

Criteria	Outstanding	Superior	Good	Substandard	Failure
Content: Initial School of Thought	0.9 points School of thought describing management style is explained clearly, accurately and comprehensively delivering all relevant information. (0.81 - 0.90)	0.765 points School of thought describing management style is explained accurately but could be more comprehensively or clearer with more relevant information. (0.72 - 0.809)	0.675 points School of thought describing management style is explained needs more clarification on some aspects. (0.63 - 0.719)	0.585 points School of thought is identified and discussed but does not fit the facts provided, inaccurate statements are made or key points missing. (0.54 - 0.629)	0 points School of thought is not discussed. (0 - 0.539)
Content: Theorist discussed that best depicts management style and contributions to field of management explained	0.9 points Theorist that best fits is identified and discussed. Contributions to management with explanation of why his/her contribution was important to field of management is described accurately and comprehensively delivering all relevant information. (0.81 - 0.9)	0.765 points Theorist that best fits is identified. Contributions to management with explanation of why his/her contribution was important to field of management is described sufficiently but is not consistently accurate or comprehensive and is missing relevant information. (0.72 - 0.809)	0.675 points Theorist that best fits is identified. Contributions to management with explanation of why his/her contribution was important to field of management is described but needs more clarification on some aspects. (0.63 - 0.719)	0.585 points Theorist that best fits is identified. No discussion of theorist or contributions to management with explanation of why his/her contribution was important to field of management is not discussed (0.54 - 0.629)	0 points Neither theorist or contributions to management was discussed. (0 - 0.539)
Content: School of Thought Once Shift Took Place	0.9 points School of thought that best describes management style once shift took place is selected and discussed and why it is the best choice is discussed clearly, accurately, and comprehensively presented delivering all relevant information. (0.81 - 0.90)	0.765 points School of thought that best describes management style once shift took place is selected and discussed and why it is the best choice is discussed sufficiently but could be more accurate and comprehensive with more relevant information. (0.72 - 0.809)	0.675 points School of thought that best describes management style once shift took place is selected and discussed and why it is the best choice is discussed but needs more clarification on some aspects. (0.63 - 0.719)	0.585 points School of thought is selected and discussed but does not fit the facts provided. School of thought identified and discussed but an explanation of why it is the best choice is missing or does not fit with the facts. Key points are missing. (0.54 - 0.629)	0 points Explanation of appropriate school of thought is not identified and there is no discussion as to why it is the best choice. (0 - 0.539)
	0.9 points Theorist is discussed and principle of theory and how	0.765 points Theorist is discussed and principle of theory and how manager would do job	0.675 points Theorist is discussed and principle of theory and how manager would	0.585 points Either theorist is discussed or principle of	0 points Theorist, principle and how manager would do job and

Content: Select and Discuss One Theorist Who Supports School of Thought	manager would do job and interact with staff is discussed clearly, accurately and comprehensively presented delivering all relevant information. Theorist proposal accurately supported facts in case study. (0.81 - 0.90)	and interact with staff is the best choice is discussed sufficiently but could be more accurate or comprehensively with more relevant information. Theorist proposal supported facts in case study. (0.72 - 0.809)	do job and interact with staff is the best choice is discussed but needs more clarification on some aspects. Theorist proposal somewhat supported facts in case study. (0.63 - 0.719)	theory and how manager would do job and interact with staff is discussed but one or the other is missing. Theorist proposal did not supported facts in case study. Key points are missing. (0.54 - 0.629)	interact with staff are not discussed. Theorist proposal was not addressed. (0 – 0.539)
Content: Compare and Contrast Management Thought	0.9 points Two schools of thought are discussed clearly, accurately and comprehensively presented delivering all relevant information. (0.81 - 0.90)	0.765 points Two schools of thought are discussed sufficiently but could be more comprehensive with more relevant information. (0.72 - 0.809)	0.675 points Two schools of thought are discussed but could be more completely explained or need more clarification on similarities or differences. (0.63 - 0.719)	0.585 points Attempt at comparing and contrasting two schools but presentation is superficial. Key points are missing. (0.54 - 0.629)	0 points Compare and contrast of schools of thought not presented. (0 - 0.539)
21st Century Manager Comparison	0.9 points 21st century comparison versus current manager is clearly, accurately and comprehensively discussed delivering all relevant information. (0.81 - 0.90)	0.765 points 21st century comparison versus current manager is discussed sufficiently but could be more comprehensive in describing similarities or differences. (0.72 - 0.809)	0.675 points 21st century comparison versus current manager is discussed but needs more clarification of similarities or differences. (0.63 - 0.719)	0.585 points 21st century comparison versus current manager is superficially discussed. Key points are missing. (0.54 - 0.629)	0 points 21st century comparison versus current manager is not discussed. (0 - 0.539)
Implications of Change Management	0.8 points Implications are clearly and comprehensively discussed delivering all relevant information using examples and detail. (0.72 - 0.8)	0.68 points Implications are sufficiently discussed but could be more clear and comprehensive with more relevant by presenting examples or detail. (0.64 - 0.719)	0.6 points Implications are discussed but needs more clarification of details and or examples. (0.56 - 0.639)	0.52 points Implications are superficially discussed. Key points are missing. (0.48 - 0.559)	0 points Implications not discussed. (0 - 0.479)
Change to Shipping Department	0.8 points New approach is accurately and comprehensively discussed delivering all relevant information. (0.72 - 0.8)	0.68 points New approach is sufficiently discussed but could be more comprehensive or clearer with more relevant information. (0.64 - 0.719)	0.6 points New approach is discussed but needs more clarification on some aspects. (0.56 - 0.639)	0.52 points New approach is superficially discussed. (0.48 - 0.559)	0 points New approach not presented. (0 - 0.479)

