This handbook has been designed to walk a user through the process of evaluating an online resource using the Achieve Open Educational Resources (OERs) rubrics, which are hosted on OERCommons.org. The guide shows an Achieve reviewer using, as an example, an object that had not been reviewed at the time of the writing — ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line. The guide includes step-by-step instructions along with screenshots of the example object during the process of the evaluation.
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Introduction to the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool

OER offer extraordinary opportunities for educators everywhere to freely share knowledge and resources. However, educators using this vast system need a method of filtering through the millions of OER learning objects to find those that will meet the needs of their students and inform their instruction.

In collaboration with leaders from the OER community, Achieve has developed a set of rubrics, organized into an online Evaluation Tool, that can be used for each OER to determine the quality of different aspects of each object and the degree to which it is aligned to the Common Core State Standards. These rubrics provide a structure for systematically, purposefully and comprehensively evaluating an online resource. The titles of the eight rubrics indicate the aspects they measure:

**Rubric I:** Degree of Alignment to Standards  
**Rubric II:** Quality of Explanation of the Subject Matter  
**Rubric III:** Utility of Materials Designed to Support Teaching  
**Rubric IV:** Quality of Assessments  
**Rubric V:** Quality of Technological Interactivity  
**Rubric VI:** Quality of Instructional and Practice Exercises  
**Rubric VII:** Opportunities for Deeper Learning  
**Rubric VIII:** Assurance of Accessibility¹

You can view and download the complete rubrics at [www.achieve.org/oer-rubrics](http://www.achieve.org/oer-rubrics).

Users can apply Rubrics I through VII using the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool at [OERCommons.org](http://OERCommons.org). To log on to the site and use this tool you will first need to click on [Register Now!](http://Register Now!) to create your own username and password.

---
¹ Application of Rubric VIII requires a level of expertise not typical even among seasoned educators. For this reason Rubric VIII is not included in the online Achieve OER Evaluation Tool.
After registering you can [Log In] and then use [Search ], [Browse All], [Groups] or [Contribute] or go directly to [My OER], which is your own personal collection of learning objects. For more information about OERCommons.org, click on [Discover New Resources] at the bottom right.

You can navigate through all the uploaded objects using [Browse All] and can quickly search through objects from specific [Subject Areas], [Grade Levels] or [Materials Types] by clicking on your selection. From there you can browse through all the uploaded learning objects on OERCommons.org. In addition you can [Browse Collection Providers] and/or take advantage of [Featured Searches], including textbooks or specialized content areas. Also notice that the number of available resources is listed to the right for each category.
If you click on one of the subject areas (for example, [Mathematics & Statistics]), you will be sent to the list of all learning objects with a connection to that content area. In the screen shown below you see the first page of a complete alphabetical listing of math objects for all Grade Levels, Material Types, Media Formats, Conditions of Use, etc. From here you can further refine your search by clicking, or unclicking, the boxes on the left side of your screen. Notice that Material Type, Media Format and Conditions of Use are all dropdown menus, so by clicking on the arrow to the left you will be able to see all the different types of materials, media and conditions for the objects.

Users can also employ the [Use Advanced Search] function at the bottom of the OERCommons.org homepage or the top of the Browse All page for more specific search results. In an advanced search, users are able to find resources not only by various keywords but also by aligned Common Core State Standards and previously evaluated OER rubrics.
Search by a specific aligned Common Core State Standard, by one of the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool rubrics and/or by any of the categories listed here.

After selecting your search options, click on the [Search] button.
Achieve OER Evaluation Tool Background

Prior to the creation of the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool, OERCommons.org offered a simple five-star rating system for users to evaluate the OERs. This quick and easy-to-use system provided a holistic approach to rating the quality of learning objects, allowing an OER user to leave a feedback “footprint” for those who followed and providing an indication that the user found, or did not find, the resource useful. Because users naturally have different needs and/or purposes for any given resource and the ratings were based on users’ own particular needs, the quality of any specific aspect of a resource was not clear from the five-star rating system alone. For example, a user looking for an interactive, student-centered game might rate a particular object with five stars, while another who is looking for a classroom demonstration tool might rate the same object with one star. Those who viewed the ratings did not know the rationale of the rater.

The five-star system can be used before or after an object is tested in the field, but it provides the most accurate feedback when used after testing the object’s effectiveness in the classroom. It relies on the user to test an object and return to the site to leave feedback. When an object does not perform as it appears to be designed to in the classroom, not only the teacher’s time, but also precious student contact time, is wasted. It is important for teachers to be able to determine whether a resource is likely to perform optimally BEFORE it is applied to their students.

For these reasons, Achieve determined that a set of rubrics that could be used to evaluate various important measures of quality would complement the five-star rating system already in place on websites like OERCommons.org. The Achieve OER Evaluation Tool allows educators to rate the quality of these teaching and student learning resources and evaluate the extent to which the individual resources align to specific standards.

