

Open Educational Resources Grant Program Playbook

Transform Your Course. Expand Access. Support Student Success.

UP TO \$5,000 FOR COURSE TRANSFORMATION

Faculty may apply to adopt, adapt, create, or build a complete online course using openly licensed and zero-cost learning materials.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

FALL DATES

Applications open September 29th

Applications close October 27th

Recipients Notified November 6th

Deliverables must be submitted to [Open Learn OK](#) by April 15th, 2027

1. Program Overview

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) invites faculty at Oklahoma public colleges and universities to apply for funding to adopt, adapt, create, or expand the use of openly licensed educational resources. The program supports course affordability, instructional innovation, accessibility, and long-term learner access.

Open Educational Resources (OER) are teaching and learning materials that are available at no cost to learners and openly licensed so they may be retained, reused, revised, remixed, and redistributed as permitted by the applicable license.

THE GOAL

Provide learners with high-quality instructional materials at zero cost and with lifelong access, while giving faculty the flexibility to improve and customize learning experiences.

What Funding Can Support

- Adoption of an existing OER textbook
- Revision or remixing of multiple OER materials
- Creation of a new OER textbook
- Development or improvement of assignments, assessments, and supporting materials
- Faculty and professional collaboration
- Development or substantial redesign of a complete zero-cost online course

OSRHE will provide award funding to participating institutions to support approved faculty projects. OSRHE will neither acquire ownership of nor directly benefit from faculty development or revision of OER textbooks, online courses, or ancillary materials.

Who Should Apply?

This opportunity is designed for faculty who want to:

- Eliminate or reduce textbook costs for learners
- Improve access to high-quality instructional materials
- Customize course content to better meet learner needs
- Refresh or strengthen an OER already in use
- Collaborate with faculty, librarians, instructional designers, accessibility professionals, or other campus partners
- Create an engaging, accessible, and fully online zero-cost course

2. Funding Priorities

Awards will be offered on a competitive basis, subject to available funding. Projects will be prioritized using the criteria below.

Priority	What It Means
Absolute Priority	Transferable, credit-bearing courses.
Competitive Preference 1	Courses listed on the Course Equivalency Project matrix.
Competitive Preference 2	High-enrollment and general education courses.
Competitive Preference 3	Courses that are part of a program supporting a critical occupation area.
Competitive Preference 4	Projects that address underrepresented or underserved populations.

Applicants are encouraged to explain how the proposed project will improve affordability, accessibility, instructional quality, learner engagement, or student success.

3. Choose the Award Level That Fits Your Project

Level 0 \$500

Strengthen an Existing OER Course

Refresh or create ancillary materials for an OER already in use or participate as a teaching collaborator. Examples include updating learning activities, assessments, course resources, or other materials that strengthen an existing OER-supported course. OER materials must be shared to [OpenLearnOK](#) at conclusion of the grant (April 15th, 2027).

Level I \$1,000

Adopt an OER Textbook

Replace a commercial textbook with one existing OER textbook and integrate it into the course. This level is ideal for faculty who have identified a high-quality OER and are ready to implement it. OER materials must be shared to [OpenLearnOK](#) at conclusion of the grant (April 15th, 2027).

Level II \$1,500

Remix or Revise OER

Combine, revise, or adapt two or more OER materials into one cohesive textbook or course resource aligned with the course outcomes and learner needs. OER materials must be shared to [OpenLearnOK](#) at conclusion of the grant (April 15th, 2027).

Level III \$3,000

Create a New OER Textbook

Author one new OER textbook containing at least 75% original content. This level is intended for significant development in areas where suitable OER does not exist or where new content addresses an important instructional need. OER materials must be shared to [OpenLearnOK](#) at conclusion of the grant (April 15th, 2027).

Level IV \$5,000

Design a Complete Zero-Cost Online Course

Develop or substantially redesign a complete, high-quality online course using openly licensed and zero-cost instructional materials. The result should be a cohesive, accessible course in which content, learning activities, assessments, and technology align with the course learning outcomes. OER materials must be shared to [OpenLearnOK](#) at conclusion of the grant (April 15th,

2027).

