Open and Affordable Textbook Authoring Award Evaluation Criteria

OAT Program Objectives
- Support course materials affordability at Rutgers
- Promote the use of open and affordable educational resources
- Empower faculty to innovate their teaching using open, free, or library-licensed materials and teaching aids

	Criteria Weights				
	30%	20%	15%	15%	20%

	Approach	Feasibility	Environmental Scan	Assessment	Accessibility
Criteria/Factors	Proposes a compelling case for the creation and development of a new open textbook that can be adopted in courses at Rutgers University, and beyond, using Creative Commons licensing	Proposes a feasible timeline for completing the textbook within one calendar year	Documents the need for an open textbook, including gaps in existing open textbook offerings	Proposes an assessment plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the material and its use in courses on the subject	The application describes a plan to create digital course materials in a web accessible format.
	Includes Table of contents. Potential for broad adoption. Description of pedagogical innovation, currency, and relevance. Appropriate CC licensing and clear plan for sharing and distribution; if plans	Clear and feasible timeline for completion. Description of progress to date. Plan for ongoing maintenance and updates. Disclosure of gaps in the author's expertise (e.g., publishing platform expertise) and a plan to address them.	Documents the sources consulted to determine the need for an open textbook. Reports the results of the environmental scan. Explains gaps in existing open textbooks on the subject.	Proposes a realistic plan for conducting quality assurance in the new open textbook. Proposes submitting the open textbook to a repository that provides peer review; alternatively, provides a plan for an evaluation or critique of the open textbook.	Gives specific examples of how the work's subject matter and approach are made more accessible Articulates how the new open textbook will meet or exceed the digital accessibility standard of WCAG 2.1 AA.

	include use of copyrighted content, shows awareness of best practices for fair use. Disclosure of contributors and roles.		Demonstrates the relevance of the proposed work to the subject as taught at Rutgers University and elsewhere.		
Comprehensive (4)	Comprehensively addresses all the factors The evaluator will have no questions about the project's approach	Comprehensively addresses all the factors The evaluator will have no questions about the project's feasibility	Comprehensively addresses all the factors The evaluator will have no questions about the project's environmental scan	Comprehensively addresses all the factors The evaluator will have no questions about the project's assessment plan	Clearly and specifically gives examples of how the work makes the subject matter and approach more accessible Articulates how the new open textbook will meet the minimum digital accessibility standard of WCAG 2.1-AA The evaluator will have no questions about the project's contribution to fostering accessibility
Good (3)	Addresses most of the criteria/factors The evaluator will have minor questions about the project's approach	Addresses most of the criteria/factors The evaluator will have minor questions about the project's feasibility	Addresses most of the criteria/factors The evaluator will have minor questions about the project's environmental scan	Addresses most of the criteria/factors The evaluators will have minor questions about the project's assessment plan	Articulates how the new open textbook fosters accessibility (beyond cost/affordability) and will meet the minimum digital accessibility standard of WCAG 2.1-AA The evaluator will have minor questions about the project's

					commitment to accessibility
Fair (2)	Addresses some of the criteria/factors The evaluator will have questions about the project's approach	Addresses some of the criteria/factors The evaluator will have questions about the project's feasibility	Addresses some of the criteria/factors The evaluator will have questions about the project's environmental scan	Addresses some of the criteria/factors The evaluator will have questions about the project's assessment plan	Addresses some web accessibility criteria/factors The evaluator will have questions about the project's commitment to accessibility
Poor (1)	Provides a cursory description of the criteria/factors	Provides a cursory description of the criteria/factors	Provides a cursory description of the criteria/factors	Provides a cursory description of the criteria/factors	Provides a cursory description of accessibility or only considers cost savings/affordability