**Rubric for 2013 Elementary Education Comprehensive Exam –Data and Analysis for Exam 2013 13 students**

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 student2 (good) | Content knowledge restated from quality sources with no interpretation or misconceptions present in personal interpretation1 (fair) | Knowledge base incomplete or missing0 (incomplete) |
| 1 (ACEI 2.2) | 3/13 23% | 5/13 38.5%1/13 = 1.5 7% | 2/13 15%1/13 = 0.5 7% | 1/13 7% |
| 2(ACEI 2.1) | 3/13 = 2.5 23% | 5/13 38.5%1/13 =1.5 7% | 3/13 23%1/13=0.5 7% |  |
| 3(ACEI 2.3) | 2/13 = 15%2 /13 = 2.5 15% | 3/13 23%1/13=1.5 7% | 4/13 30.7%1/13=0.5 7% |  |
| 4(ACEI 2.4) | 3/13 = 23%4/13 = 2.5 30.7% | 3/13 = 23%  | 2/13 15%1/13=0.5 7% |  |
| 5(ACEI 2.6) | 1/13 7%4/14 = 2.5 30.7% | 3/13 = 23% | 4/13 30.7%1/13=0.5 7% |  |

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 missing2 (good) | Strategies incorporate a few of the aspects of best practices, but more than two aspects missing or not effectively used1 (fair) |  Strategies are not detailed enough to indicate understanding of best practices 0 (incomplete) |
| 1 (ACEI 3.1) | 1/13 7%2/13 = 2.5 15% | 8/13 = 61.5%1/13 = 1.5 7% | 1/13 7% |  |
| 2 (ACEI 3.1) | 3/13 = 23%1/13 = 2.5 7% | 6/13 = 46.2% | 3/13 23% |  |
| 3 (ACEI 3.1) | 3/13 = 23%3/13 = 2.5 23% | 3/13 = 23%2/13 = 1.5 15% | 2/13 = 15% |  |
| 4 (ACEI 3.1) | 2/13 = 15%3/13 = 2.5 23% | 4/13 = 30.7%1/13 = 1.5 7% | 3/13 = 23% |  |
| 5 (ACEI 3.1) | 1/13 = 7%3/13 = 2.5 23% | 8/13 = 61.5% | 1/13 = 7% |  |

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) | 4/13 = 2.5 30.7% | 6/13 46.2%2/13 = 1.5 15% | 1/13 7% |  |
| 2 (ACEI 3.3) | 3/13 = 2.5 23% | 4/13 30.7%3/13=1.5 23% | 3/13 23% |  |
| 3 (ACEI 3.3) | 3/13 = 2.5 23% | 6/13 46.2%2/13 = 1.5 15% | 2/13 15% |  |
| 4 (ACEI 3.3) | 4/13 = 2.5 30.7 | 5/13 38.5%1/13=1.5 7% | 3/13 23% |  |
| 5 (ACEI 3.3) |  - -1/13 = 2.5 7% | 8/13 61.5%3/13 =1.5 23% | 1/13 7% |  |

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 paper3 (excellent) | Intervention embedded somewhat in theory- 8 to 9 high quality and course related readings cited throughout paper2 (good) | Intervention was lacking in theoretical base- 6 to 7 readings cited throughout paper1 (fair) | Intervention was lacking in theoretical basis-5 or fewer readings cited throughout paper0 (incomplete) |
| 1 (ACEI 5.1) | 5/13 38.5%4/13 = 2.5 30.7% | 2/13 15% | 1/13 7% | 1/13 7% |
| 2 (ACEI 5.1) | 3/13 23%4/13= 2.5 30.7% | 3/13 23%2/13 = 1.5 15% | 1/13 7% |  |
| 3 (ACEI 5.1) | 2/13 15%5/13 = 2.5 38.5% | 4/13 30.7%1/13 = 1.5 7% | 1/13 7% |  |
| 4 (ACEI 5.1) | 3/13 23%3/13 = 2.5 23% | 3/13 23% | 4/13 30.7% |  |
| 5 (ACEI 5.1) | 2/13 15%5/13 = 2.5 38.5% | 5/13 38.5% | 1/13 7% |  |

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 strategies0 (incomplete) |
| 1 (ACEI 3.2) | 2/13- 15%4/13 = 2.5 30.7% | 6/13- 46.2%1/13 = 1.5 7% |  |  |
| 2 (ACEI 3.2) | 3/13 23%4/13 = 2.5 30.7% | 4/13 30.7%2/13 = 1.5 15% |  |  |
| 3 (ACEI 3.2) | 1/13 7%4/13 = 2.5 30.7% | 5/13 38.5%2/13 = 1.5 15% | 1/13 7% |  |
| 4 (ACEI 3.2) | 3/13 23%3/13 = 2.5 23% | 3/13= 23%2/13 = 1.5 15% | 2/13 15% |  |
| 5 (ACEI 3.2) | 3/13= 2.5 23% | 5/13 = 38.5%4/13 = 2.5 30.7% | 1/13 7% |  |

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 understanding2 (good) | One Assessment strategy is provided and would effectively gauge student understanding1 (fair)  | Answer did not contain assessment strategies 0 (incomplete) |
| 1 (ACEI 4.0) | 2/13 – 15%1/13 = 2.5 7% | 4/13- 30.7% | 6/13- 46.2% |  |
| 2 (ACEI 4.0) | 1/13- 7%1/13 = 2.5- 7% | 5/13- 38.5%2/13 = 1.5— 15% | 4/13- 30.7% |  |
| 3 (ACEI 4.0) | 1/13- 7% | 3/13- 23%6/13 = 1.5- 46.2% | 3/13- 23% |  |
| 4 (ACEI 4.0) | 2/13- 15% | 6/13- 46.2% 2/13 = 1.5 | 3/13- 23% |  |
| 5 (ACEI 4.0) | 1/13- 7%2/13 = 2.5- 15% | 3/13= 23% | 3/13- 23% | 4/13- 30.7% |

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

\_\_6/13 (46.2%) No errors (grammar, sentence structure, word choice) \_\_\_\_1/13\_(7%)\_ Some errors (grade penalty)

\_\_5/13 (38.5%) Few errors \_\_\_\_1/13\_ (14%)\_ Numerous errors (grade penalty)

Comments:

Analysis: Candidates did slightly better expressing their content knowledge in math, but had difficulty expressing their content knowledge in early literacy and wellness. Many applied their content knowledge to the IREAD test instead of early literacy. The wellness question was vague and that may have contributed to this. It was interesting, however, that candidates could effectively apply the strategies needed for early literacy instruction. Science had lower scores; students had trouble applying the 5E format and inquiry strategies to the scenario presented. Candidates were stronger at differentiating their instruction for both the EL student and the struggling beginning reader, but had more difficulty assessing the understanding of the EL student. Overall, the cohort was able to apply resources and critically think about the scenarios presented Candidates also had difficulty assessing writing skills. 46% of the candidates could write their 15 page paper without any errors, while 38.5% had just one or two errors. Two students had numerous mistakes indicating poor communication skills. Students struggled the most defining their content knowledge and developing multiple assessment strategies.

The rubric was revised for the 2014 cohort. This rubric was cumbersome to use, unclear in some points and had numerous confusing points for students. The new rubric used a point system for each rubric system, and looked holistically the use of critical thinking and use of resources. Communication skills were also given a point value. It is hoped that the new rubric allowed for more transparency in expectations and grading.