



Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Peer Review and Mentoring Grant

Uniform Grant Rubric

PI-1657

The descriptors for each item are below. Reviewers should use the Rubric Scoring Sheet to record all scores.

III. Abstract

- ⇒ **Pass (4 points):** The abstract summarized the target population, summarized the key needs, and summarized the planned implementation approach(es).
- ⇒ **Fail (0 points):** The abstract had a missing or incomplete summary of the target population, the key needs, and/or the planned implementation approach(es).

VIII. Plan

1. Needs Assessment

- ⇒ **Pass (4 points):** The application completed the Needs Assessment exercise.
- ⇒ **Fail (0 points):** The application failed to complete the Needs Assessment exercise.

2. Demonstration of Need Statement

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no demonstration of need statement.
- ⇒ **Beginning (2 point):** There was a demonstration of need statement, but it did not articulate the data or evidence gathered and analyzed, the process used to conduct the analysis, or the identified need meaningfully related to the purpose of the grant.
- ⇒ **Developing (4 points):** There was a demonstration of need statement. The statement articulated data or evidence gathered and analyzed, but the data or evidence was not meaningfully related to the identified need or the purpose of the grant. The statement described the process used to analyze the data and evidence, but the process described was not organized or systematic. The demonstration of need statement and identified need(s) were related to the purpose of the grant, but only indirectly.

Other factors that reduce the Demonstration of Need Statement rating to “Developing”:

- The demonstration of need statement failed to address a required peer review, mentoring, or induction component that was not met based on the Needs Assessment exercise.
 - The demonstration of need statement failed to address an analysis of current approaches to selection, training, roles, and responsibilities of mentors.
 - The demonstration of need statement failed to draw on Educator Effectiveness System data as part of the evidence and data gathered and analyzed.
 - The above factors must be met in order to rank “Accomplished” or “Exemplary.”
- ⇒ **Accomplished (6 points):** The demonstration of need statement articulated the data or evidence gathered and analyzed, and the data was meaningfully related to the identified need(s) and the purpose of the grant. The statement described an organized and systematic process used to analyze the data and evidence. The demonstration of need statement and identified need(s) were related to the purpose of the grant and data analysis described in the statement.
 - ⇒ **Exemplary (8 points):** The demonstration of need statement clearly and concisely articulates the data and evidence gathered and analyzed that was directly related to the purpose of the grant and the statement of need. The statement clearly and concisely articulates an organized and systematic process used to analyze the data and evidence. The demonstration of need
-

statement and identified need(s) were directly related to the purpose of the grant and the data analysis described in the statement.

3. Practice Priority Statement

3a. Practice priority statement

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no practice priority statement.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a practice priority statement, but it was not directly related to adult practices or system changes relevant to peer review, mentoring, or induction.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a practice priority statement, and it was tangentially related to adult practices and system changes relevant to peer review, mentoring, or induction.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a practice priority statement based on the identified need(s), and it identified what the applicant hopes to accomplish regarding adult practices or system changes relevant to peer review, mentoring, or induction.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a well-crafted practice priority statement based on their need(s) and it clearly identifies and elaborates on what they hope to accomplish regarding adult practices or system changes relevant to peer review, mentoring, or induction.

3b. Description of resource inequities

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no description of the resource inequities.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a limited description of resource inequities, but there was no connection between that information and the student outcome and practice priority statements.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Resource inequities were described. The stated inequities were only partially connected to their stated student outcome and/or practice priority statements.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The existing resource inequities were clearly stated. The description of resource inequities was directly related to their needs and stated student outcome and practice priority statements.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The description of resource inequities included a deep analysis of existing needs, as well as a direct relationship to the stated student outcome and practice priority statements.

4. Student Outcome Priority Statement

4a. Student outcome priority statement

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no student outcome priority statement.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a priority statement, but it was not directly related to students and no substantive supporting data were used.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a student outcome priority statement and some related data was provided.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The student outcome priority statement clearly outlines the need for a specific student population, and uses related data in a meaningful way to support the need.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The student outcome priority statement clearly outlines the need for a specific student population by using multiple sources of related data to support the need.

