

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. However, pay attention to the variations in weight indicated in the second column. 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: MISSING / LACKING RELEVANCE
PROJECT COLLABORATORS Applicant details project collaborators.	X2	Applicant included two or more additional collaborators and percent of project work.	Applicant included two or more additional collaborators but the percent of project work seems skewed .	Applicant included one additional collaborator and percent of project work.	Applicant included one collaborator , but the percent of project work seems skewed .	Applicant has not mentioned any project collaborators in the application.
OER EXPERIENCE Applicant indicates their experience of OER, including giving proper attributions and understanding Creative Commons licensing.	X2	All applicant(s) have completed an Intro to OER course (OER 101 or equivalent) and have strong OER experience. Evidence is provided for each applicant.	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 taken an Intro to OER course. Other applicants indicate they will or currently are taking the Intro to OER course.	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.

	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: MISSING / LACKING RELEVANCE
<p>ACCESSIBILITY EXPERIENCE</p> <p>Applicant indicates their level of accessibility experience.</p>	X2	All applicants have demonstrated they have a clear understanding of how to create accessible materials or have taken "Universal Access Core Training". Evidence is provided for each applicant.	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 have indicated 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 take an accessibility course and will ensure that the OER content chosen or created will be fully accessible to all students.	The applicant does not adequately outline how this will be accomplished.
<p>DEMONSTRATION OF OER PROJECT NEED, GAP ANALYSIS AND COMMUNITY IMPACT</p> <p>Applicant conducted and submitted a Gap Analysis, demonstrating the need to create or adapt an OER and indicated potential impact.</p>	X5	Applicant has conducted a thorough OER materials search with the assistance of a librarian and submitted a gap analysis, demonstrating a compelling national need.	Applicant has conducted a thorough OER materials search with the assistance of a librarian and submitted a gap analysis, demonstrating a compelling institutional need.	Applicant has submitted a thorough OER materials search or gap analysis, indicating there is a need for the OER project.	Applicant has submitted a thorough OER materials search or gap analysis, indicating there is some need for the OER project.	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
<p>OER PROJECT PLAN DETAILS</p> <p>Applicant selects their OER project category, provides a project description, and specifies a potential supported distribution platform.</p>	X1	Applicant has a well-laid-out description and project will utilize a supported distribution platform	Applicant has an acceptable project description and will utilize a supported distribution platform .	Applicant has an acceptable description. Distribution platform is unknown or currently unsupported.	Applicant includes a description that is lacking , or distribution may or may not be supported.	The project category and description are disorganized and/or information to properly assess.

	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: MISSING / LACKING RELEVANCE
<p>OER LICENSING</p> <p>Applicant states CC license if determined.</p>	X1	Project licensing is planned to be designated as CC-BY or CCO.	Project licensing does not have a ND designation.	Project licensing has not yet been determined.	Project licensing has been determined and includes a ND designation.	N/A
<p>TEACHING AND LEARNING IMPACT</p> <p>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.</p>	x2	Applicant details the project digital tools and how they plan to use these materials in novel and/or meaningful ways to enhance teaching and learning and student success, for example, using Open Pedagogy.	Applicant describes the project digital tools in some substantial ways to enhance teaching and learning and to improve student success.	Applicant somewhat describes a few ways how they plan to use these materials to enhance teaching and learning and to improve student success.	Applicant gives little consideration to how they plan to use these materials to enhance teaching and learning and to improve student success.	Applicant did not address how they plan to use these materials to enhance teaching and learning and to improve student success.
<p>CULTURALLY RELEVANT</p> <p>The applicant addresses commitment to include diverse perspectives in their OER project and to serve populations disproportionately affected by textbook costs.</p>	x2	Applicant demonstrates a strong plan to include diverse perspectives in their OER project and to serve populations disproportionately affected by textbook costs.	Applicant demonstrates a commitment to include diverse perspectives into their OER project and to serve populations disproportionately affected by textbook costs.	Applicant addresses the need to include diverse perspectives into their OER project but lacks clarity on how this will be accomplished.	Applicant minimally addresses the need to include diverse perspectives in their OER project and to serve populations disproportionately affected by textbook costs.	Applicant does not address the need to include diverse perspectives in their OER project and to serve populations disproportionately affected by textbook costs.
<p>STUDENT-SAVINGS IMPACT</p> <p>The applicant provides estimates to determine the potential student-savings impact.</p>	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.

