



**Montana Comprehensive Literacy
Project Application**

**Due Date: Postmarked
NO Later than
December 15, 2017**

MONTANA COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY PROJECT

APPLICATION

Due Date: Postmarked no later than December 15, 2017

Return original and two copies to:

Office of Public Instruction
Attn: Terri Barclay
Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Funds Available: 7.6 million per year available for awards to eligible districts contingent upon the availability of federal funds. Funds made available from the Department of Education’s Striving Readers Grant.

Estimated Range of Awards: \$250,000-\$600,000 per application each year over a three-year period.

Fiscal Information: Successful projects are expected to operate for three full years and possibly a fourth year. Grant awards will be issued for each budget year within that period. For the current year (FY17), funds will be available February 1, 2018, through August 30, 2018. Continuation funds will be contingent upon sufficient progress in meeting the goals of the program.

Review Process: The application review will be a two-tier process:

Expert reviewers will evaluate and score the applications; and
The Office of Public Instruction (OPI) will make necessary policy decisions regarding the awards.

The rubric specifies that each of the 7 parts must be evaluated and scored separately. Each of the parts must receive a numerical score that falls in the “Meets Standard” or “Exemplary Plan” range in order for the applicant to receive a subgrant award. The total number of points awarded for all parts will be used to further distinguish relative strengths of the application. Along with the numerical score, each reviewer will list the strengths and weaknesses of the responses of each part. Successful applicants will be notified by January 31, 2018.

Application: See pages 2 and 3 for additional requirements. One original and two copies of the complete application package must be submitted. Staple or binder clip each complete set of application materials; do **not** use binders, plastic covers, folders, dividers, tabs, etc. Submission by fax or electronic mail will not be accepted. The original must include an original signature on all required documents.

Assistance: Contact Terri Barclay, (406) 444-0753, tbarclay2@mt.gov, Debbie Hunsaker, (406) 444-0733, dhunsaker@mt.gov; Kathi Tiefenthaler, (406) 444-1872, ktiefenthaler@mt.gov, or <http://opi.mt.gov/Leadership/Academic-Success/Title-Other-Federal-Programs/Instructional-Innovations>

MONTANA STRIVING READERS PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Each district awarded Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project funds must commit to the following requirements.

Administrative Support

- School Leadership Team, which includes the principal(s) attending two statewide workshops in Helena (\$2,000 per team per meeting)
- Use of a walkthrough system
- School Leadership Team must be present during on-site support from an Instructional Consultant and the OPI team member as identified in the preset agenda.
- A District Leadership Team will need to be formed to meet with the Instructional Consultant and OPI team member as necessary depending on the size of the district, number of students, and complexity of grant. The OPI will work with the district to determine the makeup of this team.
- Schools must identify time for teacher team meetings when the Instructional Consultant is onsite

Personnel: Costs will only be allowed if personnel directly support implementation of the required activities and if the sustainability of those components can be justified.

Instructional Consultant: Instructional Consultants must be written in each application. Instructional Consultants will be chosen from a list of approved External Partners after districts are awarded based on needs identified within the MCLP Alignment Tool (includes the comprehensive needs assessment) and subgrant application (\$2,500 per day).

Number of students or Children	Number of on-site support days per month from Instructional Consultant for all schools within the district application (October-April)	Funds Required for Instructional Consultant
1-200	2 @ \$2,500 x 7	\$35,000
201-500	3 @ \$2,500 x 7	\$52,500
501-750	4 @ \$2,500 x 7	\$70,000
751-1000	5 @ \$2,500 x 7	\$87,500
1001-2499	6 @ \$2,500 x 7	\$105,000
2500+	7 @ \$2,500 x 7	\$122,500

Assessment and Data Management: Districts will be required to adopt the assessments identified in Tables 1 and 2 to ensure the evaluation and effectiveness of the Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project (MCLP). Purchase and administer assessment instruments and data management systems identified in Tables 1 and 2. If you have questions about approved assessments, please contact Terri Barclay or Debbie Hunsaker.

