Rubric for Experiential Training

Ilke Evin Gencel [i]
Izmir Democracy University

Mustafa Erdogan [ii]
Experiential Training Center

Alice Y. Kolb [iii]
Experience Based Learning Systems

David A. Kolb [iv]
Experience Based Learning Systems

Abstract

The aim of this study was to develop a rubric as a measurement tool for experiential educators and with this purpose, we investigated a group of the participants on it. Assessing whether the experiential training process follows all four steps of the experiential learning cycle and determining correct or incorrect applications of the experiential learning theory will be functional to improve the quality of the implementation of the theory. The Rubric for Experiential Training has two main components. One of these components is the concept of Learning Spaces and the other is the concept of Educator Role Profiles. A phenomenological research design was chosen for this study to investigate the experiences of participants with the rubric. The participants of the study were 8 volunteers who took part in a training of trainers at the Experiential Training Center in Istanbul, Turkey. Data of the study was obtained through a focus group interview and analyzed through content analysis and interpreted holistically. According to the views of participants, The Rubric for Experiential Training has important functions such as increasing the level of awareness of planning and implementation processes of experiential training and enabling to receive feedback on the quality of the implementations.

Keywords: Experiential Learning, Learning Spaces, Educator Role Profiles, Rubric

----
[i] **Ilke Evin Gencel,** Prof. Dr., Educational Sciences, Izmir Democracy University, ORCID: 0000-0002-2113-701X

Correspondence: evingencel@gmail.com

[ii] **Mustafa Erdogan,** Expert, Experiential Training, Experiential Training Center

[iii] **Alice Y. Kolb,** Prof. Dr., Experience Based Learning Systems, Experience Based Learning Systems, ORCID: 0000-0003-1759-2738

[iv] **David A. Kolb,** Prof. Dr., Experience Based Learning Systems, Experience Based Learning Systems, ORCID: 0000-0001-5323-1345

INTRODUCTION

Experiential learning theory, in which the studies of James, Dewey, Follet, Lewin, Piaget, Vygotsky, Jung, Rogers and Freire (who had important contributions to the experiential learning) were influential, was theorized by Kolb in a holistic and concrete model in 1984. Since then, experiential learning theory has formed the subject of thousands of research and postgraduate studies carried out at different disciplines and education levels in many countries. Studies related to the Experiential Learning Theory increasingly continue.

Experiential Learning Theory explains learning as a process in which experiences are transformed into knowledge. Everyone has concrete experiences as a natural result of their interactions with other individuals and their environments. Individuals reflect these experiences in different ways. Reflective observations are effective for individuals to reach abstract notions, principles, and generalizations. The generalizations at issue guide individuals in their later experiences and learning. Hereby, this process continues in the form of a cycle, new experiences are gained, and these experiences play a directive role in later learning (Baker, Jensen, & Kolb, 2002; Kolb, 1984)

The main idea in experiential learning is that learning is a holistic phenomenon and a process based on experience. In this context, the basic propositions of experiential learning theory are summarized as follows (Kolb & Kolb, 2005).

- Learning should be conceived as a process and not as outcomes. In the planning of education, continuous restructuring of the experience should be ensured.

- As a matter of fact, all learning is re-learning. Throughout the learning process, the learners' ideas can be examined, tested, integrated with new ideas, and new learning can be provided.

- Learning process includes differences such as ideas, reflections, and problem-solving styles of the learners. These differences play a directive role for them in their further learning processes.

- Learning is a holistic process involving experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and acting for consistency purpose.

- Learning occurs in a way that individuals assimilate new experiences and adapt these to the concepts gained through previous experiences and associate these concepts with new experiences.

- Learning is based on the constructivist theory explaining that the learner creates "learning", but not on the traditional teaching focusing on transferring previously known and immutable ideas.

On the grounds of these propositions, the experiential learning cycle is structured as concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. In this process, prehension and transformation are the two dimensions supporting each other. Experiential learning cycle has been associated with the learning ways, which are concrete experience and abstract conceptualization in the prehension dimension while it has been associated with reflective observation and active experimentation in the transformation dimension. Learning occurs in the process of resolving the creative tension among these four learning ways. An ideal learning process requires a configuration suitable for this cycle. This process can be summarized as experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and acting (Kolb, 2015).

Two core principles in experiential learning can be stated that *learning occurs as a result of experiences, and individuals do not always learn in the same way*. Since individuals learn in different ways, learning styles classification, which is one of the important components of the experiential learning theory, has been made. Learning styles can vary depending on individuals' genetic structures, life experiences, and environmental conditions. According to this, in the beginning, four basic learning styles have been classified namely *diverging, assimilating, converging, and accommodating* (Kolb, 2000). The consideration that individuals can adopt different learning styles at the same time, and the data obtained from experimental and clinical studies over the years, showed that these four original learning styles (Accommodating, Assimilating, Converging, and Diverging) could be transformed into a nine-style typology which would be able to better define unique individual learning style patterns and reduce the limitations encountered in the old four-style typology (Eickmann, Kolb and Kolb, 2004; Kolb and Kolb, 2005). Thus, learning styles have been grouped as initiating, experiencing, imagining, acting, balancing, reflecting, deciding, thinking, and analyzing. Each learning style has been created with the combination of different learning ways in the cycle, which continues from concrete experience to active experimentation (Kolb & Kolb, 2013). Learning environments created in accordance with the experiential learning cycle are the environments suitable for these different learning styles at the same time. Each student has the opportunity to put the strengths to work, compensate for the weaknesses he/she has, and turn these weaknesses into strengths since he/she is involved in every stage of the cycle.

The Educator Role Profiles

Teaching in the context of the learning cycle and different learning styles has brought with it the need for the educators to reorganize the role they take on for their students. The Educator Role Profile has been created to assist educators to comprehend the teaching role that they prefer and to plan how they can adapt to teaching designed around the learning cycle. Educator Role Profiles emerge as a combination of teaching role preferences, beliefs about teaching and learning, goals related to the education process, preferred teaching styles and educational practices. Educator roles aren't limited to the individuals who take on official in-class training tasks. This frame can be used for all individuals who "have the role of teaching" in every step of life such as leaders, trainers, parents, and friends. Educator Role Profile defines four role positions namely Facilitator, Expert, Evaluator and Coach. Educators adopt these roles to support students to go through the four stages of experiential learning and maximize their learning capacities (Kolb & Kolb, 2017).

The characteristics related to the Educator Role Profiles developed in the context of experiential learning theory can be summarized as follows (Kolb & Kolb, 2013; Kolb & Kolb, 2017).

The Facilitator Role: In the facilitator role, educators assist students to establish connections with their personal experiences and reflect on these. They adopt a sincere and positive style to reveal the students' interests, intrinsic motivations, and self-knowledge. They mainly realize this by promoting dual conversations in small groups. They establish a personal relationship with students.

