Open SLCC Grant Evaluation Rubric

SLCC's Open Education Resources evaluators will use the rubric to select Open SLCC Grant application awardees. Before you complete your grant application, we advise and encourage applicants to review the rubric below and the other documents provided on the Open SLCC Grant Website.

Please note that the rubric below follows the same sequence as the questions/information presented on the application for your convenience. At Open SLCC, we do not anticipate nor suggest aiming for perfect scores on applications. We understand each project is unique and will excel in some categories, but not all. If your application demonstrates promise, our office may opt to seek clarification on your proposal rather than outright rejection. Additionally, the term 'applicant' within the rubric encompasses all project members.

		WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
PAGE 1	PROJECT CATEGORY, TITLE & DESCRIPTION Applicant selects their OER project category and provides a project/course title & description	X1	Applicant picked an appropriate category and had a **well-laid-out description**. Reviewers have no questions.	Applicant has an **acceptable** category and project description.	Applicant's category is appropriate, but the **description could use more detail.** *Reviewers have 1-2 questions.*	Applicant's category may not be appropriate, and/or the **description is unclear. Reviewers have several questions.**	The project category OR description is **missing information to properly assess.**
PAGE 1	COLLABORATOR DETAILS & WORKLOAD ALLOCATION Applicant details title, department, supervisor, project collaborators and percentage of workload	X2	Applicant lists their job title, supervisor, **two or more additional collaborators,** and all collaborators' workload percentages.	Applicant lists their job title, supervisor, **two or more additional collaborators,** but the project **work percentages *seem skewed.***	Applicant lists their job title, supervisor, **one additional** collaborator, and project work percentages.	Applicant lists their job title, supervisor, **includes one collaborator,** but the project **work** percentage seems **skewed.**	Applicant lists their job title, supervisor, but **has not included any project collaborators**.

Updated: 11/26/2024

		WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
PAGE 1	OER EXPERIENCE Applicant indicates their OER experience, including knowing how to give proper attributions and understands Creative Commons licensing.	X2	All applicant(s) have completed an Intro to OER course (OER 101 or equivalent) **and** have strong OER experience. **Each applicant provides evidence.**	All applicant(s) have **either** completed or are **enrolled in** an Intro to OER course (OER 101 or equivalent) **OR** have strong OER experience.	At least **one** of the applicants has strong OER licensing experience or has completed an Intro to OER course. Other applicants will take or are currently enrolled in Intro to OER.	**All applicants are new** to OER and will be or currently are taking an Intro to OER course.	Applicant **did not address** any basic OER understanding nor indicate how they will learn about licensing and attributions.
PAGE 1	ACCESSIBILITY EXPERIENCE Applicant indicates their accessibility-experience level	X2	All applicants have demonstrated they have a clear understanding of how to create accessible materials, or all have taken "Universal Access Core Training." **Each applicant provides evidence.**	All applicants indicate they have a clear understanding of how to create accessible materials, or all applicants may have taken "Universal Access Core Training." **Evidence is missing or incomplete.**	All applicants indicate **they plan to take accessibility training** or to work with the Universal Access Coordinator to create accessible materials before they begin curating or creating content.	If there is more than one author, **one** applicant will be taking an accessibility course to ensure that the OER content chosen or created will be fully accessible to all students.	The applicant **does not adequately outline** their accessibility experience or how they will accomplish it.
PAGE 2 (Select Appropriate Row)	COURSE IMPACT – **IF GEN ED COURSE** Applicant indicates the project's impact to **a Gen-Ed course.**	X2	The course impacted by this project **is new,** or the **five-year review was over four years ago**.	The course impacted by this project underwent a **five-year review three to four years ago,** or the **CCO will be revised** as part of the project.	The course impacted had a **five-year review two to three years ago,** or the **CCO will not be impacted,** or more than one Gen-Ed course is impacted.	The course had a major revision to the CCO, or the **five-year review was less than two years ago,** and/or the **CCO will not be impacted.**	This project is a revision of a current OER but had a **major revision to the CCO or had a five-year review less than one year ago.**
	COURSE IMPACT – **IF NON-GEN ED COURSE** Applicant indicates the project's impact to **a non-Gen-Ed** course**.**		The project is for a **new course**.	The project is part of creating a **revised CCO for the course.**	The project impacts a course, **but not the CCO. O**r the project **does not impact a course.** Or more than one course is impacted.	The applicant has not considered whether the CCO will need to be updated.	The project is a revision of a current OER but had a **major revision to the CCO less than one year ago.**

