Assessment 7: Comprehensive Exam for Elementary Education Majors

ACEI 2.1-2.4, 2.6

ACEI 3.1-3.3

ACEI 4.0

ACEI 5.1

Brief Description of the Assessment: This scenario format remained for 2012, but the rubric was expanded to monitor candidate understanding of the various disciplines/ACEI standards. When scoring, department members realized it was difficult to interpret various categories and the difference between content related to the discipline and from teaching of the discipline. The rubric was further revised for the 2013 exam. Categories were clarified with a guiding question and categories were disaggregated to monitor candidate understanding of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, differentiation, and assessment strategies. A copy of the 2012 exam data and revised rubric is attached.

Data: When analyzing the data for the 2012 cohort, the candidates demonstrated a high level of competence in use of English Language Arts. The papers were well written with the majority of the papers having no or very few errors present, however, some students did make errors in their written communication. Students demonstrated the most proficiency in understanding the math content of fractions (ACEI 2.3) and presenting best methods for leading that instruction. The candidates struggled with the case studies in science, especially applying inquiry lessons and the nature of science (ACEI 2.3) and early literacy (2.1). The students had various levels of competency in using resources for professional learning (ACEI 5.1). Candidates were able to critically think through the scenarios presented (ACEI 3.3) and required critical thinking of the student. Scenario 5 was written to validate candidate’s knowledge of health and wellness. Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of the concept, but paid more attention to the ‘class clown’ designation instead of the wellness, therefore, it was difficult to determine the exact level of content knowledge.

The revised rubric should help disaggregate the data from this assessment.

Comprehensive Exam Scoring Rubric: Data Comps-Winter 2012 – 22 students (data from one student incomplete)

Content knowledge/Pedagogical content knowledge:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACEI standard | Strong knowledge base displayed  3 (excellent) | Good Knowledge base displayed  2 (good) | Fair/Adequate knowledge base  1 (fair) | Knowledge base lacking-  0 (lacking) |
| 1- 2.2  Science | 7/22= 31.8 % | 8/22=36.4%  2/22=9% (2-) | 5/22= 22.7% |  |
| 2 -2.1  LA | 4/22=18%  2/22 (3-) =9% | 10/22 =45%  3/22 (2-) =13.6% | 3/22=13.6% |  |
| 3-2.4  SS | 5/22 =22.7%  3/22 (3-) = 13.6% | 6/22 =27.3%  3/22 (2-) =13.6% | 5/22 =22.7% |  |
| 4-2.3  Math | 7/22 =31.8%  7/22 (3-) =31.8% | 6/22=27.3%  2/22 (2-) = 9% |  |  |
| 5 PE-wellness (2.6/2.7) | 4/22=18%  3/22 (3-) =13.6% | 11/22 = 50%  4/22 (2-) =18% |  |  |

Use of Critical and Analytical Thinking:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACEI standard  3.3 | Intervention provided evidence of critical and analytical thinking of candidate and of k-6 student - 3 (excellent)  **56** | Intervention provided critical and analytical thinking of K-6 student only  2 (good)  **54** | Intervention provided some degree of critical and analytical thinking on both the candidate and K-6 student 1 (fair)  1 | Little critical thinking evident in intervention provided  0 (lacking) |
| 1- ACEI 3.3 | 8/22 =36.4%  6/22 (3-) =27.3% | 6/22 =27.3%  2/22 (2-) =9% |  |  |
| 2 -ACEI 3.3 | 4/22 =18%  6/22 (3-) =27.3% | 10/22 =45%  1/22 (2-)=4.5% | 1/22 =4.5% |  |
| 3-ACEI 3.3 | 4/22 =18%  6/22 (3-) =27.3% | 11/22 = 50%  1/22 (2-) =4.5% |  |  |
| 4-ACEI 3.3 | 4/22 =18%  8/22 (3-) =36.4% | 10/22 =45% |  |  |
| 5-ACEI 3.3 | 3/22 =13.6%  7/22 (3-) =31.8% | 11/22 = 50%  1/22 (2-) = 4.5% |  |  |

Proposed Intervention:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACEI standard 5.1 | Intervention embedded in theory and best practice-numerous readings cited  3 (excellent)  **29** | Intervention embedded in somewhat in theory and best practice–few readings cited  2 (good)  **65** | Intervention was lacking in either theoretical base or best practice-few readings cited  1 (fair)  **16** | Intervention was lacking in theoretical basis/best practice with no citations provided  - 0 (lacking) |
| 1 –ACEI 5.1 | 4/22 = 18%  3/22 =13.6% | 7/22 =31.8%  4/22=18% | 4/22 =18% |  |
| 2-ACEI 5.1 | 2/22=9%  7/22 (3-) =31.8% | 3/22=13.6%  6/22 (2-) =27.3% | 4/22 =18% |  |
| 3-ACEI 5.1 | 1/22 =4.5%  2/22 (3-) =9% | 8/22 =36.4%  8/22 (2-) =36.4% | 3/22=13.6% |  |
| 4-ACEI 5.1 | 2/22 =9%  3/22 (3-) =13.6% | 12/22 =54.5%  2/22 (2-) =9% | 3/22=13.6% |  |
| 5-ACEI 5.1 | 5/22 (3-) =22.7% | 10/22 =45%  5/22 (2-) =22.7% | 2/22=9% |  |

