

K–12 Open Educational Resources

2024–25 OER Project Funding Opportunity

Open Educational Resources (OER) are teaching and learning materials that are free to use, adapt, and share.

As districts develop or adapt OER, we have a tremendous opportunity to share resources across districts via our [Washington OER Hub](#)—promoting equitable access to standards-aligned, quality instructional materials. This program is in support of that goal.

For more information:

Barbara Soots
OER and Instructional Materials Program Manager
barbara.soots@k12.wa.us
[OSPI OER website](#)

[Learn more about the Education Grants Management System \(EGMS\)](#)

[Apply in EGMS](#)

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Target Area of Focus

To be considered for funding, proposals must address **one** of the following areas:

1. **Development/Adaptation:** Complete the development/adaptation of an openly licensed **unit** (2–6 weeks—comprised of multiple lessons that build student understanding of a topic or theme) aligned to identified state learning standards.

OR

2. **Professional Learning:** Provide synchronous or asynchronous professional learning for educators focused on one or more Washington-developed resources found on the OER Hub. Professional learning should be ongoing throughout the school year and include implementation of the resource with students.

Priority consideration will be given to projects that address any or all of the following:

- Content integration
- Content areas currently lacking in standards-aligned OER (e.g., Health and Physical Education, Arts, World Languages, Social Studies, Dual Language Resources)
- Resource development or adaptation that includes the histories, contributions, and perspectives of historically marginalized and underrepresented groups.
- Collaboration of small school districts (under 2K)

Resource Sharing and Distribution

All projects must:

- Ensure adherence to open licensing requirements and proper open resource attribution.
- Link content to or develop content on the [Washington OER Hub](#), so that material can be accessed and used by teachers, schools and districts across the state.



Collaboration

The intent of this effort is to share developed material or professional learning opportunities broadly. Each project must include collaboration that clearly demonstrates impact beyond a single class. Examples include:

- collaboration between teachers in a building
- collaboration between multiple buildings in the school district or between multiple districts
- collaboration between at least two entities (e.g., an Educational Service District and a district, a district and a community-based organization, or a district and a local Tribe)

AWARD AND BUDGET INFORMATION

Type and Number of Awards

- Competitive twelve-month grant for FY24-25. Grant requests may not exceed \$15,000 and most awards will be in the \$10,000 range.
- Anticipated number of awards: four to six.

Submission Details

- Apply through the [EGMS system](#).
- Submissions may come from a public, private, or tribal school, district office, ESD, or Washington non-profit organization. Only one proposal may be submitted per organization.

Indirect Costs

May be calculated at a rate of 7% for schools/districts, 10% for universities/organizations, and 11% for ESDs.

Allowable Activities and Expenses

For schools/districts/organizations:

- Costs associated with planning meetings, providing professional development, or developing resources (e.g., substitutes, after work compensation in the form of stipends, food, travel, rental fees, and facilitator stipends)
- Instructional technology—must show a direct connection of why the instructional technology is needed to support the work
- Limited personnel costs (admin assistants and project manager)—activities must be detailed in budget justification.

For educational service districts:

- Learning resources, instructional professional development, and general support

Due Dates

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| APPLICATIONS DUE: | MAY 30, 2024 (BY 11:59 PM) |
| GRANT TIMEFRAME: | JULY 01, 2024–JUNE 30, 2025 |

OER PROJECT APPLICATION INFORMATION

This information appears in the EGMS application.

Assurances

1. All project teams will attend four online meetings throughout the year.
2. All grantees will work with OER Project staff to schedule virtual check-ins as needed to assess progress towards project goals and provide technical assistance for project challenges.
3. All resources produced with the Washington Open Educational Resources (OER) grant will be licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](#). All derivative works made from others' existing OER must follow the terms of the open license on those works.
4. All resources produced with the Washington Open Educational Resources (OER) grant will be made available to the public through the [Washington OER Hub](#).
5. The grantee will complete a brief survey to establish a baseline and prepare a final report that documents project achievements, deliverables, and shifts in cost spending.
6. Participating districts may be asked to provide input on their experiences and act as models as other districts draft curriculum adoption/usage policies for OER and other digital instructional materials. This will involve completion of teacher and student photo and video release forms.

