FLO Design Rubric

The FLO Design workshop is a developmental learning opportunity; there are no "marks" or evaluative grading for your design project and participation. Building from a participatory, adult learning focus and a constructivist perspective, we adopted a reflective practice, studio-learning approach to encourage you to "make meaning" individually and in group activities.

To help you self-assess your learning progress in relationship to the FLO Design Learning Outcomes and the focus on collaborative learning and planning, the rubric identifies different criteria to apply to your participation and project development.

Criterion	Level 1: Beginning	Level 2: Developing	Level 3: Accomplished
Structure of Design Project Plan	Elements of plan disorganized Difficult to discern how learning is expected to occur. Little evidence of learner-centred design.	Basic structure is clear and logical. Descriptions, outcomes and objectives are clearly stated and appear relevant to primary purpose. Pedagogical choices for learning are evident; elements are aligned to outcomes statements. Some important principles of quality and accessibility are considered in the Plan.	Plan description contains pedagogical perspective, technological considerations, reasons for prototype activity selection and design. Plan includes consideration of learner in terms of flexibility, meaningfulness and expectations (time, resources, etc.)
Communication of Plan in Studio	Design Project Plan is presented briefly; little consideration of how to make it easier for audience to understand (language, design, method of presentation) No visuals None or little response to questions from	Plan is presented in detail - some consideration of layout design for understanding Plan is augmented with visuals - drawings or images or videos Presenter responds to questions in a	Plan is presented in a concise, easy-to-understand way (visuals are integrated and aid depth of understanding of content) Presentor adds audio or video explanations for more complex aspects or to explain pedagogical perspectives or

| | participants | timely fashion | technological choices.

Presenter responds to questions and engages in broader and deeper exploration of design challenges in education. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Feedback on Plan | Superficial feedback responses - limited to praise or minor defects

Llittle reference to list of online learning elements to consider or requests for specific feedback from presenters | Demonstrates appreciative, developmental approach when posing questions or sharing feedback.

Shows consideration of learner perspectives.

Some posts show little evidence of quality, pedagogical considerations in feedback. | Feedback is provided in a timely and meaningful way.

Questions invite further dialogue rather than stating opinions.

Reference made to requested feedback elements; links made to course design theory resources or related academic sources. |
| Participation in Workshop Events /Activities | Sporadic attendance in synchronous sessions or weekly activities

Limited efforts to participate in discussion.

Shows little engagement in course. | Attends synchronous sessions or reviews recordings and posts relevant questions and comments.

Provides weekly, clear descriptions of evolving design plan elements in Studio Forum.

Participates in weekly Reflections Forum. | Posts insightful or thought-provoking comments or questions in forums.

Responds quickly to support other participants.

Develops a consistent "presence" as an online community member. |
| Reflective Practice | Reflections on the course experiences and activities are infrequent or very brief | Regularly shares selected journal items that highlight personal learning and insights.

Integrates learning from setting objectives and/or rubric. | Notices key ideas and strategies from both readings and peers, and considers implications for practice. |