Early Childhood Education Program

Signature Assignment for EDEC 621
Literature Review Paper

Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed:

SLO #4: Analyze current issues, debates, discussions, and research in the field of early childhood education.

Description of the Signature Assignment

Candidates will conduct an in-depth review of existing research on a topic pertaining to an issue or debate or a trend in the field of early childhood education. Their written review will include a rationale for selecting the topic, statement of the problem, defining terms, identification of programs and contributors, analysis and synthesis of available research studies, conclusion drawn from the review, and personal reflections/ recommendations. The final version of the paper will be submitted and evaluated on Task Stream's e-portfolio system of the program.

Directions for Students

Candidates are required to write an in-depth review of existing research on a topic pertaining to an issue, debate, or trend in the field of early childhood education. Written review will include the following: introducing the topic, stating the problem, defining terms; identifying major issues, controversies, programs, and contributors related to the topic under discussion; synthesizing and analyzing research studies; making conclusions based on the review, and providing recommendations to teachers, administrators and parents in schools/preschools and to policy-makers.   Candidates are required to submit a reference list to include at least 10 research articles and at least 5 research-based articles relevant to the candidate's self selected topic for this assignment. This list will include research from the past 10 years. Historical references to landmark research of more than a decade ago will be clearly identified as such.

Grading criteria and rubric: The grading criteria for this assignment include three aspects (content, grammar, and writing format) and are based on a rubric (0-4 scale). The expectations for each level are qualitatively described in the rubric. The rubric for this assignment is posted on the course TaskStream site and the course Beachboard site (under the assignment section). The final version of the paper will be submitted and evaluated on Task Stream's e-portfolio system.

Grading Scale: The assignment is worth 60 points. Different components of this paper will be differentially weighted in the rubric based on their level of importance. The project bears a point total of 60. Here is the breakdown of the scores based on the rubric scale:

> 54-60 (4); 48-53 (3), 42-47 (2), 36-41 (1), below 36 (0)

Writing aspects: The paper will follow the writing format and the use of English grammar recommendations of the APA 5th edition manual. All papers must be written double-spaced using 12 point Times New Roman font with 1" margin from all sides.

Revision and late submission policy: In order to work for a higher grade and with the instructor's feedback, you are allowed to make one revision to your paper. The revised paper must be submitted on the Task Stream by the due date. Ten percent of the project's total points will be deducted if the paper is not submitted on due dates (for both the first and the final draft), unless the date for late submission is negotiated with the instructor.

Rubric clarification: The rubric will be introduced in the class including the weightage system and periodically revisited before the final submission of the paper. You will be assigned a partner to participate in the group page (of Beachboard) for this assignment. You will assist your partner in identifying resources, evaluate your partner's paper based on the rubric, and provide constructive feedback before the final draft is posted on the Taskstream.

Directions for posting the paper on the TaskStream

- Click on "Add/Edit Work" on the right side of your TaskStream screen.

- Select the "Attachments" tab at the top of the pull down screen.

- Click on "Browse" to locate the paper as a document file on your computer.

- Title the document file with First/Last name.

- Click on "Add File."

To submit for evaluation:

- Select the "Evaluation" tab #5 at the top of the screen.

- Click on the "Submit" button for EDEC 621.

Scoring Rubric:

Criteria	0= Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	1 = Does not meet expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	3 = Meets expectations	4 = Exceeds expectations	Score
Introducing the problem		Demonstrates no evidence of knowledge and understanding of introducing the problem under discussion.	-The introduction of the problem is at a very basic level and the significance of the topic is not described, -The problem statement is unclear; the scope of the review is unrealistic or not evident; - Definitions of most of the important concepts/ constructs are either missing or inappropriately stated.	-The introduction of the topic is somewhat unclear with regard to rationale, context, or significance; -The problem statement could have been developed better and the scope is either too broad or narrow; -Definitions for some important concepts/ constructs are missing and/or not appropriately stated.	-Introduction clearly states the rationale, context, and significance of the topic; -The problem is well stated and a reasonable as well as comprehensible scope for the review is established; -All important concepts/ constructs were appropriately defined.	
Major issues, controversies, programs, contributors		Demonstrates evidence of no understanding with regard to major issues, controversies, programs and contributors.	Demonstrates evidence of limited understanding with regard to major issues, controversies, programs and contributors.	Demonstrates evidence of adequate understanding with regard to major issues, controversies, programs and contributors (identifies them partly and explanations are somewhat clear).	Demonstrates evidence of advanced understanding with regard to major issues, controversies, programs and contributors (identifies them and provides clear and precise explanations).	
Synthesis and analysis of research studies		Demonstrates evidence of no understanding with regard to analyzing and synthesizing research studies	-Themes are not identified; - Citations reflect a superficial review of the topic; -Research studies are presented without interpretation, and without indication of significance; - No critique of research findings is attempted.	-Themes are appropriately identified, however not logically sequenced; - Discussions within the themes are organized around ideas rather than individual research studies; -Citations address some aspects of the problem; contrary findings are not presented; - Some findings are presented but their meaning or importance are not described; -Some findings are misinterpreted; - Some attempts are made to provide critique of research findings.	-Themes are appropriately identified and logically sequenced; - Discussions within the themes are organized around ideas rather than individual research studies; - Citations reflect a thorough review of the topic including opposing viewpoints; - Findings of the research are appropriately interpreted (and critiqued when appropriate) and their significance for the problem being investigated is clearly presented; - Identifies abundant and or missing research studies in particular areas within various themes/sub-themes.	

Criteria	0= Unable to score; incomplete or missing work	1 = Does not meet expectations	2 = Meets some expectations	3 = Meets expectations	4 = Exceeds expectations	Score
Conclusions		Demonstrates evidence of no understanding with regard to making conclusions based on the analysis and synthesis of available research studies on the problem under discussion.	-Conclusions not supported by findings; - Does not identify areas in which further research is needed.	-Not all conclusions are well-supported by findings; -Does not identify areas in which further research is needed.	- Conclusions are clearly based on reported findings; -Identifies areas in which further research is needed.	
Personal Reflections and Recommendations		Provides evidence of no personal reflections on the problem under discussion.	-Demonstrates evidence of limited personal reflections on the problem under discussion; -Reasonable course of action based on findings is not suggested.	-Provides adequate level of reflections with personal stand however without justifications; -Provides very general recommendations based on findings	-Provides advanced level of reflection with personal stand and justifications and identifies challenges; -Provides recommendations that are specifically targeted to different groups such as parents, teachers, future researchers, administrators, and policy-makers.	
APA style		APA 5th edition style is not followed at all.	APA 5th edition style is followed to a limited extent (margins, in-text citations) and not consistently.	APA 5th edition style is followed adequately (in-text citations, block quotations, reference list, running head).	APA 5th edition style is followed in all aspects of the writing (in-text citations, reference list, block quotations, running head, appropriate level of headings, and table and figures and other requirements).	
Grammar and organization		Multiple grammatical and stylistic errors	Some errors in grammar and/or format that do not interfere with clarity. However, the paper needs better organization and transition.	Few grammatical and/or stylistic errors. Organization of the paper is very good. Needs to work on transitional points.	Nearly error-free which reflects clear understanding and thorough proofreading. Organization is clear and transition from one section to the next flows very well.	
					Total	**/28**

*Note: The 0-4 College of Education score is calculated when TaskStream averages the individual criterion scores.