

Open SLCC Grant Application & Rubric (Spr 2025)

**Note: This document is provided for review purposes only. The actual application is hosted on [CampusGroups](#), which will require an SLCC login.*

IMPORTANT INFORMATION BEFORE YOU APPLY:

Please note, the intent is for this to be a fairly simple application process. Providing estimates and concise explanations should suffice. For your convenience, we provide rubrics below the questions. At Open SLCC, we do not anticipate nor suggest aiming for perfect scores. We expect many of your answers to fall into the "fair" rating. We understand each project is unique and will excel in some categories, but not all. If your application shows promise, our office may reach out to clarify your proposal rather than rejecting the application outright. Once approved, we will collaborate with you to develop a more detailed plan, addressing the more nuanced or unresolved aspects of your project.

If you start this application and are unable to finish in one sitting, you may "Save as Draft" and come back and finish it by logging back in with your SLCC credentials. Submit your application by April 4, 2025.

What if I have questions about this application?

Please review the Open SLCC grants page on the [Open SLCC webpage](#) before and during the application process. If questions are not answered there, please contact the OER Director, Andrea.Scott@slcc.edu, or the OER Faculty Fellow, Brenda.Gardner@slcc.edu.

PAGE 1: PROJECT COLLABORATORS, INCLUDING OER AND ACCESSIBILITY EXPERIENCE

In this section, please list the following:

1. The project category, title or course impacted, and a brief description.
2. All collaborators/authors involved in this project, including titles and departmental/supervisor information.
3. The anticipated percentage of work for each collaborator/author.
4. Each collaborator/author's level of Open Educational Resources (OER) experience.
5. Each collaborator/author's accessibility experience.

*Note: SLCC can currently only accommodate internal collaborators/authors using an RFP. External support is welcomed, though funding must be provided by their respective institution. **Reviewers or editing support will be listed later in this application.***

The next three questions will be combined into the rubric category: PROJECT CATEGORY, TITLE & DESCRIPTION

CATEGORY:

Which category are you applying for?

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt | <p>Adopt: an existing open textbook or open course content without making significant changes to the content (use ~75-100% of existing content).</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain | <p>Maintain: Update existing OER that requires minor editing for currency or relevance, without major changes to the content or structure.</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ancillary | <p>Ancillary: Adopt existing OER and develop missing ancillaries such as quiz question banks, lecture slides, or lab manuals.</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Revise/Remix | <p>Revise/Remix: Update existing OER with major revisions or develop custom course content from multiple open educational resources and original open content to support learning objectives not met by existing open resources (use ~50-75% of existing content).</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Author | <p>Author: Create a substantially new open textbook or open course where it is possible to demonstrate that quality resources are not currently available to meet learning objectives (use 0-50% of existing content).</p> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | <p>Other: Propose a different kind of project not covered by the categories above (up to \$30,000).</p> |

PROJECT TITLE (OPTIONAL):

Provide your project's title, if known. *Example: Intermediate Algebra Textbook*

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Provide a brief description of the work you plan to create.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
PROJECT CATEGORY, TITLE & DESCRIPTION Applicant selects their OER project category, 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 .

PROJECT LEAD:

List the Principal Project Lead/Author. *This person will be the main point of contact on the project.*

LEAD'S TITLE:

List the Lead Author's Job Title. *Example: Associate Professor*

LEAD'S DEPARTMENT:

List the Lead Author's Department.

LEAD'S SUPERVISOR:

List the lead's direct supervisor.

*The next three questions will be combined into the rubric category: **COLLABORATOR DETAILS & WORKLOAD ALLOCATION***

LEAD'S % WORK:

List the Lead Author's Anticipated % of Project Work.

PROJECT COLLABORATORS:

List all other participating collaborators.

Do not include reviewers or editors in project collaborators. Reviewers and editors will be listed later in this application.

COLLABORATORS JOB TITLE AND ALLOCATION OF WORK:

If there are other collaborators listed above, indicate the collaborator's title and the % of anticipated work that each participant will complete. You do not need to include the percent (%) for the lead since it is already listed.

Example:

Beyoncé Knowles, Assistant Professor, 20%

Elon Musk, Adjunct Faculty, 20%

Serena Williams, P.T. Staff, 10%

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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 .

OER EXPERIENCE:

Select the most appropriate statement for your project team's OER experience and/or trainings.

Please briefly describe evidence for your selected statement, if appropriate, in the comment box.

- All applicant(s) have completed an Intro to OER course (OER 101 or equivalent) and have strong OER experience.
- 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 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.
- None of the above. Please explain in the comments.

