

To use this rubric: click on File > Make a copy

CC ECHO Peer-Review Rubric

Section I:

Contains section A, B, C and D which evaluate the content, editorial aspects, and overall quality of the OER material.

A. Subject Matter and Content Presentation:

This section guides you in your review of discipline knowledge presented in the resource.

Subject Matter and Content Presentation	N/A	Weak	Adequate	Strong
Is the content accurate and presented in a culturally responsive manner? (e.g., free of examples that perpetuate stereotypes which contribute to institutional or systemic harm)				
Is the content inclusive and diverse? Will students see themselves in the content and examples? This includes, but is not limited to, persons of different racial and ethnic groups (e.g., non-Anglo names), various religions, diverse abilities, body types and appearance, and who are LGBT+.				
Does the content adequately cover the designated course within the scope of the project?				
Is clear and consistent terminology used to present the subject matter?				
Does the content reflect the current knowledge of the subject matter?				
Is the resource at an appropriate reading level for undergraduate use?				

Please provide comments on any aspect of the content presentation of this content.
When possible, be specific to the location of your comment (chapter, page, video, etc.)

B. Editorial Aspects:

This section guides you through evaluating the readability of the content.

Editorial Aspects	N/A	Weak	Adequate	Strong
Is the content consistent in its use of grammar, spelling and terminology and free of typographical errors				
Is the content written in a clear and engaging style?				
Is a coherent organization evident to the content user?				

Please provide comments on any editorial aspect of this content. When possible, be specific to the location of your comment (chapter, page, video, etc.):

C. Overall Ratings:

Taken as a whole, evaluate the product.

Overall Ratings			
	Weak	Adequate	Strong
What is your overall impression of the resource?			
	Not at all	Some Reservations	Willing
How willing would you be to adopt this content?			

D. Overall Comments:

- If you were to recommend this content to colleagues, what merits of the content would you highlight?
- What areas of this content require improvement before use in your discipline courses?

Section II:

Contains various sub rubrics for evaluation of specific kinds of OER material.
These sections will be assigned individually as needed.

A. Canvas Course:

Canvas Course	N/A	Weak	Adequate	Strong
Does the course provide opportunities to engage with the material across multiple means of representation? (e.g., visual, textual, aural, experiential)				
Is a coherent organization of the course evident to the reader/student?				
Does the course reflect best practices in the instruction of the designated discipline?				
Is the course content accessible in a variety of different electronic formats? (e.g., .txt, .pdf, .epub, etc.)				

B. OER Textbook:

OER Textbook	N/A	Weak	Adequate	Strong
Does the textbook present its subject materials at appropriate reading levels for undergraduate use?				
Does the textbook allow readers to engage with the material across multiple means of representation? (e.g., visual, textual, etc.)				
Does the textbook present explicit learning outcomes aligned with the course and curriculum?				
Does the textbook adhere to effective principles of design? (e.g., are pages laid out and organized to be clear and visually engaging and effective? Are colors, font, and typography consistent and unified?)				
Does the textbook include conventional editorial features? (e.g., a table of contents, glossary, citations, and further references)				

This Rubric is a modification of the Textbook Review Template developed by the California OER Council. Resources and their associated reviews are available at [Cool4Ed](#).



This rubric is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](#).