**BISHOP GROSSETESTE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LINCOLN**

**Assignment Brief**

|  |
| --- |
| **PROGRAMME** |
| BA (Hons) Primary Education with QTS |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LEVEL | MODULE CODE | MODULE TITLE |
| 4 | PE116 | Environmental Enquiry |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TITLE OF ASSIGNMENT | WEIGHTING |
| Essay (including a sequence of work) (4000 words) within 10% | 100% |

|  |
| --- |
| **DESCRIPTION OF TASK**  “Planning for Education”  Children should be educated and simply not taught the curriculum. Examine this principle in relation to your sequence of work (cross curricular or subject discrete) together with discussing at least three contrasting educational theorists.  Essay (including a sequence of work) (4000 words) within 10%  **This assignment will enable you to:**   * develop written presentation skills * gain a deeper understanding into your chosen Foundation Subject or RE * understand the principles associated with primary school planning   **Guidance Notes:**  Students will present an essay (including a sequence of work) of 4000 words.  The Sequence of Work should be presented using a proforma chosen by the student outlining progression, differentiation, continuity, assessment, resources, learning objectives, learning outcomes and success criteria etc. The sequence of work should be based upon your chosen Foundation Subject or RE.  The essay should be based on an understanding of cross-curricular planning and a subject discrete sequence of work planning of a foundation subject or RE. It should be centred on the student’s own sequence of work including issues such as learning styles, learning outcomes references to the National Curriculum and Every Child Matters. It is important to challenge their thinking whilst presenting an argument for a particular style of planning. **Requirements for the essay:** Students will be required to present a sequence of work written for their chosen Foundation Subject or RE. This should then be critically analysed using good current literary sources outlining the principals behind the planning and why it should be adopted as good practice within a school.  **Contents:**  Title page and word count  Scheme of work (word count equivalent to 1500 words)  Essay (2500) (within 10%)  Introduction 250 words  Critical analysis 2000 words  Conclusion 250 words  Reference List |

|  |
| --- |
| **MODULE OUTCOMES TO BE TESTED**  By the end of the module students will be able to:   * Understand the curriculum requirements for 3-11 years olds * Relate learning theories to planning learning for children * Be able to collect and categorise ideas and information about planning * Communicate effectively in writing |

|  |
| --- |
| **ASSESSMENT CRITERIA** ***Criteria for Assessment*** **Knowledge and understanding (40%)**   * clear understanding of how to plan a sequence of work outlining progression, continuity, assessment, resources, learning objectives, learning outcomes, success criteria etc; * ability to relate theory to practice; * ability to reflect and critically analyse.   **Developing Argument and Professional Perspectives (40%)**   * Use of referenced quotations or referenced paraphrasing to support your argument; * Up to date sources; * Internet resources chosen with regard to validity and reliability; * Use of referenced quotations or referenced paraphrasing for contrasting theorists.   **Quality of Communication (20%)**   * use of standard English; * appropriate use of technical vocabulary; * correct spelling, punctuation and grammar; * correct use of referencing and list of references; * appropriate use of appendix. |

|  |
| --- |
| DATE AND TIME OF SUBMISSION: ***21st May 2009***  **THIS ASSIGNMENT MUST BE HANDED INTO THE ASSIGNMENT OFFICE NO LATER THAT 4.00 PM**  This assignment will be marked anonymously so you must use your student number rather than name.  *Note to students: Any work submitted after this date will receive a mark of zero. All requests for extensions must be submitted to the Academic Coordinator 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:  **17th June 2009** |

**PLAGIARISM**

Note to students: Your attention is drawn to the University 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.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Knowledge and Understanding* | *Developing Argument and Professional Perspectives* | *Quality of Communication* |
| *A\**  *80+* | A perceptive understanding of a broad range of issues concerning personal and professional learning. The discussion elaborates on the key issues related to the two styles of a SoW. | A scholarly approach resulting in an analysis and evaluation of sources used. Extended reading and use of articles. A scholarly approach to the selection, analysis and evaluation of a SoW. | Excellent presentation and communication of academic elements of the assignment.  Exceptionally professional communication, which uses a broad range of techniques with precision and flair. |
| *A*  *70-79* | A confident understanding of relevant issues concerning personal and professional learning related to a SoW. Significant evidence of independent and sustained thinking in structuring an argument that considers differing interpretations of a SoW. | Evidence of broad and balanced reading. Critical judgement in the selection, analysis and evaluation of a SoW. Able to make connections across a variety of aspects, theorists, elements and areas demonstrating critical judgement on the assessment of evidence and SoW design. | Communication of high quality showing elegance of style, awareness of audience.  Very good accuracy of grammar, spelling and punctuation. |
| *B*  *60-69* | A thorough understanding and evaluation of some pertinent issues raised by the question and development of argument of a SoW. A well-constructed and coherent discussion of key issues.  A good understanding of different teaching strategies within a SoW. | Able to recognise distinguishing features of the design and implementation of a SoW.  Good judgement in the selection, analysis and presentation of the SoW.  Can critically reflect on 3 theorists. | A written style, which contributes to the clear and fluent communication of meaning.  Generally appropriate for the audience and generally precise and with accurate grammar, spelling and punctuation. A good standard of presentation, using appropriate techniques with a degree of individuality evident. Thorough and accurate referencing strategies used. |
| *C*  *50-59* | A sound understanding of relevant issues relating to learning. A coherent structure of discussion within the argument. Demonstrates knowledge of major theories of planning of a SoW. | There is some evidence of analysis and evaluation of the SoW and styles of learning. Able to describe and analyse the assessment evidence of a SoW.  Knows about 3 theorists. | Few inconsistencies in written style, which impair communication. Generally appropriate for the audience with accurate use of common conventions of grammar, spelling and punctuation but some weaknesses in using more complex language. Satisfactory referencing included. |
| *D*  *40-49* | Some understanding of the relevant issues relating to learning. Discussion sometimes evident and not always sustained within the argument. SoW is not progressive. | Some ability to analyses findings but the account is primarily descriptive. Has mentioned 2 theorists. | Some inconsistencies in written style, which impair communication. A number of imprecision’s of phrasing; weaknesses when more complex language is used. Accurate use of common conventions of grammar, spelling and punctuation but some weaknesses in using more complex language. Incomplete referencing. |
| *E*  *35-39* | A limited understanding of the relevant issues that seriously impairs the development of a coherent answer to the question. | Minimal interpretation and analysis of a SoW. Identified an area but did not select relevant strategies. | Inappropriate for the audience. |
| *F*  *< 35* | Little or no understanding of the issues relevant to the question. | An account that is largely descriptive and uninformed. | Many inconsistencies and inaccuracies that impair communication. Inappropriate for the audience. Very poor communication. No referencing included. |