Use of differentiation and assessment Skills:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question  ACEI 3.2 and 4.0 | - Answer displayed very effective use of differentiated instruction and assessment 3 (excellent)  **36** | Answer displayed good use of differentiated instruction and assessment techniques  2 (good)  **63** | Answer displayed fair use of differentiated instruction and assessment techniques  1 (fair)  **6** | Answer displayed limited use of differentiated instruction and assessment techniques 0-(lacking) |
| 1 | 7/22 =31.8%  3/22 (3-) =13.6% | 7/22 =31.8%  3/22 (3-) =13.6% | 2/22 =9% |  |
| 2 | 3/22 =13.6%  5/22 (3-) =22.7% | 6/22 =27.3%  7/22 (2-)=31.8% | 1/22 =4.5% |  |
| 3 | 3/22 =13.6%  2/22 =9% | 8/22 =36.4%  8/22 (2-) =36.4% | 1/22=4.5% |  |
| 4 | 4/22 =18%  3/22 (3-) =13.6% | 11/22 = 50%  3/22 (2-) =13.6% | 1/22 =4.5% |  |
| 5 | 1/22 = 4.5%  6/22 (3-)=27.3% | 9/22 = 40.9%  5/22 (2-) =22.7% | 1/22 =4.5% |  |

Communication

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACEi standard 2.1-candidates ability to communicate  Clearly | Well written with candidate voice present, good flow, no mechanical errors  3 (excellent)  61 | Well written with some areas lacking in candidates’ voice and flow; very few mechanical errors  2 (good)  43 | Writing lacking strong voice, clarity and flow; some mechanical errors present  1 (fair)  5 | Numerous errors –little proofreading, voice, clarity evident  O (lacking) |
| 1-ACEI 2.1 | 7/22=31.8%  7/22 (3-) =31.8% | 7/22 =31.8% | 1/22 =4.5% |  |
| 2-ACEI 2.1 | 5/22 =22.7%  9/22 (3-) =41% | 4/22 =18%  2/22 =9% | 2/22=9% |  |
| 3-ACEI 2.1 | 8/22 =36.4%  4/22 (3-) =18% | 7/22 =31.8%  1/22 (2-) =4.5% | 1/22=4.5% |  |
| 4-ACEI 2.1 | 5/22=22.7%  6/22 (3-) =27.3% | 9/22 =41%  1/22 (2-) =4.5% | 1/22=4.5% |  |
| 5-ACEI 2.1 | 4/22=18%  6/22 (3-) =27.3% | 9/22 =41%  3/22 (2-) =13.6% |  |  |

**Revised Comprehensive Exam Prompt-2013**

**Elementary Education Major -**

**Comprehensive Exam-March 2013**

**DUE DATE: must be received in the Education Department office to Cheryl Torline by 4 pm on Monday, March 18th, 2013. NO EXCEPTIONS.**

**The confidentiality statement will be completed before the exam packet is released and is expected to be returned with the final paper. This is an individual project-NO COLLABORATION or outside help is allowed for this paper. Students are NOT to discuss the contents of this exam with anyone in or outside the department. This exam should be a reflection of your personal work-NO OUTSIDE proofreading is allowed. All notes and rough drafts used in preparation of this exam are expected to be submitted in the exam packet.**

**Students and/or papers not following the guidelines may be asked to be redone or face a severe grade penalty, possibly failure, on the exam.**

**This exam should be a maximum of 15 double-spaced type-written pages, excluding the reference page(s). Scoring will cease at the end of the 15th page. Students are expected to stay within this parameter. At least two faculty members will grade each exam. The two scores will be averaged together and a final grade will be determined. Any score below an average of 1 is unacceptable resulting in a poor grade and revisions of the exam.**

**Students are expected to respond to all five scenarios presented. You are to address how you would address and meet the needs of these students. Answers should reflect a combination of both educational theory and classroom practice and reflect your depth of knowledge regarding the content, pedagogy and best practice for the given situations. Priority should be to use multiple texts from your EDU coursework and cite; use other outside sources as needed. Citations are required from multiple sources. Examples of differentiated practices in instruction and assessment should be evident. All questions should be answered fully and completely; the attached rubric will be used to assess the exam, so careful attention should be paid to the rubric and used as a guideline to the complexity and depth of answers.**

**­­**

**Elementary Education Comps-Winter 2013**

**What would you do with this particular child in the context of this situation?** Use the following prompts to show how you would react to the particular student in the context of the given situation. For each scenario, provide examples of what strategies you would use in order to meet your teaching responsibilities. You may use the different scenarios as headings to divide your paper into 5 sections.