The Subject Expert Role: In the subject expert role, educators assist students to connect their reflections to the knowledge base of the subject. They adopt an authoritative and reflective style. While systematically organizing and analyzing the subject matter knowledge, they generally teach by giving examples, modelling, and encouraging critical thinking. This knowledge is conveyed mainly through lectures and written texts.

The Standard-Setter/Evaluator Role: Educators as standard setters and evaluators assist students to become versed with the application of knowledge and skill so they can meet their students' performance requirements. They adopt an objective and result-oriented teaching style, which helps them determine the knowledge requirements needed for quality performance. They create performance activities for students to evaluate their own learning processes.

The Coaching Role: Educators who adopt the coaching role teach students to use the knowledge to achieve their goals. To help them learn from their life experiences, they often work with them individually and adopt a collaborative and encouraging style. They help construct personal development plans and provide ways of receiving feedback on performance.

The study of Educator Role Profiles has formed a quite complementary frame for the field of experiential learning. An explanation related to what kind of roles the educators should take on to follow this holistic cycle in their programs has taken its place in the field of experiential learning.

Debriefing is another must of the experiential learning-based education. The experience remains just as an activity unless it is reflected on and conceptualized. A debriefing session, which is well planned to transform experience into learning and is managed properly, is an inseparable part of the experiential learning cycle. The debriefing model set forth by Kolb takes students from experience to learning by enabling them to go through several stages. Stage one focuses on what students feel and experience during the activity. Stage two puts forward different perspectives by correlating an individual's experience with others' experiences. Stage three makes students establish a connection between the concepts in the current activity and previously learnt concepts and lead them to think about how to broaden the scope of the activity. Stage four focuses on to enable students to link up the activity and the real world (Kolb, Rubin, & Osland, 1995).

Experiential learning programs are the programs in which the experiential learning cycle is followed both in the methods used and in the whole. For this reason, in the curriculum design process, it is necessary to pay attention not only to the compatibility of each workshop or the method used in each workshop with experiential learning but also to the compatibility of the general flow of the program with the experiential learning cycle.

Learning Spaces

To enable a student to participate in the learning cycle fully, space should be provided to be included in the four modes of the cycle. This learning space should be safe and supportive, but also challenging. It should allow students to be responsible for their own learning processes and allocate time for repeated activities to improve proficiency (Kolb & Kolb, 2013). It is necessary for educators to elaborately set up the learning habitat where learning will occur the most efficiently. The learning space has a meaning far beyond the physical environment where learning occurs. It is a versatile concept comprising physical, cultural, institutional, social, and psychological dimensions of learning in its entirety. All these dimensions come together in the experience of the learner. The concept of learning space is based on the studies of Lewin, Bronfenbrenner, Vygotsky, Nonaka, and Konno, who examined the relationship between the human development and the environment (Kolb & Kolb, 2017). Another concept emphasizing the importance of the learning space is the continuity of the experience, which is one of the elementary concepts in Dewey's educational philosophy. This continuity regulates the experiences that encourage or impede learning. "The fact that the whole true learning occurs through experience doesn't mean that all experiences are literally educative. Some experiences teach the wrong. A mis-educative experience has an effect to stop or misdirect the progression of further experiences. Therefore, the primary concern of an experience-based education is to select the type of current experiences which will function fruitfully and creatively in further experiences" (Dewey, 1938: 25-28). For this reason, the increase in experiential learning can be ensured by creating learning spaces encouraging "developmental" experiences for students.

While creating a positive learning space, the feelings of hope and fear inevitably accompany the learning process. The hope is about specialization, understanding, and strengthening that comes with them. Fear, by the way, has many aspects. We are afraid of making mistakes, failing, feeling embarrassed and humiliated in front of others, and even questioning our own identities and self-worth. Thus, our uphill task as educators is to understand the hopes, expectations and fears of the learners and create a learning space where they will get respect and support to overcome their fears and specialize

in their subject matters. A hospitable learning space is a setting where the learners feel safe psychologically; they and their experiences get respect; they meet with an unconditionally positive approach, and a balanced challenge and support. Breaking the ice between the learners, being interested in their experiences, interests, and ideas, and making them feel that they belong to a learning community are the basic characteristics of this positive learning space (Kolb & Kolb, 2017). Another important aspect of this state of "feeling safe" is that it is a necessity set forth by the experiential learning methodology. Learners should be able to share their experiences, feelings, and opinions comfortably as they progress through the experiential learning cycle. And for this, they need a sense of trust that the group will not judge them and respect their feelings.

A learner-centered learning space is an environment in which the educator accompanies the learner in his/her experience; life experiences of the learner and how he/she understands these experiences constitute the starting point of the education. The whole learning process progresses by building itself around the learner's experience holistically. The role of the educator should also circle around this approach. The whole methodology and the content should take shape based on the active participation of the students. This is a space where the learners' attention, interests and beliefs are revealed, and the learning process is started based on these. Another prominent characteristic of the learner-centered learning space is that the educator collaborates with the learners. The educator is the expert of the education subject and the practitioner of the teaching-learning process but in the spaces where the educators are in the learner's position, learners are empowered (Kolb & Kolb, 2017). To build up all these features, it is quite important to get to know the learners, to discover what they expect from the curriculum, what attracts their attention, and to give room where they will contribute to the curriculum as "edifier".

One of the points worth noting for educators to create an appropriate learning space for experiential learning is to form a ludic learning space. The leading scientists of experiential learning, Piaget, Dewey, and Vygotsky in the first place, emphasized how important play is in the development process of learning. In the experiential learning theory, play and learning are two inseparable elements for human development. The play has an important role not only in child development but also adult development. However, how adults connect with play is different from children. Play occurs in the dialectic between being irrational and rational; playful and serious; imaginary and real, and arbitrary and framed with rules. For this reason, contrary to children who can turn anything they find into a plaything in an instant, adults need to step into a different plane of reality to play a game. Therefore, to create a ludic learning space, a positive and unbiased ecosystem, where they will be able to move on to this different plane of reality, is needed. The primary basic principle of this ecosystem is that playing should be voluntary. Adults play freely and voluntarily in such a space. Another principle is that the game rules are the most important elements that both set the boundaries of this space and maintain it. Play is an excellent tool to create a deep "concrete experience" in the experiential learning cycle (Kolb & Kolb, 2017).