Table 1: MCLP Required Assessments

Type	Description	MCLP Subgrantee Assessment Options
SCREENING	<p><u>What:</u> Quick efficient measures known to be strong indicators that predict student performance in a specific subject. Assessments are given at grade-level skill.</p> <p><u>Who:</u> All PreK-12 students</p> <p><u>When:</u> Beginning, middle, and end of year or upon arrival</p>	<p>E/ROWPVT (PreK)</p> <p>ISIP (K-10)</p> <p>DIBELS Next (K-6)</p> <p>AIMSweb (K-6)</p> <p>MAP (K-12)</p> <p>STAR reading</p>
PROGRESS MONITORING/INTERIM	<p><u>What:</u> Frequent measurement to determine if students are making adequate academic progress</p> <p><u>Who:</u> All PreK-12 students</p> <p><u>When:</u> Should be administered as part of the instructional routine: Tier 1 every 6 weeks, Tier 2 every 4 weeks, Tier 3 every 2 weeks</p>	<p>E/ROWPVT (PreK)</p> <p>ISIP (K-10)</p> <p>DIBELS Next (K-6)</p> <p>AIMSweb (K-6)</p> <p>i-Ready</p> <p>Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments</p> <p>STAR reading</p> <p>Program assessments</p> <p>Intervention program assessments</p>
DIAGNOSTIC	<p><u>What:</u> Individually administered assessments to provide in-depth information regarding a student’s skills and instructional needs</p> <p><u>Who:</u> PreK--12 students who are not responding efficiently to instruction</p> <p><u>When:</u> As needed through data analysis</p>	<p>Program diagnostic assessments</p> <p>Intervention program diagnostic assessments</p>
OUTCOME	<p><u>What:</u> Assessments which provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of instruction and indicate student year-end achievement when compared to grade-level performance standards</p> <p><u>Who:</u> PreK-12</p> <p><u>When:</u> End of school year</p>	<p>E/ROWPVT (PreK)</p> <p>SBAC assessment (3-10)</p> <p>ACT (Grade 10)</p> <p>ISIP (K-10)</p> <p>DIBELS Next (K-6)</p> <p>AIMSweb (K-6)</p> <p>MAP (K-12)</p> <p>STAR reading</p>

MONTANA COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY PROJECT

The application must include:

- Section I. Cover Page signed by the Authorized Representative
- Section II. Grant Proposal Parts 1-7
- Section III. Budget and Budget Narrative
- Section IV. Staff Assurances from each school and early childhood center

The original and two copies of the completed grant application must be postmarked by December 15, 2017.

Return application packets to:
Office of Public Instruction
Attn: Terri Barclay
Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

**BECAUSE OF THE POSSIBILITY OF ELECTRONIC MESSAGING FAILURE,
FAXED APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.**

For technical assistance regarding your application, please contact: Terri Barclay, (406) 444-0753, tbarclay2@mt.gov, Debbie Hunsaker, (406) 444-0733, dhunsaker@mt.gov; Kathi Tiefenthaler, (406) 444-1872, kiefenthaler@mt.gov, or <http://opi.mt.gov/Leadership/Academic-Success/Title-Other-Federal-Programs/Instructional-Innovations>.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Purpose of the Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project