Below is an example of a resource as it appears on the OERCommons.org Mathematics and Statistics page. On the left side of the box for this example you see the object’s title (30-60-90 triangle), Subject, Grade Level and Collection source:

If you want to read the abstract paragraph provided by the object’s contributor, you can click on [Complete Item Description]; if you want to see other objects from the same contributor, you can click on the collection title, in this case [Math Open Reference]. On the right side of the box you see that this object has been given a 5-
star rating, indicating that at least one user found this object to be of excellent quality. However, this rating does not make clear how many users have provided input or what they like about this object.

The symbol shown under the five stars indicates that this object has also been evaluated using the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool. Hover over [Read the Fine Print] to read about the copyright restrictions.

This view of the same 5-star example used above shows the rating results for both systems. The Achieve OER Evaluation Tool results identify the number of users, in addition to the average ratings for each measure of quality.

Teachers can see that:
• This object aligns well with one of the two standards selected for Rubric I.
• The explanation of subject matter in the object is useful.
• The object has good potential for use as a teaching tool.
• The object has good potential for use as an assessment tool.
• The object includes very good technological interactivity components.

However, we would expect this object to have little potential to be used for skill practice or for deeper learning experiences.

When using the tool to evaluate a resource, each rubric should be applied independently to the smallest meaningful unit of the resource or to each OER object as it appears in OERCommons.org. The rubrics should be used to rate the potential, not the actual, effectiveness of a particular object in an educational setting. They are
intended for application to an object BEFORE it has been used with students to determine the potential quality of the object.

The following five-point scoring system approximates predicted levels of quality:

- \(3\) = The object is \textit{superior} in the specific measure.
- \(2\) = The object is \textit{strong} in the specific measure.
- \(1\) = The object is \textit{limited} in the specific measure.
- \(0\) = The object is \textit{very weak} in the specific measure.
- \(N/A\) = Users can rate an object “N/A” when a particular rubric does not apply to the object being rated. “N/A” is not a pejorative score; it simply indicates that it would be inappropriate to apply this rubric to a particular object. Also, an “N/A” rating is not included in an item’s average score for a particular rubric.

Below the rubric ratings, you can view the Common Core State Standards to which the object aligns. You can mouse over the standards’ alignment tags to read more about each standard.

More specific rating descriptors are assigned to each rubric and can be seen on the online \textbf{Achieve OER Evaluation Tool} and in each of the rubric guides that follows this introduction.

The rubrics can be applied across any content area. However, at this time, the \textbf{Achieve OER Evaluation Tool} aligns resources for \textbf{Rubric I} to the Common Core State Standards for \textbf{Mathematics and English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects} only.

As the \textbf{Achieve OER Evaluation Tool} becomes more widely used, the number of raters will naturally increase. There are no right or wrong answers in the evaluation process — only the professional judgments of those reviewing the learning objects. As the number of evaluators increases, with each adding his or her professional opinion into the tool’s data, the average score for each aspect of each object will be refined and will reflect the collective raters’ overall judgment.
Using the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool

In the screenshot below you can see that this OER had no ratings or evaluation at the time of this writing:

![Screenshot of ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line](image)

We will use this object, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line, as an example to guide us through the steps involved in aligning and evaluating a resource using the rubrics. (NOTE: At any time during this demonstration you can use the link to the example lesson plan. However, remember that at the time of this writing the example had not been rated but that others may have entered data by the time you view it.) We are using an example from mathematics. However, the steps for evaluating an online resource for English language arts/literacy are similar. Explanations and demonstrations for specific components of the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool can be found in the instructions for use of the individual rubrics.

On the right side of the object’s launch page you can see any aligned standards and the overall average of all ratings submitted by previous users.

Our math example shows three previous evaluators …

and five aligned 3rd grade standards.

At the top left you see [Evaluate Resource], which will send you to the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool introduction page.

And below you find the [Align Resource] button, which will allow you to align the object before you begin evaluation.
If previously selected standards are satisfactory, you can skip the alignment process and begin evaluating immediately. If you need to add standards, start by clicking on the [Align Resource] button before you begin evaluating or using the [Add an additional standard] link at any time after you open Rubric I.

After you have added standards, or have determined that the previously selected standards are satisfactory, click on [Evaluate Resource] from the object launch page. You will be taken to the information page for the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool. On this page you will find links to:

- The Achieve website Open Educational Resources page with a pdf version of the rubrics.
- The Achieve.org website.
- An explanation of the tool and some guidelines and reminders.
- The Common Core State Standards website.
- A video with an overview of the rubrics.
- A start button for the evaluation process.
- A quick return to OERCommons.org.

After clicking on [Start Evaluating], you will see an evaluation page showing all seven titles of the rubrics. To begin you can click on any title and rate the rubrics in any order. For this tutorial we will begin with Rubric I: Degree of Alignment to Standards.
Rubric I: Degree of Alignment to Standards

Step 1: Determine whether this rubric applies to the object.

Rubric I is intended for objects that can be aligned to standards and is used to rate the degree to which an individual object aligns to a proposed standard. While this rubric could be used with any set of standards, it was designed specifically for alignment to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and English Language Arts/Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. These standards have been uploaded to OERCommons.org for use in the evaluation process.

