



Open Educational Resources Project - Request for Proposal

Digital Learning Department

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

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.

As a part of a [legislative mandate](#) to identify and develop a library of openly licensed courseware aligned with the [Common Core State Standards](#) (CCSS), the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) conducted a review of OER targeting math and ELA. Results may be found [here](#).

More districts are considering 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 a result, there is a great need to collaborate on resource adaptation and development, share ideas, define best practices, and champion effective distribution and implementation of resources.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

TARGET AREA OF FOCUS

In order to be considered for funding, proposals must show a plan of action to address one or more of the following areas:

- Ensuring adherence to resource licensing permissions, proper open resource attribution, and wide scale dissemination of **district-generated, core instructional materials**.
 - *Example: 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.*
- Creating an OER team to collaborate to develop and identify resources, supports, and best practices to help in the ongoing implementation of OER **core instructional materials** that can be accessed and used by teachers, schools and districts across the state.
 - *Example: Three small districts who are using Engage NY for math, meet to share and create core curricular supports such as parent supports, assessments, scope & sequence, etc. and post those resources on the Engage NY Users Group Collaboration site.*
- Adapting existing OER to create **core instructional materials** in a specific content area.

COLLABORATION

Each project must include collaboration in **one or more** of the following ways:

- collaboration between multiple buildings in the school district
- collaboration between school districts
- collaboration with an Educational Service District(s)

In addition to teacher participation, evidence of representation from curriculum, technology, and administrative leadership must be present.

AWARD AND BUDGET INFORMATION

ANTICIPATED TYPE OF AWARD

Competitive twelve-month grant for FY16-17, pending availability of funds in FY16-17

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](#) 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: MAY 18, 2016

GRANT TIMEFRAME: JULY 1, 2016 – JUNE 30, 2017 *(pending funding)*

OER PROJECT IGRANT APPLICATION QUESTIONS

ASSURANCES

1. All grantees will attend an online 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. The grantee will complete a brief survey to establish a baseline and final report that documents project achievements, deliverables, and impact.
5. 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.
6. The grantee will provide OSPI with access to all developed 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:

Ensuring adherence to licensing permissions, proper open resource attribution, and wide scale dissemination of district-generated core instructional materials.

Establishment or expansion of a shared pool of implementation resources and best practice policies centered on existing open core instructional material

Adaptation of existing OER to create core instructional materials in a specific content area.

7. What resource(s) or content area will be targeted by this project? If this is a resource currently available online, provide a link to the resource and to the existing open license on the instructional material.
8. Provide a brief Project Summary (approximately 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

9. Describe the needs which are addressed by the proposed project, providing evidence to support the stated need. Identify the project's intended audience and anticipated impact.
10. Describe the project goals and describe how success in achieving these goals will be measured?
11. List the specific project activities or deliverables for the 12-month grant that will enable you to meet your goals and provide an estimated timeline.
12. 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?
13. 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.
14. How will this group continue the work beyond the duration of the grant?
15. Provide a justification that includes how each budget item was calculated for the expenditures listed in each category of your iGrants budget form.

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
Summary	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 .	Summary is adequate to describe project details, need , and impact .	Summary is not clear or descriptive or is too long .		1x	/5
Needs Addressed	Information and data are presented to build a compelling case for why an OER grant is needed. Target audience and anticipated impact are clarified.	The information presented build a good case for why an OER grant is needed. Target audience and anticipated impact are clarified.	Needs are not addressed or no case is made how this project will be impactful.		2x	/10
Project Goals	The goals of the proposed program are clear . Metrics for success are described and are measurable both quantitatively and qualitatively .	The goals of the proposed program are clear . Metrics for success are described and are measurable qualitatively .	The goals of the proposed program are unclear . No metrics are provided to measure goals.		1x	/5
Project Activities/Deliverables and Timeline	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.	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.	Activities or deliverables are not listed or unreasonable .		2x	/10
Resource Vetting	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.	The OER to be adapted/created/distributed has been or will be reviewed by qualified reviewers using nationally recognized instruments and is standards-aligned .	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.		1x	/5

Collaboration	Details are provided on all project partners and their roles . Four 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.	Details are provided on all project partners and their roles . At least two-three 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.	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
Sustainability	A robust plan for maintaining and growing the project and shared resources beyond the scope of the OER grant is provided.	A plan for maintaining the project or shared resources beyond the scope of the OER grant is provided.	A limited sustainability plan is provided or sustainability plan is absent.		1x	/5
Budget	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.	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.	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.		1x	/5
Target Area of Focus	The proposal completely addresses one or more 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.	The majority of the proposal's scope of work is within one of the target area of focus for the RFP.	The scope of the grant does not fall into one of the target areas of focus .		2	/10
Reviewer Comments:						
					Total	/65