Updated: 11/26/2024

		WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
PAGE 2	LAST MAJOR CONTENT REVISION Applicant indicates the course material's date of last major revision/adoption.	X2	The course content was last revised or integrated into Canvas *over 4 years ago*.	The course content was revised *3-4 years ago*.	The project *does not impact a single course,* or the *last major revision was 2-3 years ago*.	The course content was revised *less than 2 years ago*.	Applicant *does not indicate* when the last major content revision was.
PAGE 3	STUDENT-SAVINGS IMPACT The applicant provides student enrollment and textbook costs estimates to determine the potential student-savings impact.	x3	Applicant's project plan and clear estimates will affect a *significant* number of students, leading to *significant changes* in student savings.	Applicant's project plan and clear estimates will affect a *proportional number of students*, leading to *substantial changes* in student savings.	Applicant's project plan and goals will have an *average impact* on student savings. Estimates are mostly clear.	Applicant's project plan and goals *do not affect many students and have a below-average impact* on student savings. Estimates are unclear.	Applicant's project plan *does not save students money* on textbook costs.
PAGE 4	GAP ANALYSIS Applicant conducted and submitted a gap analysis, demonstrating the need to create or adapt an OER and indicate the level of curation.	X2	Applicant has conducted a thorough, *organized, and detailed* OER materials search with a librarian's assistance and submitted a gap analysis. Their grant category selected matches the percentage of materials that can be curated.	Applicant has conducted a thorough OER materials search with a librarian's assistance and submitted a gap analysis. Their grant category is appropriate given the level of curation. *Reviewer may have some questions.*	Applicant has submitted a thorough OER materials search or gap analysis but may not have used a librarian, or there are *some questions about the gap analysis*. Their grant category may not be appropriate given the level of curation.	Applicant has submitted an OER materials search or gap analysis conducted by the lead author, but *there are several questions about the gap analysis*. Their grant category may be a mismatch with the level of curation.	The applicant did not submit a current OER materials search or gap analysis for the topic, or there are already duplicate OER materials. *REJECT this application if this is the case*

		WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
PAGE 4	OER COMMUNITY IMPACT Applicant determines the project's potential impact to other courses.	X3	Applicant anticipates other courses across the **nation** may be interested in using the materials.	Applicant anticipates other courses within **USHE** (the state of Utah) may be interested in using the materials.	Applicant anticipates other courses **within SLCC** may use the materials.	Applicant does not anticipate the project **will impact any other courses**.	Applicant does not answer the question or is **unsure**.
PAGE 5	PROJECT SCOPE AND OUTLINE Applicant has submitted a project scope and outline to develop and implement the OER.	X2	Applicant has submitted a **well-organized** outline to develop and implement the scope of OER content.	Applicant has submitted a well-organized outline, but there are **minor questions** about the scope or outline.	Applicant has submitted an outline, but there are **several questions** about the scope or outline.	Applicant's outline and scope **need improvement** or do not match up.	Applicant has **not submitted** an outline.
PAGE 5	ESTIMATED TIMELINE AND HOURS Applicant has established a timeline to develop and implement the OER.	X2	Applicant has submitted a **well-documented** timeline and estimated hours to develop and implement the OER. **Hours are in line with the OER compensation guide**.	Applicant has submitted a well-documented timeline and estimated hours, but there are **minor questions** about the timeline details.	Applicant has submitted a timeline and estimated hours, but there are **several questions** about the timeline or hours.	Applicant's timeline **needs improvement.** Hours are not at all in line with the OER compensation guide.	Applicant has **not submitted** a timeline or estimated hours.
PAGE 6	OER LICENSING Applicant states which Creative Commons CC licensing they intend to use, if determined.	X1	Project licensing is planned to be designated as **CC-BY** or CC0.	Project licensing is listed and **does not have an ND designation**.	Project licensing has **not yet been determined**.	Project licensing has been determined and **includes an ND** designation.	N/A