Table 2: Goals of Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project (MCLP)	
Objective	Description of Objective
1.	To use an independent peer review process to prioritize awards to eligible subgrantees who propose implementing a high-quality comprehensive literacy instruction program supported by moderate or strong evidence, and that aligns with the MCLP, as well as local needs.
2.	To implement a high-quality plan to prioritize and award subgrants that will serve the greatest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children, including children living in poverty, English learners, and children with disabilities.
3.	To implement a high-quality plan to align, through a progression of approaches appropriate for each age group, early language and literacy projects serving children from birth to age 5 with programs and systems to improve readiness and transitions for children across this continuum.
4.	To ensure all Awarded MCLP Subgrantees submit and implement a local literacy plan that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is informed by a comprehensive needs assessment aligned with the MCLP • provides professional development • includes interventions and practices that are supported by moderate or strong evidence • includes a plan to track children’s outcomes consistent with all applicable privacy requirements
5.	The OPI will use the continuous improvement cycle (CIC) and the results of monitoring and evaluations and other administrative data to inform the 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 MCLP in a timely fashion.
6.	To implement the revised version of the Montana Literacy Plan that is informed by a comprehensive needs assessment and developed with the assistance of the State Literacy (SL) Team, who will review and update the MCLP annually.
GPRA Goals	
1.	To increase the percentage of children aged 3 to 5 who make significant gains on the E/ROWPVT from fall to spring
2.	To increase the percentage of fifth- and eighth-grade students proficient on the SBA.
3.	To increase the percentage of tenth-grade students proficient on the ACT.

Eligibility Criteria for MCLP Subgrantees at the District Level:

- District has 50% or more students eligible for free/reduced-price meals or
- District has 15% or 1,000+ students identified with disabilities

Eligibility Criteria for MCLP Subgrantees at the School Level within a District:

- School has 40% percent or more students eligible for free/reduced price meals and either
- School has <50% students proficient on the ELA state assessment or
- School has >20% of identified English learners

Application Available/Competition Open: November 1, 2017.

Deadline for Submission Applications: Postmarked by December 15, 2017

Applications may not be faxed. The following are accepted for proof of submission:

1. a legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark; or
2. a legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service; or
3. a dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.

To be considered for funding, applications, forms with original signatures and two copies should be mailed or delivered by hand or express courier delivery no later than 5:00 p.m. on December 15, 2017, to the following:

Office of Public Instruction
Attn: Terri Barclay
Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project
1227 11th Avenue
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Private School Participation: Funds awarded through these subgrants are subject to the requirements of Section 14503 of ESEA P.L. 108-382 (Participation by Private School Children and Teachers) and the regulations in 34 CFR 299, Subpart E. The statute and regulations require that subgrantees provide private school children and their teachers, or other educational personnel, the services and benefits of the program on an equitable basis with public school children and teachers.

General Education Provisions Act (GEPA):

Local applications must indicate clear and concise steps that will be taken to assure equitable access to and participation in the Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project activities regardless of gender, race/ethnicity, national origin, or disability of age.

GRANT APPLICATION NARRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants must respond in sequence to the Section II – Grant Narrative Parts 1-7 with no more than 30 pages in total (not including worksheets).

If the district or school believes the answer is provided in response to another question, that cross-reference should be supplied.

The required components of each narrative follow the question.

The following format should be used:

- one-inch margins
- double-spaced
- 12-point proportional type or font
- All pages numbered
- No appendices attached

Grants written in whole or part by vendors will not be accepted.

Grant Application Narrative Sections

Section II.

- Part 1: Assessment of Local Needs
- Part 2: Selection of Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions
- Part 3: Creation of a Plan for Implementation
- Part 4: Development of a Plan for Monitoring and Revising Local Projects
- Part 5: Adequacy of Resources to Implement Local Projects
- Part 6: Quality of Local Project Design
- Part 7: Grant Competitive Priorities

Montana Comprehensive Literacy Project Subgrant

The subgrant application should be a narrative that addresses Parts 1-7 of a district’s plan. The subgrant selection criteria are presented for each of the 7 parts. Each of the 7 parts must receive a score in the “Meets Standard” or “Exemplary Plan” range for the application to be funded. **Absolute Priority:** To be eligible for scoring parts 1-7 of the grant application, subgrantees must first show that their proposed plan is aligned with the components within the Montana Literacy Plan. If this is not demonstrated, the Peer Reviewer will contact Terri Barclay, the MCLP Director to determine if the Application will be scored. Districts will need to complete the MCLP alignment tool and attach it to the end of the application and reference the process throughout the application as applicable. The alignment tool does not count as part of the 30 pages. You will find the MCLP alignment tool in your grant support packet. The MCLP alignment tool also includes the comprehensive needs assessment.

