUC 802 Lead Sem (Brazer) F11.003
	Program:	EDUC 802 Lead Seminar (Brazer) F11.003
	Evaluation Method:	Using Rubric

Evaluation Summary for Papers: 1: Personal Best

Final Score: 3.65 (out of 4)
DRF points awarded: 18.25/20
Evaluator added files:
📄 Chmiel (Word Document (Open XML))

Overall comments: Your paper is written in a very engaging manner. I thoroughly enjoyed reading every word. Some organization and mechanical errors get in the way of your persuasiveness, however. It is particularly important for you to edit your paragraphs well so that the reader does not get confused.

Your paper demonstrates to me that you have very high potential to produce excellent work at the doctoral level. The key to getting there, I think, is to make sure that you write multiple drafts and that you edit your work very carefully.

Detailed Results (Rubric used: EDUC802 Personal Best (Brazer) F11.003)

Thesis & introduction

(4) Exceeds Expectations	**(3)** Meets Expectations	**(2)** Approaching Expectations	**(1)** Falls Below Expectations
The paper starts with a clear and concise statement of purpose and an introduction that draws the reader into the paper and ends with a clear and compelling thesis. The introduction provides a clear roadmap for the reader, foreshadowing what the paper is intended to cover.	The paper starts with a brief introduction that alludes to the purpose of the paper, contains a thesis, and provides a general foreshadowing of what is to be included.	The introduction provides some indication of the purpose of the paper, but lacks a thesis and/or provides inadequate or confusing information about what is to be shared.	There is no clear introduction or purpose.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 10%)
Comments on this criterion (op: Your introduction is very well done. You draw me into the paper quite effectively and your thesis provides a crystal clear roadmap. Bravo! One small point: I think you split your thesis into two sentences. I would like to see you discipline yourself to get it into one sentence, gracefully.

Description of method

(4) Exceeds Expectations	(3) Meets Expectations	(2) Approaching Expectations	(1) Falls Below Expectations
The paper includes a brief but thorough description of the method, including a discussion of the subject interviewed; interview process; and analysis.	The paper includes a brief description of method, but details on some aspects of how the study was conducted are unclear.	The paper includes some discussion of method, but details on one or more aspect of how the study was conducted are omitted.	The methods section is omitted or wholly inadequate.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 10%)
Comments on this criterion (op: Your method is very well done. I got a clear sense of what you did to conduct the interview and make sense of it for the paper.

Description of personal best case

(4) Exceeds Expectations	(3) Meets Expectations	(2) Approaching Expectations	(1) Falls Below Expectations
The case is described thoroughly, including an accounting of the "personal best" situation and details about why this was selected as a personal best case.	The case is described thoroughly, but detail is lacking on why the case represents a "personal best".	Description of the case is incomplete or poorly constructed.	Description of the case is largely missing or wholly inadequate.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 10%)
Comments on this criterion (op: Your description of the case is very thorough and detailed. I could imagine the entire scenario and was even able to imagine myself in it. These are difficult situations, particularly when the person is tightly connected socially.

Case analysis

(4) Exceeds Expectations	(3) Meets Expectations	(2) Approaching Expectations	(1) Falls Below Expectations

Fullan's model is summarized and then used to thoroughly assess how the case exemplifies effective leadership.	Fullan's model is used adequately to assess how the case exemplifies effective leadership.	Analysis is weak or incomplete, or superficially considers the Fullan model.	Analysis is unrelated to the case, is largely missing or wholly inadequate.

Criterion Score: 3.50 (Weight 30%)

Comments on this criterion (op: You started off with a surprise because the thesis did not indicate anything about moral purpose. After you complete your first draft of a paper it is often necessary to return to the thesis to make sure that it is comprehensive for all you want to say in the paper and that everything in the paper is relevant to the thesis. That said, your discussion of moral purpose makes sense.

I did not find this section to be as thorough as the rest of the paper. Some of that is because you actually put some of the analysis well before the personal best description when you talked about Norton as "Mom." Emotional intelligence was important in your discussion of the case, but absent from the analysis section. I also think you could have elaborated on the limitations of the model.

Much of this is an organization problem. You had analysis scattered around in the paper, so it was hard to grasp all of it and have it be persuasive. I bumped your points up by .5 because strong analysis was present, even if it wasn't always in the ideal location.

Conclusion, implications

(4) Exceeds Expectations	**(3)** Meets Expectations	**(2)** Approaching Expectations	**(1)** Falls Below Expectations
Clear and specific lessons are derived from the case relating to leadership in the specialization, and the efficacy of the Fullan model as a tool for assessing leadership practice is discussed.	General lessons are presented relating to leadership in the specialization, and the efficacy of the Fullan model as a tool for assessing leadership practice is mentioned.	Lessons relating to the candidate's experiences and future leadership development are superficial.	Lessons learned and implications of the case are largely missing or wholly inadequate.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 20%)

Comments on this criterion (op: This section is very well done. You provide appropriate summary and important lessons that are quite clear from all that has come before in the paper.

Organization of paper

(4) Exceeds Expectations	**(3)** Meets Expectations	**(2)** Approaching Expectations	**(1)** Falls Below Expectations

The paper is powerfully organized and fully developed.	The paper includes logical progression of ideas aided by clear transitions.	The paper includes a minimal skeleton (introduction, body, conclusion) but lacks transitions.	The paper lacks logical progression of ideas.

Criterion Score: 3.00 (Weight 10%)

Comments on this criterion (op: Organization seemed to break down a bit just before your discussion of method. See my notes about analysis above. The organization of your paper was a weakness that mitigated its effectiveness. I think this might have been corrected with more careful editing, especially with respect to alignment between the thesis and the body of the paper.

Mechanics

(4) Exceeds Expectations	**(3)** Meets Expectations	**(2)** Approaching Expectations	**(1)** Falls Below Expectations
The paper is nearly error-free which reflects clear understanding of APA format and thorough proofreading.	Occasional APA and/or grammatical errors and questionable word choice are evident.	Errors in grammar, APA format, or punctuation are present, but spelling has been proofread.	Frequent errors in spelling, grammar, format and/or punctuation are evident.

Criterion Score: 3.00 (Weight 10%)

Comments on this criterion (op: Paragraphing was a problem at times. Clear paragraphing is vital to effective writing. I found some instances where words were left out or letters were left off of words. You need to find a way to edit your work more carefully. Also, see some of the commas that I inserted. Mechanics kind of went haywire at the bottom of p. 6 and that is where I ended my markup.