You should always apply this rubric unless no standards apply to a given object or you are unfamiliar with the Common Core State Standards. Remember that objects from disciplines such as science and social studies may align to Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and English Language Arts/Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. Also, it is possible for an object to align to multiple domains or even multiple grade levels.

Step 2: Align standards to the object.

Degree of alignment can be assessed only after standard(s) have been aligned to the learning object. Alignment review involves two major aspects: content and performance expectations. The content addressed and the performances required in the object should match the content and performances required in the aligned standard(s).

If an object has not been aligned in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool, you will be able to choose between [align resource] and [skip as not applicable].

Click here to view an instructional video about Rubric I.
If you believe an object does not align to any standards in the Common Core you should choose [skip as not applicable] for Rubric I and go on to the other rubrics for evaluation.

If no standards are aligned to a learning object, if you would like to add other standard(s) to those already listed, or if you need to verify the standards aligned by previous users, you will need to determine the content and performances required in the object and match them to one or more standards.

For demonstration purposes this reviewer will use the example, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line. All screenshots and examples are related to this lesson.

To align a resource to a standard, click [Align this item] on the object's browse screen. If you have already entered the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool, click [Add an additional standard] on the Rubric I screen.

When aligning an object to a new standard, you must first select the set of standards that matches the object's subject: either “Common Core State Standards Math” or “Common Core State Standards English Language Arts.”
Then select the grade:

Then the learning domain:

And finally, the alignment tag of the specific standard to which the object aligns:

You will be able to see only the first 10 or so words of the standard in the Select alignment tag dropdown menu but can read the full text of the selected standard in the yellow box at the top right of the working screen. If you are satisfied with the standard selection, click on [Add selected tag] in the bottom right corner.
The code for your selected standard appears in the box at the top of the alignment tool, and you can either [Close] this screen or align more standards by selecting a different alignment tag from the same domain or by changing either the grade level or learning domain.

You can delete any standard you select by clicking the [x] beside the selected standard tag. Only the person who originated an alignment may delete it and then only if other users have not yet rated the alignment.

Now if you go back to the browse page for the object, you can see that the standard appears above [Align this item], and if you hover over the standard the full text will appear.
Step 2: Determine your rating for the object.

You can now evaluate the learning object for its alignment to this standard and also evaluate the alignment of standards that have already been tagged to the object by other users. Click on [Evaluate Resource], which will take you to the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool. Remember that adding additional standards for alignment with the object can also be accomplished while working in Rubric I.

In this view you see that CC.3.NF.2 is the selected standard (highlighted in orange). Users can see the full text of any rating descriptor by hovering over the rating numbers. Using this text (which varies by rubric) you can select the proper rating by clicking on the number and then either on [Next standard] or on any of the other standards.

If you change your mind, you can delete a rating by clicking on [Clear rating] next to the comment button.

Detailed rating descriptors and examples of rating scenarios for both mathematics and English language arts/literacy for Rubric I follow.

3: An object has superior alignment if both of the following are true:
   • All of the content and performance expectations in the identified standard are completely addressed by the object.
   • The content and performance expectations of the standard are the focus of the object.

While some objects may cover a range of standards that could potentially be aligned, for a superior alignment the content and performance expectations must not be peripheral.

2: An object has strong alignment for either one of two reasons:
   • It covers all but minor elements of the identified standard, cluster or domain.
   • The content and performance expectations of the standard align to a minor part of the object.
An object has **limited** alignment if:

- A significant part of the content or performance expectations of the identified standard is not addressed in the object, but there is fidelity to the part it does cover.

An object has **very weak** alignment for either one of two reasons:

- The object does not match the identified standard.
- The object matches only minimally important aspects of the standard, cluster or domain.

These objects will not typically be useful for instruction of core concepts and performances covered by the standard.

This rubric does not apply for an object that has no suggested standards for alignment. *For example, the rubric might not be applicable to a set of raw data.*

As you enter ratings they will be recorded in the standard boxes, as seen here:
# Evaluation in Action — Rubric I

Following are examples of ratings for math and English language arts/literacy.

## Mathematics

**Object aligned to:** CCSS 2.NBT.2, “Count within 1000; skip-count by 5s, 10s, and 100s.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If the primary focus of the object is counting to 1,000 and skip counting by 5s, 10s and 100s, with any other content/performance requirements secondary. <em>For example, in an object that focuses on all these requirements, there may be an interactive game that requires counting by 2s or relating counting to addition and subtraction or an activity that requires measurement by counting whole units. These would be peripheral to the overall focus of the object and would not detract from the 3 rating.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If the object requires counting to 1,000 and skip counting by 5s and 10s, with a minor part (counting by 100s) not addressed OR addressed only peripherally. <em>For example, counting by 100s might be addressed only in an extension activity, which users may opt not to use or may not even see.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If the object requires counting with numbers to 500 and therefore aligns very closely with a limited part of the standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>If the object addresses only skip counting by 10s, with no clear indication stated as to the limitation (count to 1,000). Or if the object requires only counting within 100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## English Language Arts/Literacy

**Object aligned to:** CCSS RI.9-10.8, “Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If the object requires students to evaluate the argument of a text, assessing the validity of its evidence and reasoning including identifying false statements and reasoning. The text and instructional material must be constructed to include some false statements and reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If the object requires students to evaluate the argument of a text, assessing the validity of its evidence and reasoning, but does not require identifying false statements and reasoning OR the evaluation is a minor part of the activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If the object requires only delineating the argument but does not require students to evaluate its reasoning or evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>If the text of the object includes an argument, but none of the activities require students to delineate or evaluate it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3: Add any comments.