To create a space for conversational learning is another important dimension in creating a learning space. In fact, the main purpose of a dual conversation is learning. During the dual conversation, the individual moves along a learning cycle where speaking and listening are combined. There are many forms of creating a conversational learning space such as creating a physical space where the educator sits in a circle with the learners rather than sitting at a table in front of them or creating an emotional space supported by this physical space and open to listening to each learner. Conversational learning space has two different aspects; the first of which is the boundaries defining and maintaining this space, and the second is the internal process shaping the conversation. As the conversation goes on boundaries reshape the internal processes and internal processes reshape the boundaries. To keep the balance between the experience and reflective dialectic, during the conversation, feelings and abstract rational subjects should be handled elaborately and in a balanced manner. For a balanced discursive and recursive dialectic, it is necessary to allocate appropriate time to the process in which the individuals explain how they understand the handled topic at the beginning, and to the process in which they share their reinterpretation of the topic at the end of the

conversation. To employ individuality and rationality dialectic in a balanced way, the individuals should both express their own thoughts and share their experiences related to these thoughts. To tread a fine line between the status and the solidarity, it is necessary to provide a space, where learners can defend their arguments and connect with others' arguments. Therefore, the educator should handle the process of conversation as a whole, forge a link between the conversations made in the different periods, and create a conversation space that develops organically based on the learners' attention and interests (Kolb & Kolb, 2017).

Reflective Thinking and Deep Learning are another two elements to be considered in creating learning spaces. The process of transition from the condition of thinking to the condition of reflective thinking can be defined with three fundamental stages that progress from dualism to multiplicity, from multiplicity to relativism and from relativism to commitment. In the stage of dualism, the world appears to the eyes of the learners as a certainty consisting of only rights and wrongs. There are correct answers for all questions, educators have these answers, and they are responsible for teaching what is correct to the learners. In the stage of multiplicity, knowledge is absolute only in some areas, but in many areas, nothing can be certain. In this stage, uncertainty is considered temporary, each person's opinion is as valid as everyone's. The learners realize that not every answer, the educator will give, begin to approach the subject from different perspectives and examine the views of others. In the stage of relativism, learners are aware of that the knowledge is contextual and relative. There isn't one right or wrong. They begin to analyze the weak and strong sides of their and others' arguments. Finally, in the stage of commitment, learners select the most appropriate point of view for themselves by testing and evaluating different points of view. They create their own synthesis and this synthesis shapes their own personalized values, lifestyles, and identities at the same time. The notion of deep learning refers to a development process that holistically integrates with the four modes (having an experience, reflecting, concluding, acting) of experiential learning. To create spaces that improve and maintain deep learning, first, it is necessary to provide a space in which learners repeat their experiences and their learning spreads over time. This space requires a process that the educators provide support, and the learners go through the experiential learning cycle, show their performances, and receive feedback. The progress in the process of deep learning takes place in the model of development stages of the experiential learning theory consisting of three stages namely acquisition, specialization, and integration. In the first stage, learning is registrative and performance oriented. In this stage, two learning modes, in which only learning style is emphasized, are used. In the second stage, learning is interpretative and the focus in on learning itself. In this stage, the learner is in a process that includes the three learning modes of the cycle. In the third stage, learning is integrative and development oriented. In this stage, the learner can include four learning modes of the cycle into a holistic learning process called as full-cycle learning. Creating spaces that develop and maintain deep learning requires educators to get into different roles in these spaces. First, an educator needs to discern which relevant development stage the learners are in. The facilitator role is the most appropriate educative role for the learners in the acquisition stage while the standard-setter and evaluator role for the learners in the specialization stage, and the coaching role for the learners in the integration stage. Another key element supporting deep learning is that the curriculum has a methodology enabling to progress through the whole cycle. Hereby learners will be able to progress in a development process touching on the four modes of the cycle. This progress will bring together learning flexibility and facilitate learners to move towards the ultimate point of development called full-cycle learning (Kolb & Kolb, 2017).

Rubric for Experiential Training

Practicing experiential learning in full compliance with the experiential learning theory is directly related to the experiential learner training activities. To meet the needs for the evaluation process of these training activities, it was decided to develop a rubric for experiential training. The assessment of whether the application processes follow all four steps of the experiential learning cycle in the trainer training activities, whether the experiential learning cycle is introduced properly, the knowledge level of the educators about the learning styles, and right or wrong applications of the

experiential learning will be functional to improve the quality of the applications. In general, in the development process of the rubric for experiential training, the steps suggested by Goodrich (2000) was followed, and these steps are respectively listing the criteria, deciding the rubric type (An analytic rubric was developed because the focus was on the evaluation of the process.), determining performance indicators and making level definitions (The highest performing participant gets 4 points while the lowest-performing participant gets 1 point.) and receiving the views of the subject matter experts.

In the rubric for experiential training, two main components, which take place in the theory and explained above briefly, were selected to measure the accordance of a curriculum with the experiential learning theory. One of these components is the concept of Learning Spaces, and the other is the concept of Educator Role Profiles. The learning spaces refer to a learning habitat that is necessary to be designed for an experiential learning-based curriculum. Unless this habitat is built holistically, the learning process in it will not be entirely experiential. Educator role profiles offer a conceptual framework about the necessity for an educator to follow a diversified methodology in the curriculum that moves around the experiential learning cycle. Since learning is considered holistic in the experiential learning theory only when all four modes of the cycle are touched, it is possible to understand whether a curriculum includes the entire experiential learning cycle by observing what roles educators play in these learning spaces. For this reason, while learning spaces define the ecosystem of the curriculum, educator role profiles emphasize the roles that the educators play in this ecosystem. While the concept of learning space defines six different learning spaces in itself, the concept of educator role profiles defines four different educator roles in itself. Thus, the rubric took the subcomponents (6+4=10 subcomponents) of these two main components as a direct reference. Rubrics consist of criteria that are used to measure performance, behavior, or qualification (Campbell, A., 2005).

Quality Criteria to Be Evaluated

After the determination of ten subcomponents, quality criteria have been developed to ensure each subcomponent to be fully included in a curriculum. In total, 29 quality criteria emerged. Quality indicators with four scales were specified (In total, 116 indicators) to measure how each quality criterion is met in a curriculum. Indicators with four scales were divided into the following basic levels.

Unacceptable: This level means that no data are available in the curriculum to meet the relevant quality criterion (1 point).

Unsatisfactory: This level means that there was an endeavor to add the relevant quality criterion, it was applied quite incompletely and incorrectly, and it needs to be improved greatly (2 points).

Needs Improvement: This level means that the relevant quality criterion takes place in the curriculum prominently, but some qualifications underlined by the theory are still missing and it needs a small improvement (3 points).

Satisfactory: This level means that the relevant quality criterion takes place in the curriculum in a way to include all elementary qualifications indicated in the theory (4 points).

It is suggested to use this qualitative measurement tool with the 180-degree assessment method. At the end of the training, much more significant results will be obtained in the case that both educator(s) and participants score separately, and the curriculum is evaluated by getting an average of the average score of the participants and the average score of the educator(s). Besides this tool can be used as a self-reflection tool that the educators evaluate their previous curricula. Finally, this tool can

be used not only for the purpose of evaluation after the training program ends but also as a checklist for preparation when designing the curriculum.

The components of the Rubric for The Experiential Training and the quality criteria were summarized in the Table 1 below.