Level IV Required Course Elements

A Level IV project should include:

- A complete online course organized into clearly structured modules
- An openly licensed textbook or curated collection of OER and zero-cost materials
- Clearly stated course-level and module-level learning outcomes
- Original or adapted instructional content
- Engaging learning activities and opportunities for learner interaction
- Assessments aligned with the stated learning outcomes
- Accessible and inclusive course design
- Instructor guidance, grading criteria, and learner support information
- Appropriate licensing and attribution for created or adapted materials
- Readiness for delivery through the institution's learning management system

Level IV projects should demonstrate meaningful course improvement rather than simply transferring an existing face-to-face course into an online format. Applicants should explain how the design will improve affordability, accessibility, engagement, flexibility, and learner success.

4. Level IV Deliverables

Level IV award recipients should submit the following at project completion:

1. A complete online course ready for institutional review and implementation
2. A course map aligning outcomes, instructional materials, learning activities, and assessments
3. Documentation of an accessibility review using the institution's approved process
4. A list of all OER and zero-cost materials, including licenses and attribution
5. A brief implementation plan identifying when and how the course will be offered
6. A faculty reflection describing key design decisions and anticipated benefits for learners
7. A plan for evaluating course effectiveness, learner outcomes, and estimated student cost savings

COLLABORATION ENCOURAGED

Level IV applicants are encouraged to work with librarians, instructional designers, accessibility professionals, multimedia specialists, and other faculty members when those partnerships strengthen the course.

6. Award Options at a Glance

Award	Project Focus	Funding
Level 0	Refresh ancillary materials for an existing OER or serve as a teaching collaborator	\$500
Level I	Adopt one existing OER textbook	\$1,000
Level II	Remix or revise two or more OER into one resource	\$1,500
Level III	Author a new OER textbook with at least 75% original content	\$3,000
Level IV	Develop or substantially redesign a complete zero-cost online course using OER	\$5,000

7. Why Participate?

An OER project is more than a textbook replacement. It is an opportunity to redesign the learning experience around access, relevance, flexibility, and student success.

- Remove financial barriers for learners
- Provide immediate and lifelong access to instructional materials
- Customize course content for specific disciplines, courses, and learner populations
- Improve the relevance and flexibility of learning resources
- Encourage faculty and cross-campus collaboration
- Advance accessibility and inclusive teaching practices
- Share knowledge and innovation across Oklahoma higher education
- Create complete online learning pathways without textbook costs

8. Preparing a Strong Proposal

A strong application should clearly identify:

8. The course and learners the project will serve
9. The selected award level and any requested add-ons
10. The instructional problem or opportunity being addressed
11. The OER or zero-cost materials to be adopted, adapted, created, or curated
12. How the project aligns with one or more funding priorities
13. The expected impact on affordability, accessibility, engagement, instructional quality, or learner success
14. The project timeline, collaborators, deliverables, and implementation plan
15. How learner impact and estimated cost savings will be evaluated

READY TO OPEN THE DOOR TO LEARNING?

Choose the award level that best matches your goal, identify the people who can strengthen the work, and show how your project will expand access, affordability, and learner success across Oklahoma.

Program Administration Notes

Final application instructions, eligibility requirements, project dates, licensing expectations, reporting requirements, payment procedures, and submission deadlines should be provided in the official solicitation and Memorandum of Understanding.

AI Use and Attribution Statement

If artificial intelligence (AI) tools are used in the creation, adaptation, revision, or enhancement of Open Educational Resources (OER), authors must provide appropriate attribution. This includes identifying the AI tool(s) used (e.g., ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, Claude, Gemini, etc.) and documenting the prompt(s) or instructions provided to generate the content. Transparency in AI use helps maintain academic integrity, supports reproducibility, and enables users to evaluate the origin and development process of the OER materials. Acknowledgment of AI-generated contributions should be included within the resource or accompanying documentation.

Example Citation:

Portions of this OER were developed with assistance from Microsoft Copilot (GPT-5). Prompt used: *"Create a beginner-level overview of microcredentials in higher education, including definitions, benefits, and examples."* Content was reviewed, revised, and validated by the author prior to publication.

