Rubric Review for the Open Pedagogy Toolkit

Thank you for your commitment to reviewing the Open Pedagogy Toolkit! The Open Pedagogy Toolkit aims to highlight relevant literature, resources, projects, and research in the area of open pedagogy. This toolkit was developed by a multi-institutional group, The Open Practices Collaborative. Our purpose was to focus on building relationships that support us as we create, share, and collaborate on various projects that support the Open movement.

Purpose of the review:

As a reviewer, we invite you to read through the toolkit to support and evolve the work this group has begun. As subject experts, we are interested in your feedback on the big picture related to the content of open pedagogy (e.g., are there new resources we should be including? Do you see any gaps in the work? How would you use this resource? etc.). We value your impressions and expertise to improve this work. As you review the toolkit in Pressbooks, you may find broken links, typos, or other errors — feel free to use the private hypothes.is to note these items, but don't get too caught up on the copyediting. We are providing a copy of our style guide for your reference - please review this prior to adding comments regarding any formatting or copyediting. Please note that we intentionally designed this toolkit so that each chapter reflected the specific author's voice and tone rather than having the same voice and tone throughout the toolkit.

Note that James Madison University Libraries is the publisher. Do you want to be credited as a reviewer in the metadata? If so, please complete the following table:

I would *like to be credited* as a reviewer in the metadata of the Open Pedagogy Toolkit Pressbook published by James Madison University Libraries.	Please respond with your: • {Name - write it how you would like it listed} • {Contact info} • {institution} • {job title}

Reviewer assignments & timeline

Peer review will occur between August 26 and Oct 11. Your review is due by Oct 11, COB. After completing your review, please email the co-editor, Nicole Wilson, at wilso2rn@jmu.edu informing her you completed your review in both hypothes.is and the Rubric Table.

Using hypothes.is when reviewing

We will use hypothes.is for the open review process. If you are unfamiliar with using this platform, please refer to the [instructions here to add the browser extension](#) and refer to these [detailed instructions for how to use the platform](#). We set up a private group for this review process. Please join the [group here](#). These [instructions provide details](#) on how to annotate within a private group. If you have any suggested resources, articles, or other materials to be added to the toolkit please provide any information you can through a hypothes.is comment.

Using the rubric table when reviewing

After reviewing the toolkit and providing feedback in the private hypothes.is group, please share an overall review of the toolkit using the following table. Under the rating column, select one of the options to provide your overall rating in the specific category.
Criteria adapted from https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/reviews/rubric.

Criteria	Rating	Comments
Organization: The topics in the text are presented in a logical, clear fashion.	Not reviewed ⌄	
Content Accuracy: Content is accurate, error-free, and unbiased.	Not reviewed ⌄	
Clarity: The text is written in lucid, accessible prose, and provides adequate context for any jargon/technical terminology used.	Not reviewed ⌄	

Consistency: The text is internally consistent in terms of terminology and framework.	**Not reviewed** ▾	
Relevance: Content is up-to-date, but not in a way that will quickly make the text obsolete within a short period. The text is written and/or arranged so necessary updates will be relatively straightforward.	**Not reviewed** ▾	
Comprehensiveness: The text covers all areas and ideas of the subject appropriately, and provides various examples, definitions as appropriate, and serves as a resource to the open pedagogy community.	**Not reviewed** ▾	
Inclusivity: The text is not culturally insensitive or offensive in any way. It makes use of examples that are inclusive of a variety of races, ethnicities, and backgrounds. The text welcomes the reader into the open pedagogy landscape, removing barriers to access.	**Not reviewed** ▾	
Accessibility: The text is free of significant interface issues, including navigation problems, distortion of images/charts, and any other display features that may distract or confuse the reader. All content meets the WCAG AA standards.	**Not reviewed** ▾	
Grammatical errors: The text contains no grammatical errors.	**Not reviewed** ▾	
Additional Notes, Comments, or Links: Please add any other information based on your review here.		