Definitions

Open Educational Resources (OER) are teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license that permits their free use and re-purposing by others. The purpose of OER participation is to positively impact both the teaching and learning process by providing teachers and administrators with cost-effective materials that are available for sharing, accessing, and collaborating for personalized learning.

Proposal Scoring Rubric

All proposals will be reviewed with the scoring rubric at the end of this document. Please review.

Application Questions: Project information and Contact Info

1. Project Name
2. Contact Name
3. Contact Phone
4. Contact Email
5. Check your project **target area of focus**:

Development/Adaptation: Complete the development/adaptation of an openly licensed **unit** (2–6 weeks—comprised of multiple lessons that build student understanding of a topic or theme) aligned to identified state learning standards.

Professional Learning: Provide synchronous or asynchronous professional learning for educators focused on one or more Washington-developed resources found on the OER Hub. Professional learning should be ongoing throughout the school year and include implementation of the resource with students.

6. What content area(s) and grade band are targeted by this project?
7. Provide a **brief** Project Summary (250 words or less) that presents a self-contained description of the project activity that would result if the proposal were funded. The summary should address the project’s merits and impact on teacher instruction and student learning.

Application Questions: Project description

This grant is focused on the wide scale sharing of or professional learning around openly licensed, district-developed, instructional materials.

1. Describe the needs addressed by the proposed project, providing evidence to support the need.
2. List the specific project activities or deliverables for the 12-month grant. Provide a timeline.
3. How will adapted or original instructional material developed or at the center of professional learning be reviewed? Describe the instruments and the process.
4. List the collaborating organizations (this may include individual schools, districts, or ESDs). Include names of teaching staff, curriculum, technology, and administrative leadership participating in the project and identify key roles and responsibilities. Describe your collaboration strategy.
5. If your project is in progress, describe accomplishments to date and clarify how you will build on that work. If work has yet to start, what is your organization’s capacity to complete and share the work by the grant end date?
6. Describe your project’s experience with openly licensed resources (locating, vetting, adaptation, etc.).

7. The average award has been ~\$10,000 in past years. How much are you requesting?
8. Detail your requested award amount and provide a justification for how the amounts were calculated. Categories include salaries/benefits, supplies, purchased services, or travel. Please note if there any additional in-kind contributions. A budget will be required if you receive an award.

Here is a generic example.

| | | |
|------------------|--|-----------|
| <i>Salaries:</i> | <i>Cost of work outside contracted hours for X teachers at \$Y/hr.</i> | <i>\$</i> |
| <i>Supplies:</i> | <i>Printing costs to provide text for committee review</i> | <i>\$</i> |
| <i>Services:</i> | <i>Costs for external cultural advisor and Tribal liaison</i> | <i>\$</i> |
| | <i>Substitute teacher costs paid in-kind by district</i> | |



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

OER GRANT PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC

| Section | Exceeds Standard (4-5 pts each) | Meets Standard (2-3 pts each) | Below Standard (0-1 pts each) | Score (0-5) | Weight | Total |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|--------|------------|
| Target Area of Focus | <p>The proposal completely addresses one of the target areas of focus – calling out standards alignment and resources that build on student understanding.</p> <p>Any additional activities beyond the scope described in the RFP are in support of the target focus area.</p> <p>(for 5 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • under-represented content area • blended/remote delivery • focus on small school districts | <p>The proposal addresses one of the target areas of focus.</p> <p>Most activities beyond the scope described in the RFP are in support of the target focus area.</p> <p>(for 3 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • under-represented content area • blended/remote delivery • focus on small school districts | <p>The scope of the grant does not fall into one of the target areas of focus (e.g., a stand-alone lesson or activity).</p> | | 2X | /10 |
| Content Area/Grade Band | <p>Target content area and grade or grade band is clearly defined.</p> <p>Project involves a content area that is lacking in standards aligned OER (e.g., Health and Physical Education, the Arts, World Languages, Social Studies).</p> <p>(for 5 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • focus on small school districts | <p>Target content area and grade or grade band is clearly defined.</p> <p>(for 3 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • focus on small school districts | <p>Target content area and grade or grade band is NOT defined.</p> | | 2X | /10 |
| Summary | <p>The summary is succinct, well written, and clear. It describes in detail why the project is needed and what it looks like, as well as identifying the project impact.</p> | <p>Summary is adequate to describe project details, need, and impact.</p> | <p>Summary is not clear or descriptive or is too long.</p> | | 1x | /5 |
| Needs Addressed | <p>Information and data are presented to build a compelling case for why an OER grant is needed. Target audience and anticipated impact are clarified.</p> | <p>The information presented build a good case for why an OER grant is needed. Target audience and anticipated impact are clarified.</p> | <p>Needs are not addressed, or no case is made how this project will be impactful.</p> | | 2x | /10 |

