ARC OER/ZTC Project Evaluation Rubric

Purpose: To guide the Affordable Learning Materials Committee in evaluating and selecting OER/ZTC project proposals for funding based on **student impact, alignment, feasibility, and innovation**.

Scoring Scale

Score	Descriptor
5 – Excellent	Fully meets and exceeds expectations; clear, well-supported, and ready for implementation.
4 – Strong	Meets expectations with minor improvements suggested.
3 – Adequate	Meets most expectations; additional clarification or planning needed.
2 – Limited	Partially meets expectations; significant gaps or uncertainties exist.
1 – Insufficient	Does not meet expectations or lacks sufficient information.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Student Impact and Cost Savings (Weight: 25%)

Measures: Number of students and sections impacted annually, cost savings per student, and potential to increase access.

- 5 – High-impact project benefiting large enrollment courses or multiple sections with substantial cost savings.
- 4 – Strong impact benefiting several sections with moderate to high cost savings.
- 3 – Moderate impact or smaller enrollment but clear savings for students.
- 2 – Limited or uncertain impact.
- 1 – Minimal or no demonstrated student benefit or cost savings.

2. ZTC Outcome and Program Alignment (Weight: 20%)

Measures: Extent to which the project results in **course sections designated as Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC)** and supports ARC's strategic goals related to affordability, access, and equity.

- 5 – Clearly results in ZTC course sections; strongly aligned with ARC's equity, access, and institutional initiatives.
- 4 – Results in ZTC and aligns well with program goals.
- 3 – Likely to result in partial ZTC alignment; moderate connection to institutional goals.
- 2 – Unclear or limited connection to ZTC designation or ARC priorities.
- 1 – Does not align with ZTC or program objectives.

3. Feasibility, Readiness, and Project Quality (Weight: 20%)

Measures: Clarity, scope, and quality of the project proposal, timeline, and demonstrated ability to complete the work within available time and resources.

- 5 – Well-developed project with clear goals, realistic timeline, and evidence of readiness (PEX eligibility verified, Chair/Dean support secured).
- 4 – Strong project plan with minor clarifications needed; feasible within timeline.
- 3 – Adequate plan but some uncertainty regarding timeline, deliverables, or readiness.
- 2 – Limited or unclear project plan; concerns about feasibility or support.
- 1 – Unfeasible, incomplete, or lacking clear objectives or support.

4. Course and Pathway Relevance (Weight: 20%)

Measures: Course's role in degree or transfer pathways, Cal-GETC alignment, and scalability of the proposed work.

- 5 – High-enrollment or required course with strong transfer, Cal-GETC, or pathway relevance; broad student impact.
- 4 – Relevant to program or transfer, with potential for adoption across sections or disciplines.
- 3 – Moderate enrollment or elective course with limited scalability.
- 2 – Specialized or low-enrollment course with narrow impact.
- 1 – Minimal relevance to degree, pathway, or transfer requirements.

5. Collaboration and Sustainability (Weight: 10%)

Measures: Extent of collaboration across faculty or departments and potential for continued use and sharing of materials.

- 5 – Strong collaborative project with plans for reuse, adaptation, and long-term sustainability.
- 4 – Includes some collaboration and sustainability measures.
- 3 – Primarily individual project with limited sustainability planning.
- 2 – Minimal collaboration or unclear sustainability strategy.
- 1 – No indication of collaboration or future use.

6. Innovation and Pedagogical Value (Weight: 5%)

Measures: Creativity, open pedagogy integration, and improvement of teaching and learning through OER.

- 5 – Highly innovative; demonstrates open pedagogy or transformative teaching practices.
- 4 – Strong integration of creative approaches or learner engagement strategies.
- 3 – Standard implementation with moderate pedagogical improvement.
- 2 – Limited pedagogical value beyond cost savings.
- 1 – No pedagogical or innovative elements described.

Scoring Summary Template

Category	Weight	Score (1–5)	Weighted Score
Student Impact and Cost Savings	25%		
ZTC Outcome and Program Alignment	20%		
Feasibility, Readiness, and Project Quality	20%		
Course and Pathway Relevance	20%		
Collaboration and Sustainability	10%		
Innovation and Pedagogical Value	5%		
Total	**100%**		**/5.0**

Interpretation of Scores

Overall Average	Recommendation
4.5 – 5.0	High priority for funding; exemplary project with strong impact and feasibility.
3.5 – 4.4	Strong proposal; fund if budget allows.
2.5 – 3.4	Moderate potential; may need clarification or revision.
Below 2.5	Not recommended for funding at this time.

Implementation Notes

- Each reviewer will complete the rubric independently before committee discussion.
- Committee discussions will take place during regularly scheduled ALMC meetings.
- Reviewers may add **qualitative comments** to explain scores, or note questions for follow-up.
- Scores will be averaged across reviewers to rank projects objectively.
- The OER/ZTC Liaison will communicate application results to applicants and their respective, Department Chair and Dean.