Comprehensive Examinations: Option 2 Application

General instructions for completing this application

This application asks you to provide information about three artifacts. One artifact is evaluated by the Department Comprehensive Examination Committee; we call that the “Department Piece.” Two artifacts are evaluated by your Guidance Committee; we call those the “Committee Pieces.” The requirements for the Department Piece are somewhat different from the Committee Pieces, and those differences are indicated in these instructions and on the application form.

Please Note:
- **Formative review** refers to the critical readings that you receive in the process of revising and improving your work. This application asks you to provide information about formative reviews for all three of your artifacts. We expect that all three pieces will be revised repeatedly through a series of formative reviews before you submit those pieces for summative evaluation.
- **Summative evaluation** refers to the final outcome: Pass, Revise, or Fail. This application also asks you to provide the name of one external summative evaluator for each of your two Committee Pieces.

Summary of logistical requirements for three comps artifacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Artifacts</th>
<th>Formative Review</th>
<th>Summative Evaluation</th>
<th>Due Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Piece</td>
<td>3-5 reviewers</td>
<td>TE Department Comprehensive Exam Committee</td>
<td>Set by Department Comps Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum length = 10,000 words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Committee Piece</td>
<td>3-5 reviewers</td>
<td>Your Guidance Committee plus one external evaluator (you choose)</td>
<td>Set by your Guidance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length set by your Guidance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Committee Piece</td>
<td>3-5 reviewers</td>
<td>Your Guidance Committee plus one external evaluator (you choose)</td>
<td>Set by your Guidance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length set by your Guidance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is a separate section of this application for each of the three pieces.
- To complete this application, please respond to each question in the space provided; extend the space only when necessary. Most responses should be in words or phrases, not sentences.
- The Department Comprehensive Exam Committee will read and respond to this application. Your application may be approved. You may be asked to provide further information. You may be asked to revise your application. You may be asked to postpone your comprehensive examination to a later semester.
- For consideration of special case circumstances, please contact the comps committee.
Genre
Across the three artifacts, at least two different genres must be represented. The genre for the Department Piece is restricted. Genres of Committee Pieces are open for discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre eligible for the Department Piece</th>
<th>Possible genres for the Committee Pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research report, broadly defined:</td>
<td>Research report, broadly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of a qualitative study (e.g.,</td>
<td>Annotated syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnographic; sociological;</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychological; case-based; narrative;</td>
<td>Book review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretive)</td>
<td>Oral presentation of teaching, research,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiki, or Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection on teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of a quantitative study (e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental; survey-based; empirical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of a conceptual, historical, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophical study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: When appropriate, we recommend that one of your committee pieces contain an oral component.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Expertise
Across the three comps artifacts, at least two areas of expertise must be represented. Examples of areas/topics of expertise include, but are not limited to: science education, teacher knowledge, curriculum history, educational policy, critical race theory, charter schools, sociology of education, teacher induction, early literacy, philosophy of mathematics, teacher quality.

Authorship
For the Department Piece:
- You (the comps candidate) must be the first author.
- For co-authored pieces, you (the comps candidate) and one other author must provide (on the application form) a statement attesting to your respective roles in writing the piece.

For the Committee Pieces: Your committee will determine authorship guidelines.

Formative Review of Comps Pieces
For all three comps pieces, you will need to document the review/revision process. For each piece, before submitting it for summative evaluation, you are expected to receive feedback from at least three, but no more than five, formative reviewers (=critical readers). You will revise your work repeatedly in response to the feedback from your reviewers. Your set of 3-5 formative reviewers should meet all of these criteria:
- No more than two of your committee members for each piece.
- Not co-authors of the piece.
- At least one person not on your committee.
At least two faculty members (from any institution).
People with expertise in your area of study.

Formative reviewers may include:
- Peers
- Anonymous journal reviewers
- Non-university people

NOTE: In planning for formative reviews, please remember that a critical reading can take several weeks. Also, it is usually not helpful to receive and try to respond to several different reviews all at the same time. The review/revision process will be more effective if you solicit formative reviews one at a time, and respond to each in turn. Be strategic.

**Summative Review of Comps Pieces**
For the Department Piece, the TE Department Comprehensive Exam Committee will provide summative evaluation. Your piece will be read and evaluated by at least three faculty members according to the rubric provided by the Department.

For the Committee Pieces, your Guidance Committee plus one external evaluator will provide summative evaluation. You and your committee will choose or design a summative evaluation rubric for both Committee Pieces. You may use or adapt the Department Piece rubric if that is appropriate. For both Committee Pieces, you will also choose an external summative reviewer who meets all of these criteria:
- Is a faculty member (from any institution).
- Is not on your committee.
- Has agreed to serve as a summative reviewer for you.
- Is not a co-author of the paper or director of the project with which this artifact is associated.
- Is not a formative reviewer for that piece.
- Has expertise in the relevant area of the piece.

