**QUESTION 1: FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY**

Written Comprehension Exam Rubric *(15 possible points = 9 for content; 6 for writing style)*

**EXAM DESIGNER:** Please be sure the task and questions are framed to provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge in each area. Please share this rubric with the student before comprehensive exams begin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td>All of Meets the Standard (8) plus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insights about educational theories and/or philosophies in relation to specialization area are original, critical, and thought provoking (+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The discussion of theory and educational philosophy is grounded in a solid literature base (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The discussion of theory and educational philosophy is insufficiently grounded in the literature (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The discussion of theory is clearly linked to relevant ideas and/or theorists or philosophers covered in EDP 610, 611, 620, and/or 621 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The links to course-related topics around theory and philosophy are insufficient (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insights about how educational theory and/or philosophy informs or aligns with candidate’s specialization area are evident (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Few insights about how theory informs or aligns with specialization area are evident (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses of educational theories are discussed and valid conclusions are reached in related to specialization area (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses of theory are inappropriately applied and valid conclusions not reached (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence of academic dishonesty** (0)

**IN COMMENTS, PLEASE CITE EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT EACH ITEM**
REVIEWER COMMENTS ABOUT QUALITY OF CANDIDATES RESPONSES IN RELATED TO FOUR KNOWLEDGE EXPECTATIONS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL THEORY

A. The discussion of theory and educational philosophy is grounded in a solid literature base.

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

B. The discussion of theory is clearly linked to relevant ideas and/or theorists or philosophers covered in EDP 610, 611, 620 or 621.

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

C. Insights about how educational theory and/or philosophy informs or aligns with candidate’s specialization area are evident.

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

D. Strengths and weaknesses of educational theories are discussed and valid conclusions are reached in related to specialization area

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY OF WRITING: ORGANIZATION AND CONVENTIONS (For Question 1)</th>
<th>Above Standard Outstanding Pass</th>
<th>Meets Standard Satisfactory Pass</th>
<th>Below Standard Failed Recommend Reexamination</th>
<th>Far Below Standard Failed Recommend Dismissal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### QUALITY OF WRITING:
- **Organized and clear:**
  - Key ideas are delineated and organized (2)
  - Standards of writing and conventions (APA-style citations and references) are observed (2)
- **Coherent and logical:**
  - Key ideas are flawed or not clearly stated (1)
  - Standards of writing and conventions of APA style are incorrect (1)
- **Consistent and accurate:**
  - Key ideas are missing or poorly stated (0)
  - Standards of writing and conventions of APA style are not observed (0)
SUMMARY OF SCORES FOR CANDIDATE

QUESTION 1: DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY (15 possible points)

Candidate's Name: ___________________________ RIC ID # ______ URI ID # _________________________

Major Professor: ____________________________

Reader: ____________________________ Date: ____________________

Total Score for Content: ____ / 9

Total Score for Writing Quality: ____ / 6

TOTAL SCORE: ____ / 15

☐ Passed (12 points or more with no indicator less than 2) ☐ Failed (re-examination) ☐ Failed (dism
QUESTION 2: EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY
Written Comprehension Exam Rubric (21 possible points = 15 for content; 6 for writing style)

EXAM DESIGNER: Please be sure the task and questions are framed to provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge in each area. Please share this rubric with the student before comprehensive exams begin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>Far Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Pass</td>
<td>Satisfactory Pass</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Halted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTENT**

- All of Meets the Standard (14) plus:
  - Insights about research design elements in relation to candidates' specialization area are original, critical, and thought provoking (+1)

- Demonstrates outcomes from EDP 612, 613, and 623 including:
  - Provides **clear problem statement and rationale** for this research, noting its importance to the field. (2)
  - **Research questions** are clearly designed to address problem statement. (2)
  - Provides clear, research-based **operational definitions of key constructs** (2)
  - Clearly describes **data sources and analytical methods that logically align** with key constructs and research questions (2)
  - Discusses **data analysis methods**, including reliability, validity, and/or triangulation (2)
  - Considers **alternative designs** and briefly outlines a specific plan for how to address similar problem using this different approach (2)
  - Discusses **strengths and limitations** of proposed design and compares with strengths and limitations of alternative design (2)

**IN COMMENTS, PLEASE CITE EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>Far Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Problem statement, rationale and/or research questions are weak and/or not well supported by literature.** (1)
- **Operational definitions of key constructs are weak/unclear and not well supported.** (1)
- **Description of data sources and methods is somewhat unclear and connection to key constructs and research questions is weak.** (1)
- **Discussion of data analysis methods, reliability and validity is weak and/or not well grounded in literature.**
- **Discussion of alternative design is weak and/or unclear.** (1)
- **Discussion of strengths and limitations of proposed and alternative design is limited, too general, and/or unclear.** (1)

**Evidence of academic dishonesty** (0)

- **Problem statement, rationale and/or research questions are missing or illogical** (0)
- **Operational definitions of key constructs are missing or invalid.** (0)
- **Description of data sources and methods is very unclear and not aligned to key constructs and RQs** (0)
- **Discussion of reliability and validity is missing or inaccurate.** (0)
- **Discussion of alternative design is missing or inaccurate** (0)
- **Discussion of strengths and limitations is missing or inaccurate.** (0)

**Evidence of academic dishonesty** (0)
REVIEWER COMMENTS ABOUT QUALITY OF CANDIDATES RESPONSES IN RELATION TO FOUR KNOWLEDGE EXPECTATIONS ABOUT RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Provides clear problem statement and rationale for this research, noting its importance to the field.

