

OER Grant Rubric

The OER Grant program aims to significantly lower or eliminate the cost of required materials (e.g. textbooks) to enrolled students which is why applications are open to all faculty teaching at Rollins including adjuncts, artists-in-residence, lecturers, and visiting assistant professors.

This program aims to:

- Significantly lower or eliminate the cost of required materials to enrolled students in a specific course.
- Maintain and improve student learning outcomes and satisfaction with the required materials.
- Contribute to the growing body of OER available to the global higher education community.

Grants in the form of stipends of between \$500-\$3500 are available for Rollins faculty members interested in working with a team consisting of a librarian, an instructional technologist, and the Director of the Endeavor Center for Faculty Development to lower or eliminate the required course material costs for students in a specific course using Open Educational Resources (OER). The grant will be for two years, with, at least, two iterations of a specific course. The committee will fund OER projects based on resource opportunities.

This rubric will be the basis for how the Olin Library OER Group will judge and award OER grants.

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

Qualifying Questions	Yes	Νο
Is the proposed material an Open Educational Resource (OER)?		
Is the proposed material a replacement of a course material of at least \$50?		
Will the proposed material have a <u>Creative Commons</u> or <u>GNU</u> <u>license</u> that stipulates how the material may be used, reused, adapted, and shared?		

PROPOSAL

	EXCEEDS REQUIREMENTS 3 POINTS	MEETS REQUIREMENTS 2 POINTS	DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS 1 POINTS	INCOMPLETE 0 POINTS	POINT TOTAL
Project Goals	 Applicant clearly outlines specific, measurable, realistic, and achievable goals. A reviewer would have no questions about the project's goals. Application is well conceived, clearly stated, and would not need revisions. 	Applicant outlines specific, measurable, realistic, and achievable goals. A reviewer would have minor questions about the project's goals. Section could be edited for clarity.	Applicant outlines goals which are not specific, measurable, realistic and/or achievable. A reviewer would have many questions about the project's goals. Section would need to be significantly revised.	Goals not included.	
Project Outline (Timeline & Dates)	Applicant clearly outlines a specific and realistic timeline to complete the grant in two years, with, at least, two iterations of a specific course. A reviewer would have no questions about the project's timeline.	Applicant outlines a specific and realistic timeline to complete the grant in two years, with, at least, two iterations of a specific course. A reviewer would have minor questions about the project's timeline. Section could be edited for clarity.	Applicant outlines a timeline which is not specific and/or not realistic. A reviewer would have many questions about the project's timeline. Section would need to be significantly revised.	Timeline not included.	
Project Methods (Describes how materials will be created, gathered, assessed, evaluated and sustained)	Applicant clearly discusses how materials will be created, gathered, assessed, evaluated, and sustained using specific examples and details. A reviewer would have no questions about the project's methods and how they will contribute towards open education initiatives at Rollins.	Applicant discusses how materials will be created, gathered, assessed, evaluated, and sustained. Applicant uses some specific examples and details. A reviewer would have minor questions about the project's methods or how they will contribute towards open education initiatives at Rollins. Section could be edited for clarity.	Applicant's discussion of methods does not adequately address how materials will be created, gathered, assessed, evaluated, and sustained. Applicant uses no or very few examples and details. A reviewer would have many questions about the project's methods and its contributions to open education initiatives at Rollins. Section would need to be significantly revised.	Project methods not included.	
Project Impact: Cost Savings	Applicant clearly discusses how the project will significantly lower or eliminate the cost of required materials to enrolled students in a specific course using specific examples and details. The average enrollment in the course and the frequency with which it is scheduled is considered for maximum impact. A reviewer would have no questions about the project's impact.	Applicant discusses how the project will lower or eliminate the cost of required materials for enrolled students in a specific course. A reviewer would have minor questions about the project's methods. Section could be edited for clarity.	Applicant's discussion does not adequately address how the project will lower or eliminate the cost of required materials. A reviewer would have many questions about the project's methods. Section would need to be significantly revised.	Project impact on cost savings not included.	

Grant Application Total

PROPOSAL CRITERIA

CRITERIA TO PRIORITIZE	RESOURCES NEEDED FOR PROJECT SUCCESS	COST SAVINGS FOR STUDENTS
• Does the proposal have the potential to lower the costs of required course materials for many students because the course has high enrollment, is taught frequently, or in multiple	• Applicant outlines appropriate and relevant resources needed for success using specific examples and details.	• Applicant discusses and demonstrates potential cost savings for students.
sections?	• The availability of suitable OER in major repositories (MERLOT, Florida's Digital Orange Grove, OER Commons, etc.	• Applicant discusses how to eliminate or significantly lower the cost of required materials.
 Does the proposal make effective use of Library personnel, instructional technologists, and the Director of the Endeavor Center for Faculty Development? 	 The creation of new OER materials is considered.	• Applicant considers student learning outcomes and satisfaction with the required materials.



SCOPE OF PROJECT

INCORPORATE	INNOVATE	CREATE
 Proposals in this category will replace an existing commercial textbook with a no- or low-cost alternative such that total textbook costs for the course are less than \$50.00. Priority will be given to proposals that utilize existing openly licensed materials to bring down the total cost of traditional required materials from the last time the course was taught to impact the largest amount of students. <i>Examples: Use an Open Textbook Library mathematics textbook in Math 111.</i> 	Proposals in this category will replace a commercial textbook with an open textbook and use freely licensed materials to bridge the gap in available resources through remix of new and/or existing openly licensed content. <i>Example: Compile an introductory textbook for genetics by</i> <i>incorporating revised openly available works with chapters from</i> <i>an OER commons textbook and create ancillary materials and</i> <i>homework.</i>	Proposals in this category will create a new OER where there is currently no sufficient OER available to meet learning objectives. <i>Examples: Author a new openly licensed textbook or collaborate</i> <i>with students on the creation of a new textbook.</i>
RUBRIC TOTAL: 12 - 11 points: \$1000.00 10 - 9 points: \$750.00 8 - 6 points: \$500.00	RUBRIC TOTAL: 12 - 11 points: \$1000.00- \$2500.00 10 - 9 points: \$750.00-\$2000.00 8 - 6 points: \$500.00-\$1500.00	RUBRIC TOTAL: 12 - 11 points: \$1000.00-\$3500.00 10 - 9 points: \$750.00-\$3000.00 8 - 6 points: \$500.00-\$2500.00

Notice: A proposal that falls within a column and scores within a range does not necessarily warrant an awarded OER grant. The OER grant committee will use the rubric to evaluate the proposal and decide if a grant will be offered. OER grant awards are contingent on funding.

