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**Peer Review Protocol for Learning Scenarios**

Follow the peer review protocol below when evaluating each learning scenario. This protocol is divided into key sections reflecting the important elements that each learning scenario should include.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **General Information about the Learning Scenario** | | |
| **Level of Education** |  | |
| **Scenario Title** |  | |
| **Group who has developed the learning scenario** |  | |
| **Reviewer Group** |  | |
| **Feedback Overall / Comments/ Recommendations for Improvement** | | |
|  | | |
| **Element** | **Description** | **YES / NO** |
| **Completeness** | | |
| **Age Level** | Is the specified grade level appropriate for the content and activities? |  |
| **Duration** | Does the activity's duration match the scope and complexity of the tasks? |  |
| **Content Domain  (Integrated Subjects)** | Are the linked subjects relevant and connected to the curriculum? |  |
| **Clarity and Quality of Learning Objectives** | | |
| * Are the learning objectives specific and measurable (SMART)? * Are the learning objectives developed based on Bloom’s taxonomy? * Do the objectives focus on student outcomes (e.g., “apply,” “design,” “evaluate”)? * Are they clearly tied to the scenario and the activities described? | |  |
| **Scenario Description** | | |
| **Setting** | * Does the scenario present a real-life issue linked to the learning objectives? * Is the scenario engaging and relatable? * Is the language clear, and direct? |  |
| **Tools and Materials** | Are all tools (digital and physical) necessary for the activity listed and clearly described? |  |
| **Activities** | | |
| * Are the activity steps clear, logical, and easy to follow for teachers? * Does the learning scenario include plugged and/or unplugged activities? * Are the steps explicitly aligned with the learning objectives? * Is there a balance between structure and flexibility for teacher adaptation? | |  |
| **Roles of Teachers and Students** | | |
| * Are the roles of teachers and students clearly defined? * Are the described roles practical and supportive of achieving the learning objectives? | |  |
| **Evaluation and Assessment** | | |
| * Are the evaluation methods suitable for assessing the stated learning objectives? * Do they include formative and/or summative approaches (e.g., observations, rubrics, or quizzes)? * Is the assessment process feasible within the given timeframe and resources? | |  |
| **TINKER Framework Integration** | | |
| **Authentic Learning** | * Does the scenario integrate real-world applications and problem-solving? * Are principles of authentic learning (e.g., context, collaboration, scaffolding) applied effectively? |  |
| **Gender Inclusiveness** | * Are measures included to promote equal participation and avoid stereotypes? * Are mixed-gender team activities explicitly encouraged? |  |
| **Adaptability and Progression** | * Are suggestions for adapting the activity to different skill levels clear and practical? * Do they provide meaningful progression options for both less and more advanced learners? |  |