**Postponing Comprehensive Exams**
If you decide (for whatever reason) to postpone your comprehensive examination to a later semester, that's fine. Please notify the chair of the comps committee about your plans.

If you decide to postpone your comps to a later semester, you will need to submit a new application according to the schedule for that later date.

**Ask Questions**
Please feel free to contact your advisor and/or members of the Department Comps Committee if you have any questions, or if you would like to discuss anything about your comps.
Name: _________________________________________________________
Advisor: ________________________________________________________
For what semester are you applying to take comps? ______________________

Department Piece
Description of the Department Piece

1. Title of the Department Piece

2. Authors of Department Piece
REMINDERS: Maximum length for Department Piece is 10,000 words.
For the Department Piece, you must be the first author. For co-authored pieces, indicate the nature and
degree of participation by each author. List author(s) in order and describe the participation of co-author(s).

3. Origin of the Department Piece
   Course paper (specify course):
   Research assistantship (specify project):
   Teaching project (specify teaching situation):
   Other (specify):

4. Genre of Department Piece
REMINDER: The genre of the Department Piece is restricted to a research report, broadly defined. Across
the three comps artifacts, two different genres must be represented.

   Qualitative research report
   Quantitative research report
   Conceptual/philosophical/historical research report

5. What area of expertise most closely describes the focus of this study? (e.g., science education, teacher
knowledge, curriculum history, educational policy, critical race theory, charter schools, sociology of education,
teacher induction, early literacy, philosophy of mathematics, teacher quality)
REMINDER: Across the three comps artifacts, at least two areas of expertise must be represented.

6. What body of literature, theories, and/or methodologies does the study draw upon?

7. What is the purpose of the study?

8. What are its major (preliminary) findings or (tentative) insights?

9. Who are you writing to? (e.g., social studies teacher educators, state-level policy makers, critical curriculum
theorists, literacy researchers, mathematics standards developers, proponents of NCLB)

10. List 1-2 journals or venues suitable for making this study public.

11. Which AERA Division or SIG would be the most appropriate home for this study?

12. List 3-5 keywords that characterize this study.
Documentation of Formative Review for the Department Piece

The Option 2 Comprehensive Examination requires that you receive critical feedback on all your artifacts, and that you revise your work in response to those formative reviews before submitting it for summative evaluation. You choose the formative reviewers (critical readers) for each of your pieces. Your set of 3-5 formative reviewers must meet all these criteria:

- No more than two of your committee members.
- Not a co-author.
- At least one person not on your committee.
- At least two faculty members (from any institution).
- People with expertise in your area of study.

Formative reviewers may include:
- Peers
- Anonymous journal reviewers
- Non-university people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of reviewer</th>
<th>Describe the extensiveness, time, and nature of formative review (e.g., suggestions for further references, critiques of logical coherence, methodological guidance, suggestions to sharpen focus, recommendations for making more nuanced claims)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the reviews you have already received;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the reviews you expect to receive before submitting the artifact for summative evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Add additional lines for more reviewers)

------ End of Department Piece portion ------
First Committee Piece  
Description of the First Committee Piece

1. Title of first Committee Piece
2. Authors of first Committee Piece
   REMINDER: For co-authored pieces, indicate the nature and extent of participation by each author.  
   List author(s) in order:

3. Origin of the first Committee Piece:  
   Course paper (specify course):  
   Research assistantship (specify project):  
   Teaching project (specify teaching situation):  
   Other (specify):

4. Genre of first Committee Piece (e.g., qualitative research report, quantitative research report, historical analysis, literature review, annotated syllabus, website, narrative essay, philosophical study, book review, case study, research proposal, wiki, etc.). Where appropriate, committee artifacts may contain an oral component.  
   REMINDER: Across the three comps artifacts, at least two different genres must be represented.

5. What area of expertise most closely describes the focus of this study? (e.g., science education, teacher knowledge, curriculum history, educational policy, critical race theory, charter schools, sociology of education, teacher induction, early literacy, philosophy of mathematics, teacher quality)  
   REMINDER: Across the three comps artifacts, at least two areas of expertise must be represented.

6. What body of literature, theories, and/or methodologies does the study draw upon?

7. What is the purpose of the study?

8. What are its major (preliminary) findings or (tentative) insights?

9. Who are you writing to? (e.g., social studies teacher educators, state-level policy makers, critical curriculum theorists, literacy researchers, mathematics standards developers, proponents of NCLB)

10. List 1-2 journals or venues suitable for making this study public.

11. Which AERA Division or SIG would be the most appropriate home for this study?

12. List 3-5 keywords that characterize this study.
Documentation of Formative Review for the First Committee Piece

The Option 2 Comprehensive Examination requires that you receive critical feedback on all your artifacts, and that you revise your work in response to those formative reviews before submitting it for summative evaluation. You choose the formative reviewers (critical readers) for each of your pieces.

