

## ASSIGNMENT 1:

### TWO SHORT ESSAYS ON QUALITY CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

**Due Date:** Friday of Week 7

**Value:** 20%

**Length:** 500 – 750 words per short essay

#### ***Instructions:***

1. You will write two essays for this assignment.
2. Read the following questions carefully.
3. Select two (2) topics.
4. Write a short essay of about 500 – 750 words on each topic. Remember to contextualize your discussion in the Pacific islands and your home country.
5. You are also expected to make reference to ideas and curriculum thinkers discussed in this course.
6. You are expected to make reference to at least 7-10 textual references in each essay.

#### **Essay topics to choose from:**

1. Differentiate *curriculum theory* and *curriculum practice* and describe their significance to Curriculum Development in your home country.
2. Summarize the three change strategies and **identify** the change strategy that is most commonly used in your home country? Why do you think this is?.
3. Differentiate the Progressivist and Reconstructionist Philosophical perspectives. Describe your personal philosophical perspective of Curriculum Development stating your reasons.
4. Describe two Curriculum Development Models and explain their impacts on Curriculum Development in your country.

RSD Assessment Criteria	MARKING RUBRIC					
	Level 1. Highly Proficient > 75%		Level 2. Proficient 50 – 74%		Level 3. Limited Proficiency <50%	
<b>Embark &amp; Clarify:</b>	Succinct coverage of all parts of the question	(3.75 – 5m)	Detracts from questions in some places.	(2.5 - 3m)	Lacks focus with some inaccuracies.	(0 – 2m)
	Well-grounded in Pacific/ home country context. .	(3.75 – 5m)	Some contextualization.	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no contextualization.	(0 – 2m)
<b>Find &amp; Generate:</b>	Covers all/ most key themes & relevant ideas.	(6 – 8m)	Some relevant ideas or themes.	(4 – 5.5m)	Unrelated/irrelevant information.	(0 – 3.5 m)
	Holistic understanding & ideas coherently linked,	(6 – 8m)	Some areas lack development.	(4 – 5.5m)	Little/no attempt to link/connect ideas.	(0 – 3.5m)
	Good use of credible sources of information.	(3 - 4m)	Heavy reliance on readings, some questionable sources.	(2 – 2.5m)	Course materials main source of information; and/or, many questionable sources.	(0 – 1.5m)
<b>Evaluate &amp; Reflect:</b>	Good understanding of limitations.	(7.5 – 10m)	Some reference to limitations.	(5 – 7m)	Little/no treatment of limitations.	(0 – 4.5m)
	High level data analysis and critical reflection identifying strengths and weaknesses	(7.5 – 10m)	Some analysis of data/ strengths and weaknesses.	(5 – 7m)	Little/no data-analysis or critical reflection.	(0 – 4.5m)
<b>Organize &amp; Manage:</b>	Paragraphs developed around ideas/themes	(3.75 – 5m)	Some undeveloped ideas/themes.	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no development, repetition, long/ short paragraphs and/or main paragraph idea is unclear.	(0 – 2m)
	Ideas linked cohesively & paragraphs sequenced well.	(7.5 – 10m)	Inconsistency of ideas /linkages between paragraphs.	(5 – 7m)	Little/ no apparent sequence to themes/ ideas.	(0 – 4.5m)
	Examples, figures and tables enhance the discussion.	(3.75 – 5m)	Some irrelevant/incorrect examples/ figures/tables used.	(2.5 - 3m)	Most examples/figures/tables are irrelevant.	(0 – 2m)
<b>Analyse &amp; Synthesise:</b>	Comprehensive analysis of data/information.	(3 - 4m)	Some surface analysis of data.	(2 – 2.5m)	Incomplete findings; and/or little/no analysis.	(0 – 1.5m)
	Logical reasoning applied to high level analysis/interpretation.	(6 - 8m)	Limited/Technical analysis and interpretation.	(4 – 5.5m)	Little/no analysis of data, presentation of facts, and/or no interrogation of information.	(0 – 3m)
	Reasoned personal standpoints in summarizing information.	(3 – 4m)	Weak positioning of personal/creative synthesis	(2 – 2.5m)	Little/no personal standpoint and/or summary.	(0 – 1.5m)
	Comprehensive recommendations. Presents new knowledge/ ideas.	(3 – 4m)	Few recommendations, new knowledge/ideas	(2 – 2.5m)	No recommendations or new knowledge/ideas.	(0 – 1.5m)
<b>Communicate &amp; Apply Ethically:</b>	Within word limit. Appropriate/formal academic writing style.	(3 – 4m)	Within word limit but writing style informal/ inconsistent.	(2 – 2.5m)	Ignores word limit and writing style inappropriate.	(0 -1.5m)
	Similarity <23%. Consistent referencing style & proper in-text citation and bibliography.	(2.5 – 3m)	Similarity % may be within range, but inconsistency in referencing & bibliography.	(1.5 - 2m)	Similarity % > 35%. Many referencing/ bibliographical errors, and may not include a bibliography.	(0 -1m)
	Appropriate titles/sub-headings, few errors in grammar, spelling & punctuation.	(2.5 - 3m)	Long/vague subheadings; common grammatical, spelling & punctuation errors.	(1.5 - 2m)	Long, confusing, off-topic headers. Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors affect the overall flow/quality of the paper.	(0 -1m)



