

**Rubrics for assessing quality of the Teaching Tools article contribution**

	<b>Insufficient</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>Context</b>	Learning goals and objectives are not clearly stated.	Learning goals and objectives are stated, but may be unclear or not relevant to stated educational priorities.	The learning goals are clearly stated, relevant to the activity, and, if applicable, authors have listed relevant educational priorities that align with their teaching innovation. The learning objectives define what students should be able to do upon completion of the activity (i.e., measurable behaviors).
<b>Background</b>	There is insufficient background information to evaluate the usefulness of the activity. An appropriate student population for the activity is not clear.	Background information and student population are mentioned but there is insufficient information to assess the suitability of the activity to the reader's teaching context.	Sufficient background information is provided to allow the reader to evaluate the usefulness of the activity without referring to extensive outside sources. The target student population, and any prerequisite knowledge or skills, are clearly stated.
<b>Lesson plan (description of the teaching innovation in context)</b>	The description of the activity is not sufficient to allow for replication.	Details may be provided, but the description of the activity is insufficient for replication. Key information is missing.	The description of the activity is sufficient to enable the reader to replicate the activity in their class in the same way as the authors taught it.
<b>Discussion</b>	There is little evidence of the effectiveness of the activity.	The effectiveness of the activity is discussed, but reflection may be limited. There may be little discussion of how to modify the activity for other teaching contexts.	The effectiveness of the activity is discussed. This discussion could include observations, reflections, student performance outcomes etc. Possible modifications, to broaden applicability, are discussed.
<b>Materials</b>	Materials are not provided, or provided materials are insufficient to	Materials are provided, but may be insufficient to	Adequate and well-written supporting materials (references, presentations, answer

	allow for replication.	allow for replication by the reader.	keys, student handouts or worksheets, etc.) are provided to enable replication of the activity. These materials are the author's own work or appropriate sources are cited.
<b>Communication</b>	The contribution fails to argue and communicate in one or several of the following: audience adaptation, language, structure, or reference handling.	The contents of the contribution are well communicated and argued for. It is audience-adapted for accessibility in terms of language as well as structure. The contribution applies the APA style for referencing.	The content is well communicated and audience-adapted for accessibility in terms of language as well as structure. The argumentation is convincing and adapted in order not to exclude relevant groups. The contribution applies the APA style for referencing.