

K–12 Open Educational Resources

2026–27 OER Project Funding Opportunity

Open Resources. Ready to Adapt. Built to Share.

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

The Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) invites Washington school districts, nonprofit organizations, and education partners to develop or adapt high-quality, standards-aligned supplemental instructional materials for statewide sharing through the [Washington OER Hub](#)—OSPI’s online library of free, openly licensed K–12 instructional resources.

AT A GLANCE

Purpose:	Develop or adapt openly licensed, standards-aligned, supplemental instructional materials.
Priority areas:	Resource development targeting revised Washington learning standards in Mathematics, English Language Arts, and Science.
Who can apply:	Washington-based public schools and districts, charter schools, Tribal schools, educational service districts, nonprofit organizations, and higher education institutions.
Funding:	Typical contract amount ~\$10,000; maximum \$15,000. Anticipated awards: 4–6 (subject to available funding).
Contract period:	mid-July, 2026–June 30, 2027 (approximately 11 months).
Key dates:	proposals due May 29; review period June 1–12; notifications week of June 15.
Information session:	May 14 at 4:00 pm (online) Register for the information session
How to apply:	Complete the online proposal submission portal application form by May 29. OER Funding Proposal Submission

For More Information:

[Barbara Soots](#)

Assistant Director, Open Education and Instructional Materials

[OSPI OER website](#)



PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Scope and Priority Area

Funded projects will focus on developing or adapting openly licensed instructional materials consisting of multiple lessons addressing a specific topic or theme. Resources must align to Washington state learning standards and are intended to **supplement** existing core instructional materials.

All deliverables must be openly licensed, accessible, and will be made publicly available through the [Washington OER Hub](#).

Priority will be given to projects that support implementation of [revised Washington learning standards](#) in:

- Mathematics
- English Language Arts
- Science, including Environmental Sustainability

Projects are encouraged to incorporate new areas highlighted in the revised Washington learning standards including data science, research and media literacy, and speaking and listening across digital environments. Integration across content areas is encouraged, provided standards alignment is clearly demonstrated.

Eligibility

Eligible applicants include the following Washington-based entities:

- Public school districts
- Charter schools
- Tribal schools
- Educational service districts
- Nonprofit organizations
- Higher education institutions

Each organization may submit one application.

Collaboration Expectations

Collaboration is a central goal of the OER Project. Proposals must demonstrate meaningful collaboration extending beyond a single classroom (e.g., across schools, districts, regions, or partner organizations such as ESDs, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, or Tribes).

Applications should clearly describe partner roles and responsibilities.

FUNDING AND CONTRACT INFORMATION

- Contract duration: approximately **11 months** (mid-July 2026–June 30, 2027)
- Typical contract amount: approximately **\$10,000**
- Maximum contract amount: **\$15,000**
- Anticipated number of contracts: **four to six**, subject to available funding

Final deliverables and budgets will be refined with selected contractors prior to contract execution.

Contract model and expectations

- This funding opportunity is administered as a **competitive contracting process**. Applicants selected through this process will enter into a contract with OSPI and complete the scope of work outlined in the final agreement.
- Contractors will be expected to participate in required meetings and check-ins, comply with open licensing and accessibility requirements, and submit deliverables and final reporting as specified by OSPI.

Allowable Activities and Expenses

- Costs associated with planning meetings 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 to why it is needed to support the work)
- Limited personnel costs (e.g., administrative assistants and project manager) activities must be detailed in the budget justification

HOW TO APPLY

Applicants must complete the online application form through the proposal submission portal and provide all required responses by **May 29**, including:

- A brief project summary
- Description of instructional need and intended impact
- Proposed activities, deliverables, and timeline
- Description of collaboration and partner roles
- Evidence of capacity to complete and share the work
- Requested contract amount and budget justification

APPLICATION AND AWARD TIMELINE

Applications due: **May 29**

Application review period: **June 1–12**

Notification of potential contract to selected applicants: **week of June 15**

Contract period: **mid-July, 2026–June 30, 2027**

Note: *This opportunity is subject to the availability of funding for the 2026–2027 fiscal year. All proposals will be reviewed; only selected applicants will be invited to enter into the contracting process with OSPI. Submission of a proposal does not guarantee the award of a contract.*

HOW PROPOSALS ARE SCORED

All proposals will be reviewed and scored using the scoring rubric included at the end of this document. In addition to rubric scores, OSPI may also consider the overall balance of selected projects to ensure coverage across content areas and grade bands.

QUESTIONS / MORE INFORMATION

[Barbara Soots](#)

Assistant Director, Open Education and Instructional Materials
Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

OER 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 the target area 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 • incorporation of adopted revised learning standards 	<p>The proposal addresses the target area 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 • incorporation of adopted revised learning standards 	<p>The scope of the proposal does not fall into the target area 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>(for 5 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • incorporation of adopted revised learning standards 	<p>Target content area and grade or grade band is broadly defined.</p> <p>(for 3 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • incorporation of adopted revised learning standards 	<p>Target content area and grade or grade band is NOT defined.</p>		1X	/5
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 development contract is needed. Target audience and anticipated impact are clarified.</p>	<p>The information presented build a good case for why an OER development contract 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	<p>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 11-month timeframe. Open licensing of resources is addressed among the project activities.</p> <p>(for 5 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • incorporation of adopted revised learning standards 	<p>Most project activities and/or deliverables are clearly listed and are consistent with achieving project goals. The timeline is reasonable within the 11-month contract timeframe.</p> <p>(for 3 pts) One or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • content integration • incorporation of adopted revised learning standards 	<p>Activities or deliverables are not listed or unreasonable.</p>		2x	/10
Resource Review	<p>OER to be adapted or created have been or will be reviewed during development by multiple qualified reviewers using nationally or district recognized instruments or techniques to determine quality and standards alignment.</p> <p>Multiple school buildings or districts are using or will be using the resource and can provide critical feedback on implementation needs.</p>	<p>OER to be adapted/created have been or will be reviewed during development by multiple qualified reviewers using nationally or district recognized instruments or techniques to determine quality and standards alignment.</p>	<p>OER to be adapted/created have not been reviewed by qualified reviewers during development or does not align with state learning standards.</p>		2x	/10
Collaboration	<p>Details are provided on all project partners. Representation from teachers, district curriculum, technology, and administrative leaders is present and authentic.</p> <p>A description of partner roles and responsibilities in the collaboration is provided in a clear and complete manner. Previous effective collaboration between partners is in place.</p>	<p>Details are provided on all project partners. Representation from teachers, district curriculum, technology, or administrative leaders is present. A description of partner roles and responsibilities in the collaboration is provided.</p>	<p>Proposal provides limited detail about project partners or does not include representation from teachers, district curriculum, technology, and administrative leaders. Roles are unclear.</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
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 contract timeframe. District is supportive of project.</p>	<p>Development/adaptation of OER is in the exploratory stages or commitment to complete the work is unclear.</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 80):