OPENSLCC

		WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
PAGE 6	NEW TOOLS FOR CONTENT ENGAGEMENT The applicant describes the specific new OER digital tools and how they plan to use these materials to enhance teaching and learning and to improve student success.	x2	Applicant provides a **comprehensive and detailed description** of the new OER digital tools, using **innovative and meaningful** applications to enhance teaching, learning, and student success.	Applicant describes the new OER digital tools in a **substantial** manner, explaining how they will enhance teaching, learning, and student success.	Applicant mentions they plan to use new OER digital tools but provides **limited details** on how they will enhance teaching, learning, and student success.	Applicant acknowledges they plan to use new OER digital tools **but does not adequately address** how these tools will enhance teaching, learning, and student success.	Applicant **does not address** that they will use new OER digital tools or their potential impact on teaching, learning, and student success.
PAGE 6	STUDENT-CENTRIC CONTENT DEVELOPMENT The applicant addresses how their project will integrate students' diverse perspectives and experiences in their OER project.	X2	Applicant demonstrates a **comprehensive plan** to integrate students' diverse perspectives and experiences into their OER project.	Applicant presents a **strong commitment** to integrate students' diverse perspectives and experiences into their project and has some details of how this will be achieved.	Applicant **acknowledges the importance** of integrating students' diverse perspectives and experiences into their project but provides **limited details** on how they will achieve this.	Applicant **marginally addresses** the need to include students' diverse perspectives and experiences in their OER project.	Applicant **does not address** integrating students' diverse perspectives and experiences in their OER project.
PAGE 6	PUBLISHING PLATFORM Applicant addresses their publishing platform.	X1	N/A	N/A	Project will use a **supported distribution platform.**	The distribution platform is **unknown**.	The distribution platform is currently **unsupported**.
PAGE 7	SLCC SUPPORT The applicant has approached appropriate departments to secure support.	X1	Applicant has communicated with **all anticipated** pre-project support people for help.	Based on anticipated support, applicant has contacted **more than one, but not all** pre-project support people for help.	Applicant has contacted **one** pre-project support person for help.	Based on anticipated support, applicant has **not contacted any** pre-project support people for help.	Both anticipated and contacted SLCC support questions were **left blank**.

Updated: 11/26/2024

		WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
PAGE 7	EDITING PLAN The applicant has provided a content editing plan and timeline.	X2	Applicant has provided a **strong** project editing plan and timeline, which they have planned with the Open SLCC editor.	Applicant has provided a **feasible** editing plan and timeline. Content will be edited either with the Open SLCC editor or a nationally recognized instrument.	*The original applicant(s)* will *edit the* content.	The applicant's content *editing plan is unclear or unknown*.	Applicant *does not mention editing* for the OER to be adapted/created, and it is clear from the description that editing will be necessary.
PAGE 7	PEER REVIEW PLAN Applicant has determined how the OER to be adapted/created will be peer-reviewed.	X1	Applicant has detailed how the OER to be adapted/created will be peer-reviewed by multiple qualified reviewers to determine the OER's quality and standards alignment. *Peer reviewers have already agreed.*	Applicant has detailed how the OER to be adapted/created will be peer-reviewed by multiple qualified reviewers to determine the OER's quality and standards alignment. *Peer reviewers are to be determined.*	*One additional peer reviewer* will be used. OR applicants will be reviewing the work themselves.	Applicant wants a peer review but *does not have a plan* yet about who will review the OER to be adapted/created or is *unclear about who* will peer review the OER.	Applicant *does not plan on or need peer reviewing or does not provide information* or mention who or if the OER to be adapted/created will be peer reviewed.
PAGE 8	DEPARTMENT SUPPORT LETTER Applicant attaches a department or division support letter.	x2	Applicant's department and division **strongly support** the project.	Applicant's department and division **support** the project.	Applicant's department and division's **support is unclear,** or applicant is *awaiting* a department support letter.	Applicant's project *lacks full department support*.	Applicant's project does not include any department support. *REJECT the application if this is the case.*