OER Deliverable and Funding Requirement

Grant funds will not be awarded until the final OER deliverable has been completed and successfully published on the [OpenLearnOK website](#). All required OER materials must be uploaded and accessible through [OpenLearnOK](#) no later than **April 15, 2027**. Failure to submit and publish the required deliverable by this deadline may result in the forfeiture of grant funding and/or reimbursement. Recipients are responsible for ensuring that all materials meet project requirements and are publicly available through [OpenLearnOK](#) prior to the release of funds.

Funds will be awarded to the project with the largest Competitive Rubric score.

Part II: Competitive Review Rubric

Scoring Scale - Use the following performance levels for each criterion.

Rating	General Description
4: Exemplary	The proposal provides specific, compelling, and complete evidence. The approach is well aligned, feasible, and likely to produce meaningful learner impact.
3: Strong	The proposal addresses the criterion clearly and provides sufficient evidence, with only minor gaps or weaknesses.
2: Developing	The proposal partially addresses the criterion but lacks important details, evidence, alignment, or clarity.
1: Limited	The proposal minimally addresses the criterion and contains substantial weaknesses or unanswered questions.
0: Not	The proposal does not address the criterion or provides insufficient information for evaluation.

Reviewers should assign points within the range provided for each criterion.

1. Project Need and Purpose - Maximum: 10 points

Evaluate whether the proposal clearly identifies the instructional need, affordability challenge, access barrier, or course-improvement opportunity.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Clearly defines a significant course or learner need; provides convincing evidence or context; explains why OER is an appropriate response.	9–10
Strong	Identifies a relevant need and explains how the project will address it, with minor details missing.	7–8
Developing	Identifies a general need, but the connection to the proposed OER project is incomplete or insufficiently supported.	4–6
Limited	Provides a vague or minimally developed statement of need.	1–3
Not Addressed	Does not identify a project need or purpose.	0

Score: ____ / 10

Reviewer comments:

2. Alignment with the Selected Award Level - Maximum: 10 points

Evaluate whether the project scope, proposed work, timeline, and deliverables are appropriate for the requested award level.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Project activities and deliverables fully match the selected award level and demonstrate a clear understanding of its expectations.	9–10
Strong	Project generally matches the selected level, with only minor questions about scope or deliverables.	7–8
Developing	Project partially matches the selected level, but the scope may be too limited, too ambitious, or unclear.	4–6
Limited	Significant mismatch exists between the project and the requested award level.	1–3
Not Addressed	Award-level requirements are not addressed.	0

Score: ____ / 10

Reviewer comments:

3. Quality and Appropriateness of the Proposed OER - Maximum: 15 points

Evaluate the quality, relevance, accuracy, adaptability, and instructional suitability of the proposed materials.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Proposed materials are clearly identified and appear high quality, current, relevant, adaptable, and well suited to the course and learners. The evaluation and selection process is clearly explained.	13–15
Strong	Materials are appropriate and relevant, with sufficient evidence of quality and suitability. Minor evaluation details may be missing.	10–12
Developing	Materials are identified, but quality, relevance, completeness, or suitability is not fully demonstrated.	6–9
Limited	Materials are insufficiently identified or appear poorly aligned with the course.	1–5
Not	No proposed OER or resource-selection process is provided.	0

Score: ____ / 15

Reviewer comments:**4. Instructional Design and Learning-Outcome Alignment - Maximum: 15 points**

Evaluate how well the instructional materials, learning activities, and assessments align with course outcomes.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Demonstrates strong alignment among learning outcomes, content, activities, and assessments. The project supports active, relevant, and meaningful learning.	13–15
Strong	Demonstrates clear instructional alignment, with only minor gaps in activities, assessments, or implementation details.	10–12
Developing	Some alignment is evident, but important connections among outcomes, materials, activities, or assessments are unclear.	6–9
Limited	Instructional alignment is weak or minimally explained.	1–5
Not Addressed	Does not address instructional alignment.	0

Score: ____ / 15

Reviewer comments:**5. Accessibility, Inclusion, and Learner Access - Maximum: 15 points**

Evaluate whether accessibility and inclusive design are integrated throughout the project.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Provides a clear plan for accessible and inclusive design, identifies appropriate review processes, and addresses the needs of diverse learners.	13–15
Strong	Addresses accessibility and inclusion appropriately, with minor details about verification or implementation missing.	10–12
Developing	Acknowledges accessibility but provides a limited implementation or review plan.	6–9
Limited	Makes only a general reference to accessibility or inclusion without an actionable approach.	1–5
Not Addressed	Does not address accessibility or inclusive design.	0

