|  |
| --- |
| PROGRAMME |
| BA (Hons) Primary Education & QTS |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LEVEL | MODULE CODE | MODULE TITLE |
| 2 | PE201 | Investigations |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TITLE OF ASSIGNMENT | WEIGHTING |
| Evaluating a SoW in Science | 50% |

|  |
| --- |
| GUIDANCE  Before teachers start teaching a topic they are required to produce a Scheme (or Sequence) of Work indicating the objectives and outlining the activities and outcomes for the series of lessons. You will experience this in the first solo placement and possibly did experience this in the paired placement, producing a SoW for science. In recent years QCA has produced a collection of SoW in all of the National Curriculum subjects. While these are useful as models for your own planning, they should not be adopted completely as they require adjustments to match the children, the situation and the teacher.  Please note that medium term planning is somewhat different in the Foundation Stage. Although there is no subject titled ‘science’, scientific concepts are included in KUW. Your planning might involve a different theme each week but there would still be scope for planning for investigational skills across the different themes.  Although the SoW needs to be planned before the teaching commences, it usually needs to be adjusted in practice according to the rate and extent of the pupils’ developing understanding. It is these formative assessments and adjustments to planning that ensure effective teaching and learning.  For this assignment you need to evaluate and revise the SoW for science that you taught in the first solo placement or the paired placement based on:   * *theories of children’s learning in science;* * *your experience of teaching the SoW;* * *your other experiences of teaching science;* * *children’s progress;* * *scientific misconceptions;* * *the role of investigations and the development of process skills.*   In the evaluation, you are expected to use recent books and articles from journals on teaching and learning science as well as publications exploring the particular science topic for both teachers and children. Key authors in the field include Feasey, Goldworthy, Harlen and Driver. The Primary S. P. A. C. E. Research Reports and Primary Science Review should also be useful. Specific reference should also be made to pupils’ work including the misconceptions you encounter and your formative assessments of children’s understanding.  Your revised SoW and the justifications for changes may be organised as you wish, either as prose or in tabular form. Changes on the SoW should be clearly indicated and the justification should be directly related to your reading and your assessment evidence. You must also plan assessment opportunities in your revised SoW and consider how the SoW might need to be altered in the light of these assessments.  Contents (maximum 2,500 words, not including the appendices):   * evaluation of the original SoW with reference to literary sources and school experience * revised SoW with rationales for each of the changes made with reference to literary sources and school experience * an explanation of how, when and why formative assessments will be made and how the planning might be adjusted according to the results of the assessments * Appendix * original SoW from either the first solo placement or the paired placement, including a brief description of the context (year group(s), time of year, amount of teaching time, pupils’ previous experience) * samples of work, assessments from the original SoW that you refer to in the evaluation |

|  |
| --- |
| MODULE OUTCOMES TO BE TESTED   * develop a range of effective investigations for school * evaluate their own learning using own criteria   07 QTS References  Q7,Q10,Q12,Q14,Q15,Q17,Q22,Q25 b,d,Q26 |

|  |
| --- |
| ASSESSMENT CRITERIA   * Knowledge and Understanding: Detailed knowledge of planning and assessing investigations * Evaluation: Can evaluate the relevance and significance of the data collected * Application: Able to improve SoW, investigations and assessment based on evaluation * Communication: Can communicate effectively in a clear and concise manner |

|  |
| --- |
| DATE AND TIME OF SUBMISSION  Monday 15th December 2008 8.30 – 4.00pm  *Note to students: Any work submitted after this date will receive a mark of zero. All requests for extensions must be submitted to the Programme Leader for approval before the date stated. Such claims must be on the standard pro forma and must be accompanied by corroborating evidence. Following the date of submission requests may be made for the Board of Examiners to take extenuating circumstances for non-submission into account. All such requests must be made on the standard pro forma and must be accompanied by corroborating evidence*. |

|  |
| --- |
| DATE ON WHICH MARKED WORK WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR COLLECTION  Monday 2nd February 2009 8.30 – 4.00pm |

PLAGIARISM

Note to students: Your attention is drawn to the College’s Code of Practice covering plagiarism. Penalties for work found to be plagiarised are severe and can include the withdrawal of the right to resubmit work and termination of studies. On the submission of the assignment you will be required to sign a declaration that the work is your own and that all sources have been properly acknowledged.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mark Range | Knowledge and Understanding | Evaluation | Application | Communication |
| A\*  80+ | Demonstrates a detailed knowledge of major theories of planning, scientific misconceptions, investigations and how to assess them, including a range of recent views and research. | Able to demonstrate insight and sophistication through reflection on strengths and weaknesses; able to evaluate the assessment evidence and SoW design | Key areas of improvement were identified and addressed using a range of appropriate teaching and assessment strategies. | Excellent communication and presentation |
| A  70-79 | Demonstrates a detailed knowledge of major theories, including an awareness of the interplay between planning and assessment, investigations and scientific misconceptions. | Able to make connections across a variety of aspects, elements and areas, demonstrating critical judgement on the assessment evidence and SoW design | Able to identify key areas needing improvement. Used a range of suitable teaching and assessment strategies. | Concise communication of high quality with precision of phrasing |
| B  60-69 | Demonstrates a detailed knowledge of planning, scientific misconceptions, investigations and how to assess them. | Able to recognise common features and make connections between the assessment evidence and SoW design | Able to identify a key area needing improvement and chose appropriate teaching and assessment strategies. | A written style which contributes to clear communication of meaning and is generally precise |
| C  50-59 | Demonstrates knowledge of major theories of planning, investigations and how to assess them. | Able to describe and analyse the assessment evidence and SoW design | Able to identify areas needing improvement. Able to choose some appropriate teaching and assessment strategies to address them. | Able to communicate meaning despite an informal register |
| D  40-49 | Demonstrates knowledge of major theories of investigations and how to assess them. | Some ability to analyse findings but the account is primarily descriptive | Able to identify some areas needing improvement. Able to choose some teaching and assessment strategies to address them. | Able to keep within the word limit and some key messages are conveyed |
| E  35-39 | Demonstrates limited knowledge of investigations, planning and assessment issues | Minimal interpretation and analysis of research evidence | Identified an area but did not select relevant strategies | Communication is hindered by many inaccuracies |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mark Range | Knowledge and Understanding | Evaluation | Application | Communication |
| F  Below 34 | Demonstrates serious misconceptions about investigations, planning and assessment | An account which is largely descriptive, derivative or uninformed | Was unable to identify a relevant area of need. Did not use suitable strategies. | Is unable to communicate meaning |