Reviewers will:

- Evaluate each of Parts 1-7 separately;
- indicate whether the proposal “Does Not Meet Standard,” “Meets Standard,” or describes an “Exemplary Plan”
- give each aspect of total number of points;
- and; in bullet form, list the strengths and weaknesses of each aspect.

SECTION I—GENERAL INFORMATION

District Name District(s) Name	Project Starting Date	Project Ending Date
Authorized Representative's Name	Title	Telephone Fax E-Mail
Address	City	ZIP Code

I herby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct; the local Board of Trustees has authorized me, as its representative, to file this application. The Board of Trustees agrees to the Common Assurances on file with the OPI for the 2017-2018 school year and those contained in this application in regard to this grant.

Additional Assurance:

The district schools and early childhood centers will follow the written commitments of this grant made by the district and the requirements identified by the Montana Comprehensive Project and the Montana Office of Public Instruction. By signing this application, the district agrees to participate in the National Evaluation of the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program.

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

For OPI Information/Approval

Date Received _____

Approved _____

Amount of Award _____

Reviewer's Signature _____

Date _____

SECTION II- GRANT NARRATIVE

The total points available for Parts 1-6 equal 90, with an additional 30 competitive points in Part 7 and 10 points in Section III (Budget and Budget Narrative) for a total possible of 130 points.

Application Criteria: <u>Part 1 - Assessment of Local Needs</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete the 6-steps of the Gap Analysis ▪ Describe the Gap Analysis process ▪ Identify the results of the Gap Analysis ▪ Identify needed evidence-based interventions, practices, and strategies to address results from Gap Analysis 		
Does Not Meet Standards 0-5	Meets Some Standards 6-10	Exemplary 11-15
To what extent did the subgrantee meet standards for competing the Gap Analysis, describing the process used and the results to identify needed evidence-based interventions?		
<p>Little evidence of all 6 steps of the gap analysis was defined with modifications to the steps.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Evidence of less than 3 steps of the gap analysis was clearly described.</p>	<p>Some evidence of all 6 steps of the gap analysis was defined with modifications to the steps.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Evidence of 3-4 steps of the gap analysis was clearly described.</p>	<p>Evidence of all 6 steps of the gap analysis was clearly described.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specific state and local disaggregated data was specified and used. 2. The chart for disadvantaged subgroups was completed following the data review. 3. The process of using comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) within the MCLP Alignment Tool was clearly described. 4. Following a clearly described process of analyzing the CNA data, strengths and weaknesses clearly indicated. 5. A clear process of correlating the student data to the CNA was indicated and next steps determined. 6. Identification of the gaps and what interventions are needed is clearly described.

Application Criteria: Part 2: Selection of Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions

- Describe how the chosen evidence-based interventions, practices, and strategies align with the results from the Gap Analysis
- Provide evidence that chosen evidence-based interventions, practices, and strategies have moderate or strong evidence
- Describe how chosen evidence-based interventions, practices, and strategies are relevant to proposed local project and identified needs and differentiated and appropriate for the age level the intervention is being proposed for
- Describe capacity to implement chosen evidence-based interventions, practices, and strategies

Does Not Meet Standards 5	Meets Some Standards 10	Exemplary 15
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------

To what extent did the subgrantee meet standards for researching and identifying interventions that are supported by moderate or strong evidence?