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

B. Research questions are clearly designed to address problem statement.

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

C. Provides clear, research-based operational definitions of key constructs (2)

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

C. Clearly describes data sources and analytical methods that logically align with key constructs and research questions (2)

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

D. Discusses data analysis methods, including reliability, validity, and/or triangulation (2)

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

E. Considers alternative designs and briefly outlines a specific plan for how to address similar problem using this different approach (2)

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

F. Discusses strengths and limitations of proposed design and compares with strengths and limitations of alternative design (2)

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:
### SUMMARY OF SCORES FOR CANDIDATE

#### QUESTION 2: DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH DESIGN (21 possible points)

Candidate's Name: ___________________________ RIC ID #: __________ URI ID #: ___________________________

Major Professor: ___________________________

Reader: ___________________________

Date: ___________________________

Total Score for Content: ____ / 15
Total Score for Writing Quality: ____ / 6

TOTAL SCORE: ____ / 21

☐ Passed (18 points or more with no indicator less than 2) ☐ Failed (re-examination) ☐ Failed (dismissal)
## QUESTION 3 EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Written Comprehension Exam Rubric (15 possible points = 9 content; 6 writing quality)

**EXAM DESIGNER:** Please be sure the task and questions are framed to provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge in each area. Please share this rubric with the student before comprehensive exams begin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of Meets the Standard (8) plus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insights gained in the specialization area are original and thought provoking (+1)</td>
<td>• The discussion of educational policy is grounded in a solid literature base (2)</td>
<td>• The discussion of educational policy is insufficiently grounded in the literature (1)</td>
<td>• The discussion of educational policy is flawed, not grounded and/or misapplied (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The discussion of policy is clearly linked to relevant ideas and/or readings covered in EDP 630 and EDP 631 (2)</td>
<td>• The links to course-related topics around educational policy are insufficient (1)</td>
<td>• Links to course-related topics are not made or invalid (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insights about how educational policy initiatives informs or aligns with candidate’s specialization area are evident (2)</td>
<td>• Few insights are evident about how educational policy initiatives informs or aligns with specialization area (1)</td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses of educational policy initiatives are not clearly identified and/or many conclusions are invalid. (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses of educational policy initiatives are discussed and valid conclusions are reached in related to specialization area (2)</td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses of educational policy initiatives are inappropriately applied and/or some conclusions are invalid. (1)</td>
<td>Evidence of academic dishonesty (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comments, please cite examples of evidence to support each item.
REVIEWER COMMENTS ABOUT QUALITY OF CANDIDATES RESPONSES IN RELATED TO FOUR KNOWLEDGE EXPECTATIONS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL POLICY

A. The discussion of educational policy is **grounded in a solid literature base**
EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

B. The discussion of policy is clearly linked to relevant ideas and/or readings **covered in EDP 630 and EDP 631**
EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

C. Insights about how educational policy initiatives **informs or aligns with candidate’s specialization area** are evident
EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

D. **Strengths and weaknesses** of educational policy and reform initiatives are discussed and valid conclusions are reached in related to specialization area
EVIDENCE OF QUALITY:
AREAS OF CONCERN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of Meets the Standard (4) plus 2 points:</td>
<td>• Key ideas are delineated and organized (2)</td>
<td>• Key ideas are flawed or not clearly stated (1)</td>
<td>• Key ideas are missing or poorly stated (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• incorporates engaging language and solid transitions</td>
<td>• Standards of writing and conventions (APA-style citations and references) are observed (2)</td>
<td>• Standards of writing and conventions of APA style are incorrect (1)</td>
<td>• Standards of writing and conventions of APA style are not observed (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Includes strong opening &amp; closure; relevant details enrich writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF SCORES FOR CANDIDATE

QUESTION 3: DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND REFORM (15 possible points)

Candidate’s Name: ____________________________ RIC ID # _______ URI ID # ________________

Major Professor: ________________________________

Reader: ________________________________ Date: ________________

Total Score for Content: ___ / 9

Total Score for Writing Quality: ___ / 6

TOTAL SCORE: ___ / 15

☐ Passed (12 points or more with no indicator less than 2)  ☐ Failed (re-examination)  ☐ Failed (dismissal)