Others may not agree with your evaluations, but remember that there are no RIGHT or WRONG answers for these ratings and the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool will reach its full potential only when many raters input many opinions. To leave a comment for any reviewers that follow to explain your thoughts, click the [+Comment] button in the bottom left corner.

These comments are not meant to try to convince but only to explain. If you struggle with any of your ratings, it is a good idea to leave a comment for those who follow. After leaving a comment click [Save].

Users who open the object will then see comments near the bottom of the landing page for the resource. Comments indicate specific rubrics, standards, and ratings (if applicable), as well as the commenter’s username.

Step 4: Save your rating and move on to the next rubric.

When you are satisfied with your alignment and ratings in Rubric I and you are ready to move on to the next rubric, click on [Save & Go to Next Rubric].
Rubric II: Quality of Explanation of the Subject Matter

Step 1: Determine whether this rubric applies to the object.

This rubric is applied only to resources that require an explanation of the subject matter to be taught to students. These resources are most often found in objects intended for use by a student but might also be found in teacher-directed resources. For student-directed objects this subject matter explanation will most often be the central part of the lesson or activity. For teacher-directed objects, such as lesson plans, the focus of the object is generally the presentation of the lesson or activity that explains the subject matter. However, in some cases an explanation of the subject matter may also be present in a teacher-directed object to help the teacher learn or be refreshed on the concepts addressed in the lesson or to guide the teacher in the lesson presentation. Only these subject matter explanation sections of the object are considered when applying this rubric.

Step 2: Determine your rating for the object.

The Rubric II rating descriptors and examples from OERCommons.org follow. There are links to objects with at least one example of a rating for mathematics and/or English language arts/literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects at that level.

(Note: Ratings on examples provided here are the opinions of individual raters and do not necessarily reflect the views of Achieve or OER Commons. They have been selected only for the purpose of reflection on the rating descriptor. Examples of all ratings are not necessarily available in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool at this time.)

3: An object is rated superior for explanation of subject matter only if all of the following are true:
   • The object provides comprehensive information so effectively that the target audience should be able to understand the subject matter.
   • The object connects important associated concepts within the subject matter. For example, a lesson on multi-digit addition makes connections with place value, rather than simply showing how to add multi-digit numbers. Or a lesson designed to analyze how an author develops ideas across extended text makes connections among the various developmental steps and the various purposes the author has for the text.
   • The object does not need to be augmented with additional explanation or materials.
   • The main ideas of the subject matter addressed in the object are clearly identified for the learner.

Examples: http://www.oercommons.org/courses/imaginative-writing
                       http://www.oercommons.org/courses/ramp-up-your-writing
2: An object is rated *strong* for explanation of subject matter if it explains the subject matter in a way that makes skills, procedures, concepts and/or information understandable. It falls short of superior because it does not make connections among important associated concepts within the subject matter. *For example, a lesson on multi-digit addition may focus on the procedure and fail to connect it with place value.*

Examples:  
[http://www.oercommons.org/courses/visual-fractions](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/visual-fractions)  
[http://www.oercommons.org/courses/persuasive-paragraph](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/persuasive-paragraph)  

1: An object is rated *limited* for explanation of subject matter if it explains the subject matter correctly but in a limited way. This cursory treatment of the content is not sufficiently developed for a first-time learner of the content. The explanations are not thorough and would likely serve as a review for most learners.

Examples:  
[http://www.oercommons.org/courses/basic-math-facts-fluency](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/basic-math-facts-fluency)  

0: An object is rated *very weak or no value* for explanation of subject matter if its explanations are confusing or contain errors. There is little likelihood that this object will contribute to understanding.

Examples:  
[http://www.oercommons.org/courses/algebra-fractions](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/algebra-fractions)  
[http://www.oercommons.org/courses/what2019s-your-name](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/what2019s-your-name)

N/A: This rubric is *not applicable (N/A)* for an object that is not designed to explain subject matter — for example, a sheet of mathematical formulae, a map, or a lesson plan or organization tool developed for a teacher that has no specific subject matter explanation. It may be possible to apply the object in some way that aids a learner's understanding, but that is beyond any obvious or described purpose of the object.

Examples:  
[http://www.oercommons.org/libraries/writing-conventions](http://www.oercommons.org/libraries/writing-conventions)

---

**Step 3: Add any comments, save your rating and move on to the next rubric.**

When you are satisfied with your rating and have entered any comments you would like to leave for other reviewers, click on [Save & Go to Next Rubric](http://www.oercommons.org) in the bottom right corner of the Rubric II screen.
Evaluation in Action — Rubric II

The screenshot below shows the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool when you are evaluating a resource using Rubric II. Mouse over the numbers to read more about each rating.