| Section | Exceeds Standard (4-5 pts each) | Meets Standard (2-3 pts each) | Below Standard (0-1 pts each) | Score (0-5) | Weight | Total |
|---|---|--|---|----------------|--------|------------|
| Project Activities, Deliverables, & Timeline | All project activities and deliverables are clearly listed. Project has a compelling strategy for achieving project goals. A detailed timeline is provided that is highly achievable within the 12-month timeframe. Open licensing and wide-scale distribution of resources is addressed among the project activities. (for 5 pts) One or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • under-represented content area • blended/remote delivery • focus on small school districts | Most project activities and/or deliverables are clearly listed and are consistent with achieving project goals. The timeline is reasonable within the 12-month grant timeframe. (for 3 pts) One or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • under-represented content area • blended/remote delivery • focus on small school districts | Activities or deliverables are not listed or unreasonable. | | 2x | /10 |
| Resource Vetting | OER to be adapted/created/at center of professional learning have been or will be reviewed by multiple qualified reviewers using EQuIP or other nationally recognized instruments to determine quality and standards alignment. Multiple school buildings or districts are using or will be using the resource and can provide critical feedback on implementation needs. | OER to be adapted/created have been or will be reviewed by multiple qualified reviewers using EQuIP or other nationally recognized instruments to determine quality and standards alignment. | OER to be adapted/created have not been reviewed by qualified reviewers using nationally recognized instruments or does not align with state learning standards. | | 2x | /10 |
| Collaboration | Details are provided on all project partners and their roles. Representation from teachers, district curriculum, technology, and administrative leaders is present and authentic. A description of how partners will collaborate is provided in a clear and complete manner. Previous effective collaboration between partners is in place. | Details are provided on all project partners and their roles. Representation from teachers, district curriculum, technology, and administrative leaders is present. A description of how partners will collaborate is provided in a clear and complete manner. | Proposal provides limited detail about project partners or does not include representation from teachers, district curriculum, technology, and administrative leaders. Collaboration strategy is unclear. | | 2x | /10 |

| Section | Exceeds Standard (4-5 pts each) | Meets Standard (2-3 pts each) | Below Standard (0-1 pts each) | Score (0-5) | Weight | Total |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|----------------|--------|------------|
| Progress to Date/Capacity | <p>Existing projects: Previous deliverables completed in exemplary fashion. Examples of effective implementation provided. Proposal presents clear plan to build on existing efforts.</p> <p>New projects: District administration has committed staff and time to complete project, implement, and share work.</p> | <p>Existing projects: Previous deliverables completed. Proposal presents clear plan to build on existing efforts.</p> <p>New projects: Work has begun on OER instructional materials. Project has capacity to complete materials in grant timeframe. District is supportive of project.</p> | <p>Development/adaptation of OER is in the exploratory stages.</p> | | 2 | /10 |
| Experience with OER | <p>Project staff are experienced with using, adapting, and implementing OER. Strong example is provided.</p> | <p>Project staff are familiar with using, adapting, and implementing OER. Good example if provided.</p> | <p>Project staff have limited to no experience using OER. No example is provided.</p> | | 1 | /5 |
| Budget | <p>Budget is appropriate for project scale. Budget costs are for allowable activities or expenses and any technology requests are reasonable. Budget justification provides detail on how expenditures were calculated. There is additional committed fiscal or in-kind support.</p> | <p>Budget is appropriate for project scale. Budget costs are for allowable activities or expenses. Any technology requests are reasonable. Budget justification provides detail on how expenditures were calculated.</p> | <p>Budget is not appropriate for project scale or costs are not for allowable activities or expenses. Budget justification is missing or provides limited detail on how expenditures were calculated.</p> | | 1x | /5 |

Total Score (out of 85):