Quality Rubric for Curriculum Materials

# Reviewer’s Name: Reviewer #2 Date: 6.24.18

# Instructions:

Review the document(s) assigned to you. Evaluate the curriculum materials collectively, as appropriate, and use this document to assess the quality by selecting the applicable rating for each category. For example: all simulation scenarios for a course or program could be reviewed together. However, if individual documents are not of similar quality, they must be reviewed separately.

## List documents included in this review: 2016 OTA Bryan Simulation Activities 1

| **Criteria** | **3 – Superior** | **2 – Strong** | **1 – Limited** | **0 – Weak**  | **N/A** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Learning Objectives/Outcomes** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The material relates directly to one or more of the course objectives stated in the course syllabus. | The learning objectives of the scenario are clearly stated and are designed to assist the student to achieve mastery of one or more course outcomes or objectives.  | The learning objectives of the scenario are clearly stated and are designed to assist the student to learn the one or more course outcomes or objectives.  | The learning objectives are unclear, not stated or only indirectly relate to any of the course objectives.  | There is little relationship between the material and any of the course objectives or outcomes stated in the course syllabus.  | This does not apply. | 3 |
| **2. Use of Information** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The information provided in the material covers the subject matter and is specific to the subject matter.  | Demonstrates sound use of scholarly information about the subject matter. Elements of the subject matter are covered thoroughly. | Demonstrates moderate use of scholarly information about the subject matter, and addresses some elements are covered with excellent clarity and thoroughness while others could be improved. | Minimal use of scholarly information. Subject matter elements are addressed, but material lacks thoroughness and clarity. | Little to no use of information | This does not apply. | 2 |

| **Criteria** | **3 – Superior** | **2 – Strong** | **1 – Limited** | **0 – Weak**  | **N/A** | **Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Quality of Explanation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The subject matter in the material is explained thoroughly and in a clear and concise manner.  | Provides comprehensive information so effectively that the target audience[[1]](#footnote-1) should be able to understand the subject matter and connect important associated concepts. The main ideas of the subject matter are clearly identified. | Subject matter is presented in a way that makes skills, procedures, concepts, and/or information understandable. It does not make connections among important associated concepts within the subject matter. | Subject matter is explained correctly but in a limited way. The explanations are not thorough and would likely serve as a review for most learners. | Information is presented in a way that makes it confusing or it contains errors. There is little likelihood that this object will contribute to understanding | This does not apply. | 3 |
| **4. Organization of content** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Format of the material is presented in such a manner that the information presented is easy to follow.  | The object shows a continuous progression of ideas and tells a complete, easily followed story. Well organized. Excellent, well thought out explanation shows superior effort. | The object is fairly well organized. Format is easy to follow. Good explanation but not excellent. | Portions may be poorly organized. Hard to follow the progressions of the presentation.  | Not organized. Difficult to follow. Poor quality. | This does not apply. | 2 |
| **5. Usefulness** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is the subject matter relevant to the target audience[[2]](#footnote-2)? | The information presented is relevant to the target audience and promotes further discussion and/or understanding of the topic. | The information presented is relevant but does not provide useful information to promote further discussion and/or understanding of the topic. | The information is relevant but limited.  | The object’s usefulness for target audience is in question. Does not inform and does not stay focused on the topic. | This does not apply. | 3 |
| **6. Assessment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment of student learning is included and is aligned to the content and performance expectations stated or implied.  | The assessment is included and relates directly to the learning objectives. The assessment requires students to create, evaluate or analyze what has been learned.  | The assessment is included and relates directly to the learning objectives. The assessment requires students to apply, understand or remember what has been learned | The assessment is included but does not relate directly to the learning objectives.  | No assessment is provided, or the assessment contains significant errors | This does not apply. | 3 |

## Please provide Feedback for the criteria above.

### Learning Objectives/Outcomes – Upon review of the AL162 course syllabus the simulation objectives relate to at least 6 course objectives.

### Use of Information – The information in the simulation document is specific to the subject matter. Outside of medical record data, medical terminology, and professional standards there is no scholarly information associated with the simulation as an outside or preparatory resource. However, the simulation is related to a specific course, which has required reading materials.

### Quality of Explanation – The important concepts of the subject matter are clearly present.

### Organization of content – After reading the complete document it is clear what the simulations address and how the story unfolds, however an overview section could be helpful to someone who has not designed the simulation and simply wants an general understanding of what it intends to do and how it will play out.

###  Usefulness – This is a useful learning experience for OTA students and promotes self-reflection of the student’s performance.

## Overall Feedback - Overall this simulation offers a variety of patient scenarios all focused on meeting the defined objectives. The details in the document offer expected outcomes, recommended facilitator prompts, a self-evaluation tool, and pre and post assessments to gauge the effectiveness of the learning experience.

This table is to be completed during the Grant Management review.

| **6. Accessibility/Disclaimers/CCBY** | **Yes\No\NA** |
| --- | --- |
| Each document has no errors according to the MS word accessibility check. | **Yes** |
| Each document passes the RTI accessibility check | **Yes** |
| Each document contains the US Department of Labor disclaimers | **Yes** |
| Each document includes the CCBY license | **Yes** |

# Disclaimer and License Information

This workforce product was funded by a grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Labor’s Employment and Training Administration. The product was created by the grantee and does not necessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Department of Labor. The U.S. Department of Labor makes no guarantees, warranties, or assurances of any kind, express or implied, with respect to such information, including any information on linked sites and including, but not limited to, accuracy of the information or its completeness, timeliness, usefulness, adequacy, continued availability, or ownership.

Quality Rubric for Course Materials by [Washburn University of Topeka](http://www.washburn.edu)is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Based on a work at [original work](https://www.achieve.org/files/AchieveOERRubrics.pdf).

1. Target audience refers to student(s) enrolled for the program for which the material was created. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)