Since the example we are using, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line, includes a clear explanation of the content, representing fractions on a number line, but does not make it easy for the user to make important connections to other ways to relate fractions and their number line representations, the reviewer has rated this object 2: Strong. While a deeper search of all links, and even possibly links-to-links, may lead to those connected concepts, the connections are not made in the object itself.

You can see whether or not your ratings have been saved in the evaluation window:

The ✗ indicates that the rating for Rubric I was not saved (No Rating). The ✔ indicates that Rubric II was rated and saved.
Rubric III: Utility of Materials Designed to Support Teaching

Step 1: Determine whether this rubric applies to the object.

Rubric III should be used to evaluate objects that are designed support teachers in a lesson’s presentation. A teacher would be the primary user of this kind of object.

Evaluation in Action — Rubric III

The screenshot below shows the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool when you are evaluating a resource using Rubric III. Notice that both Rubrics I and II have the symbol, indicating that your ratings for those rubrics have been saved.

Our example, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line, provides support materials that are comprehensive and easy to understand and also provides for varying learning needs. It includes suggestions for pairing students for work on the lesson body and also offers suggestions for both remediation and extensions. This reviewer has rated this example 3: Superior.
Step 2: Determine your rating for the object.

The Rubric III rating descriptors and examples from OERCommons.org follow. There are links to objects with at least one example of a rating for mathematics and/or English language arts/literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects at that level.

(Note: Ratings on examples provided here are the opinions of individual raters and do not necessarily reflect the views of Achieve or OER Commons. They have been selected only for the purpose of reflection on the rating descriptor. Examples of all ratings are not necessarily available in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool at this time.)

3: An object is rated superior for the utility of materials designed to support teaching only if all of the following are true:
   • The object provides materials that are comprehensive and easy to understand and use.
   • The object includes suggestions for ways to use the materials with a variety of learners. These suggestions include materials such as common error analysis tips and precursor skills and knowledge that go beyond the basic lesson or unit elements.
   • All objects and all components are provided and function as intended and described. For example, the time needed for lesson planning appears accurately estimated, materials lists are complete and explanations make sense.
   • For larger objects like units, materials facilitate the use of a mix of instructional approaches (direct instruction, group work, investigations, etc.).

Examples:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/anthill-number-round-off
            http://www.oercommons.org/courses/animal-adjecitives
            http://www.oercommons.org/courses/alex-lesson-plan-fractions-on-a-number-line

2: An object is rated strong for the utility of materials designed to support teaching if it offers materials that are comprehensive and easy to understand and use but falls short of superior for either one of two reasons:
   • The object does not include suggestions for ways to use the materials with a variety of learners (e.g., error analysis tips).
   • Some core components (e.g., directions) are underdeveloped in the object.

Examples: http://www.oercommons.org/courses/nyc-8th-grade-expressions-and-equations
          http://www.oercommons.org/courses/20-20-vision

1: An object is rated limited for the utility of materials designed to support teaching if it includes a useful approach or idea to teach an important topic but falls short of strong for either one of two reasons:
   • The object is missing important elements (e.g., directions for some parts of a lesson are not included).
• Important elements do not function as they are intended (e.g., directions are unclear or practice exercises are missing or inadequate). Teachers would need to supplement this object to use it effectively.

Example:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/persuasive-paragraph

0:  An object is rated *very weak or no value* for the utility of materials designed to support teaching if it is confusing, contains errors, is missing important elements or is for some other reason simply not useful, in spite of an intention to be used as a support for teachers in planning or preparation.

Example:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/exploring-place-value-with-m-ms

N/A:  This rubric is *not applicable* (N/A) for an object that is not designed to support teachers in planning and/or presenting subject matter. *For example, an object might be an interactive game or module intended for student use, with no interaction with the teacher required. An educator may be able to find an application for such an object during a lesson, but that would not be the intended use.*

Examples:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/probability-concepts  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/collaborative-statistics-data-sets

**Step 3: Add any comments, save your rating and move on to the next rubric.**

When you are satisfied with your rating and have entered any comments you would like to leave for other reviewers, click on [Save & Go to Next Rubric] in the bottom right corner of the Rubric III screen.
Rubric IV: Quality of Instructional and Practice Exercises

Step 1: Determine whether this rubric applies to the object.

Rubric IV is used to evaluate objects with components designed to determine what a student knows before, during or after a topic is taught. The assessment might be a small part of an object or the entire object. It could take many different forms from more traditional tests or quizzes to more unconventional games or interactive applets.

A reviewer should take into account the apparent intentions of the object’s creator. While some objects could be used as assessments, it is important to consider whether or not the creator of the object intended for any part of it to be used as an assessment. When many assessment components are included in one object, as is often the case, the rubric is applied to the entire collection of assessments or assessment items.

Step 2: Determine your rating for the object.

The Rubric IV rating descriptors and examples from OERCommons.org follow. There are links to objects with at least one example of a rating for mathematics and/or English language arts/literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects at that level.