Intro to OER (OER 101) is an asynchronous OER course that is offered through SLCC trainings. Equivalent courses would be Creative Commons courses or similar/past Intro to OER trainings or webinars.

Strong OER experience means that an applicant has written or curated OER materials in the past, knows how to write attributions, and understands Creative Commons licensing.

Basic OER experience means that an applicant has participated in some writing or curating OER materials. There may still be some confusion about using or mixing Creative Commons licenses.

Comments

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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.

ACCESSIBILITY EXPERIENCE:

Select the most appropriate statement for your project team's accessibility experience and/or trainings.

Please briefly describe evidence for your selected statement, if appropriate, in the comment box.

- All applicants already have a clear understanding of how to create accessible materials. For example, all applicants have implemented accessibility into courses and are familiar with accessibility best practices like alt text, color contrast, logical order, and assistive technology compatibility, or all applicants have taken the Canvas course: "Universal Access Core Training."
- All applicants indicate they plan to take accessibility training or work with the Universal Access Coordinator to create accessible materials before they begin curating or creating content. The training timeline could be after the application is selected.
- If there is more than one author, one applicant will be taking an accessibility course and will ensure that the OER content chosen or created will be fully accessible to all students.
- Other. Please explain below.

In the comment box briefly list applicants' accessibility experience or courses/training or plans to acquire, if known.

Comments:

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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: COURSE IMPACT

In this section, you will provide details about the history and potential impacts of the course related to your project.

Specifically, you will:

- Indicate if the course is new or existing.
- Identify if the course impacted is a General Education course and its last 5-year review date.
- Determine if a new Course Curriculum Outline (CCO) will be required as part of the project.
- Assess if the project involves modifications to Canvas (LMS) and note the date of the last major course revision or update with eLearning.

Your responses will help us understand the implications for curriculum development and management.

NEW COURSE:

Is your project for a new course?

- Yes
- No

A **new course** is defined as a course that is new to the course catalog or has not been taught before. If your project does not impact a course, use "no" as your answer.

COURSE NUMBER:

List the Course Number(s) and Course Name(s) which will be impacted by your project. *Example: Math 1010 - Intermediate Algebra.*
 If your project does not impact a course, or you are unsure, please reach out to Andrea Scott.

The next several questions will be combined into the rubric category: COURSE IMPACT – GEN ED/New OR NON-GEN ED/New

GENERAL EDUCATION DESIGNATION:

Is the course impacted by the project a General Education course?

- Yes
- No

GENERAL EDUCATION FIVE-YEAR REVIEW: (QUESTION OPENS ONLY IF YES IS SELECTED ABOVE)

All Gen-Ed courses go through a five-year review process. When was the last five-year review completed for the course impacted? If you are unsure, check with Michael.Young@slcc.edu to confirm the date.

CCO IMPACT:

Do you anticipate needing to revise the CCO (Course Curriculum Outline) or conduct a new Gen-Ed review as part of this project?

- Yes
- No
- Unknown

Comments:

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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 will be revised as part of the project.	The course impacted by this project had a five-year review two to three years ago , or the CCO or review 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 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 , or 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 .

LAST MAJOR CONTENT REVISION:

When was the last major revision or adoption of new course materials? This includes using eLearning to help integrate new content into Canvas or going through a faculty textbook committee to adopt new materials. Feel free to clarify in the comments.

- Unknown
- Over 4 years ago
- 3-4 years ago
- 2-3 years ago
- 1-2 years ago

Comments:

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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 know when the last major content revision was.

PAGE 3: STUDENT SAVINGS IMPACT

In this section, you will provide information about the course offerings and the materials currently in use. This includes:

- The number of sections the course was offered in the last academic year, broken down by semester.
- The average number of students enrolled per section.
- Whether the proposed OER (Open Educational Resources) will replace the primary course materials.
- The total cost of textbook materials that each student is currently required to purchase for this course, which will be replaced by the proposed OER.

Your responses will help us understand the scope of the course offerings and the financial impact on students. You may skip this entire page if your project does not impact an SLCC course.

Answers on this page will be combined into the rubric category: STUDENT-SAVINGS IMPACT

NUMBER OF SECTIONS:

List the number of sections this course was offered in the last academic year. Include all semesters it was offered and the number of sections for each semester. *Example: Fall=15; Spring=8; Summer=2*

ENROLLMENT:

List the average number of students enrolled per section.

REPLACEMENT OF MATERIALS:

Will the OER you are proposing replace the primary course materials?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure. Please explain in the comments. *Comments:*

STUDENT COST:

What is the total cost of textbook materials that each student is currently required to purchase for this course that will be replaced?

