Evaluation Results	**Author:**	Margaret Chmiel
	Date Evaluated:	11/01/2011 03:08:43 PM (EST)
	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: 2: Leadership Case--Group Paper

Final Score: 3.90 (out of 4)
DRF points awarded: 19.50/20
Evaluator added files:

MarjeeJonathonTrevor
(Microsoft Word)

Overall comments: As someone who has taught history and enjoys engaging with it, I thoroughly enjoyed reading your case. You provided fascinating insights into one person's somewhat quirky form of leadership and you related it to a larger analytical frame (or set of frames) quite well. I think you have clearly demonstrated that there is a lot that can be learned from this case.

Detailed Results (Rubric used: EDUC802 Leadership Case (Brazer) F11.003)

Abstract

(4) Exceeds Expectations	**(3)** Meets Expectations	**(2)** Approaching Expectations	**(1)** Falls Below Expectations
A clear and concise 100 word abstract describing the topics of the case and providing a synopsis of the case is included.	A 100 word abstract describing the topics of the case and providing a synopsis of the case is included, but it is somewhat hard to follow or omits important information.	An abstract is included, but it either exceeds recommended length or fails to provide a clear description of the case.	The abstract is either missing or not at all useful in describing the case.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 10%)
Comments on this criterion: The abstract is well written. On its face (I haven't read the whole case yet), it appears to cover the case quite effectively. Most important, I find it engaging and want to read on. My only concern is that there is no openendedness indicated. Will there be any ambiguity that needs to be addressed? What will I figure out as I make my way through the case? I'm not saying you need to be explicit about those things in the abstract, but there should be some indication of a problem to be solved.

Text of case

(4) Exceeds Expectations	**(3)** Meets Expectations	**(2)** Approaching Expectations	**(1)** Falls Below Expectations
A well thought out and stimulating case that meets most or all elements of a JCEL case is provided.	A case that satisfies many elements of a JCEL case is provided.	A case dealing with the leader's role in change is provided, but it lacks detail and fails to satisfy many of the elements of a JCEL case.	The case description is either missing of fails to satisfy virtually any of the elements of a JCEL case.

Criterion Score: 3.75 (Weight 40%)

Comments on this criterion: The case as you have presented it strikes me as a very powerful lesson in the potential for leadershp from a higher education perch. You have this guy who was a revolutionary who by virtue of doing his work and pushing his agenda became a leader in his field--despite its hidebound stuffiness. That's pretty fascinating. Leadership from the ground up. I'm not sure that's how you view the case, but that's what I get from it. It exposes the very loosely coupled nature of higher education and how working in the cracks (or "lacunae" as an historian might put it), one can achieve a great deal.

I think you have addressed the criteria for cases rather well, with the possible exception of "Provides the description of a problem that can sustain student discussion of alternative solutions." Also, what would you say are the links between theory and practice?

One important criterion that you violated: The case runs 295 words over the limit. It might be rejected outright on that basis.

Teaching notes

(4) Exceeds Expectations	**(3)** Meets Expectations	**(2)** Approaching Expectations	**(1)** Falls Below Expectations
A well thought out single page of teaching notes is provided, suggesting sound approaches on how the case may best be used to develop effective leadership in the specialization.	A page of teaching notes is provided, suggesting approaches on how the case may best be used to develop effective leadership in the specialization.	Teaching notes are provided, but are either hard to follow or suggest approaches on how the case may be used that are unclear or do not make sense given the facts of the case.	Teaching notes are omitted or fail to connect well to any aspects of the case presented.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 20%)

Comments on this criterion: The teaching notes are stimulating and support the case very well. Unfortunately, you have violated the length limit again. I'll let this one go because I think it is very tough to get it done in one page.

Support

(4) Exceeds Expectations	(3) Meets Expectations	(2) Approaching Expectations	(1) Falls Below Expectations
Specific, developed ideas and/or evidence from theory or research are used to support the case and/or notes.	Supporting theory or research used to support the case lacks specificity or is only loosely developed.	The case uses some supporting ideas and/or evidence.	Few or no supporting ideas are provided.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 10%)

Comments on this criterion: Very strong connections to analytical sources and to the historiography of the movement. Well done.

Organization of paper

(4) Exceeds Expectations	(3) Meets Expectations	(2) Approaching Expectations	(1) Falls Below Expectations
The case is powerfully organized and fully developed.	The case includes a logical progression of ideas aided by clear transitions.	The case is rough; writing is unclear and/or lacks transitions.	The case is virtually impossible to understand; it lacks a logical progression of events or ideas.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 10%)

Comments on this criterion: The paper is well organized and easy to follow. I had just one small transition difficulty.

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, format, grammar, or punctuation are present.

Criterion Score: 4.00 (Weight 10%)

Comments on this criterion: The paper is well edited with just a few minor errors.