

**ADV370/PR367: INTEGRATED COMMUNICATION MANAGEMENT  
CASE EVALUATION FEEDBACK FORM**

**Format (5 points):** \_\_\_\_\_

Organization, Layout, and Design: Review Exhibit 1-1 on p.7 of the text

- Make it easier to read with indents, heads, subheads, etc.
- Content reads too much like an outline, too brief.
- Sloppy, grammatical and/or spelling errors, omitted words, etc.

**Statement of the Problem (5 points):** \_\_\_\_\_

- Frame the problem within the management area under discussion
- Focus on integrated communication management issues, not broad issues outside the scope of the case

**List of Critical Factors (25 points):** \_\_\_\_\_

- Identify the key factors in the case, look for the few “driving force” issues
- Include more analysis when articulating critical factors, too brief
- Don’t just replay descriptive facts in the case, articulate factors useful in making a decision
- Rank order of factors is out of sequence, always list the most critical factor first
- Reduce the number of factors to a manageable number, usually between 5-9
  - Eliminate minor factors that don’t materially affect your decision
  - Combine minor factors into a higher-ranking factor, if possible
- Need to quantify, make factors more rich and informative through quantification
  - Analyze exhibits, table data, and quantifiable statements within the text
  - Pull together quantifiable facts and draw a conclusion to bring analysis into sharper focus
- You miss a key critical factor in the case (\_\_\_\_\_)

**Definition of Alternatives (30 points):** \_\_\_\_\_

- Alternatives don’t directly and completely answer the question posted in the Statement of the Problem
- “Strawman” alternatives – not viable, implausible, or can’t be implemented given the facts in the case
- Alternatives are too closely akin to each other, they don’t represent a real choice
- Alternatives are too radically disparate, cannot be reasonably linked to the critical factors
- Alternatives need to be better explained, not well-articulated

**Pro/Con Discussion (30 points):** \_\_\_\_\_

- Failed to use the following mental word drill when constructing arguments:  
*Alternative is strong/weak, because it “[action verb] + [within the context of the critical factors]”*
- Articulation is weak – poor word choices, imprecise statements, etc.
- Improve the ordering of arguments – lead with the strongest point
- Discussion is too simplistic or states the obvious, indicates a shallow analysis
- Confused reasoning or logic, your train of thought is difficult to follow
- Pro/Con not clearly related to the cited critical factors

**Conclusion and Additional Comments (5 points):** \_\_\_\_\_

- Failed to clearly state the alternative that you’re recommending
- Introduced significant new factors not identified or developed in list of critical factors
- Repeated arguments already covered in pro/con discussion, or contradicted own conclusion

**Summary remarks on your case analysis:**

**Score (out of 100 points):** \_\_\_\_\_