

Criterion (weightage)	Level 1 (Fair)	Level 2 (Good)	Level 3 (Excellent)
<u>Learning goals:</u> State the learning goals of the course or MOOC. (5%)	Learning goals stated, but are not clear regarding what students will learn.		Learning goals state clearly what the student is expected to learn from the material.
<u>Learning design and features:</u> Describe the learning design of the course or MOOC, identifying specific learning features (tasks, scaffolds, social rules, etc) and how they come together. (10%)	All learning features are not identified and the sequence is incorrect.		All the learning features - the task, scaffolds, and social rules - are identified and their sequencing is correct.
<u>Learning Theories or Pedagogical Models Used:</u> Describe which learning theories the course is (broadly) based on and your reasons for choosing this theory (15%)	A learning theory is mentioned, but the rationale for the choosing the theory is unconvincing.		The specific learning theories are articulated, along with a clear rationale for choosing these theories.
<u>Assessment of learning theory:</u> Assess whether the learning theories were appropriate for the learning goals above, with reasons (20%)	A weak argument, without any evidence, is made for the claim of how the identified learning theories are appropriate for the learning goal, partially or completely.		A strong argument is made for the claim of how the identified learning theories are appropriate for the learning goal, either partially or completely. Appropriate evidence is provided for the claim.

<u>Evaluation of learning design:</u> Evaluate if the design of the course engendered theorized learning processes that could lead to attaining your learning goals. (25%)	The learning design is evaluated, but a judgment is not made about whether the design leads to attaining the learning goals or not. The explanation of how the design does or doesn't engender the theorized learning processes to attain the learning goals is weak.		The learning design is evaluated in detail and a judgment is made about whether the design leads to attaining the learning goals or not. A rational explanation of how the design does or doesn't engender the theorized learning processes to attain the learning goals is provided.
<u>Redesign Features:</u> Describe how you would improve the course to achieve the learning goals. Describe the learning features you would add/change, which theories they are based on, and why you conjecture they would lead to the desired learning goals. (15%)	Learning feature suggestions are not provided or conjectures of how the suggested features would engender desirable processes are not presented.	Learning feature suggestions are provided but not grounded in learning theories. Conjectures of how the suggested features would engender desirable processes are presented, but don't align with the learning theories.	Learning feature suggestions grounded in the learning theories are provided for how the gaps previously identified in attaining the learning goals can be filled. Conjectures of how the suggested features would engender desirable learning processes are presented.
Overall organization (10%)	The report lacks meaningful organization and coherence.		The report is well-organized into paragraphs and sections. There is coherence between the paragraphs and sections.

Contribution of each person to -

- 1) The arguments developed for each of the criteria - Equal/ Partner 1/Partner 2
- 2) Writing of each section - Equal/Partner 1/Partner 2