(Note: Ratings on examples provided here are the opinions of individual raters and do not necessarily reflect the views of Achieve or OER Commons. They have been selected only for the purpose of reflection on the rating descriptor. Examples of all ratings are not necessarily available in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool at this time.)

3: An object is rated superior for the quality of its assessments only if all of the following are true:
   • All of the skills and knowledge assessed align clearly to the content and performance expectations intended, as stated or implied in the object.
   • Nothing is assessed that is not included in the scope of intended material unless it is differentiated as extension material.
   • The most important aspects of the expectations are targeted and are given appropriate weight/attention in the assessment.
   • The assessment modes used in the object, such as selected response, long-and short-constructed response, or group work require the student to demonstrate proficiency in the intended concept/skill.
   • The level of difficulty is a result of the complexity of the subject area content and performance expectations and of the degree of cognitive demand, rather than a result of unrelated issues (e.g., overly complex vocabulary used in math word problems).

http://www.oercommons.org/courses/nyc-8th-grade-expressions-and-equations

2: An object is rated strong for the quality of its assessments if it assesses all of the content and performance expectations intended, but the assessment modes do not consistently offer the student opportunities to demonstrate proficiency in the intended concept/skill.
Example: http://www.oercommons.org/courses/media-arts-critical-viewing-cigarette-ads

1: An object is rated limited for the quality of its assessments if it assesses some of the content or performance expectations intended, as stated or implicit in the object, but omits some important content or performance expectations and/or fails to offer the student opportunities to demonstrate proficiency in the intended content/skills.
Example: http://www.oercommons.org/courses/animal-adjectives

0: An object is rated very weak or no value for the quality of its assessments if its assessments contain significant errors, do not assess important content/skills, are written in a way that is confusing to students or are unsound for other reasons.

N/A: This rubric is not applicable (N/A) for an object that is not designed to have an assessment component. Even if one might imagine ways an object could be used for assessment purposes, if it is not the intended purpose, not applicable is the appropriate score.

Step 3: Add any comments, save your rating and move on to the next rubric.

When you are satisfied with your rating and have entered any comments you would like to leave for other reviewers, click on [Save & Go to Next Rubric] in the bottom right corner of the Rubric IV screen.
Evaluation in Action — Rubric IV

The screenshot below shows the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool when you are evaluating a resource using Rubric IV. Notice that ratings for Rubrics I–III are completed and saved (✓).

In our example, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line, it is apparent to this reviewer that the object’s creator did not intend for this object to be used as an assessment. While the object includes some assessment strategies, they are informal and based on teacher observations of the students’ interactions and the posters they create following the lesson. For this reason this reviewer believes that the N/A rating for the quality of assessments is appropriate.
Rubric V: Quality of Technological Interactivity

Step 1: Determine whether this rubric applies to the object.

Rubric V is intended to evaluate objects with technology-based interactive element(s) on the degree and quality of the interactivity. Here “interactivity” broadly means that the object responds to what the user does and behaves differently depending on the actions of the user. This rubric is not meant to rate either the quality of technology in general or how students interact with each other. It is only meant to rate the technological interactivity, or how the technology in the object responds to the user.

Evaluation in Action — Rubric V

The screenshot below shows the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool when you are evaluating a resource using Rubric V. In this case our example has several links to interactive games and tasks, making this rubric relevant for this object.

In the example this reviewer found the interactive components to be responsive, individualized, adaptive, purposeful, well designed and functioning flawlessly. This reviewer rates the technological interactivity of this example 3: Superior.
Step 2: Determine your rating for the object.

The Rubric V rating descriptors and examples from OERCommons.org follow. There are links to objects with at least one example of a rating for mathematics and/or English language arts/literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects at that level.

(Note: Ratings on examples provided here are the opinions of individual raters and do not necessarily reflect the views of Achieve or OER Commons. They have been selected only for the purpose of reflection on the rating descriptor. Examples of all ratings are not necessarily available in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool at this time.)

3: An object, or interactive component of an object, is rated superior for the quality of its technological interactivity only if all of the following are true:
   • The object is responsive to student input in a way that creates an individualized learning experience. This means that the object adapts to the user based on what s/he does or that the object allows the user some flexibility or individual control during the learning experience.
   • The interactive element is purposeful and directly related to learning.
   • The object is well designed and easy to use, encouraging learner use.
   • The object appears to function flawlessly on the intended platform.

Examples:
   http://www.oercommons.org/courses/alex-lesson-plan-fractions-on-a-number-line

2: An object, or interactive component of an object, is rated strong for the quality of its technological interactivity if it has an interactive feature that is purposeful and directly related to learning but does not provide an individualized learning experience. Similar to the superior objects, strong interactive objects must be well designed and easy to use, and they must function flawlessly on the intended platform. Some technological elements may not be directly related to the content, but for a strong rating they must not detract from the learning experience. These kinds of interactive elements, including earning points or achieving levels for correct answers, might be designed to increase student motivation and build content understanding by rewarding or entertaining the learner and may extend the time the user engages with the content.

