*Reviewer Questionnaire*

*Severe Storms*

*Dr. Jeffrey Halverson*

**Overview**

1. *Your Current Text.* Please list the book you use for the course now, and evaluate it. How well does it serve the course you teach now? Is it current, accurate, well-written, and presented at the right level? What things stand out as particularly good or particularly in need of improvement?
2. *Your Course.* Please tell us a little about the course you teach. Who takes the course and why? What, if any, prerequisites are required? What are your current enrollments and what have the enrollment trends been over the past several years?
3. *Organization and table of contents.* Please evaluate the table of contents of Halverson. Does it appear to have all the chapters you’d need to use if for your course? If not, what is missing? Are there any extraneous chapters?

**Severe Storms**

Halverson takes a new approach to presenting the science for this course. Rather than beginning with a certain number of chapters about basic science before proceeding to the chapters about severe weather, Dr. Halverson presents fewer introductory chapters about basic science, and then integrates more science with the discussion of the severe weather in those chapters. This approach allows him to get to the “meat” of the course more quickly. The most important thing we’re trying to accomplish with this review is to make sure that we have included the right amount of foundational science for the course you teach. Given our approach, we would like you to evaluate both **foundational chapters** and **chapters about different kinds of severe weather**.

We’ve included a number of things we think will be sufficient for you to make this evaluation. We have provided two introductory chapters (2 and 3) and two chapters about severe weather phenomena (8 and 11). We’ve also included a fairly comprehensive list of the scientific principles by chapter. Lastly, the art of every chapter is available and should be reviewed in conjunction with the appropriate chapters. Please read and spend some time with these chapters, and then reply to the questions below.

1. *Science pedagogy.* Please evaluate the four enclosed chapters as a whole and let us know if you think we have included the right amount of science at the right level. Is the scientific coverage about the right things? Is it complete? Is it presented in sufficient depth and at an appropriate level for the course you personally teach? Please know this question is the focus of this review and we are requesting a complete, detailed, and discursive answer so that we can understand your views as clearly and completely as possible.
2. *Art.* Please evaluate the art. Unusual in publishing, the art in *Severe Storms* has been developed in close concert with the manuscript as it has been written. We think this provides for a very strong integration which should result in a much more efficacious marriage of art and verbal discussion. Does the art in the chapters provided support the concepts at hand the way it should? How does it compare to the art in the book you use now?

**General Questions**

1. *Currency and Accuracy.* Do the materials in the chapters present an appropriately accurate and current picture of the topics as they currently stand?
2. *Competition*. Please comment on the competing books with which you are familiar. How does this book differ? If it isn’t obvious from your response please explain whether or not you think the differences you see are improvements.
3. *Strengths.* What are the primary strengths of this textbook for your course? In what ways does it meet or exceed your expectations?
4. *Weaknesses.* What are the primary limitations of this textbook for your course? In what ways does it not live up to your course goals?
5. *Helpfulness.* What is the single most important thing the author could do to make this text adoptable for your course?
6. *Uniqueness.* With the goal of distinguishing this text from others, how would you describe the text in just a sentence or two to a colleague?
7. *Your Thoughts.* Please let us know what you think of this manuscript in your own words. What makes it special and interesting? What potential do you see?
8. *Potential*. We would like to know if you think the book proposed here has the potential to be better than the book you are using for the course now. We know this takes a lot of imagination at this point, but judging from what you see here, please complete the below chart using 1 as “lowest or least likely” and 10 as “highest or most likely.”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Satisfaction with your current text in this course.** | 1[ ]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  6[ ]  7[ ]  8[ ]  9[ ]  10[ ]  |
| **Please rate the overall quality of the writing and reading-level of this textbook for your students.** | 1[ ]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  6[ ]  7[ ]  8[ ]  9[ ]  10[ ]  |
| **Overall opinion of this book proposal and reviewed sample chapters.** | 1[ ]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  6[ ]  7[ ]  8[ ]  9[ ]  10[ ]  |
| **Likelihood that *you personally* would adopt this new textbook for your Severe and Hazardous Weather course.** | 1[ ]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  6[ ]  7[ ]  8[ ]  9[ ]  10[ ]  |
| **(If applicable): Likelihood that *your committee* would adopt this new textbook for your Severe and Hazardous Weather course.** | 1[ ]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  6[ ]  7[ ]  8[ ]  9[ ]  10[ ]  |

1. *Anything else you can add?* Our goal is to create a new book for historical geology that is unique, and that will be perceived as “better than the current offerings” by many people teaching the course. If it isn’t obvious from your responses to the questions above, do you think we are on the right track? What can you tell us in the service of this goal that we have neglected to ask about here?