4b. Root cause(s) of student outcome priority statement

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no root cause(s) listed for the student outcome priority statement.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The root cause analysis was identified, but was not closely connected to the student outcome priority statement.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The likely root cause was identified, but it was only partially aligned to the student outcome priority statement.

- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The likely root cause(s) was clearly identified, and it fits naturally with the student outcome priority statement.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The likely root cause(s) was clearly identified, focuses on areas of strength in relation to the area(s) of need, and fits naturally with the student outcome priority statement.

IX. Do (Action Plan)

Note to reviewers: If there are multiple action plans, be sure to “read across” each action plan before scoring the two sections below.

1. Action Plan’s Student Outcome Priority Statement and SMART Goal

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was not an action plan for every student outcome priority statement and/or SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an action plan for each student outcome priority, but the goal does not meet all SMART goal requirements. Or, it is a SMART goal that does not directly address the student outcome priority statement.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was an action plan for each student outcome priority. The goal does not meet all SMART goal requirements. The stated goal does address the student outcome priority statement.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was an action plan for each student outcome priority. The action plan included a goal that met all SMART goal requirements and directly addresses the student outcome priority statement.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an action plan for each student outcome priority statement. The action plan included a goal that met all SMART goal requirements, directly addressed the student outcome priority statement, and connects directly to their previously stated practice priority statement.

2. Action Plan’s Action Step, Timeline, Evidence of Completion, and Personnel

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was significant information missing in the action step, timeline, evidence, and/or personnel sections.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible were partially incomplete.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible were included, but were not well-aligned to the practice and student outcome priority statements and/or the SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible were fully addressed and correspond to the stated goal. The action step(s) related directly to the practice and student outcome priority statements and SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The Action Plan’s action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible were thoughtfully addressed and would help achieve the stated goal. The action step(s) tightly align with the practice and student outcome priority statements and SMART goal.

X. Study/Check

➤ 1. Evaluation

1a. Data collection and analysis

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No process is described for how data will be collected and/or analyzed.
 - ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a reference to data collection and analysis, but what data, and how it would be analyzed, was unclear.
-

- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description of either the data collection process or the data analysis process, but not both.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description of both what and how data will be collected as well as how these data would then be analyzed. The description of the data to be collected is directly connected to the accomplishment of the identified SMART goal(s) and purpose of the grant.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a description of both what and how data will be collected, as well as how a protocol will be used to analyze these data. The description of the data to be collected is directly connected to the accomplishment of the identified SMART goal(s), includes collection of and alignment to Educator Effectiveness data and the purpose of the grant.

1b. Process for changing or making improvements to action steps

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No process is in place for changing or making improvements to the action step(s).
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an incomplete description of the process for changing or making improvements to the action step(s).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There is an unclear description of the process for how changes and/or improvements to the action step(s) would occur.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a sufficient description, including a review of data, for how any changes or improvements to the action step(s) would occur.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a well-crafted plan that thoroughly uses data to determine when and how any changes or improvements to the action step(s) would occur, including incorporating the local Educator Effectiveness process into the implementation of changes (e.g., peer reviewers or evaluators implementing changes in coaching protocols recommended by the evaluation data, etc.).

XI. Act

➤ **1. Coordination and Sustainability**

1a. Coordination with other programs

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no description of any possible coordination with other federal, state, or local programs to use these grant funds more effectively.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an incomplete description about coordination with other federal, state, or local programs to use these grant funds more effectively (i.e., the description identified programs that would be coordinated with but not how the coordination would improve the effectiveness or vice versa).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was an unclear description about the effective use of these grant funds in relation to other federal, state, or local programs (i.e., the description both identified other programs to coordinate with and how it would improve the effectiveness of the grant project, but the description was insufficiently clear about the coordination or the mechanism for improving the grant program).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a clear description about the effective use of these grant funds in coordination with other federal, state, or local programs, including Educator Effectiveness and other continuous improvement processes.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description about the effective use of these grant funds in relation to existing federal, state, or local programs, including an analysis of how these initiatives could support one another. The description includes alignment of hiring, peer review, mentoring, induction and ongoing professional development and support of educators and the Educator Effectiveness System.

