

## Open and Affordable Textbook Course Redesign Evaluation Rubric

### 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	Sustainability	Assessment	Cost Savings	Accessibility
	20%	15%	15%	30%	20%

	Approach	Sustainability	Assessment	Cost Savings	Accessibility
Criteria/Factors	Specifies open educational resources (OER) or other free or low-cost alternatives that will replace traditional course materials.	Demonstrates potential for use of new course materials over time and across the campus/university	Proposes an assessment plan to evaluate the quality of the new material and their use in courses on the subject	Demonstrates cost savings to students (as represented by savings per student x number of students impacted)	Describes a plan to use course materials in a web accessible format
	<p>Clear statement of the materials that are currently being used that are not low-cost, no cost, or open access.</p> <p>Clear statement of the materials that will be used.</p> <p>Clear and realistic</p>	<p>Potential and likelihood for broad adoption.</p> <p>Curricular position: course is a required undergraduate, graduate, or general education course.</p> <p>Anticipated ongoing course offerings for</p>	<p>Clear statement of a plan for gathering feedback from peers and students about the quality of the materials and their alignment with curricular goals.</p> <p>Clear statement of a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the</p>	Calculated by Rutgers University Libraries using information provided on the application	<p>Gives specific examples of how the new course materials are more accessible for students</p> <p>The new course materials will meet or exceed the <a href="#">digital accessibility standard of WCAG 2.1-AA</a>.</p>

	<p>project plan including a timeline for adoption (researching, identifying, and verifying the availability of the materials).</p> <p>Alignment with the university's strategic plans.</p> <p>Description of support that is available to complete the project, including support from the department or school.</p> <p>Applicant's capacity to complete the project.</p>	<p>sections using the material.</p> <p>Plan for ongoing maintenance and updates.</p> <p>Long-term viability of the resource.</p>	<p>materials.</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 sustainability</p>	<p>Comprehensively addresses all the factors</p> <p>The evaluator will have no questions about the project's assessment plan</p>	<p>Cost savings per student are over \$251 and/or total cost savings are over \$10,000</p>	<p>Clearly and specifically gives examples of how the course materials make the subject matter and approach more accessible to students</p> <p>Articulates how the course materials will meet the minimum</p>

					<a href="#">digital accessibility standard of WCAG 2.1-AA</a>  The evaluator will have no questions about the project's commitment to 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 sustainability	Addresses most of the criteria/factors  The evaluator will have minor questions about the project's assessment plan	Cost savings per student are \$101 - \$250 and/or total cost savings are between \$3,801 and 9,999	Articulates how the materials foster accessibility (beyond cost/affordability) and will meet the minimum <a href="#">digital accessibility standard of WCAG 2.1-AA</a>  The evaluator will have minor questions about the project's commitment to equality, opportunity, and 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 sustainability	Addresses some of the criteria/factors  The evaluator will have questions about the project's assessment plan	Cost savings per student are \$75 - \$100 and/or total cost savings are between \$2,501 and \$3,800	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	Cost savings per student are under \$74 and/or total cost savings are less than \$2500	Provides a cursory description of accessibility, or only considers cost savings/affordability

