



**Curriculum & Instruction Program**  
*Signature Assignment for EDCI 500*  
*Literature Review*

**Student Learning Outcome Assessed:**

SLO #1: Develop and apply theoretical insights and research findings to curriculum, instruction, and assessment in K-12 schools.

**Description of the Signature Assignment**

Candidates will prepare a Review of Literature on a topic within the field of curriculum studies. The purpose of this review of literature is to condense into an 8-10 page paper the research, ideas and beliefs that individuals have about a particular topic or point of view. Candidates are to select a current issue in educational news, gather information specific to the issue and view points of researchers/writers.

**Directions for Students**

Candidates are to prepare a Review of Literature on a topic within the field of curriculum studies. Included in the literature review should be the various points of view on the particular topic and a historical look at the issue. The topic selected must be approved by the instructor. It is suggested that candidates select a topic that is pertinent to their job/interests; candidates should not select a topic just to get the assignment out of the way. This is the candidates' opportunity to gain knowledge from a historical perspective as well as current research and trends. The paper should be 8-10 pages in length and should have a minimum of 12 references from a variety of sources. This paper must follow the APA Style Manual.

## Scoring Rubric:

Criteria	4 Exceeds expectations	3 Meets expectations	2 Meets some expectations	1 Does not meet expectations	0 Incomplete or missing work	Rating
<b>Selection of Sources</b>	The parameters of the review are extensive. The literature selected is clearly relevant to the problem. Sources clearly support, extend, and inform, but do not substitute writer's own development of the problem. Primary literature is emphasized and secondary literature is used selectively. Search strategies are revised as information is located or could not be found.	The parameters of the review are appropriate. The literature selected is relevant to the problem. Sources support, and inform, but do not substitute writer's own development of the problem. Primary literature is appropriately emphasized and secondary literature is used selectively. Student efficiently determines the appropriate sources for information.	The parameters of the review are adequate. The literature selected is relevant but lacks in the skillful combination of primary and secondary sources. Student uses the minimal number of sources.	The parameters of the review are insufficient. The literature selected is interesting but not relevant to the problem. Primary literature not included and secondary literature is used extensively.	The selection of sources is incomplete.	
<b>Critique of Literature</b>	The review is organized by topics or ideas, not authors. The review is organized logically. Major studies or theories are discussed in extensive detail and minor studies w/ similar limitations or results are discussed as a group. There is extensive criticism of the design and methodology of important studies. Studies are compared and contrasted.	The review is organized logically. Major studies or theories are discussed in appropriate detail and minor studies w/ similar limitations or results are discussed as a group. There is appropriate criticism of the design and methodology of important studies. Studies are compared and contrasted.	The review is not well organized. Major studies or theories are discussed in some detail and minor studies w/ similar limitations or results are discussed. There is minimal criticism of the design and methodology of important studies. Studies are not compared and contrasted.	The review is disjointed and groundless. Major studies or theories are not included and minor studies w/ similar limitations or results are not discussed. There is insufficient criticism of the design and methodology of important studies. Studies are not compared and contrasted.	The critique of the literature is missing.	

Criteria	4 Exceeds expectations	3 Meets expectations	2 Meets some expectations	1 Does not meet expectations	0 Incomplete or missing work	Rating
<b>Summary and Interpretation</b>	The summary clearly provides an overall interpretation and understanding of our knowledge of the problem. Gaps in knowledge are clearly identified. The summary clearly provides a rationale for the specific problem statement, or research question to follow. Student summarizes information in a meaningful way and creates a product that clearly answers the questions with accuracy, detail and understanding.	The summary provides an overall interpretation and understanding of our knowledge of the problem. Gaps in knowledge are identified. The summary provides a rationale for the specific problem statement, or research question to follow. Student summarizes information and creates a product that answers the questions with appropriate accuracy, detail and understanding.	The summary provides an adequate interpretation and understanding of our knowledge of the problem. Gaps in knowledge are not identified. The summary provides a rationale for the specific problem statement, or research question to follow. Student summarizes information and creates a product that adequately answers the questions with some detail and understanding.	The summary is insufficient and does not provide an overall interpretation and understanding of our knowledge of the problem. Gaps in knowledge are not identified. The summary does not provide a rationale for the specific problem statement, or research question to follow. The summary leaves questions unanswered.	The summary and interpretation is missing.	
<b>Writing and Editing</b>	Writing reflects depth of content and perceptiveness of the author at the graduate level. The paper is cogent, coherent, and well organized. Adheres to standard writing conventions and appearance is professional. Contains few or no spelling and grammatical errors. Writing is essentially error-free in terms of mechanics. Models the style and format appropriate to the assignment.	The paper is coherent, and well organized. Adheres to standard writing conventions and appearance is professional. While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout and has been carefully proofread. Appropriate conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources.	The paper is well organized. Adheres to standard writing conventions and appearance is professional. Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure and/or other writing conventions distract the reader. Writing does not consistently follow appropriate style and/or format. Source documentation is incomplete. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased.	The paper is not well organized. Does not adhere to standard writing conventions and appearance is professional. Writing contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, and/or sentence structure which interfere with comprehension. Style and/or format are inappropriate for the assignment. Fails to demonstrate thoroughness and competence in documentation.	The paper is incomplete.	

Criteria	<b>4</b> Exceeds expectations	<b>3</b> Meets expectations	<b>2</b> Meets some expectations	<b>1</b> Does not meet expectations	<b>0</b> Incomplete or missing work	Rating
<b>Use of APA</b>	APA format is exact. No errors are evident.	APA format is followed. Student lists most of the components in correct form.	APA format is followed although several errors are apparent.	Sources are not cited properly.	Sources are missing	
<b>Total</b>						

Evaluation of EDCI 500 Signature Assignment

Candidate Name \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Score				
Selection of Sources	0	1	2	3	4
Critique of Literature	0	1	2	3	4
Summary and Interpretation	0	1	2	3	4
Writing and Editing	0	1	2	3	4
APA Style	0	1	2	3	4

**Legend**

Professor's System Total Points	Common System Total Points	College of Education Assessment Scale Equivalent
	<b>18-20</b>	4 (Exceeds Expectations)
	<b>16-17</b>	3 (Meets Expectations)
	<b>14-15</b>	2 (Meets Some Expectations)
	<b>2-13</b>	1 (Does Not Meet Expectations)
	<b>0-11</b>	0 (Can't Score)