

## **AB 798 RFP Evaluation Rubric for Bonus Funding 2018-2020**

The rubric below is composed of 2 sets of criteria. The first set of criteria (Questions 1-7) reflect requirements that proposal must meet (all are required) to be eligible for an award. The second set of criteria (Questions 8-15) reflect dimensions that proposals can vary in their capabilities and abilities to deliver on the goals of their textbook affordability program.

Criteria **required** to be eligible for funding:

- 1) The proposal has included their campus academic senate resolution that meets the requirements of AB 798.
  - a) YES
  - b) NO
  
- 2) The proposal has included a plan for their AB 798 textbook affordability program that was approved by the campus academic senate.
  - a) YES
  - b) NO
  
- 3) All the courses included in the campus' plan for their AB 798 textbook affordable program will be implemented in the spring 2019 and/or fall 2020.
  - a) YES
  - b) NO
  
- 4) All the course sections included in the campus plan for their AB 798 textbook affordability program will have an estimated savings to students of 30% or more.
  - a) YES
  - b) NO
  
- 5) Every course included in the Campus Textbook Affordability plan must include some free and open educational resources that are being adopted by faculty and used by students in the course. These materials that are partial or complete substitutes for existing course materials meet the requirement for being **free for students and** with a public domain license **or free for students with** a Creative Commons license or **free for students with** legal licenses for acceptable use by faculty and all students in the course.
  - a) YES
  - b) NO

- 6) The campus plan includes a Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator assigned to fulfill the required activities.
  - a) YES
  - b) NO
  
- 7) The proposal describes how the campus will provide access to open educational resource materials for students, including how the campus will make hard copies of these materials available for students who lack access to these materials off campus and make it possible for students with such access to print hard copies.
  - a) YES
  - b) NO

**TOTAL SCORE: Must have seven (7) yes's to be eligible for funding**

### Criteria to Evaluate the Relative Quality of the Campus Proposal

- 8) The proposal for the campus coordinator meets the requirements in the RFP.
  - 4- Meets all requirements, leverages existing organizations, and addresses many recommendations
  
  - 3- Meets all requirements and addresses many recommendations
  - 2- Meets all requirements and addresses a few recommendations
  - 1- Meets all requirements and not address recommendations
  
- 9) Proposed activities are reasonable and well-planned, with a high likelihood of achieving the intended outcomes.
  - 4 – The proposal is very well-crafted, with a clear description of reasonable activities, a practical timeline, and achievable objectives.
  - 3 – The proposal has a description of reasonable activities, a practical timeline, and achievable objectives
  - 2 – The proposal has a description of activities, a timeline, and objectives, but one or more parts of the plan are vague or questionable.
  - 1 – The project plans are hard to understand, vague, and/or unreasonable.
  
- 10) Proposed services to support faculty and student participation in the campus's Textbook Affordability Program are comprehensive, aligned with campus culture and resources, and supportive of the goals for the campus plan

- 4 – The proposed services are inclusive of all the types of services supportive of a textbook affordability program as outlined in the RFP, effectively leverages existing services, and are targeted to the needs of faculty and students.
- 3 – The proposed services are inclusive of at least 5 types of services supportive of a textbook affordability program as outlined in the RFP, partially leverages existing services, and are targeted to the needs of faculty and students.
- 2 – The proposed services are inclusive of no more than 3 types of services supportive of a textbook affordability program as outlined in the RFP, do not leverage existing services, and it is unclear how they are aligned with the needs of faculty and students.
- 1 – The proposed services are not articulated affordability program as outlined in the RFP, does not leverage existing services, and not aligned with the needs of faculty and students.

11) Scope of impact on cost savings, course sections, number of faculty, students or staff.

- 4 – Description of cost savings and impact to campus is well supported to have a highly significant impact.
- 3 – Description of cost savings and impact to campus is well supported to have a significant impact.
- 2 – Description of cost saving and impact to campus is smaller in scale but still meets the 30% cost savings requirement.
- 1 – Description of cost savings and impact to campus is unclear but still meets the 30% cost savings requirement.

12) How materials/practices are disseminated to students/stakeholders.

- 4 – Project plan describes how the benefit of OER practices, processes and/or materials OER will be distributed to students and/or stakeholders in a reasonable, achievable way.
- 3 – Project plan describes good practice and processes for OER distribution.
- 2 – Project plan describes good practice for OER distribution.
- 1 – Project plan is weak in its description of support for distribution of processes, practices and mechanisms.

13) Budget is reasonable, and justification is provided for each item.

- 4 – Plan is accurately budgeted and a strong justification for its utility is given.
- 3 – Plan is accurately budgeted and justification for its utility is given.
- 2 – Rationale for budget shows moderate support for plan.
- 1 – Request is not clear or reasonable.

14) Project is sustainable.

- 4 – Project has a strong campus support/interest; there is a strong possibility of developing an OER culture on campus that is sustainable in multiple areas and across multiple disciplines.
- 3 – Project has some campus support/interest; there is a good possibility of developing an OER culture on campus that is sustainable in some areas or across multiple disciplines.

- 2 – Project has limited campus support/interest; there is a limited possibility of developing an OER culture on campus that is sustainable.
- 1 – No indication that practices from the proposal will be ongoing.

15) The plan for reporting on the outcomes of the campus' textbook affordability program are comprehensive and should be effectively and reliably implemented.

- 4 – The reporting is assigned to an organization and personnel with the expertise, resources, and a sustainable interest to collect and report on the success of the program for the next 2 years.

3 – The reporting is assigned to a reasonable organization and personnel, with a sustainable interest to collect and report on the success of the program for the next 2 years.

2 – Rationale for budget shows moderate support for plan.

- 1 – Request is not clear or reasonable

**Total: 32 points maximum score for criteria 8-15**

Email [cool4ed@cdl.edu](mailto:cool4ed@cdl.edu) for any questions.