

## OPEN PEDAGOGY BOOK: PROPOSAL EVALUATION DRAFT PROCESS: 3 KEY STEPS

**1. Pre-Rubric Screening:** Does the proposal meet the definition of Open? Under which category of Open?

- a. Not at all: Do not proceed to Rubric      b. Yes (or interesting outlier): Proceed to Rubric

**2. Quantitative Score/Rubric:** Grade each proposal using scores within Exceeding, Meeting, Not quite, and Not at all

	<b>Exceeding (3)</b>	<b>Meeting (2)</b>	<b>Not quite (1)</b>	<b>Not at all (0)</b>
<b>Organization/structure</b>	Crystal clear to follow; logical flow of one section to the next; leads to a conclusion	Proposal is logically laid out and makes sense as a whole	Some parts are choppy and don't naturally flow	Confusing and disjointed
<b>Clarity of ideas</b>	The description of the idea/project was more than expected and fully details the uniqueness of the idea.	The idea/project is completely understandable. There is no need for further questions.	Further questions are needed to fully understand what the authors are proposing as an idea.	This idea has not been fully developed.
<b>Library/faculty collaboration - value to the field</b>	The collaboration is inspiring and worthy of replicating. It models highly effective partnerships between the library and teaching faculty.	The collaboration is clear and balanced. It provides a strong example of an effective partnership.	The collaboration is tilted more to the librarian or faculty side. The other partner has minimal input.	There is little evidence to show that the library and faculty are working in partnership with each other.
<b>Creative/Innovative Approach</b>	The idea/approach to open pedagogy is unique and worthy of replicating.	The idea/approach provides a strong and clear example of open pedagogy.	The idea/approach is basic and widely covered.	The idea/approach does not contribute to the literature.
<b>Tells a Compelling Story</b>	Commands attention and encourages further reading to learn more: exciting and stimulating	Maintains attention and is an enjoyable read.	Inconsistently engaging.	Unengaging, little seems noteworthy.
<b>Demonstrates expertise</b>	Demonstrates impressive grasp of principles of pedagogy and librarianship, and a deep knowledge of how and why the partnership succeeded.	Shows a full and clear understanding of teaching techniques and how collaborations can work to benefit all parties.	Touches on principles of pedagogy and librarianship; does not examine what it means to have a successful collaboration.	Minimal or no mention of principles, context, or larger goals.

**Total score:**

**3. Of those with highest scores, final preference to those where:**

- The proposal explores a diverse approach; not duplicative of others
- We aim to include a diversity of author backgrounds, geographies, institution types, etc.