

### Module Review Form

Our goal is to create modules that address teaching methods of high interest to faculty and link them with examples illustrating the use of those methods. Each pedagogic approach should be described succinctly so faculty can quickly understand how the technique might be relevant to their teaching. Specific pages should include tips for effectively using the technique, related research on their impacts on learning, as well as a set of example activities.

**Instructions to the Reviewer:** Please write comments regarding each aspect of the module you have reviewed. Following your comments, please provide an overall rating for each question.

Name of module being reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date (or date range) of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

---

#### Part I: Overarching questions

A. Overall, does this **module** present a teaching method that is compelling, engaging, accurate, complete and useful?

Overall module score: (mark one)

Excellent      Good    Fair    Poor    Not applicable

Comments:

---

B. Does the **'what'** section describe the foundations of the method and how it differs from other similar approaches?

Score for 'what' section: (mark one)

Excellent      Good    Fair    Poor    Not applicable

Comments:

---

C. Does the **'why'** section make a compelling case for this method, and is this grounded in the educational literature?

Score for 'why' section: (mark one)

Excellent      Good    Fair    Poor    Not applicable

Comments:

---

D. Does the **'how'** section provide sufficient information for faculty to be able to implement the method successfully, particularly when used in conjunction with the examples?

Score for 'how' section: (mark one)

Excellent      Good   Fair   Poor   Not applicable

Comments:

---

E. Are the **examples** logical applications of this method?

Score for examples: (mark one or provide separate scores for each example)

Excellent      Good   Fair   Poor   Not applicable

Comments: (comment on each activity as needed)

---

F. Is the material **referenced** appropriately? Does it include expected landmark papers? Are there unsupported claims? Are there additional references that you would recommend? Are there important pieces of information that are missing?

Score for references: (mark one)

Excellent      Good   Fair   Poor   Not applicable

Comments:

---

## Part II: Mechanics

A. Is the content **well-written**, concise and clear?

Score for writing: (mark one)

Excellent      Good   Fair   Poor   Not applicable

Comments:

---

B. Will the module **motivate** users to read and use its content? Are the content, layout, and graphics engaging?

Score for motivation: (mark one)

Excellent      Good   Fair   Poor   Not applicable

Comments:

---

C. Is the use of **graphics** appropriate and helpful? Do they add information? Do they make the site more browseable? Do they enhance the appeal of the site?

Score for graphics: (mark one)

Excellent      Good    Fair    Poor    Not applicable

Comments:

---

### **Part III: Overall**

A. How could the module be enhanced?

B. Should the module be made available to the public? (*mark one*)

**As is**

**With Minor Revisions**

**With Major Revisions**

**Not at All**