Resources

REVISED Montana Comprehensive Literacy Plan (MCLP) w/ Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Continuous Improvement Cycle (CIC)

Local Literacy Plan (LLP) aligned to MCLP

Independent Peer Reviewer (IPR) Toolkit

Activities

OPI TA:
SRCL Grant Application Modules

OPI TA:
Regional SRCL Grant Application Workshops

OPI TA and IC TA:
SRCL Conferences with SL Teams using SRCL Implementation Modules

Awarded Subgrantees provide PD to all staff

OPI TA and IC TA:
Follow-up with on-site support

Outputs

SRCL Subgrantees write grants using CNA and aligning LLP to MCLP and ensuring interventions w/ strong or moderate evidence

IPR Process to prioritize SRCL subgrantees that propose a high-quality Comprehensive Literacy Instruction Program

CICs used for awarded subgrantees to implement and OPI to monitor

OPI, ICs & SL Teams track student progress (i.e., analysis of data by disadvantaged subgroups)

Yr 1 Outcomes — External Evaluation

To what extent did the OPI:

Use an IPR process to prioritize awards to eligible subgrantees who propose a high-quality comprehensive literacy instruction program, supported by moderate or strong evidence and that aligns with the MCLP and local needs?

To what extent did the OPI:

Implement a high-quality plan to prioritize and award subgrants that will serve the greatest numbers of disadvantaged children, including children living in poverty, English learners, who are American Indian, and children with disabilities?

To what extent in Yrs. 1, 2 and 3 did the OPI implement a high-quality plan to align, through a progression of approaches appropriate for each age group, early language and literacy projects supported by this grant that serve children from birth-age 5 with programs and systems that serve students in K-5 to improve readiness and transitions for children across this continuum?

To what extent in Yrs. 1, 2 and 3 did the Awarded Subgrantees use the CIC to implement a LLP that (1) was informed by a CNA (2) provided PD, (3) implemented interventions that are supported by moderate or strong evidence, and (4) implemented a plan to track children's outcomes consistently with all applicable privacy requirements?

To what extent in Yrs. 1, 2, and 3 did OPI use the CIC for continuous program improvement, including the results of monitoring evaluations, and other administrative data, to inform the program's continuous improvement and decision making, to improve program participant outcomes and to ensure that disadvantaged children are served & and other stakeholders receive the results of the effectiveness of the MSRCLP in a timely

Initial 5% growth on Montana interim assessments and GPRA performance measures for all disadvantaged subgroups

Walkthrough data demonstrates beginning of implementation of interventions

Yr 2 Outcomes — External Evaluation

Additional 10% growth on Montana interim assessments and GPRA performance measures for all disadvantaged subgroups

Walkthrough data demonstrates full implementation of interventions

Yr 3 Outcomes — External Evaluation

Additional 10% growth on Montana interim assessments and GPRA performance measures for all disadvantaged subgroups

Walkthrough data demonstrates sustained implementation of interventions

---

All Possible SRCL Subgrantees

Awarded SRCL Subgrantees

All Possible & Awarded SRCL Subgrantees

A+ Montana
Office of Public Instruction
opi.mt.gov   Elsie Arntzen, Superintendent