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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 AND OER COMMUNITY IMPACT

In this section, you will provide details about your collaboration with a Library Liaison and the gap analysis process for identifying suitable Open Educational Resources (OER). Specifically, you will:

- Confirm whether you have worked with a Library Liaison.
- Describe the suitable OER materials that you or the Library Liaison found and identify any gaps in the available OER.
- Upload your gap analysis or search worksheet, if available.
- Estimate the percentage of the project that can be curated from the materials mentioned in the OER gap analysis.
- Indicate the anticipated impact of your project materials on other courses at SLCC or other institutions.

Your responses will help us understand the extent of your research and the potential reach and impact of your project materials.

The next three questions will be combined into the rubric category: GAP ANALYSIS

LIBRARIAN:

Have you worked with a Library Liaison?

- Yes
- No
- Other. Please explain.

Comments:

GAP ANALYSIS:

Describe the suitable OER materials that you or the Library Liaison found or the repositories and directories that you searched and identify any gaps in the available OER. If applicable, you can upload the gap analysis in the next question.

For example, OER Commons, MERLOT, and OpenStax, etc., and identify gaps in the available OER.

GAP ANALYSIS UPLOAD (OPTIONAL):

Upload your gap analysis or search worksheet.

ESTIMATE OF RE-USABLE OER CONTENT:

After conducting a gap analysis, I estimate that I will be able to:

- Use none of the materials mentioned in the OER gap analysis.
- Curate 0-50% of the project from materials mentioned in the OER gap analysis.

- Curate 50-75% of the project from materials mentioned in the OER gap analysis (*Note: this would be considered a revise/remix category. If you select this box, be sure it matches your selected category on Page 1, if not, update your category.*)
- Curate 75-100% of the project from materials mentioned in the OER gap analysis. (*Note: this would be considered an adopt category. If you select this box, be sure it matches your selected category on Page 1, if not, update your category.*)
- Other - Please describe in the comment box.

Comments:

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
GAP ANALYSIS Applicant conducted and submitted a gap analysis, demonstrating the need to create or adapt an OER and indicates 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

OER COMMUNITY IMPACT:

Do you anticipate that other courses at SLCC or other institutions will use your project materials? If so, please select the statement that most closely aligns with the anticipated reach of your project.

- I anticipate other courses in my department may use the materials.
- I anticipate other courses in my division, or other courses outside my division but within SLCC, may use the materials.
- I anticipate other courses within USHE (the state of Utah) may be interested in using the materials.
- I anticipate other courses across the nation may be interested in using the materials.
- I don't anticipate this project will impact any other courses.
- Unsure. Please explain.

Comments:

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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, OUTLINE, AND TIMELINE

In this section, you will provide detailed information about your project’s, scope, outline, and timeline. Please use the compensation and timeline guide found on the [Open SLCC Website](#) to provide the projected hours and to create a budget that outlines specific responsibilities for each project role, including editing and reviewing.

This section includes:

- Scope: The anticipated number of chapters, modules, or articles.
- Outline: Your project’s outline, if available, including names or topics of modules or chapters, outcomes, objectives, etc.
- Timeline Dates: Your anticipated project start date and estimated timelines for piloting and fully rolling out your OER.
- Timeline Hours: A detailed project timeline based on your outline, highlighting key milestones and estimated hours dedicated by your project team.

This information will help us understand the breadth of your project and ensures proper planning and allocation of resources.

The next two questions will be combined into the rubric category: PROJECT SCOPE AND OUTLINE

SCOPE:

Approximately how many chapters, modules, or articles do you anticipate for your project? *If your project does not have this type of structure, please leave it blank and describe the approximate scope in your project outline.*

OUTLINE:

If completed, attach an outline of your project, including module or chapter names or topics, outcomes, objectives, etc.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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.

The next five questions will be combined into the rubric category: ESTIMATED TIMELINE AND HOURS

ESTIMATED TIMELINE:

Anticipated Project Start Date

- July 2025 *Note: Funding will be available in July at the earliest.*
- August 2025
- Fall 2025
- Spring 2026
- Other. Please indicate in the comments. *Comments:*

Anticipated Project Pilot Date

What is your anticipated semester to pilot your OER? (Initial Completion).

- Fall 2025
- Spring 2026
- Summer 2026
- Fall 2026
- Spring 2027
- N/A
- Other. Please indicate in the comments. *Comments:*

Anticipated Project Completion Date

What is your anticipated semester to fully roll out your OER? (Final Completion).

- Spring 2026
- Summer 2026
- Fall 2027
- Spring 2027
- Summer 2027
- Fall 2027
- Other. Please indicate in the comments.

