

April 2017

Kevin,

It was a pleasure to read your well written learning plan, annotations, and the brief review on the history of libraries.

You write very well, with an engaging style. At times, you use unconventional sentence structures, but generally your writing is logical, well organized, and free from typos, spelling or grammatical errors.

I have written comment sin track-changes in your document and some comments below about each aspect of the AE500. As you can see, you did extremely well in all areas. I especially appreciated your presence and participation during the FI, your presentation, as well as the narrative and the review on libraries. You bring many assets to this program: a fine analytical –but compassionate—mind; good writing skills; an ability to conceptualize significant and relevant questions for research; sincerity and honesty in your interactions with others; and nobility of purpose.

I truly appreciate your choice of a less travelled path and in the long run it will serve you and others well. You have the courage to dare and be authentic yet also sensitive and diplomatic: you used the term “people you served” and it seems that this is probably most people you meet as there is nothing self-centered in your approach. While self-awareness and self-development are always necessary, you are clear that this is within the context of being a member of a community.

I look forward to working with you and reading your work.

Grade for AE500:

Congratulations! Well done!

AE500 Grade sheet

Assignment AE500	Comments	Worth %	Total
A – Participation	<p>EXCELLENT participation. Consistently punctual. Consistently attentive to others. Made very insightful comments. Offered comments and asked questions to presenters. Sensitive to others; seem very honest and generous. Expressed significant self-knowledge. Great attention, great presence.</p> <p>Week 2- Tuesday: very honest about finding the social dimension challenging—needing time alone. This gave others permission to also identify their own needs.</p> <p>Week 3- Made comments but always supported others. Very authentic; did not let the classroom situation force you to share more than you wanted; excellent respect for yourself, your own boundaries, very appropriate in the context.</p> <p>Overall seem like a synergistic leader in the group, helping to rally others without seemingly imposing on them.</p>	10%	
B – Presentation- non-formal learning spaces	<p>Excellent delivery. Very comfortable, confident, at ease as a speaker. Started with participatory small group work which was engaging. Very well organized. Used PowerPoint very effectively.</p> <p>Content: posed excellent questions. Gave examples discussed in the article. Discussed the research methodology and limitations. Suggested shortcomings of non-formal education. Introduced the concept of community of practice.</p> <p>Very well done.</p>	20%	
C – Learning Plan	Generally, well written: clear, logical, with few typos or grammatical errors. Well organized with headings so easy to navigate.	30%	
1. Narrative 6- 10pp	Very engaging and self-reflective. Identified relevant and significant themes about being a student/learner & teacher/ad educator.		
2. Personal & professional goals 1/2p	Clear, well articulated. With enough scope for learning yet narrow enough to be feasible. Nobility of purpose: learning is for intrinsic purpose, not only for credential.		

<p>3. Research plan ½ p</p>	<p>Well defined and articulated with general learning goals. Also, well thought of in terms of personal location in the community. Seems realistic and doable. Can lead to interesting learning and possibly publication given the gap identified in the literature in ad ed.</p> <p>While reading your narrative it occurred to me that depending how your reading goes, you may want to consider leadership as an area of interest given your location in the community. Another consideration might be looking at libraries and asking if they provide some institutional leadership in the community or help foster development of leadership. These are not “should”, only ideas.</p>		
<p>4. Self-assessment 2-3pp</p>	<p>Reflects considerable self-knowledge. Good sense of strengths and abilities. Aware of possible challenges and specified some strategies for resilience including identifying specific allies (social worker, cohort & advisor, another local student doing the MAEd, other resources in London)</p>		
<p>5. Journaling 2 pp</p>	<p>Provided honest reflection on struggling with reflective practice. Used to journaling but not necessarily about everyday life. Suggestion: work from your strength.</p>		
<p>D – 6 Annotations</p>	<p>Succinct summaries and critical evaluative statements. Identified what worked or what was appreciated and usually identified a gap or asked pertinent questions. Interestingly these were very analytical but communicated little of your reactions in general.</p>	<p>20%</p>	
<p>E – Review history 7pp</p>	<p>Very well written. I especially appreciated the ability to conceptualize this review on history of libraries based on Welton’s themes. That was clever and allowed you to discuss significant factors about the role of libraries and librarians in adult education over such an extended period. You had a clear structure and logical connection between different sections. I am impressed that you could write a significant review in so few pages. You have the ability to sift through a lot of material and identify the salient and relevant facts. Very well done.</p>	<p>20%</p>	
<p>Total</p>			