<p>The Local Project minimally addressed all criteria for the Process to Select Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions in great detail.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>The Local Project addressed less than 3 criteria for the Process to Select Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions in great detail.</p>	<p>The Local Project vaguely addressed all criteria for the Process to Select Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions in great detail.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>The Local Project addressed 3-4 criteria for the Process to Select Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions in great detail.</p>	<p>The Local Project addressed all 5 criteria for the Process to Select Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions in great detail.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides evidence that the chosen interventions, practices, and strategies align to the results of the gap analysis 2. Provides evidence of choosing only strong or moderate Relevant, Evidence-Based Interventions; 3. Provide evidence that the strong or moderate interventions that were chosen are also relevant to the proposed local project and identified needs; 4. Provides evidence that the strong and moderate interventions that were chosen will also be differentiated and appropriate for the age level the intervention is being proposed for; and 5. Provides evidence that the site has capacity to fully implement the chosen interventions, practices, and strategies.
---	---	---

Application Criteria: Part 3 - Creation of a Plan for Implementation

- Create a high-quality plan that includes key goals, key activities, rationale for how activities support goals, realistic timeline, parties responsible for each activity
- Describe the use of the Gap Analysis in designing your local high-quality plan
- Describe the use of the MCLP Alignment Tool in designing your high-quality plan
- Describe the process for using evidence-based interventions, practices, and strategies in designing your high-quality plan
- Describe a strong theory or rationale for your local project, which may be demonstrated by a logic model

Does Not Meet Standards 5	Meets Some Standards 10	Exemplary 15
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------

To what extent did the subgrantee develop a high quality plan (e.g., key goals, key activities, rationale for how activities support goals, realistic timeline, parties responsible for each activity, and a strong theory or rationale, which may be demonstrated by a logic model)

<p>The high-quality plan minimally indicates the 8 criteria</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Less than 5 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The high quality plan vaguely indicates the 8 criteria</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Only 5-7 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The high-quality plan clearly indicates the following 8 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key goals identified are clear and measureable 2. Key activities support the achievement of the goals with rationale behind why they should occur 3. A realistic timeline for the activities has been set 4. Persons responsible for the activities have been determined 5. A clear process of using the Gap Analysis to determine the plan is described 6. A clear process of using the MCLP Alignment Tool to determine the plan is described 7. Description of the use of evidence-based interventions, practices, and strategies to design the plan clearly explained 8. The theory or rationale for your local project that may be demonstrated by a logic model
---	--	--

Application Criteria – Part 4: Development of a Plan for Monitoring and Revising Local Projects

- Describes a plan for monitoring high-quality plan through data-driven decision making
- Describes a plan for reflecting and revising a high-quality plan using ongoing data-driven decision making throughout the year
- Describes interim assessments and predictability of achieving GPRA Measures
- Describes plan for effective transition into kindergarten and through grade 3 utilizing data from the (E/ROWPVT), approved interim assessments, and SBAC
- Describes plan for effective transition into middle school utilizing approved interim assessments and SBAC
- Describes plan for effective transition into high school utilizing approved interim assessments and ACT

Does Not Meet Standards 5	Meets Some Standards 10	Exemplary 15
To what extent did the subgrantee develop a plan for monitoring and revising their local project to ensure interim assessments align with and support achievement of GRPA measures?		
<p>The high-quality plan minimally indicates the 6 criteria</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Less than 4 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The high-quality plan vaguely indicates the 6 criteria</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Only 4-5 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The high-quality plan clearly indicates the following 6 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A clear process for using data to make decisions during the development of the plan 2. A clear reflective process for using data to make decisions during the plan implementation and revising based on the data 3. A clear description of the interim assessments in the plan and how it aligns to the predictability of GPRA measures (student achievement) 4. A clear plan using approved assessments to design an effective transition into kindergarten and through grade 3 5. A clear plan using approved assessments, including SBAC to design an effective transition into middle school 6. A clear plan using approved assessments including ACT to design an effective transition into high school

Application Criteria – Part 5 – Adequacy of Resources to Implement Local Projects

- Describe how proposed budget is of sufficient size and aligns with other subgrantee budgets, including Title I, II, III, IDEA, and local funds to support proposed local project
- Demonstrates how 15 percent of the proposed budget will be used to serve children from birth through age 5; 40 percent to serve students in kindergarten through grade 5 or 6 if part of elementary; 40 percent serve students in middle and high school, through grade 12.