Critical Thinking/Reasoning	4 points Concepts and ideas are fully developed. Thinking is consistent in accurately interpreting questions and material/provides solid assumptions, reasoning and evaluation with sound conclusions. Reader can easily follow the author's logic and reasoning. (3.6 - 4)	3.4 points Concepts and ideas are developed. Thinking is mostly consistent in accurately interpreting questions and material/provides good assumptions, reasoning and evaluation with sound conclusions. Reader can easily follow the author's logic and reasoning. (3.2 - 3.59)	3 points Concepts and ideas are mostly developed but may need clarification on some aspects of thinking, reasoning or evaluation. Conclusions are drawn. Reader follows the author's logic but occasionally there are areas that are unclear. (2.8 - 3.19)	2.6 points Concepts and ideas are not cohesive. Misinterprets questions or material; ignores or superficially evaluates, justifies little and seldom explains reasoning; draws unwarranted conclusions. At times, the reader must attempt to determine the author's train of thought. (2.4 - 2.79)	0 points Concepts and ideas are not fully developed or presented in a cohesive manner. Misinterprets questions or material. (0 - 2.39)
	4 points Arguments or positions are well-supported with evidence from the readings/experience; ideas go beyond the course material and recognize implications and extensions of the material and concepts. (3.6 - 4)	3.4 points Arguments or positions are mostly supported by evidence from the readings and course content; ideas presented demonstrate understanding of the material and concepts. (3.2 - 3.59)	3 points Arguments are more often based on opinion or unclear views than on position grounded in the readings of material or external sources of material. (2.8 - 3.19)	2.6 points Arguments are frequently illogical and unsubstantiated; Limited use of facts in case study and essential information presented in resources; May resort to ad hominem attacks on the author instead of making meaningful application of the material. (2.4 - 2.79)	0 points Arguments lack meaningful explanation or support of ideas. Does not provide facts presented in case study. (0 - 2.39)
	2 points demonstrated full understanding of requirements responded to each aspect of assignment (1.8 - 2.0)	1.7 points demonstrated understanding of requirements; missed one minor aspect of assignment (1.6 - 1.79)	1.5 points demonstrated some understanding of requirements; missed a key element or two minor aspects of assignment (1.4 - 1.59)	1.3 points failed to show a firm understanding of requirements; missed two key elements or several minor aspects of assignment (1.2 - 1.39)	0 points did not demonstrate understanding of assignment requirements (0 - 1.19)
	2 points	1.7 points	1.5 points	1.3 points	0 points

Writing Mechanics	Strictly adheres to standard usage rules of written English, including but not limited to capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. No errors found. No jargon used. (1.8 - 2.0)	Adheres to standard usage of mechanics: conventions of written English, including capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. One to three errors found. (1.6 - 1.79)	Minimally adheres to standard usage rules of mechanics: conventions of English, including capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. Four to 10 errors found. (1.4 - 1.59)	Does not adhere to standard usage rules of mechanics: conventions of written English, including capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. More than 10 errors found. (1.2 - 1.39)	Does not adhere to standard usage rules of mechanics: conventions of written English largely incomprehensible and errors are too plentiful to count. (0 - 1.19)
APA Style (6th ed.)	1 point No APA style errors; Proper citation of source material is used throughout paper. Reference titles follow APA with only the first word, the first word after a colon and proper nouns capitalized. (0.9 - 1)	0.85 points Attempts in-text citations and reference list but one or two APA style errors noted. (0.8 - 0.89)	0.75 points Attempts in-text citations and reference lists; APA style errors are noted; inconsistencies in citation usage are noted throughout document. (0.7 - 0.79)	0.65 points Attempts either in-text citations or reference list but omits the other. (0.6 - 0.69)	0 points No attempt at APA style. (0 - 0.59)
Overall Score	Outstanding 18 or more	Superior 16 or more	Good 14 or more	Substandard 12 or more	Failure 0 or more