

## 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					
	Approach	Feasibility	Environmental Scan	Assessment	Accessibility
	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	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	Documents the sources consulted to determine the need for an open textbook.  Reports the results of the environmental scan.  Explains gaps in existing open	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	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 <a href="#">digital accessibility standard of WCAG 2.1 AA</a> .

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

			environmental scan		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