Table 1. The components of the rubric for the experiential training and the quality criteria

COMPONENT	SUBCOMPONENT	QUALITY CRITERION
LEARNING SPACES	Creating a hospitable learning space	Getting to know each other
		Group Dynamic
		Basic Rules
	Creating a learner-centered learning space	Expectations & Contributions
		Methodology
		Participant Assessment
	Creating a ludic learning space	Energizers
		Learning games
		Having fun
	Creating a conversational learning space	Discussion
		Analysis
		Natural development of conversation
	Creating a space for reflective thinking	From dualism to multiplicity
		From multiplicity to relativism
		From relativism to commitment
	Creating spaces to develop and maintain deep learning	Learning Styles & Learning Flexibility
		Development Stages
EDUCATOR ROLES	Facilitator	Experience related to the topic
		Participants' own experiences
		Reflection
	Subject Matter Expert	Collecting knowledge and analyzing it
		Associating knowledge
		Knowledge sources
	Standard Setter & Evaluator	Setting the standards
		Feedback
		Self-Assessment
	Coach	Coaching
		Learning Plan
		Real Life Applications

The first part of the Rubric for Experiential Training is about learning spaces while the second part is about educator roles (Appendix-I).

Rubric for Experiential Training is the first standardized measurement tool to evaluate the appropriateness of the learning environments created by the experiential educators. In this sense, we believe that it will be functional in self-assessment of trainers, evaluation of the learning environments of learners and trainers, and increasing the quality of experiential learning. In this study, the Rubric for Experiential Training was administered to a group of participants who attended experiential trainer training program and the aim was to get their reflections and suggestions regarding to the rubric.

METHOD

This study, which examines the reflections and suggestions of a group of experiential educators on Rubric for Experiential Training, can be considered within the phenomenological design which is one of the qualitative research methods. Phenomenological design is often utilized to attain a deeper understanding of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). Because phenomenological design investigates how individuals comprehend, see, and transfer their experiences to their minds (Patton,

2014). In this study, experiences of the study group of the Rubric for Experiential Training were investigated as a phenomenon. The program of the training of trainers lasted 9 weeks. In one week (56 hours) of the program, face-to-face education was carried out and the rest of the program was interactive online education (24 hours). Online education was carried out in the online platform based on experiential learning theory; DeM-Land (Appendix II). At the end of the program, Rubric for Experiential Training was administered to the participants.

Participants

The Rubric for Experiential Training was applied to 20 participants who took part in a training of trainers at the Experiential Training Center in İstanbul, Turkey in July 2020, and participants' reflections were requested. 8 volunteers whose professions are teacher, researcher, youth worker, training manager, and psychological counsellor submitted their opinions on the rubric.

Data Collection

Data of the study was obtained through a focus group interview. The purpose of the focus group discussion is to reflect on the perspectives, experiences, and tendencies of the participants about a specified topic (Bowling, 2002). Participants of the focus group interview should be among 4-10 persons. According to Edmunds (2000) if the group consists of more than 10 people, the dynamics of the group could be weakened, the interaction between the participants may lose its effect and the control of the group may become more difficult. In this study, there were 8 participants, and this is an appropriate number for a focus group interview. During the interview, researchers asked open-ended questions to the participants about their experiences, thoughts, and suggestions for the training and the Rubric for Experiential Training. The focus group interview lasted 130 minutes and was recorded with the permission of the participants. After the transcription of the record, participants' approvals were obtained as well.

Data Analysis

Since there are no generalization concerns in focus group interviews, findings should be presented without digitization (Fern, 2001). In this study, data was analyzed through content analysis. Statements of the participants were quoted directly and interpreted holistically. In this process, two experts in experiential education worked together.

Validity and Reliability

For the internal consistency of the study, and to avoid the researcher bias, two different researchers studied on the content analysis process, deciding the quoting parts separately. After this process match percentage of the content analysis was %89. For the verifiability of the study, the record of the focus group interview was preserved. For the trustworthiness of the study, participants controlled the result of the content analysis and quotes. For the transferability of the study, the research method, characteristics of the participants, data collection and interpretation process were explained in detail.

FINDINGS

The focus group interview was conducted by two researchers as moderators. There were five rounds during the interview. Findings were presented as reflections on The Rubric for Experiential Training based on quotations of the participants' statements.

Reflections on The Rubric for Experiential Training

Participant 1 stated: *"This rubric for experiential training provides feedback to the studies designed and applied and ensures the quality of the evaluations. It enabled me to see the strong and weak sides of my works and evaluate the training activities that I gave as an experiential educator. The rubric will ensure the achievement to the attainments determined by considering the functionality of the experiential learning cycle as a whole. It will have detected at which points the cycle is strong or weak."*

Participant 2 explained: *"The rubric is quite meaningful as an evaluation tool showing how inclusive we are in the process of creating a learning space and how much we pay regard to the flexibility to enhance the depth of learning. On the other hand, it gives clues as to in what dimensions educator role profiles can stretch in the process of constructing learning spaces. It let me realize that in my previous training activities, my own potential was prominent rather than the participants'. That is to say, the rubric raised my awareness of how I need to design learning spaces according to educator roles and learning styles during the designation of the training while creating spaces where I can exhibit my professional skills at an optimum level. So much so that because my points related to developing and maintaining deep learning were unsatisfactory, I added some activities to my next training to create these learning spaces. Most of the time, we, educators are quite resistant to change and involvement of the participants in the experiential processes to protect our existing spaces. Of course, there are many other reasons but when we interpret the situation in terms of experiential training; training activities will gain meaning from some aspects such as the creation of learning depth, improvement of educator competencies, involvement of the participants in the learning process through their life experiences, the functionality of abstract conceptualization and transformation processes, and evolution of acquired knowledge into an experience rather than access to information. It will shed light on how much educators are able to share the authority by decentralizing it in the activities that they will carry out with the experiential training methodology. It will also give the opportunity to recognize all patterns, which may affect learning processes, and operationalize the mechanism of inclusion into learning."* It is understood that the rubric raised the participant's (as an experiential educator) awareness of the process and the applications and contributed to self-regulation following this awareness.

Participant 3 stated: *"A rubric prepared in detail. A wonderful tool that I can use as a checklist when planning my training as a teacher… It enabled me to realize the points that I overlooked when preparing the content of my training. It let me get prepared in a more planned and holistic way. I will be able to plan my next training activities more extensively. It will ensure the planned sessions to remain in the center of experiential training."* With these comments, participant 3 pointed out the function of the rubric in the stage of planning according to the experiential learning theory besides its function of evaluation.