**.Scenario #1: Rosa is a 4th grade Level 1 ENL student and is having trouble understanding your physical science unit on Newton’s Laws of Motion.**

**Scenario #2: Joey is a 2nd grader that is reading significantly below grade level and is in need of remediation as he prepares for taking IREAD next year.**

**Scenario #3: Mary is very distracted; you are having trouble motivating her when writing in your 5th grade social studies unit over early colonial life.**

**Scenario #4: Paul is a third grader that has tested into your level 3 RTI group during your introductory unit over fractions.**

**Scenario #5: Ben is the class clown. He is always “up to something” and disrupting the class. Recently, he jokes and laughs more so during your unit on wellness-the value of healthy eating and exercise.**

Revised Rubric for 2013 Comprehensive Exam

Comprehensive Exam Scoring Rubric: Subject area content knowledge: Do you know the subject area content you are required to teach?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Content knowledge clearly described in student’s personal words/understanding with no misconceptions  3 (excellent) | Content knowledge restated from quality source with some interpretation from student  2 (good) | Content knowledge restated from quality sources with no interpretation or misconceptions present in personal interpretation  1 (fair) | Knowledge base incomplete or missing  0 (incomplete) |
| 1  (ACEI 2.2) |  |  |  |  |
| 2  (ACEI 2.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 3  (ACEI 2.3) |  |  |  |  |
| 4  (ACEI 2.4) |  |  |  |  |
| 5  (ACEI 2.6) |  |  |  |  |

PCK: Do you know the pedagogical strategies to plan and present the information in an effective manner?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strategies effectively integrate all aspects of best teaching practices in discipline and are well described  3 (excellent) | Strategies integrate majority of the aspects of best practices, but one or two key aspects are missing  2 (good) | Strategies incorporate a few of the aspects of best practices, but more than two aspects missing or not effectively used  1 (fair) | Strategies are not detailed enough to indicate understanding of best practices    0 (incomplete) |
| 1  (ACEI 3.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 2  (ACEI 3.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 3  (ACEI 3.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 4  (ACEI 3.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 5  (ACEI 3.1) |  |  |  |  |

Use of Critical and Analytical Thinking: Does your intervention involve critical thinking/depth?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intervention demonstrated deep critical thinking and problem solving skills of both the candidate and k-6 student; variety of possible intervention strategies presented  3 (excellent) | Intervention provided evidence of critical thinking and problem solving skills of candidate but limited critical thinking and problem solving of K-6 student  2 (good) | Intervention provided limited evidence of critical thinking and problem solving skills for both the candidate and K-6 student as only one possible solution was explored  1 (fair) | Intervention provided is shallow and surface-level; no critical thinking or problem-solving is required for the candidate or the k-6 student.  0 (incomplete) |
| 1  (ACEI 3.3) |  |  |  |  |
| 2  (ACEI 3.3) |  |  |  |  |
| 3  (ACEI 3.3) |  |  |  |  |
| 4  (ACEI 3.3) |  |  |  |  |
| 5  (ACEI 3.3) |  |  |  |  |

Proposed Intervention: Is the intervention you propose supported by literature?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intervention embedded in theory -10 or more high quality and course related readings cited throughout paper  3 (excellent) | Intervention embedded somewhat in theory- 8 to 9 high quality and course related readings cited throughout paper  2 (good) | Intervention was lacking in theoretical base- 6 to 7 readings cited throughout paper  1 (fair) | Intervention was lacking in theoretical basis-5 or fewer readings cited throughout paper  0 (incomplete) |
| 1  (ACEI 5.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 2  (ACEI 5.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 3  (ACEI 5.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 4  (ACEI 5.1) |  |  |  |  |
| 5  (ACEI 5.1) |  |  |  |  |

Use of differentiation: What strategies will you use to diversify your teaching to accommodate this student?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Two Strategies detailed and described to effectively incorporate best practices to meet the needs of this student to be successful  3 (excellent) | Two Strategies provided but questionable as to effectiveness of student need and do not meet best practices  2 (good) | One teaching strategy provided  1 (fair) | Answer displayed no differentiation strategies  0 (incomplete) |
| 1  (ACEI 3.2) |  |  |  |  |
| 2  (ACEI 3.2) |  |  |  |  |
| 3  (ACEI 3.2) |  |  |  |  |
| 4  (ACEI 3.2) |  |  |  |  |
| 5  (ACEI 3.2) |  |  |  |  |

Use of assessment strategies: How will you check for student learning and understanding?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Two Assessment strategies are detailed, embedded in best practice and would effectively gauge student understanding  3 (excellent) | Two Assessment strategies are provided but are questionable in whether they are effective in gauging student understanding  2 (good) | One Assessment strategy is provided and would effectively gauge student understanding  1 (fair) | Answer did not contain assessment strategies  0 (incomplete) |
| 1  (ACEI 4.0) |  |  |  |  |
| 2  (ACEI 4.0) |  |  |  |  |
| 3  (ACEI 4.0) |  |  |  |  |
| 4  (ACEI 4.0) |  |  |  |  |
| 5  (ACEI 4.0) |  |  |  |  |

Communication Skills: Is this document easily read demonstrating effective written communication skills?

\_\_\_\_\_\_ No errors (grammar, sentence structure, word choice) \_\_\_\_\_\_ Some errors (grade penalty)

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Few errors \_\_\_\_\_\_ Numerous errors (grade penalty)

Comments: