

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.

	Above Standard Outstanding Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Standard Satisfactory Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Below Standard Failed Recommend Reexamination <input type="checkbox"/>	Far Below Standard Failed Recommend Dismissal <input type="checkbox"/>
CONTENT	<p>All of Meets the Standard (8) plus:</p> <p>Insights about educational theories and/or philosophies in relation to specialization area are original, critical, and thought provoking (+1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of theory and educational philosophy is grounded in a solid literature base (2) 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) Insights about how educational theory and/or philosophy informs or aligns with candidate’s specialization area are evident (2) Strengths and weaknesses of educational theories are discussed and valid conclusions are reached in related to specialization area (2) <p>IN COMMENTS, PLEASE CITE EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT EACH ITEM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of theory and educational philosophy is insufficiently grounded in the literature (1) The links to course-related topics around theory and philosophy are insufficient (1) Few insights about how theory informs or aligns with specialization area are evident (1) Strengths and weaknesses of theory are inappropriately applied and valid conclusions not reached (1) <p>Evidence of academic dishonesty (0)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of theory and educational philosophy is flawed, not grounded and/or misapplied (0) Links to course-related topics are not made or invalid (0) Strengths and weaknesses of theory are not identified and invalid conclusions are reached (0) <p>Evidence of academic dishonesty (0)</p>

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:

	Above Standard Outstanding Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Standard Satisfactory Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Below Standard Failed Recommend Reexamination <input type="checkbox"/>	Far Below Standard Failed Recommend Dismissal <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>QUALITY OF WRITING: ORGANIZATION AND CONVENTIONS (For Question 1)</p>	<p>All of Meets the Standard (4) plus 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incorporates engaging language and solid transitions • Includes strong opening & closure; • relevant details enrich writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ideas are delineated and organized (2) • Standards of writing and conventions (APA-style citations and references) are observed (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ideas are flawed or not clearly stated (1) • Standards of writing and conventions of APA style are incorrect (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

	Above Standard Outstanding Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Standard Satisfactory Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Below Standard Failed Recommend Reexamination <input type="checkbox"/>	Far Below Standard Failed Recommend Dismissal <input type="checkbox"/>
CONTENT	<p>All of Meets the Standard (14) plus:</p> <p>Insights about research design elements in relation to candidates' specialization area are original, critical, and thought provoking (+1)</p>	<p>Demonstrates outcomes from EDP 612, 613, and 623 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <p>IN COMMENTS, PLEASE CITE EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) <p>Evidence of academic dishonesty (0)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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/or 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) <p>Evidence of academic dishonesty (0)</p>

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:

	Above Standard Outstanding Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Standard Satisfactory Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Below Standard Failed Recommend Reexamination <input type="checkbox"/>	Far Below Standard Failed Recommend Dismissal <input type="checkbox"/>
QUALITY OF WRITING: ORGANIZATION AND CONVENTIONS (For Question 2)	All of Meets the Standard (4) plus 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incorporates engaging language and solid transitions • Includes strong opening & closure; • relevant details enrich writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ideas are delineated and organized (2) • Standards of writing and conventions (APA-style citations and references) are observed (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ideas are flawed or not clearly stated (1) • Standards of writing and conventions of APA style are incorrect (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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.

	Above Standard Outstanding Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Standard Satisfactory Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Below Standard Failed Recommend Reexamination <input type="checkbox"/>	Far Below Standard Failed Recommend Dismissal <input type="checkbox"/>
CONTENT	<p>All of Meets the Standard (8) plus:</p> <p>Insights gained in the specialization area are original and thought provoking (+1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of educational policy is grounded in a solid literature base (2) The discussion of policy is clearly linked to relevant ideas and/or readings covered in EDP 630 and EDP 631 (2) Insights about how educational policy initiatives informs or aligns with candidate’s specialization area are evident (2) Strengths and weaknesses of educational initiatives are discussed and valid conclusions are reached in related to specialization area (2) <p>IN COMMENTS, PLEASE CITE EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT EACH ITEM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of educational policy is insufficiently grounded in the literature (1) The links to course-related topics around educational policy are insufficient (1) Few insights are evident about how educational policy initiatives informs or aligns with specialization area (1) Strengths and weaknesses of educational initiatives are inappropriately applied and/or some conclusions are invalid. (1) <p>Evidence of academic dishonesty (0)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of educational policy is flawed, not grounded and/or misapplied (0) Links to course-related topics are not made or invalid (0) Strengths and weaknesses of educational policy initiatives are not clearly identified and/or many conclusions are invalid. (0) <p>Evidence of academic dishonesty (0)</p>

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:

	Above Standard Outstanding Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Meets Standard Satisfactory Pass <input type="checkbox"/>	Below Standard Failed Recommend Reexamination <input type="checkbox"/>	Far Below Standard Failed Recommend Dismissal <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>QUALITY OF WRITING: ORGANIZATION AND CONVENTIONS (For Question 3)</p>	<p>All of Meets the Standard (4) plus 2 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • incorporates engaging language and solid transitions • Includes strong opening & closure; • relevant details enrich writing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ideas are delineated and organized (2) • Standards of writing and conventions (APA-style citations and references) are observed (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key ideas are flawed or not clearly stated (1) • Standards of writing and conventions of APA style are incorrect (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 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)