Participant 4 was an academician and indicated his/her opinions as: *"After the training activities that I will carry out in accordance with the experiential learning cycle, it will be useful for self-assessment. I want to use it to improve my training in keeping with the cycle and raise my self-awareness of the shortcomings in the training activities. The rubric enabled me to realize both whether I move through the experiential learning cycle and how much I could do this in the training that I designed, and at what rate and in what proportion the activities included (to complete the cycle) in the training module are completed in compliance with the cycle. In this way, it helped me revise two dimensions of my training both quantitatively and qualitatively and develop a kind of self-awareness. When educators test their training activities according to the rubric at every turn, this will contribute to the completion of the experiential learning cycle in an excellent/ideal way. When educators evaluate and improve their training and professional skills after each training, this will contribute to the experiential training as well. Besides, since the rubric requests to give information about the experiential training, it will contribute the experiential training to become widespread and popular.* Participant 4 also made some suggestions: *"Especially for the short-term programs, it was*

difficult to answer the questions in the sections Deep Learning and Learning Plans, and Real-Life Applications. Maybe, the answer choices for short and long-term programs can be differentiated. Or different versions of the rubric can be developed for the short-term modules and the long-term programs.

Similar to the other participants, participant 5 drew attention to the fact that the rubric raised the awareness in terms of the teaching profession and explained: *"The rubric is very useful and raises the awareness of trainer identity, and also reveals the tendency of an educator in the teaching profession. First, it provides educators to realize the main features and tendencies of trainer identities. Additionally, it may let them see in which areas (regarding the studies in the field of education) they can be more flexible."*

Participant 6 indicated: *"I think the rubric shows what and how learners learn and where they have rough edges. It doesn't focus on absolute success or absolute failure. And this provides learners with motivating support to improve themselves and an opportunity for self-knowledge. This rubric let me (as a youth worker) realize that the evaluation methods used in the youth work were lacking. We learn what and how learners attain, awareness is gained but we fall short in maintaining it. It is required to develop the methods that will ensure this continuity. The use of this rubric, I think, will enable the experiential training to be practiced in the daily life more, because the learners' acquisitions from the experiential training and the return of these acquisitions will be better understood."*

Participant 7 who is a training manager shared his/her reflections and stated: *"This rubric is favorable in terms of offering a clear perspective in the context of learning spaces and educator role profiles. The fact that it enabled me to ascertain a subject on deep learning that I considered as deficient fostered my awareness seriously to develop the process. The application of the rubric after the determination of learning styles and educator role profiles specifies your position in the cycle more transparently. In this regard, the application of the whole content by the educators can make a more significant contribution because the feedbacks of the three determinants are different from each other and as you gain experience in the cycle you are able to make sense of it more. Thanks to the rubric enhancing the self-awareness of the educator, your road map becomes more meaningful.*

Participant 8 who is a psychological counsellor stated: *"The rubric, I think, was an excellent tool to reflect on a curriculum and receive feedback on our design. The fact that it handled the curriculum design from such a broad framework opened my mind. After the application of rubric, frankly, I started to design the training programs from a broader framework. Before I met the Experiential Training Centre, I used to design something to transform knowledge or an idea into an experience. After I met the Experiential Training Centre my mind was opened with the idea that the experience would serve the cycle. With this rubric, I realized how much before and after of this experience also serve the learning process. I told myself that designing a module isn't just about creating an experience and analyzing it. I think when educators use this rubric; participants will be involved in the experience much more and after the experience, a deep learning process will occur firmly. Besides, a personal feedback mechanism is working here. Somehow, not every trainer is able to work with a team and may receive feedback to the training program or module that he/she prepared. This tool gives the trainer an opportunity to receive feedback both in the frame of his/her profession and making learners experience the cycle. And this actually serves the process of planning and carrying into active practice again while preparing this module. I believe that this tool actually gives room to educators to complete their own learning cycles in the instructional design. I think the idea that the educator prepares this process by going through that cycle during the preparation of an experiential learning space is exciting. In this regard, I think the rubric contributes to experiential learning."*

As it is seen, related to the rubric developed for the training of experiential trainers, important advantages were addressed such as raising the level of awareness regarding the process of planning

and implementing, enhancement of the quality, and maintaining applications in compliance with the experiential learning theory. It was emphasized that different versions of the rubric (prepared for the training of trainers) could be developed for different types and levels of education and hereby, educational practices in different levels could be carried out in accordance with the experiential learning theory.

To examine the participants' opinions about the rubric in more depth two of the authors held an online focus group meeting with five female and two male participants on July 27, 2020. The focus group interview lasted 1 hour and 17 minutes. After the purpose of the focus group meeting was explained participants' opinions and suggestions about the Rubric for Experiential Training were received.

In the first round, a question inquiring the intelligibility of the rubric was asked to reveal whether the rubric was applicable for different groups. Participants were asked whether this measurement tool was intelligible for the individuals who didn't attend the experiential learning training of trainers but want to carry out learning activities in accordance with the experiential learning theory. Answers given to this question were in the direction that the individuals who didn't attend the training activity could also use the rubric. Participant 1 explained: *"It can be applied easily. Even it may produce more accurate results. That is to say, individuals who already received training about experiential learning; the ones with a vast accumulation of knowledge may lay low and sing small, that is they can give acceptable and satisfactory answers. Of course, this situation is possible for all self-reported data collecting tools but what I mean is this rubric is intelligible, its structure is available to be applied to different individuals, I wanted to say this.* Participant 2 explained: *"... This rubric is like a confrontation..."* Participant 3 indicated: *"I think the correct target audience of this rubric is the ones who attended this training like us. The others can't answer thoroughly. Let's talk about creating a positive learning space, I know since I have been giving training to teachers. To the question of whether the participants know each other well enough if only the names are known, the teachers will answer yes. However, a welcoming environment created through icebreakers and acquaintance games is actually in question. I think those who are far from the fields of non-formal learning and experiential learning can't answer in a way to serve the purpose. They can give answers, but their perspectives will be different from ours."* At this point, the interviewer felt the need to remind the participants of the explanation regarding the grading in the rubric. The indicators defined for the four-point competency in the question "Did participants get to know each other?" were reminded. Following this reminder, the participant said: *"Yes, then, maybe, I need to change the statement like the ones who didn't participate in the training of experiential trainers cannot reach the fourth level. That is actually understandable when we look at the explanations."* Participant 4 explained the opinions and gave some suggestions: *"Some questions, I think, can be answered by the persons who didn't take the training of experiential trainers. It will also be beneficial for the trainer to reflect. When I examine in terms of in-depth learning, some items wouldn't work for them in this sense. I think this rubric should be developed in different versions for short, long-term training activities, for the ones who attend/, do not attend the training of trainers, or the ones who provide formal or non-formal education."* Other participants agreed with this view.