<p>Does Not Meet Standards</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Meets Some Standards</p> <p>10</p>	<p>Exemplary</p> <p>15</p>
<p>To what extent did the subgrantee describe alignment and adequacy of resources to implement local plans and ensure correct percentages for birth through age 5 elementary school, and middle and high school will be distributed?</p>		
<p>The proposed budget and budget narrative minimally indicates the 5 requirements:</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Less than 3 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The proposed budget and budget narrative vaguely indicates the 5 requirements:</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Only 3-4 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The proposed budget and budget narrative clearly explains the following 5 requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How the budget is of sufficient size to implement a high-quality plan 2. How the budget is aligned with other Subgrantee budgets such as Title I, II, III, IDEA, and local funds to support the implementation of the high-quality plan 3. How the budget distribution will be 15% for birth through age 5 4. How the budget distribution will be 40% for K-5 or 6 if part of an elementary 5. How the budget distribution will be 40% for middle and high school with an equitable distribution between middle and high school based on student population

Application Criteria – Part 6 – Quality of Local Project Design		
Does Not Meet Standards 5	Meets Some Standards 10	Exemplary 15
To what extent did the subgrantee describe how the proposed local project and high-quality plan is designed to build capacity and yield results?		
<p>The high quality plan minimally indicates the 4 criteria:</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Less than 2 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The high quality plan vaguely indicates the 4 criteria:</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Only 2-3 of the criteria were addressed</p>	<p>The high quality plan clearly indicates the following 4 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A clear plan for how this grant will build upon current efforts to improve literacy 2. A clear plan (i.e., activities and goals) for building capacity within each school and across the district to improve literacy beyond the life of the grant 3. A timeline for building capacity to implement the plan 4. A method to monitor the effectiveness of building capacity for each school and the district and how it's impacting teaching and learning

Application Criteria – Part 7 – Meets MCLP Grant Competitive Priorities

- Describes high-quality plan to serve the greatest numbers of or percentages of disadvantaged children
- Describes a continuum or progression, including standards, curriculum, activities, and transitions for serving preschool children through grade 5
- Describes the role of instructional coaching in supporting the high-quality plan and local project and follow-through in between instructional consultant and OPI visit

Does Not Meet Standards 0	Meets Some Standards 5	Exemplary 10
--	---	-------------------------------

To what extent did the subgrantee describe a high-quality plan that serves the greatest number or percentage of disadvantaged students?

The high quality plan minimally describes a method to ensure the greatest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children are being supported	The high quality plan vaguely describes a method to ensure the greatest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children are being supported	The high-quality plan clearly describes a method to ensure the greatest numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children are being supported
Does Not Meet Standards 0	Meets Some Standards 5	Exemplary 10

To what extent did the grantee describe a continuum or progression, including standards, curriculum, activities, and transitions for serving preschool children through grade 5?

The high quality plan minimally describes a continuum or progression, including standards, curriculum, activities, and transitions for serving preschool children through grade 5	The high-quality plan vaguely describes a continuum or progression, including standards, curriculum, activities, and transitions for serving preschool children through grade 5	The high quality plan clearly describes a continuum or progression, including standards, curriculum, activities, and transitions for serving preschool children through grade 5
Does Not Meet Standards 0	Meets Some Standards 5	Exemplary 10

To what extent did the subgrantee describe the role of instructional coaching in supporting the high-quality plan and local project and follow through in between instructional consultant and OPI visits?

The high-quality plan minimally	The high quality plan vaguely	The high-quality plan clearly
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

describes how instructional coaching will support the implementation of the plan and how staff will continue with the plan between instructional consultant and OPI visits	describes how instructional coaching will support the implementation of the plan and how staff will continue with the plan between instructional consultant and OPI visits	describes how instructional coaching will support the implementation of the plan and how staff will continue with the plan between instructional consultant and OPI visits
--	--	--

SECTION III- BUDGET AND NARRATIVE (10 pts.)