**REMINDER**: Your set of 3-5 formative reviewers must meet all of the following criteria:
- No more than two of your committee members.
- Not a co-author.
- At least one person not on your committee.
- At least two faculty members (from any institution).
- People with expertise in your area of study.

Formative reviewers may include:
- Peers.
- Anonymous journal reviewers.
- Non-university people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of reviewer</th>
<th>Describe the extensiveness, time, and nature of formative review (e.g., suggestions for further references, critiques of logical coherence, methodological guidance, suggestions to sharpen focus, recommendations for making more nuanced claims)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for the reviews you have already received,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for the reviews you expect to receive before submitting the artifact for summative evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Name of reviewer | |
|------------------| |
| Name of reviewer | |
| Name of Reviewer | |
| (Add additional lines for other reviewers) | |
Summative Evaluation of First Committee Piece

Summative Evaluators

A. Guidance Committee members:

1.
2.
3.
4.

B. External summative evaluator for the first Committee Piece

**REMINDER: You choose a summative external evaluator who meets all of these criteria:**

- Is a faculty member (from any institution).
- Is not on your committee.
- Has agreed to serve as a summative evaluator for you.
- Is not a co-author of the paper or director of the project with which this artifact is associated.
- Is not a formative reviewer for this piece.
- Has expertise in your field.

Name:

Title and affiliation:

------- End of first Committee Piece portion -------
Second Committee Piece
Description of the Second Committee Piece

1. Title of second Committee Piece

2. Authors of second Committee Piece
   REMINDER: For co-authored pieces, indicate the nature and extent of participation by each author.
   List author(s) in order:

3. Origin of the second Committee Piece
   Course paper (specify course):
   Research assistantship (specify project):
   Teaching project (specify teaching situation):
   Other (specify):

4. Genre of second Committee Piece (e.g., qualitative research report, quantitative research report, historical
   analysis, literature review, annotated syllabus, website, narrative essay, philosophical study, book review,
   case study, research proposal, wiki, etc.). Where appropriate, committee artifacts may contain an oral
   component.
   REMINDER: Across the three comps artifacts, at least two different genres must be represented.

5. What area of expertise most closely describes the focus of this study? (e.g., science education, teacher
   knowledge, curriculum history, educational policy, critical race theory, charter schools, sociology of
   education, teacher induction, early literacy, philosophy of mathematics, teacher quality)
   REMINDER: Across the three comps artifacts, at least two areas of expertise must be represented.

6. What body of literature, theories, and/or methodologies does the study draw upon?

7. What is the purpose of the study?

8. What are its major (preliminary) findings or (tentative) insights?

9. Who are you writing to? (e.g., social studies teacher educators, state-level policy makers, critical
   curriculum theorists, literacy researchers, mathematics standards developers, proponents of NCLB)

10. List 1-2 journals or venues suitable for making this study public.

11. Which AERA Division or SIG would be the most appropriate home for this study?

12. List 3-5 keywords that characterize this study.
# Documentation of Formative Review for the Second Committee Piece

The Option 2 Comprehensive Examination requires that you receive critical feedback on all your artifacts, and that you revise your work in response to those formative reviews before submitting it for summative evaluation. You choose the formative reviewers (critical readers) for each of your pieces.

**REMINDER:** Your set of 3-5 formative reviewers must meet all of the following criteria:
- No more than two of your committee members.
- Not a co-author.
- At least one person not on your committee.
- At least two faculty members (from any institution).
- People with expertise in your area of study.

Formative reviewers *may* include:
- Peers.
- Anonymous journal reviewers.
- Non-university people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of reviewer</th>
<th>Describe the extensiveness, time, and nature of formative review (e.g., suggestions for further references, critiques of logical coherence, methodological guidance, suggestions to sharpen focus, recommendations for making more nuanced claims)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for the reviews you have already received;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for the reviews you expect to receive before submitting the artifact for summative evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List the names of 3-5 formative reviewers who have given you critical comments your piece and/or will give you critical comments on your piece.

(Add additional lines for other reviewers)
Summative Evaluation of Second Committee Piece

Summative Evaluators
A. Guidance Committee members:

1.
2.
3.
4.

B. External summative evaluator for the second Committee Piece

REMINDER: You choose a summative external evaluator who meets all of these criteria:

• Is a faculty member (from any institution).
• Is not on your committee.
• Has agreed to serve as a summative reviewer for you.
• Is not a co-author of the paper or director of the project with which this artifact is associated.
• Is not a formative evaluator for this piece.
• Has expertise in your field.

Name:

Title and affiliation:

----- End of Second Committee Piece portion -----

Print this last page only, get signatures, and give this last page only to Vicki Adams.

REQUIRED SIGNATURES

Student signature: By signing here, the student attests to the fact that all three artifacts have been drafted and that the information provided above is accurate.

_____________________________       _______________
Student signature                          date

Advisor signature: By signing here, the faculty advisor attests to the fact that all three artifacts have been drafted and that the information provided above is accurate.

_____________________________       _______________
Advisor signature                          date