In the second round, participants were asked whether the rubric could be applied with 180-degree feedback or not, and the opinions of the trainers and those who attended the training to carry out a mutual assessment. Participant 3 told: *"The trainer could think himself/herself to have practiced very well, he/she could assess himself/herself by taking credit for his/her practices. However, it will be very good to apply it mutually to observe whether this redounded on the participant in the same way."* Participant 1 indicated a view: *"Applying it in this way will be very useful as a feedback tool. We can see where the common views of the trainer and the participant come together. Everything may look very beautiful from the lens of trainers or nothing may be good but let's see from what perspective the participants see. The mutual application will be good to determine whether any participants were neglected or if there are ones who didn't get involved in the process."* Participant 6 stated: *"To apply the rubric 180 degrees will raise the participants' awareness, they can assimilate*

the experiential training more." With the consensus of all participants, an idea was formed that addition can be made to the suggestion given in the previous question round. In answers given to the previous question, the suggestion was that the versions of the rubric could be developed for short and long-term training activities and formal and non-formal education. In this round, a consensus was reached that the development of a trainer-learner version of the rubric will bring to more valid results. When participant 7 told: *"It will be good if this rubric is applied both at the beginning and at the end of the training. That is, I want to say an application like pre and post-tests. We do these in our studies and research in the field. New questions may also be added to check the consistency of the answers."* the other participants told that this rubric was more suitable for the end of a process. Following these opinions, all participants agreed that before attending the training, individuals who would participate in the training of trainers could be provided to evaluate any X program that belonged to them according to the rubric, and after that, at the end of the training, they could evaluate their own programs with the same rubric again and the results would be examined. It was indicated that it would be appropriate to name the developed rubric as "Experiential Training Rubric 1.0", develop different or updated versions in the direction of applications and number these like 1.1 or 2.0.

In the third round, considering the fact that almost every participant indicated in the written reflections that the rubric created educators' awareness, their opinions were asked on this subject. Participant 2 told: *"The fact that it enables educators to reflect on the training that they applied is actually like metacognitive thinking."* Participant 1 explained: *"I gave both formal and non-formal training. Especially, I had difficulty in formal education because I felt that I was a coach but not a teacher. That is there is self-awareness but if you give training at more than one field or place, the answers actually change according to the context, we also realize this. Educator role profiles aren't also stable; we also see this. It is important in terms of making educators realize on what subjects, how much and to what extent they can stretch. That is, I can say that it creates self-awareness of the educator's own area of freedom. In addition, speaking for myself, I want to add that it enabled me to be aware of the difference between what I want to do and what I do."* Participant 3 explained: *"the rubric actually made me say that Oh! Actually, I didn't do very well for the things that I thought I did very well especially when I took stock of myself according to the indicators. I said that I didn't pay attention to this. My awareness increased in this respect. This has been a checklist for a trainer, and I liked this very much."* Participant 5 stated: *"If you don't know so much about the subject, it raises your awareness; if you do know about the subject, the awareness of the dimensions increases. That is, in either case, it increases. It is important in terms of keeping in the experiential learning cycle. Are you moving through the cycle? How right are you moving through the cycle?"* Participant 6 told: *"I agree with my friends. I assumed that I applied experiential training in my previous training activities when I gave learners experience and make them talk about that experience. I didn't outside the box, I realized this. Applying this rubric actually meant for me to re-experience the stage of concrete experience. So, the cycle continued in a spiral. My occupation as a trainer is also an experience and the rubric at the end of it is a new experience. That is, I didn't get into a new cycle after giving the training, but I am going into a new experience with the rubric, I realized this. Simply, this has been a breaking point for me. The things that I said I had short here dragged me into a new experience. The rubric has become a trigger for me."* Participants 4 told: *"A road map and gives autonomy, I think."* and Participant 7 indicated: *"It actually provides to realize their own learning styles as well as educator roles."*

In the fourth round, participants were asked how the existence of such a rubric could be evaluated in terms of a contribution to the experiential learning theory alongside the inventories Kolb's Learning Styles and Educator Role Profiles. Participant 1 contributed: *"We all have different backgrounds. It can be revealed with this rubric, which ones of the people with trainer identity and having different foundations have a facility with experiential learning, and a contribution can be made to the experiential learning theory in this regard. Depending on this, it can be revealed in what fields experiential learning can be applied easily or in what fields it has many limitations.* With the contribution of all participants, there has been a consensus in the idea that a blow would be struck by associating the answers given in the rubric to the answers given to the independent variable questions

(which will be added to the top of the developed rubric) such as age, job experience, and level of education.

In the fifth round, participants were asked what they would like to add in general. Participant 4 contributed: "*We, for example, knew about the learning spaces theoretically but in practice, we see what we should do to reach the ideal situation. In the educator role profiles, the rubric answers when I do what, I will become a subject matter expert, and when I do what, I will become a coach. So, this is not only an evaluation tool for me but also a tool for learning.*" Participant 2 explained: "*Since the questions in the second part, in the educator role profiles, embodied the requirements that I met, they were good for me.*" Participant 3 explained: "*Actually, as in the other measurement tools used in the experiential learning theory, situations, where people are dominant, are determined; there is no labelling for you; I think a very beautiful application to make up shortages.*" Participant 1 stated: "*When it is considered in terms of educator roles, the rubric is very didactic in the way of telling you that you will get 4 points if you do this and this. That is, you see, when I do what and with which indicators, I will reach that profile.*" With the consensus of all participants, it was stated that there might be a misunderstanding such as perceiving the profile of subject matter expert as a person who was really an expert on a subject, and it was necessary to feature that this was a role by emphasizing it in the training activities. Participant 5 contributed to the process with the views: "*It became very good that the indicators of the educator role profiles were written so clearly. If there are conceptual confusions, this can be eliminated.*" and Participant 7 indicated: "*It was important for me to see that I myself could stretch both in the learning spaces and in the educator role profiles.*" Participant 6 contributed: "*In some way, one or two questions may be added to the rubric regarding what extent the experiential learning philosophy is adopted, or a blank section can be left where the person (the one the rubric is applied to) can write an opinion. I think the fact that it is a qualitative measurement tool, and there isn't only one-point categorization, is an important factor in answering it honestly.* Participant 2 shared a view in reply to this contribution: "*All in all if scoring like percentage value is included, it can increase the motivation*".

CONCLUSION

In this study, it was considered that carrying out experiential learning implementations in accordance with the experiential learning theory is directly connected to the experiential learning training activities, and therefore the Rubric for Experiential Training was developed as an alternative measurement tool to evaluate these training activities. According to the views of participants, The Rubric for Experiential Training has important functions such as increasing the level of awareness of planning and implementation processes of experiential training and enabling to receive feedback on the quality of the implementations. It was revealed that the rubric enabled educators to see the shortcomings that they needed to improve, in this context, it was beneficial in terms of both planning and implementing. The rubric was considered as a motivation source for the educators. It was emphasized that the short and long versions of the rubric, which was developed for different types and levels of education, could be created, hereby, training activities at different levels could be carried out in compliance with the experiential learning theory. The Rubric for Experiential Training was developed not only as a checklist. It was developed to determine to what extent the experiential learning philosophy could be reflected in the learning settings, and with the aim of guiding educators and participants in a sense. Rubrics are authentic measurement tools encouraging critical thinking, reflecting and self-assessment. In this respect, the fact that a rubric has been developed to apply in the experiential learning training activities will help clarify expectations in terms of experiential learning implementations.