Comments:

ESTIMATED HOURS AND TIMELINE BASED ON OUTLINE:

Please attach your project timeline based on your outline. Be sure to consider key project milestones such as developmental editing, end-of-project editing, reviewing, piloting, publishing, wrap-up, and rollout to students. Include a breakdown of anticipated hours by semester, author, and project progression (writing/development, piloting, etc.).

Do not include other institutional support people's hours such as the Open SLCC editor, peer review, or eLearning. Please provide the following details for your project.

1. Project Timeline:

- Break down development of your chapter goals, objectives, topics, and articles by month or week.
- Include key milestones such as:
 - Developmental editing
 - End-of-project editing
 - Reviewing
 - Piloting
 - Publishing
 - Wrap-up
 - Rollout to students

2. Estimated Hours:

- Provide an estimated breakdown of hours per author and per semester.
- Detail the hours required for each stage of the project's progression.

TOTAL COLLABORATOR HRS:

Based on your timeline hours, enter the total estimated hours that your project team will spend on this project.

Do not include other institutional support people's hours such as the Open SLCC editor, peer review, or eLearning.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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 PROJECT DETAILS

In this section, you will select the Open Educational Resources (OER) project category, provide a project description, and specify a potential distribution platform, if available. Following that, you will outline the project's license, teaching and learning impact as well as its cultural relevance, demonstrating how it will benefit populations disproportionately affected by textbook costs.

OER LICENSING:

State which Creative Commons license you intend to apply to your work, if already determined.

See: <https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/licenses/>

- CC-BY
- CC BY-SA
- CC BY-NC
- CC BY-NC-SA
- CC BY-ND
- CC BY-NC-ND
- CCO
- To be determined

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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 CCO.	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

NEW TOOLS FOR CONTENT ENGAGEMENT:

If you are creating or using new or interactive digital tools (beyond content) in your project that were not previously used in the course, please list the tool and how it will be used to enhance teaching and to engage your students.

Examples could include the use of quizzes, H5P, interactive maps, audio, videos to create interactivity and engagement.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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.

STUDENT-CENTRIC CONTENT DEVELOPMENT:

How will you ensure that students' diverse perspectives and experiences are integrated into your project? For example, you could include varied authorship perspectives or reviewers or incorporate open pedagogy into building your content.

[Examples](#) of Open Pedagogy

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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.

PUBLISHING PLATFORM:

If already determined, on which platform will the content or project be shared with students, the college, and the broader community?

- Pressbooks
- Canvas Commons
- Other - please indicate in comments
- Unknown

Part of being "open" is the requirement to share your project with the broader community. SLCC currently supports the platforms of Pressbook and Canvas Commons.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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: USE OF OPEN SLCC SUPPORT TEAM MEMBERS

In this section, you will indicate what supports you may need outside of your project team. You will also specify the pre-application steps taken using SLCC support personnel and indicate the post-application support your project may require, including using the OER Editor, eLearning, and peer reviewers.

The next two questions will be combined into the rubric category: SLCC SUPPORT

SLCC SUPPORT ANTICIPATED:

I anticipate needing or have utilized the following support people for the project and/or application. Select all that apply.

- Pre-Project Help: Performing A Gap Analysis (Library Liaison)
- Pre-Project Help: Creating a Project Timeline (OER Director)
- Pre-Project Help: Creating a Project Outline (OER Editor)
- Pre-Project Help: Determining Editing Hours (OER Editor)
- Pre-Project Help: OER 101 Training (OER Faculty Fellow)
- Post-Grant Approval Help: Canvas Integration (eLearning)
- Post-Grant Approval Help: Accessibility Training (Accessibility Coordinator)
- Post-Grant Approval Help: OER Copyright Review (OER Director & Library Liaison)
- Post-Production Help: Pressbook Integration (OER Director)
- Other - Please list

Please note that not all listed supports may be required for your project. In the next question you will select those that you have already contacted. Comments:

SLCC SUPPORT PEOPLE CONTACTED:

I have already communicated with the following support people for the listed pre-project help. Select all that apply.

- Pre-Project Help: Performing A Gap Analysis (Library Liaison)
- Pre-Project Help: Creating a Project Timeline (OER Director)
- Pre-Project Help: Creating a Project Outline (OER Editor)
- Pre-Project Help: Determining Editing Hours (OER Editor)
- Pre-Project Help: OER 101 Training (OER Faculty Fellow)
- Other - Please list

Please note that not all listed supports may be required for your project.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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.