1b. Sustainability

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There was no description of any procedures or policies to sustain the grant work beyond the grant period.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was an incomplete description of any procedures or policies to sustain the grant work beyond the grant period.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a limited description of procedures or policies to sustain the grant work beyond the grant period. The description was vague about precisely what activities would be continued, who would be responsible, and how the activities would be sustained past the one-year period of the grant.
 - ⇒ Other factors reducing the Sustainability rating to “Developing”:
 - The Sustainability statement identified future Peer Review and Mentoring Grant applications as a means for sustaining the program locally.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description of procedures and policies to sustain the grant work beyond the grant period. The description identified what activities would be continued, who would be responsible for ensuring their continuation, and how the activities would be sustained.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description about procedures and policies to sustain the grant work beyond the grant period, including clear identification of what activities would be sustained, who would be responsible for ensuring sustainability, and how the activities would be sustained locally.

XII. Readiness

➤ **1. Stakeholders**

1a/1b. Identification of Stakeholders and Stakeholder Roles

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No planned stakeholders and/or planned stakeholder roles were identified.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The planned stakeholders or planned stakeholder roles were not adequately described.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The planned stakeholder team and stakeholder roles were described, but there appeared to be little/no stakeholder representation from the target population.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The planned stakeholders and corresponding roles were adequately described. The stakeholders represent the target population for this grant (for instance, teachers).
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The planned stakeholder team and corresponding roles were described in-depth. These stakeholders represent individuals from groups who have been historically and/or are currently marginalized and each were chosen specifically for their expertise in the peer review, mentoring, or induction.

1c/1d/1e. Engagement/Engagement Strategy/Continued Partnerships

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** No stakeholder engagement has occurred, nor is there an engagement strategy with consortium members, or a plan to partner with diverse stakeholders to address continuous improvement.
 - ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The description has addressed only a portion of the requirements for stakeholder engagement, planned engagement with consortia members, and/or a plan to partner with diverse stakeholders to address continuous improvement.
 - ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The description has addressed in a limited way the requirements for stakeholder engagement, planned engagement with consortia members, and/or a plan to partner with diverse stakeholders to address continuous improvement. The meeting schedule is undefined.
 - ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The description has clearly addressed the requirements for stakeholder engagement, planned engagement with consortium members, and/or a plan to
-

partner with diverse stakeholders to address continuous improvement. Regular (e.g., quarterly) meetings are planned and specific meeting topics have been identified for continuous improvement of the project.

- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The in-depth description clearly addressed the requirements for stakeholder engagement, planned engagement with consortium members, and/ or a plan to partner with diverse stakeholders to address continuous improvement. Ongoing (e.g., monthly) meetings are planned and specific meeting topics and meeting protocols have been identified for continuous improvement of the project.

1f. Protocols for ongoing communication

- ⇒ **Not Present (0 points):** There are no planned procedures or protocols for ongoing communication.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There are some planned procedures or protocols for ongoing communication, but they were not adequately described.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Plan describes how communications with stakeholders will occur using formal protocols.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Plan describes how communications with internal/external stakeholders (as applicable) will occur regularly, defines the means of communication, and establishes communication protocols.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** Plan includes an in-depth description for how communications with internal/external stakeholders (as applicable) will occur regularly, clearly defines the means of communication, and establishes clear communication protocols for the entire grant program and educational system (i.e., incorporates students, educators, administrators, consortium partners, regional partners, community partners, and the state).