REFERENCES

Baker, A. C., Jensen, P. J., and Kolb, D. A. (2002). Learning and Conversation. In Baker, A.

 C., Jensen, P. J., and Kolb, D. A. (2002) *Conversational learning: An experiential approach to knowledge creation*. Westport Conn.: Quorum Books um Books, 2002.

Bowling, A. (2002). *Research methods in health: Investigating health and health services*. Philadelphia: McGraw-Hill House.

Campbell, A. (2005). Application of ICT and rubrics to the assessment process where professional judgment is involved: the features of an e-marking tool. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30 (5), 529–37.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Education and experience.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Edmunds, H. (2000). *The focus group research handbook*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eickmann, P., Kolb, A.Y., & Kolb, D.A. (2004). Designing Learning. In Collopy, F., and Boland, R. (Eds.), *Managing as designing: Creating a new vocabulary for management education and research.* Stanford University Press.

Fern, E. F. (2001). *Advanced focus group research.* California: SAGE.

Goodrich, A. H. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 57(5), 13-18.

Kolb, A.Y. & Kolb, D.A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(2):193-212.

Kolb, A. Y. & Kolb, D.A. (2013). The Kolb learning style inventory 4.0: A comprehensive guide to the theory, Psychometrics, Research on Validity and Educational Applications. Boston, MA: Hay Resources Direct.

Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2017). *The experiential educator: Principles and practices of experiential learning*. Kaunakakai, HI: EBLS Press

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kolb, D., Osland, J. & Rubin, I. (1995). *The organizational behavior reader* (6th edition). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Kolb, D. A. (2000). *Facilitator's guide to learning.* TRG Hay/McBer, Training Resources Group

Kolb, (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* 2nd Edition Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Appendix I- Rubric for Experiential Training

1. LEARNING SPACES				
1.1. Creating and Holding a Hospitable Space for Learning	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
1.1.1. Getting to know each other	There was no activity for learners to get to know each other.	Educator and some of the learners learned the names of each other.	Educators and learners learned the names of all participants.	Educators and learners learned the names of all participants and they got to know each other personally.
1.1.2. Group Dynamics	There was no activity to build the sense of trust and break the ice among the group.	Ice were broken among some of the learners and educators of the group.	Ice were broken among all the learners and educators and group dynamics were increased.	Ice were broken among all the learners and educators; group dynamics were increased, and a team sprit was established within the group.
1.1.3. Ground Rules	There were no ground rules set.	The ground rules for ensuring the respect and efficient group learning process was set only by the educator.	The ground rules for ensuring the respect and efficient group learning process was set by involvement of educator and some of the learners.	The ground rules for ensuring the respect and efficient group learning process was set by active involvement of educator and all learners.

1.2. Creating Learner-Centered Learning Space	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
1.2.1. Expectations & Contributions	Learners were not asked to share their expectations from and potential contributions to the program.	Learners only shared their expectations and/or contributions.	Learners shared their expectations from and contributions to the program and the program was revised by the educator accordingly.	Learners shared their expectations from and contributions to the program, the expectations and contributions were analyzed together with the learners and the program was revised by active involvement of learners.
1.2.2. Methodology	The methods were not chosen considering the learning preferences/difficulties of the learners. A monotone methodology is followed.	Some different methods were chosen considering the learning preferences/difficulties of the learners according to the assumptions of the educator.	Variety of methods were chosen considering the learning preferences/difficulties of the learners according to the analysis on the learners made by the educator.	Variety of methods were chosen considering the learning preferences/difficulties of the learners according to the analysis on the learners made by the educator. Learners had the space to reflect on/give feedback to the methodology. Educator re-adapted the methodology accordingly.
1.2.3. Evaluation by Learners	Program was not evaluated by the Learners	Program was evaluated by the learners only at the end of the program	Program was evaluated by the learners during and at the end of the program.	Program was evaluated by the learners at the end of the program and during the program. The feedbacks during the program were took into consideration and the programs was revised accordingly.

1.3. Creating a Ludic Learning Space	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
1.3.1. Energizers	There was no energizer implemented.	Energizers were implemented however profiles of the learners and dynamics of the group weren't considered while choosing the energizers.	Energizers were implemented and chosen by taking only profiles of the learners into account.	Energizers were implemented and chosen by taking profiles of the learners and dynamics of the group into account.
1.3.2. Learning Games	There was no learning game implemented.	Learning games were implemented however the learners weren't prepared to be ready to play together.	Learning games were implemented after the group was prepared through warming up activities to play together, however there was no cooling down activity to support the learners to step back to real life.	Learning games were implemented after the group was prepared through warming up activities to play together and there were cooling down activities to support the learners to step back to real life.
1.3.3. Having Fun	There was no informal social activity where the learners played and had fun together.	There were informal social activities where the learners played and had fun together however the educator was not involved.	There were informal social activities where the learners played and had fun together where the educator was involved too however the activity was organized only by the educator.	There were informal social activities where the learners played and had fun together where the educator was involved too, and the activity was organized the learners with the support of educator.
1.4. Creating Space for Conversational Learning	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
1.4.1. Discussion	There was no activity for the learners to discuss on the subjects.	There were discussion activities on subjects only between the educator and the learners but not among the learners.	There were discussion activities on subjects among educators and learners however the discussions were dominated by one or few of the learners.	There were discussion activities on subjects among educators and learners that listening and talking were balanced by appropriate moderation.
1.4.2. Debrief	There was no debriefing after experiences.	There were only evaluations of the experiences/activities.	There were debriefings however they were not structured according to all four steps of the learning cycle.	The debriefings were structured according to all four steps of the learning cycle; experience, reflect, think, act.
1.4.3. Progress of Conversations	The conversations during the program were not interlinked with each other.	Sometimes educator made connections between the conversations happened in different times.	Educator made connections among conversations and facilitated the development of the conversations only according to the subject-matter.	All conversations during the program were connected by the educator and the educator facilitated the organic development of conversations according to both interests of the learners and the subject-matter.

