OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES PROJECT GRANT

SYNOPSIS OF PROGRAM:

Open Educational Resources (OER) are teaching and learning materials that reside in the public domain or have been released under an open license. These resources may be used free of charge, distributed without restriction, and modified without permission.

Washington has advocated district consideration of OER as part of a legislative mandate. This message has been amplified by a similar push from the U.S. Department of Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, and the State Educational Technology Director’s Association -- all encouraging districts and states to explore OER as an important part of the instructional materials ecosystem.

Many districts are now developing their own openly licensed core instructional material, implementing OER reviewed by the OSPI OER Project, or adapting resources reviewed using the same methodology. As more districts develop or adapt OER, we have a tremendous opportunity to share resources across districts via our OER Commons Washington Hub and reduce duplication of efforts. This program is in support of that goal.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

TARGET AREA OF FOCUS

In order to be considered for funding, proposals must address one of the following areas:

1. Complete the development/adaptation of OER core instructional materials aligned to state learning standards in a specific content area.

   OR

2. Develop and/or identify resources, supports, and best practices, to help in the ongoing implementation of district-adopted OER core instructional materials.

RESOURCE SHARING AND DISTRIBUTION

All proposals must include a plan to:

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

Budgets should include travel funds for a project team of 2-5 to attend a one day Grant Kickoff in the Seattle area (late summer/early fall) that will cover permitted use, attribution, applying an open license, and using the OER Commons Washington Hub.

Examples:

   District X developed full-course grade 4 science materials by pulling together multiple resources on the internet and creating their own content. Funds could be used to pull together a team to review content for permitted use, substitute resources if necessary, provide attribution for all the sources, upload content on a public-facing site, and hold training sessions on implementation of the developed content.

   Three small districts who have adopted Open Up Resources/Illustrative Mathematics meet to share professional learning strategies. They create implementation resources on OER Commons directly using the Open Author tool.
### Collaboration
Each project must include collaboration in **at least one** of the following ways:
- collaboration between multiple buildings in the school district
- collaboration between school districts
- collaboration with an Educational Service District(s)

### AWARD AND BUDGET INFORMATION

#### ANTICIPATED TYPE OF AWARD
Competitive twelve-month grant for FY18-19.

#### ESTIMATED NUMBER OF AWARDS
Four to six. Grant requests may not exceed $15,000 and most awards are anticipated to be in the $10,000 range.

#### SUBMISSION DETAILS
Submissions may come from a public school, district office, or ESD. Only one proposal may be submitted per organization.

**PLEASE NOTE**
Apply through the [iGrants](https://igrants.wa.gov) system – Form Package Number 730.

#### INDIRECT COSTS
May be calculated at a rate of 7% for districts and 11% for ESDs

#### ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES AND EXPENSES

*For public schools/districts:*
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 district:* learning resources, instructional professional development, and general support

### DUE DATES
- **PROPOSALS DUE:** JUNE 28, 2018 (BY 4 PM)
- **GRANT TIMEFRAME:** JULY 16, 2018 – JUNE 30, 2019
OER PROJECT IGRANT APPLICATION INFORMATION AND QUESTIONS

This information appears in the iGrants application – Form Package Number 730.

ASSURANCES

1. All project teams will attend an in-person meeting to discuss grant objectives, open licensing requirements, and effective resource distribution.

2. All grantees will work with OER Project staff to schedule a one-day site visit and 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 OER Commons Washington 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.

DEFINITIONS

Core Instructional Materials are the primary instructional resources for a given course. They are district-approved and provided to all students to help meet learning standards and provide instruction towards course requirements.

Open Educational Resources
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.
PROJECT INFORMATION AND CONTACT INFO

1. Project Name
2. Contact Name:
3. Contact Phone:
4. Contact Email:
5. Identify the lead partner responsible for project oversight, reporting, and who will act as fiscal agent.
6. Check your project target area of focus:
   Complete the development/adaptation of OER to create core instructional material aligned to state learning standards in a specific content area.
   Develop and/or identify resources, supports, and best practices to help in the ongoing implementation of district-adopted OER core instructional material.
7. What resource(s) or content area will be targeted by this project?
8. 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.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This grant is focused on the wide scale sharing of openly licensed district-developed core instructional materials or implementation resources for district-adopted OER. As such, preference will be given to projects where this work is already underway or who can make a compelling case for how these materials will be complete and ready to share with the public by the grant end date.

