

OER Review Criteria Templates

Use one of the following criteria to guide your review of an OER.

- Open Textbooks Review Criteria
- Interactive Learning Materials Evaluation Criteria

Open Textbooks Review Criteria for Writing Spaces: Volume I, Chapter 5: Backpacks vs. Briefcases: Steps Toward Rhetorical Analysis by Laura Bolin Carroll

1. **Comprehensiveness** - The content covers all areas and ideas of the subject appropriately and provides an effective index and/or glossary

This is a comprehensive text covering basics of rhetorical analysis. However, it is missing aspects of how to do a rhetorical analysis for a text, as well as the actual ad that the author does a rhetorical analysis on as an example. In terms of scaffolding, I would use this prior to jumping into a rhetorical analysis for a text.

2. **Content Accuracy** - Content is accurate, error-free and unbiased.

It is accurate and error-free. Some bias may exist. See cultural relevance for further details.

3. **Relevance/Longevity** - Content is up-to-date, but not in a way that will quickly make the text obsolete within a short period of time. The text is written and/or arranged in such a way that necessary updates will be relatively easy and straightforward to implement.

It is not that current since it was published in 2010, but it is still relevant as it opens with the scenario of students making predictions and analyzing what a professor is like based upon first impressions. It is also relevant because it connects this concept to media, which is what most of my students will easily relate to. It is missing information about how to rhetorically analyze a text, but it provides the basic introductory information related to analyzing rhetoric.

4. **Clarity** - The text is written in lucid, accessible prose, and provides adequate context for any jargon/technical terminology used.

This article is clearly written for a FYE student taking college composition for the first time. The prose is clear and easy to understand.

5. **Consistency** - The content is internally consistent in terms of terminology and framework.

Content is consistent in terms of terminology and framework.

6. **Modularity** - The content is easily and readily divisible into smaller reading sections that can be assigned at different points within the course (i.e., enormous blocks of text without subheadings should be avoided). The text should not be overly self-referential, and should be easily reorganized

and realigned with various subunits of a course without presenting much disruption to the reader.

Yes, this article leads itself to be broken down into smaller sections. The text could be broken down into clearer outlined and smaller sections. The information in this article is so closely linked that it is beneficial for students to read all sections.

7. **Organization/Structure/Flow** - The topics are presented in a logical, clear fashion.

This reading flows very well and is organized in a very logical, easy-to-follow manner. The guiding questions and discussion questions are helpful in facilitating critical thinking to help students complete a rhetorical analysis. However, I do believe that some of the sections in this article is a bit long. My audience would benefit from smaller chunks of information, sectioned off in a clearer way.

8. **Interface** - There are no significant interface issues, including navigation problems, distortion of images/charts, and any other display features that may distract or confuse the reader.

Not really since it is a PDF article. The Table of Contents links directly to the chapter in the text, which have been PDFed. However, in evaluating how visually aesthetic this is, this is definitely not visually aesthetic. There are no pictures. The visual layout of this is similar to any type of peer reviewed journal. Because of this, I may not have students read the whole chapter, but only a few pages from the section.

9. **Grammatical Errors** - The text contains no grammatical errors.

Title didn't follow MLA with capitalization.

10. **Cultural Relevance** - The text is not culturally insensitive or offensive in any way. It should make use of examples that are inclusive of a variety of races, ethnicities, and backgrounds.

I do not believe it is insensitive or offensive in any way, but it definitely makes assumptions about the audience's knowledge and background information. For example, it assumes that the readers of the text is American since many of the examples given relate to American fashion and issues (social media, government, college life, etc.)

11. Are there any other comments you would like to make about this book, for example, its appropriateness in the local context or specific updates you think need to be made?

In giving an example of a rhetorical analysis, it would've been helpful if this text provided the link or ad or image of the example that was being displayed. This would help the students better understand the different aspects that are being discussed in the text.

12. For what level would this text be appropriate (i.e. First year, Second year, etc.)

I believe this text is appropriate for first year students, but for some of them, it might still be fairly challenging. I would definitely try to find a video to summarize this reading, as well.

Sample textbook reviews [click here](#).

Interactive Learning Materials Evaluation Criteria

1. **Content Quality** - Validity of the information and alignment with learning objectives.

N/A

2. **Activity Types** - Learning activity, e.g. exercises, case studies, games, etc., matches the type and nature of the learning process.

N/A

3. **Interactivity** - Level of student engagement with the material.

N/A

4. **Feedback** - Built-in feedback component to gauge understanding of the material.

N/A

5. **Usability** - Navigation and ease of use.

N/A

6. **Technical Requirements** - Uses standard software programs which are accessible using common web browsers and operating systems.

N/A

The Open Textbooks Review Criteria is found at [Open Textbook Library](#) and was developed for evaluating and reviewing textbooks.

The Interactive Learning Materials Review Criteria is from Shank, J. D. (2014). *Interactive open educational resources: A guide to finding, choosing, and using what's out there to transform college teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.



OER Review Criteria by Leeward Community College is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#).