Examples:
   http://www.oercommons.org/courses/spider-legs

1: An object, or interactive component of an object, is rated limited for the quality of its technological interactivity if its interactive element does not relate to the subject matter and may detract from the learning experience. These kinds of interactive elements may slightly increase motivation but do
not provide strong support for understanding the subject matter addressed in the object. It is unlikely that this interactive feature will increase understanding or extend the time a user engages with the content.

Examples:  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/visual-fractions

0:  An object, or interactive component of an object, is rated very weak or no value for the quality of its technological interactivity if it has interactive features that are poorly conceived and/or executed. The interactive features might fail to operate as intended, distract the user or unnecessarily take up user time.

Example:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/beginning-algebra-videos

N/A:  This rubric is not applicable (N/A) for an object that does not have an interactive technological element. For example, the rubric does not apply if interaction with the object is limited to opening a user-selected PDF.

Examples:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/probability-concepts
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/fact-and-opinion

Step 3: Add any comments, save your rating and move on to the next rubric.

When you are satisfied with your rating and have entered any comments you would like to leave for other reviewers, click on [Save & Go to Next Rubric] in the bottom right corner of the Rubric V screen.
Rubric VI: Quality of Instructional and Practice Exercises

Step 1: Determine whether this rubric applies to the object.

Rubric VI is meant to measure the quality of instructional tasks and exercises included in an object that are designed to help strengthen skills and knowledge. When a concept or skill is introduced, providing the proper amount of practice is very important. However, when dealing with complex tasks, the number of exercises is less important than their overall quality. Users should consider both measures when evaluating an object for this rubric. Also, an entire group of practice exercises should be treated as a single entity for these purposes.

Step 2: Determine your rating for the object.

The Rubric VI rating descriptors and examples from OERCommons.org follow. There are links to objects with at least one example of a rating for mathematics and/or English language arts/literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects at that level.

(Note: Ratings on examples provided here are the opinions of individual raters and do not necessarily reflect the views of Achieve or OER Commons. They have been selected only for the purpose of reflection on the rating descriptor. Examples of all ratings are not necessarily available in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool at this time.)

3: An object is rated superior for the quality of its instructional and practice exercises only if all of the following are true:
   • The object offers more exercises than needed for the average student to facilitate mastery of the targeted skills, as stated or implied in the object. For complex tasks, one or two rich practice exercises may be considered more than enough.
   • The exercises are clearly written and supported by accurate answer keys or scoring guidelines as applicable.
   • A variety of exercise types and/or the exercises are available in a variety of formats, as appropriate to the targeted concepts and skills. For more complex practice exercises, the formats used provide an opportunity for the learner to integrate a variety of skills.

Examples:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/visual-fractions  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/alex-lesson-plan-fractions-on-a-number-line

2: An object is rated strong for the quality of its instructional and practice exercises if it offers only a sufficient number of well-written exercises to
facilitate mastery of targeted skills, which are supported by accurate answer keys or scoring guidelines, but there is little variety of exercise types or formats.

Examples:  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/animal-adjectives  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/anthill-number-round-off

1: An object is rated \textit{limited} for the quality of its instructional and practice exercises if it has some, but too few, exercises to facilitate mastery of the targeted skills; does not have answer keys; and provides no variation in type or format.

Examples:  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/exploring-place-value-with-m-ms  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/chicken-coop-construction

0: An object is rated \textit{very weak or no value} for the quality of its instructional and practice exercises if the exercises do not facilitate mastery of the targeted skills, contain errors or are unsound for other reasons.

Examples:  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/aaa-doesn-t-work  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/what2019s-your-name

N/A: This rubric is \textit{not applicable} (N/A) to an object that does not include opportunities to practice targeted skills.

Examples:  
http://www.oercommons.org/courses/acc-basketball  

\textbf{Step 3: Add any comments, save your rating and move on to the next rubric.}

When you are satisfied with your rating and have entered any comments you would like to leave for other reviewers, click on [Save & Go to Next Rubric] in the bottom right corner of the \textbf{Rubric VI} screen.
Evaluation in Action — Rubric VI

The screenshot below shows the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool when you are evaluating a resource using Rubric VI.

This reviewer found that our example object, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line, functions primarily as a practice exercise. The object focuses on introduction and practice for placing fractions on a number line. The interactive components include more practice than is needed for an average student. The components are clear and include a variety of types. They also provide instantaneous feedback to the student. For these reasons this reviewer has rated the practice aspect of this object 3: Superior.
Rubric VII: Opportunities for Deeper Learning

Step 1: Determine whether this rubric applies to the object.

Rubric VII is used to evaluate objects that are designed provide opportunities for deeper learning and engage learners in any of the following ways:

- Think critically and solve complex problems;
- Work collaboratively;
- Communicate effectively;
- Learn how to learn;
- Reason abstractly;
- Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others;
- Apply discrete knowledge and skills to real-world situations; and
- Construct, use or analyze models.

Step 2: Determine your rating for the object.

The Rubric VII rating descriptors and examples from OERCommons.org follow. There are links to objects with at least one example of a rating for mathematics and/or English language arts/literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects at that level.