1.5. Creating Space for Reflective Thinking	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
1.5.1. Dualism to Multiplicity	There was no sharing activity to reveal the learners' stereotypical thoughts on the subjects about themselves and about others.	There were sharing activities only to reveal the learners' stereotypical thoughts on the subjects about themselves and about others however they didn't have chance to listen-discover others' different point of views.	There were sharing activities to reveal the learners' stereotypical thoughts on the subjects about themselves and about others and listen-discover others' different point of views.	There were sharing activities to reveal the learners' stereotypical thoughts on the subjects about themselves and about others and listen-discover others' different point of views. The learners had space to critically think and reflect about those different point of views.
1.5.2. Multiplicity to Relativism	There was no debate activity where the learners challenge their arguments.	There were debate activities where the learners only challenge their arguments.	There were debate activities where the learners challenge their arguments and analyze the disagreements in detail.	There were debate activities where the learners challenge their arguments and analyze the disagreements in detail. The learners had space to critically re-think about their assumptions.
1.5.3. Relativism to Commitment	There was no activity for the learners where they try to use alternative approaches and point of views.	There were activities for the learners where they try to use alternative approaches and point of views, but they didn't have space to reflect on their experience of dealing with ambiguity and the relativism.	There were activities for the learners where they try to use alternative approaches and point of views. They had space to reflect on their experience of dealing with ambiguity and the relativism.	There were activities for the learners where they try to use alternative approaches and point of views. They had space to reflect on their experience of dealing with ambiguity and the relativism and they had opportunity to structure their own learning about which subjects they will research more.

1.6. Creating Spaces to Develop and Sustain Deep Learning	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
1.6.1. Learning Styles & Learning Flexibility	There was no activity to introduce Kolb Learning Styles.	Kolb Learning Styles was introduced however there was no implementation to discover the learners' learning styles.	Kolb Learning Styles was introduced to the learners and learners discovered their learning styles through Kolb Learning Styles Inventory or any other tool.	Kolb Learning Styles was introduced to the learners; learners discovered their learning styles through Kolb Learning Styles Inventory or any other tool and the learners were supported to plan how to increase their learning flexibility in order to engage to full cycle learning.
1.6.2. Development Stages	The concept of experiential learning theory of development was not introduced.	The concept of experiential learning theory of development was introduced to the learners however there was no activity to support learners to discover at which development stages they are about the program.	The concept of experiential learning theory of development was introduced to the learners and there were activities to support learners to discover at which development stages they are about the program.	The concept of experiential learning theory of development was introduced to the learners and there were activities to support learners to discover at which development stages they are about the program. The educator played appropriate educator roles for each learner according to the development stage of him/her.
2. EDUCATOR ROLES				
2.1. Facilitator	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
2.1.1. Experience on Subjects	The learners didn't experience any of the subjects of the program.	Some of the subjects of the program was experienced by the learners through playing/sensing/real life experiences.	All subjects of the program were experienced by the learners through playing/sensing/real life experiences however learners didn't have space to talk about their feelings on these experiences.	All subjects of the program were experienced by the learners through playing/sensing/real life experiences and learners had space to talk about their feelings on these experiences.
2.1.2. Learners Experiences	The learners didn't have any opportunity to share their previous experiences about the program.	The learners had the opportunity to share their previous experiences on some of the subjects of the program.	The learners had the opportunity to share their previous experiences on all subjects of the program however they didn't have space to talk what they feel about these subjects.	The learners had the opportunity to share their previous experiences on all subjects of the program and they had space to talk what they feel about these subjects.
2.1.3. Reflection	The learners didn't have space to reflect on their ongoing improvement.	The learners sometimes had space to reflect on their ongoing improvement.	The learners constantly had space to reflect on their ongoing improvement.	The learners constantly had space to reflect on their ongoing improvement and variety of methods were implemented for providing them the most suitable way for reflection.

2.2. Subject Expert	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
2.2.1. Gathering & Analyzing Information	The learners didn't have any opportunity to search, gather/receive information on the subjects.	There was space where the learners had opportunity to search, gather/receive information on only some of the subjects.	There was space where the learners had opportunity to search, gather/receive information on all the subjects.	There was space where the learners had opportunity to search, gather/receive information on all the subjects and they had the opportunity to compare and critically analyze these concepts.
2.2.2. Linking the knowledge	There was no space for the learners to link the new abstract information with the previous concrete experiences and concepts.	There was space for the learners to link some of the new abstract information with the previous concrete experiences and concepts.	There was space for the learners to link all the new abstract information with the previous concrete experiences and concepts.	There was space for the learners to link all the new abstract information with the previous concrete experiences and concepts and they had opportunity to create their own knowledge.
2.2.3. Resources of Knowledge	There were no resources of knowledge shared with the learners.	Resources of knowledge on some of the subjects were shared with learners by the educator.	Resources of knowledge on all subjects were shared with the learners by the educator.	Resources of knowledge on all subjects were shared with the learners and the learners had the opportunity to bring and share their resources.

2.3. Evaluator	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
2.3.1. Setting the Standards	There were no performance standards/learning objectives set.	The performance standards/learning objectives were set only by the educator according to the content of the subject.	The performance standards/learning objectives were set by the educator according to the content of the subject and real-life challenges of the learners. This was done by active involvement of the learners.	The performance standards/learning objectives were set by the educator according to the content of the subject and real-life challenges of the learners. This was done by active involvement of the learners and development goals were personalized for each learner together with the learner.
2.3.2. Feedback	The learners didn't practice their new knowledge and they didn't get feedback.	The learners had chance to try/practice their new knowledge within the course, but they didn't receive constructive feedback from the educator.	The learners had chance to try/practice their new knowledge within the course and received constructive feedback from the educator.	The learners had chance to try/practice their new knowledge within the course and received constructive feedback from the educator according to the performance standards that were set together with the learners.
2.3.3. Self-Assessment	The learners didn't have any chance to make self-assessment.	The learners had chance to make self-assessment but not according to the performance standards.	The learners had chance to make self-assessment according to the performance standards.	The learners had chance to make self-assessment according to the performance standards and they had space to set new goals based on the assessment with the support of the educator.

2.4. Coach	Unacceptable	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory
2.4.1. Coaching	There was no coaching support for the learners.	The learners received coaching support partly, but the coaching was not completely planned.	The learners received planned and timely coaching support.	The learners received planned and timely coaching support which was structured according to experiential learning cycle.
2.4.2. Learning Plan	The learners didn't make any learning plan.	The learners determined what they need to learn more at the end of the course, but they didn't create individual learning plans which have concrete and timely actions.	The learners determined what they need to learn more at the end of the course, and they created individual learning plans which have concrete and timely actions.	The learners determined what they need to learn more at the end of the course, and they created individual learning plans which have concrete and timely actions. This plan included a future meeting with the educator to evaluate the progress.
2.4.3. Practice in Real Life	There was no practice of new knowledge in real life context.	The learners had chance to practice their new knowledge in real life context but there was no evaluation afterwards.	The learners had chance to practice their new knowledge in real life context and these new experiences were reflected and evaluated by the learners and the educator.	The learners had chance to practice their new knowledge in real life context, these new experiences were reflected and evaluated by the learners and the educator and the learners set new goals and action plans based on the evaluation results.

Appendix II- DeM-LAND Interactive Online Education Platform Based on Experiential Learning Theory