The next two questions will be combined into the rubric category: EDITING PLAN

EDITING PLAN:

Select the most appropriate statement for your editing plan. Then briefly describe your plan, including the instrument and timeline for editing in the comment box below the choices.

- I/we intend to edit the content utilizing the Open SLCC editor. We have already spoken with the editor and have included the plan in our timeline.
- I/we intend to edit the content either with the Open SLCC editor or a nationally recognized instrument. We have not spoken with the editor but have included estimated editing in our submitted timeline.
- I/we intend to edit the content between the team members using a nationally recognized instrument.
- I/we are currently unsure about how we will edit.
- Other. Please explain.

Nationally recognized documents include Grammarly, ChatGPT (just for checking editing, grammar), etc.

SLCC EDITOR:

List the anticipated editing hours you require from the SLCC editor. You may want to contact Linda.Bult@slcc.edu for help estimating.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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.

PEER REVIEW PLAN:

Select the most appropriate statement for your peer-review plan. Then briefly describe your plan and timeline for reviewing, including who the reviewers are, if determined, in the comment box below the choices.

- More than one peer reviewer, outside of the applicant(s), has already agreed to ensure quality and standards alignment.
- More than one peer reviewer, outside of the applicant(s), will be used to ensure quality and standards alignment, but we don't have them determined.
- One peer reviewer will be used, OR applicants will review the work themselves.
- Applicant(s) want the project peer reviewed, but we don't have a plan yet.
- Applicant(s) do not plan on or need peer reviewing. Please explain in the comments.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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. <i>Peer reviewers have already agreed.</i>	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. <i>Peer reviewers are to be determined.</i>	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: PUBLICIZING AND FINALIZING YOUR PROJECT

In this section, you will indicate any external or other internal funding sources, and you will outline your plans for publicizing this project, if known, and provide any additional comments you wish the evaluation committee to consider. You will also add a letter from your supervisor, review the requirements for all Open SLCC Grants, and agree with a digital signature.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES:

Have you applied for or been granted any external or other internal funding sources (money or release time) for this proposal? Please indicate "yes" if this project includes working with eLearning on a course redesign.

- Yes. Please indicate additional funding in comments.
- No
- To be determined. Please indicate potential funding/compensation in the comments.

PUBLICIZING PLANS (OPTIONAL):

I/we plan to publicize this grant-funded project by:

- Providing Open SLCC with press-worthy updates.
- Presenting in webinars, workshops, and professional meetings.
- Give a presentation to department colleagues.
- Other - please comment below.

Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (OPTIONAL):

Please add any additional comments that you want the review committee to know. Include unaddressed comments about this project, where applicable.

DEPARTMENT SUPPORT LETTER:

Please attach a support letter from your supervisor, such as your Chair, AD, or Dean.

This letter verifies that the grant recipients will be approved of the RFP and assigned to teach the redesigned course at least once during the grant timeline. If it is not possible to guarantee that the grant recipients will teach the redesigned course during this period, please identify one or more alternates who will commit to using the open materials if the grant is awarded and the course is redesigned. Letters can be attached via this form or emailed to Andrea Scott.

RUBRIC	WEIGHT	5: OUTSTANDING	4: EXCELLENT	3: FAIR	2: NEEDS WORK	0: LACKING
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.

PAGE 9: SIGNATURE & SUBMIT YOUR APPLICATION:

Your signature indicates agreement to the following:

1. I/we agree to share a link with Open SLCC to the OER content during the project's creation. For example, you may add Open SLCC to a Sharepoint site during the development/collaboration phase.
2. I/we agree to provide a list of resources used to curate or build the project.
3. I/we agree to provide an open link (no login required) to the fully developed content so that material can be accessed, cataloged, and used by Open SLCC as well as anyone in the institution and the broader community. Examples: Pressbooks, Canvas Commons.
4. I/we agree to add the \$5 OER course fee (no cost/low cost) to all courses taught with the content created.
5. I/we agree to share course enrollment numbers with Open SLCC.
6. I/we agree to report adoption to the campus bookstore on time.
7. I/we agree to complete a final project form for final payment.

1) When you hit submit, your application will be forwarded to your supervisor for review and approval.

2) You will be notified by Open SLCC via email if awarded or if there are additional suggestions for your proposal if it is not accepted this round.

3) Once awarded, a meeting will be scheduled with the OER director to discuss payout structure and other project details. At the end of this meeting, an initial RFP will be drafted and sent for signatures.

PLEASE CLICK THE "SUBMIT" BUTTON TO COMPLETE THE FORM!

Open SLCC Contact Information

Andrea.Scott@slcc.edu
801.957.4734