Evidence may include:

- Accessible heading and document structure
- Alternative text for meaningful images
- Captioning and transcripts
- Appropriate color contrast
- Accessible tables and links
- Keyboard-accessible content
- Accessible multimedia and file formats
- Institutional accessibility review
- Consideration of underserved or underrepresented learners

Score: ____ / 15

Reviewer comments:**6. Open Licensing, Attribution, and Permissions - Maximum: 10 points**

Evaluate whether the applicant demonstrates an appropriate understanding of open licensing and provides a credible plan for attribution and permissions.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Clearly identifies applicable licenses, provides a sound attribution plan, addresses license compatibility, and distinguishes openly licensed content from restricted third-party content.	9–10
Strong	Provides an appropriate licensing and attribution plan, with only minor details requiring clarification.	7–8
Developing	Demonstrates basic licensing awareness but does not fully address attribution, compatibility, or permissions.	4–6
Limited	Licensing information is vague, incomplete, or potentially inconsistent with project requirements.	1–3
Not Addressed	Does not address licensing, attribution, or permissions.	0

Score: ____ / 10

Reviewer comments:**7. Feasibility, Timeline, and Institutional Capacity - Maximum: 10 points**

Evaluate whether the project can reasonably be completed and implemented within the proposed period.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Provides a detailed, realistic timeline with clear milestones, responsibilities, implementation dates, and evidence of appropriate institutional support.	9–10
Strong	Provides a feasible timeline and sufficient support, with minor details missing.	7–8
Developing	Timeline is generally plausible but lacks milestones, clear responsibilities, or evidence of adequate support.	4–6
Limited	Timeline appears unrealistic, incomplete, or unsupported.	1–3
Not Addressed	Does not provide a timeline or implementation plan.	0

Score: ____ / 10

Reviewer comments:

8. Learner Impact and Evaluation Plan - Maximum: 10 points

Evaluate the anticipated reach and the plan for measuring project results.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Defines measurable outcomes and provides a clear plan for documenting learner reach, estimated savings, implementation, student experience, and course effectiveness.	9–10
Strong	Identifies meaningful outcomes and appropriate evaluation measures, with minor details missing.	7–8
Developing	Describes anticipated benefits but offers limited measures or data-collection methods.	4–6
Limited	States broad benefits without measurable outcomes or an evaluation plan.	1–3
Not Addressed	Does not address learner impact or evaluation.	0

Recommended measures include:

- Number of courses and sections
- Anticipated learner enrollment
- Previous instructional-material cost
- Estimated cost savings

- Student access from the first day of class
- Student feedback
- Faculty reflection
- Learning-outcome or course-success measures, when appropriate
- Continued use after the funded period

Score: ____ / 10

Reviewer comments:

9. Sustainability, Collaboration, and Potential for Expansion - Maximum: 5 points

Evaluate whether the project can be maintained, reused, shared, or expanded beyond the initial implementation.

Performance Level	Description	Points
Exemplary	Provides a convincing plan for continued use, updating, sharing, collaboration, and possible adoption in additional sections, courses, or institutions.	5
Strong	Provides a reasonable sustainability plan and identifies opportunities for continued use or collaboration.	4
Developing	Mentions continued use or collaboration but provides limited details.	2–3
Limited	Sustainability or expansion is unlikely or minimally addressed.	1
Not Addressed	Does not address sustainability, collaboration, or future use.	0

Score: ____ / 5

Reviewer comments:

Base Score Summary

Criterion	Maximum	Score
1. Project Need and Purpose	10	
2. Alignment with Award Level	10	
3. Quality and Appropriateness of OER	15	
4. Instructional Design and Outcome Alignment	15	
5. Accessibility, Inclusion, and Learner Access	15	
6. Licensing, Attribution, and Permissions	10	
7. Feasibility, Timeline, and Capacity	10	
8. Learner Impact and Evaluation	10	
9. Sustainability, Collaboration, and Expansion	5	
Total Base Score	100	

RESOURCES:

[Course Equivalency Project Matrix](#)