



Internal Review Form: Questions by Article Type

News articles need one reviewer. Fact sheets, bulletins and reports need two reviewers.

Author Name(s):

Institute / Department(s):

Reviewer 1 Name:

Reviewer 2 Name:

Title of work:

Target audience:

Type: News article Fact sheet Bulletin Report Other:

Author Reviewer 1 Reviewer 2

Address Public Policy.

Examples:

- Medical marijuana ballot initiative
New federal nutrition labeling
Modifications of pesticide label
Removing animals to/from threatened or endangered list
Change of local zoning ordinance

Complete below checklist if the article addresses public policy:

- Explains varied dimensions of the issue.
Identifies the array of perspectives on the issue.
Provides fair and balanced attention to all perspectives.
Refrains from taking a position on the issue.
Follows Public Policy Education Principles and Guidelines for MSU Extension.

Make recommendations.

Examples:

- Livestock management
Wildlife protection
Diet or exercise
Financial management
Food safety

Complete below checklist if the article makes recommendations:

- Provides the rationale for the recommendation.
Is appropriate for the target audience.
Is geographically appropriate.
Provides evidence why the recommendation is appropriate.
States consequences of following or not following.

Interpret/ Report Research.

Examples:

- Reports of field trial results
Summary of published research report or journal article
Sharing original research results

Complete below checklist if the article interprets or reports research results:

- Research was soundly conducted.
Interpretation of results is accurate.
Results are clearly communicated.
Importance and implications are clearly communicated.



Internal Review Form: Questions for All Materials

Author
Reviewer 1
Reviewer 2

Writing Quality Review (All Materials)

- Content is unbiased and research based.
- Materials build upon and not duplicate existing materials.
- Topic is appropriate, useful and interesting to the target audience.
- The most important points are given adequate discussion.
- If appropriate, a call to action is clear and explicit.
- The main idea(s) are apparent.
- Claims are adequately and logically supported.
- Paragraphs flow together and are sequenced appropriately.
- Writing is clear, concise, and easy to understand.
- The level of the writing is appropriate for the audience.
- Hyperlinks link to specific pages and not to general websites.

Academic Honesty Review (All Materials)

- Includes proper citations and references.
- Permission obtained for any images, tables/graphs or graphics included.

Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Reviewer 2:

Author:

Author agrees with academic integrity guidelines.

The information I have submitted is accurate and my document maintains academic integrity ([see academic integrity guidelines for more information](#)). "Michigan State University affirms the principle that all individuals associated with the academic community have a responsibility for establishing, maintaining, and fostering an understanding and appreciation for academic integrity. Academic integrity is honest and responsible scholarship and is the foundation of university success. Michigan State University Extension's mission is to help people improve their lives through an educational process that applies knowledge to critical issues, needs and opportunities. Producing high-quality, useful, current and reliable content on a consistent basis and sharing this content on our website is a large part of this mission."