	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: MISSING / LACKING RELEVANCE
<p>FEASIBLE TIMELINE</p> <p>Applicant has indicated key timelines for the project.</p>	X1	Based on project category and description, the applicant has indicated a feasible timeline to develop and implement the OER.	Based on project category and description, the indicated a timeline to develop and implement the OER, but there are minor questions about the feasibility	Based on project category and description, the indicated a timeline to develop and implement the OER, but there are several concerns about the timeline.	Applicant's key timelines are not feasible or otherwise need improvement.	Applicant has not submitted a timeline.
<p>PEER REVIEW PLAN</p> <p>Applicant has determined how the OER to be adapted/created will be reviewed.</p>	X1	Applicant has detailed how the OER to be adapted/created will be 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 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 has not provided information about who will review the OER to be adapted/created or is unclear about who will peer review the OER.	Applicant does not provide information or mention who or if the OER to be adapted/created will be peer reviewed.
<p>EDITING PLAN</p> <p>The applicant has provided a content editing plan and timeline.</p>	X2	Applicant has provided a strong project editing plan and timeline which has been 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 content will be edited by the original applicant(s).	The applicant's content editing plan is unclear or unknown.	Applicant does not mention editing for the OER to be adapted/created but it is clear from the description that editing will be necessary.

	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: MISSING / LACKING RELEVANCE
<p>SLCC SUPPORT</p> <p>The applicant has approached appropriate departments to secure support.</p>	X1	Based on project description and requested support, applicant has reached out to all appropriate support departments to secure support.	Based on description and requested support, applicant has reached out to all but one of the appropriate support departments to secure support.	Based on project description and requested support, applicant has reached out to all but two appropriate support departments to secure support.	N/A	Based on project description, applicant should have reached out to at least one of the support departments but did not.
<p>PROJECT OUTLINE/TIMELINE</p> <p>Applicant has submitted an outline and/or timeline to develop and implement the OER.</p>	X2	Applicant has submitted a well-documented timeline to develop and implement the OER.	Applicant has submitted a well-documented timeline but there are minor questions about the timeline details.	Applicant has submitted a timeline but there are several questions about the timeline.	Applicant's timeline needs improvement.	Applicant has not submitted a timeline.
<p>DETAILED BUDGET</p> <p>The applicant provides a project budget that defines member's roles and work-time estimates.</p>	X2	Applicant provides a detailed organized, and realistic budget for the project. Estimated times per person to complete their part of the project are realistic and stated within the budget.	Applicant's project plan provides an average-level project budget . Estimated times per person to complete their part of the project seem plausible.	Applicant provides some budget preparedness for the project, but the plan details or roles are somewhat vague . Estimated times per person to complete their part of the project may need some work.	Applicant's budget is not set up to fulfill the project's goals or budget, and plan details are either scarce or disorganized . Estimated times per person are not realistic.	Applicant's project plan budget is missing.
<p>DEPARTMENT SUPPORT LETTER</p> <p>Applicant attaches a department or division support letter.</p>	x2	Applicant's department and division strongly support the project.	Applicant's department and division support the project.	Applicant's department and division 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.

Attributions & Licensing:

Rubric customized for Salt Lake Community College by Brenda Gardner. Adapted from the following sources: [Affordable Learning Georgia](#), [Texas Tech University](#), and [Open Oregon's OER grant evaluation rubric](#). All sources listed, including this rubric, are licensed under [CC BY 4.0](#)