(Note: Ratings on examples provided here are the opinions of individual raters and do not necessarily reflect the views of Achieve or OER Commons. They have been selected only for the purpose of reflection on the rating descriptor. Examples of all ratings are not necessarily available in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool at this time.)

3: An object is rated superior for its opportunities for deeper learning only if all of the following are true:

- At least three of the deeper learning skills from the list identified in this rubric are required in the object.
- The object offers a range of cognitive demand that is appropriate and supportive of the material.
- Appropriate scaffolding and direction are provided.

Examples:  http://www.oercommons.org/courses/ramp-up-your-writing
            http://www.oercommons.org/courses/nyc-8th-grade-expressions-and-equations

2: An object is rated strong for its opportunities for deeper learning if it includes one or two deeper learning skills identified in this rubric. For example, the object might involve a complex problem that requires abstract reasoning skills to reach a solution.

1: An object is rated limited for its opportunities for deeper learning if it includes one deeper learning skill identified in the rubric but is missing clear guidance on how to tap into the various aspects of deeper learning. For example, an object might include a provision for learners to collaborate, but the process and product are unclear.

Examples:  [http://www.oercommons.org/courses/visual-fractions](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/visual-fractions)

0: An object is rated very weak or no value for its opportunities for deeper learning if it appears to be designed to provide some of the deeper learning opportunities identified in this rubric, but it is not useful as it is presented. For example, the object might be based on poorly formulated problems and/or unclear directions, making it unlikely that this lesson or activity will lead to skills like critical thinking, abstract reasoning, constructing arguments or modeling.

Example:  [http://www.oercommons.org/courses/exploring-place-value-with-m-ms](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/exploring-place-value-with-m-ms)

N/A: This rubric is not applicable (N/A) to an object that does not appear to be designed to provide the opportunity for deeper learning, even though one might imagine how it could be used to do so.

Examples:  [http://www.oercommons.org/courses/time-flies-when-you-re-having-fun](http://www.oercommons.org/courses/time-flies-when-you-re-having-fun)  

**Step 3: Add any comments, save your rating and move on to the next rubric.**

When you are satisfied with your rating and have entered any comments you would like to leave for other reviewers, click on [Save & View Results] in the bottom right corner. Clicking this link will take you to the Results page to finalize your ratings (see “Final Results” for more information).
Evaluation in Action — Rubric VII

The screenshot below shows the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool when you are evaluating a resource using Rubric VII.

For our example, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on a Number Line, this reviewer believes that, even though working collaboratively is suggested in the object, it is not intended to provide the learner with opportunities for deeper learning. For this reason Rubric VII has been rated N/A by this reviewer.
Final Results

After you have rated all seven rubrics, clicking [Save & View Results] will lead you directly to the Results page, as shown below for our example object, ALEX Lesson Plan: Fractions on the Number Line. Your scores will be listed in the left column, and if there have been other reviewers, the average of the scores will appear on the right.

Notice that the comment this reviewer left on Rubric IV for our example is indicated by the comment balloon next to the rating. You can read the comment by clicking on or hovering over the balloon.

When this reviewer started the evaluation process for our example object there were no other reviews for this object in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool. We see now, based on the average scores for Rubrics II, IV and V, that at least one other reviewer has rated this object. You can also see that in some cases the ratings agree; in other cases they do not. This is an important and positive part of this review process. The tool provides an opportunity for communication between current and former reviewers. You may compare and consider other reviews before finalizing your scores. After considering your collection of ratings you can either [Go Back & Change Your Scores] or [Finalize OER Review]. Even after clicking to finalize, you may return to your review and change your scores.
Evaluation Rubrics/Tool FAQs

• Can anyone evaluate resources on OERCommons.org?
Yes. Anyone is welcome to create a username and profile on OERCommons.org and evaluate resources. The “Guidelines and Reminders” page in the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool reminds users that this tool requires the input of knowledgeable and experienced educators.

• Can Rubric I be applied using different educational standards?
Rubric I is agnostic about which educational standards users employ when rating items. The Achieve OER Evaluation Tool uses the Common Core State Standards; however, users could use other educational standards when applying Rubric I.

• Can I use the rubrics and/or the evaluation tool on my website?
Yes. The OER rubrics have a Creative Commons CC-BY license attached to them, meaning anyone is able to use, share and remix the rubrics, as long as they are attributed to Achieve. Also, the evaluation tool source code is open and freely available online at the following URL: http://iskme.github.com/oer-evaluation-tool.js/. Please contact Achieve if you are interested in including the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool on your website.

• Can other users see how I evaluated an item?
No. Each user’s ratings are not publicly displayed on OERCommons.org — only the average scores of all ratings. Rating comments, however, are linked to a user’s username and publicly displayed.

• Are my comments submitted through the Achieve OER Evaluation Tool tagged to my username?
Yes. The username will appear following a user’s submitted comment.

• Where can I see a list of the items I have previously evaluated?
By clicking “My OER” in the top navigation bar on OERCommons.org, users can see submitted ratings, ratings they have saved but not submitted, items they have tagged, item comments, items they have uploaded to OERCommons.org and searches they have saved.