## ED255 Assignment 1 Mark sheet

Assessment Criteria	Scores
<b>Embark &amp; Clarify:</b> Assessment task demonstrates good understanding of question requirements; and, the student's ability to contextualize topic to the wider Pacific & home country. <b>10 Marks</b>	
Interpretation of the assignment question and student ability to focus on instructions.	/5
Contextualization of discussion to the Pacific and home country context	/5
<b>Find &amp; Generate:</b> Assessment task shows the student's conceptual understanding of subject area through effective mapping of key ideas/themes and linkages between these; and, ability to access and use a wide range of credible references. <b>20 Marks</b>	
Key themes and ideas are identified and discussed	/8
Ideas are coherently linked and demonstrate holistic understanding of the subject	/8
Evidence of use of information from a wide range of credible sources	/4
<b>Evaluate &amp; Reflect:</b> Assessment task demonstrates student recognition of the important link between research limitations & holistic treatment of the topic discussion. The high level thinker attempts to address these demonstrating deep learning/ reflective thinking in the quality of discussion. <b>20 Marks</b>	
Limitations of the task are recognized and discussed.	/10
Critical thinking is applied in analysis of information/data.	/10
<b>Organize &amp; Manage:</b> Assessment task shows the student's ability to translate information into focused, well developed paragraphs. Ideas are succinctly sequence d and student makes effective use of examples, figures and tables. <b>20 Marks</b>	
Paragraphs structure and development.	/5
Sequencing and linking of paragraphs.	/10
Use of examples, figures and tables used are appropriate.	/5
<b>Analyse &amp; Synthesise:</b> Assessment task includes signposts that indicate analytical skills through effective data analysis & interpretation. There is a clear summary & synthesis of data and new knowledge is generated. <b>20 Marks</b>	
Demonstration of Analytical skills.	/4
Logical reasoning is applied to analysis of results and shows high levels of critical thinking.	/8
Ability to summarize and synthesis information.	/4
Evidence of critical reflection and new knowledge/ideas are generated.	/4
<b>Communicate &amp; Apply Ethically:</b> Assessment task adheres to formal academic format/ presentation & writing style. The Turnitin similarity % is within the acceptable range and there is consistency in referencing and bibliography. Due attention is given to technical aspects. <b>10 Marks</b>	
Formal academic writing style is adhered to.	/4
Similarity % is within the acceptable range and there is consistency in referencing and bibliographical citations.	/3
Titles and Sub-headings are appropriate. Due attention is given to spelling, grammar and punctuation.	/3
<b>Total score out of 100%</b>	<b>/ 100</b>
<b>Assignment Mark %</b>	<b>/20</b>

### Markers Comments:

#### 1. Overall Assessment of task

Excellent  
  Very Good  
  Good Effort  
  Recommendation to seek writing assistance

#### 2. General Comments:



Signature of Marker: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_