1. Describe the needs which are addressed by the proposed project, providing evidence to support the stated need.
2. List the specific project activities or deliverables for the 12-month grant. Provide an estimated timeline.
3. If using an existing open core curriculum, how was the target resource reviewed and ranked favorably for standards alignment. If existing open resources will be adapted to develop core instructional material, or original core-material will be developed, how will those resources be vetted?
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 the collaboration strategy.
5. Provide a justification that includes how each budget item was calculated for the expenditures listed in each category of your iGrants budget form.
6. If your project is in progress, describe what has been accomplished to date. If work has yet to start, what is your organization’s capacity to complete and share the work by the grant end date?
7. Describe your project’s experience with openly licensed resources (locating, vetting, adaptation, etc.).

8. Outline your technology strategy for making these resources accessible to the public. Where will they be stored so they can be linked to via the OER Commons Washington Hub or will they be created on the Hub itself?
# OER Grant Proposal Review Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard (4-5 pts each)</th>
<th>Meets Standard (2-3 pts each)</th>
<th>Below Standard (0-1 pts each)</th>
<th>Score (0-5)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Area of Focus</strong></td>
<td>The proposal completely addresses one or both of the target areas of focus selected in the RFP. Any additional activities beyond the scope described in the RFP are in support of the target area of focus.</td>
<td>The majority of the proposal's scope of work is within one of the target area of focus for the RFP.</td>
<td>The scope of the grant does not fall into one of the target areas of focus.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Summary is adequate to describe project details, need, and impact.</td>
<td>Summary is not clear or descriptive or is too long.</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td></td>
<td>/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs Addressed</strong></td>
<td>Information and data are presented to build a compelling case for why an OER grant is needed. Target audience and anticipated impact are clarified.</td>
<td>The information presented build a good case for why an OER grant is needed. Target audience and anticipated impact are clarified.</td>
<td>Needs are not addressed or no case is made how this project will be impactful.</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td></td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Activities/Deliverables and Timeline</strong></td>
<td>All project activities and deliverables are clearly listed and build an excellent 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.</td>
<td>Most project activities and/or deliverables are clearly listed and consistent with the achieving project goals. The timeline is reasonable within the 12-month grant timeframe. Open licensing and sharing of resources is addressed among the project activities.</td>
<td>Activities or deliverables are not listed or unreasonable.</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td></td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Vetting</strong></td>
<td>The OER to be adapted/created/distributed has been or will be reviewed by multiple qualified reviewers using EQuIP/IMET or other nationally recognized instruments and is standards-aligned. Multiple school buildings or districts are using or will be using the resource and can provide critical feedback on implementation needs.</td>
<td>The OER to be adapted/created/distributed has been or will be reviewed by qualified reviewers using nationally recognized instruments and is standards-aligned.</td>
<td>The OER to be adapted/distributed has not been reviewed by qualified reviewers using nationally recognized instruments or does not align with state learning standards.</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td></td>
<td>/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Exceeds Standard (4-5 pts each)</td>
<td>Meets Standard (2-3 pts each)</td>
<td>Below Standard (0-1 pts each)</td>
<td>Score (0-5)</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Details are provided on all project partners and their roles. Three or more buildings in the same or different districts are collaborating on the project. 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.</td>
<td>Details are provided on all project partners and their roles. At least two buildings in the same or different districts are collaborating on the project. 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.</td>
<td>Proposal provides limited detail about project partners or does not include representation from teachers, district curriculum, technology, and administrative leaders. Collaboration strategy is unclear.</td>
<td>2x</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>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 from district or ESD.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>1x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to Date</td>
<td>OER core instructional materials have been developed or are near completion. Only small adaptions, licensing, and dissemination are required.</td>
<td>Work has begun on OER core instructional materials. Project has capacity to complete materials in grant timeframe.</td>
<td>Development/adaptation of OER is in the exploratory stages.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Exceeds Standard (4-5 pts each)</td>
<td>Meets Standard (2-3 pts each)</td>
<td>Below Standard (0-1 pts each)</td>
<td>Score (0-5)</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with OER</td>
<td>Project staff are <strong>experienced</strong> with using, adapting, and implementing OER. <strong>Strong example</strong> is provided.</td>
<td>Project staff are <strong>familiar</strong> with using, adapting, and implementing OER. <strong>Good example</strong> if provided.</td>
<td>Project staff have <strong>limited to no experience using OER. No example</strong> is provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>Project has an <strong>existing mechanism</strong> and the <strong>technical support</strong> to create and/or store materials outside any district LMS so they are available for public access and download</td>
<td>Project has a <strong>good plan</strong> and <strong>technical guidance</strong> to create and/or store materials outside any district LMS so they are available for public access and download</td>
<td>Project has <strong>no strategy</strong> for sharing developed resources outside the district.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score (out of 85):**

**Reviewer Comments:**