- A. (2 to 6 pages)- The applicant district must submit a budget that combines proposed expenditures of participating schools for all three years. Applicants are encouraged to use the three-column budget worksheet when considering all areas listed below. Year 1 (February 1- June 30) should be significantly lower than year 2 and 3, which will allow the possibility of the OPI funding year 4.
- B. (6 pages)- The applicant must also submit a budget narrative/justification which presents a rationale for the amount and use of funds received under the grant. The funds should be distributed with 15% designated for preschool activities, 40% for elementary, and 40% equitable distribution for middle school and high schools. Consider the number of students at the middle school and high school when determining the 40% equitable distribution.

Salaries

Personnel

- Stipends for staff to attend professional development identified within the grant narrative
- Salaries will only be allowed if the identified staff directly supports implementation of the MCLP activities and if sustainability of those components can be justified.

Combine the total costs of these areas and place the dollar figure in the “Salaries and Benefits” section of the budget page.

Operating Expenses

Travel and Professional Development: Estimate the total costs for professional development for this district as described in your grant application.

- Include the costs of travel for Leadership Team members to attend two state-level professional development in Helena.
- Include the costs of all professional development identified within the grant narrative.

Supplies and Materials

- Approved Assessments
- Additional assessments materials identified in grant narrative
- Additional supplies and materials in grant narrative

Contractual

- Instructional Consultant Team Member (\$2,500 per day). See Funding and Support Table for appropriate number of days to include in the budget.

Funding and Support Table					
Number of students or Children	Funds needed yearly	Number of on-site support days/months from OPI Team member (September-May)	Number of on-site support days/months from Instructional Consultant (October-April)	Funds for Required MCLP Activities	Funds for Comprehensive Needs Assessment identified in MCLP Subgrantee Grant Application
1-200	\$250,000	1	2	\$100,000	\$150,000
201-500	\$300,000	2	3	\$125,000	\$175,000
501-750	\$375,000	3	4	\$150,000	\$200,000
751-1000	\$400,000	3	5	\$175,000	\$225,000
1001-2499	\$450,000	3	6	\$175,000	\$250,000
2500+	\$600,000	3	7	\$225,000	\$375,000

Successful Subgrantees must enter district, school, and early childhood center information onto the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) Web site within one month of award notice. <http://www.fsr.gov>

3 Column Budget Worksheet
Required Costs for MCLP Activities are highlighted below in gray

Category	Description	Year 1 (should be significantly lower than years 2 and 3 by almost half)	Year 2	Year 3
1) Personnel	Personnel Costs (only allowed if directly supports implementation of required activities and if sustainability of those supports can be justified, including the instructional coach)			
2) Travel and PD	MCLP Conferences (Costs to send SL Team to two 2-day MCLP Conferences at approximately \$2,000/SL team/day)			
3) Supplies and Materials	Interventions with strong or moderate evidence			
	Assessments			
	Additional supplies and materials in Grant Application			
	Additional professional development activities proposed within grant			
4) Contractual	Instructional Consultant \$2,500/day			
5) Total Direct Costs				
Indirect Costs				
Total Costs				

SECTION IV-- STAFF ASSURANCES

I have participated in developing or reading the _____(school or Early Childhood Center) application for a Montana Comprehensive Literacy Grant and agree to the requirements and commitments identified in the grant.

_____ Signature of Superintendent	_____ Date	
_____ Signature of Board Chair	_____ Date	
_____ Signature of Principal	_____ Date	
_____ Signature of Assistant Principal	_____ Date	
_____ Signature of Assistant Principal	_____ Date	
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date
_____ Signature of Staff	_____ Grade Level/Content	_____ Date

Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date
Signature of Staff	Grade Level/Content	Date

Number of staff:

Number of staff supporting this application:

Percent of staff supporting this application:

Putting Montana Students First **A⁺**