

Peer Review and Mentoring Grants

Guidance for Applicants

Developed by
Educator Development and Support
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction



Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Carolyn Stanford Taylor, State Superintendent
Madison, Wisconsin

This publication is available from:

Educator Development and Support
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53703

<https://dpi.wi.gov/educator-development-support>

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, creed, age, national origin, ancestry, pregnancy, marital status or parental status, sexual orientation, or disability.

Table of Contents

Program Description	4
Purpose.....	4
Background.....	4
Evidence Supporting Comprehensive Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction	4
Wisconsin Requirements for Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction.....	4
Priorities.....	5
Wisconsin Equity Plan	5
State Resources for Mentoring and Induction	6
General Guidelines	6
Application Timeline	7
Review Timeline.....	7
Application Instructions	9
Application Sections.....	9
Completing Section IX. Program Plan.....	11
Measurable Objectives	12
Relevant Program Standards.....	13
Program Activities.....	13
Timeline	13
Evaluation Activities.....	13
Completing Section XII. Budget Detail and VII. Budget Summary.....	14
Budget Detail.....	14
Budget Summary.....	15
Local Match.....	16
Definitions	17
References	18

Program Description

Purpose

The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant (PRMG) funds the development of comprehensive peer review and mentoring programs for beginning educators in public schools in Wisconsin.

A single PRMG alone cannot support a comprehensive mentoring and induction program in most school systems.

Applicants that do not have an existing mentoring and induction program should carefully consider how to most effectively use funds to improve the capacity of the consortium to implement a comprehensive program.

Applicants that have existing mentoring and induction programs should consider how best to use the grant to support, redesign, or expand the capacity of local programs.

Background

Evidence shows that implementing comprehensive mentoring and induction programs is a valuable strategy for improving student outcomes, improving educator practice, and promoting positive cultures in schools and districts.

Evidence Supporting Comprehensive Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction

Research has long shown that the most important factor for student achievement is an effective classroom teacher and that teachers experience vital professional growth in the first few years of their career. However, in Wisconsin, the least experienced teachers are often placed in classrooms with students in the most need (Wisconsin Teacher Equitable Access Plan. 2015, 9-20).

Research also shows that beginning teachers who receive comprehensive mentoring and induction support improved their professional practice relative to peers. Beginning teachers who participate in comprehensive mentoring and induction have a positive impact on student test scores (Ingersoll, R., & Strong, M 2011, 12-41). Further, beginning teachers who receive comprehensive mentoring and induction support are more likely to remain in the profession (Gray, L., and Taie, S. 2015, 3).

Wisconsin Requirements for Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction

Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter [PI 34.040\(5\)](#) now requires school districts to provide teachers holding a Tier II provisional license with less than three years of full-time teaching experience ongoing orientation, support, and mentorship. [PI 34.040\(5\)](#) specifically requires:

“Ongoing orientation and support which is collaboratively developed by teachers, administrators, and other school district stakeholders.

A licensed mentor who successfully completed a mentor training program approved by the department.”

Note: DPI is developing a process for reviewing and approving mentor training available in Wisconsin. Until that process is available, the Mentoring Essentials Training is the only training available “approved by the department.” Districts may continue to use other trainings, but should be careful to select high-quality training.

Further, the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System state model requires peer review as a part of the regular evaluation process. Educators should meet with peers to discuss both student learning objectives and professional practice goals during their supporting years.

While the PI 34 requirements are specific to teachers holding a Tier II provisional license, comprehensive peer review, mentoring and induction can have positive impacts on other educator groups, such as pupil services educators, principals, and other administrators. Administrator commitment to, development and oversight of beginning educator peer review, mentoring, and induction programs is essential to overall program success. Activities that support other essential aspects of comprehensive peer review, mentoring, and induction programs may be supported by the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant.

Priorities

DPI is committed to achieving educational equity for all students in Wisconsin. In Wisconsin, educational equity means “every student has access to the resources and educational rigor they need at the right moment in their education, across race, gender, ethnicity, language, disability, sexual orientation, family background, and/or family income (<https://dpi.wi.gov/rti/equity>). As such, DPI will give priority to PRMG applications that focus on closing achievement gaps across student groups.

Wisconsin Equity Plan

The Wisconsin Teacher Equitable Access Plan (<http://dpi.wi.gov/wi-equity-plan>) addresses state strategies to eliminate the inequitable distribution of inexperienced or unqualified (as defined by the plan) teachers working in schools with high enrollments of students of color and living in poverty. In Wisconsin, nine (9) school districts have been identified as having the greatest need regarding the inequitable distribution of inexperienced beginning or unqualified educators (Beloit, Green Bay, Janesville, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, Racine, Waukesha, and West Allis-West Milwaukee). Applications which include these districts and focus on inequitable distribution of teachers will be given priority.

State Resources for Mentoring and Induction

DPI has developed a webpage dedicated to [Teacher Mentoring and Induction](#), including a research-based, foundational mentor training: the [Mentoring Essentials Series](#). DPI and CESAs jointly developed the Mentoring Essentials Series to be facilitated by either a CESA or locally within the district. The Mentoring Essentials Series webpage makes resources available to help local facilitators. Districts interested in training mentors should strongly consider attending Mentoring Essentials at CESA or planning to deliver the training in-district.

General Guidelines

- Applicants may request only up to \$25,000.
- Eligibility: Eligible applicants include the following:
 - A CESA,
 - A consortium consisting of two or more school districts or 2r/2x charter schools,
 - A consortium consisting of two or more CESAs, and
 - Any combination of the above.
- Rejection of applications: DPI reserves the right to reject applications submitted to DPI that fail to meet the submission guidelines, including:
 - Format requirements (an original submitted via mail),
 - Deadline (May 1, 2019), and
 - Completion (failing to adequately completing and answering all required application components).
- Allowable Expenditures: Most kinds of expenditures for professional development are allowable expenses under the PRMG: stipends or salary for staff to attend professional development, travel to attend training, registration for conferences, etc. However, there are a few types of expenses which are strictly prohibited.
- Prohibited expenses:
 - Capital objects, including capital equipment, buildings, vehicles, 3D printers, etc,
 - Food or meals, and
 - Gifts or prizes of any kind.

As always, expenses should be prudent and necessary, in other words tied directly to the accomplishment of program objectives. Further, applicants should be careful to avoid supplanting local spending using the PRMG. In general, supplanting is using state dollars to replace activities that are locally funded. For instance, using the PRMG to pay for expenses related to mentoring or induction training *the district already pays for using local funds*. The PRMG should be used to supplement district funding, meaning the activities funded through the PRMG were not previously funded by local dollars and would not occur without funding through the grant. Budgets will be reviewed for appropriateness as part of the internal review process. DPI reserves the right to require applicants or awardees to revise their budgets in order to meet state guidelines.

- Indirect Costs: applicants may include indirect costs to cover administrative costs related to the grant using the fiscal agent's *approved restricted indirect rate*. However, indirect costs may not be charged to the grant beyond the \$25,000 maximum award. For more information on indirect costs, visit the [DPI Indirect Cost webpage](#).
- Local Match: awardees are required to match at least 20 percent of their total grant award. Local match may be in the form of money, in-kind services, or both. Applicants must describe their local match in section XI. Budget and Local Match Description.

Application Timeline

- March 14, 2019: Application available on the DPI webpage
- May 1, 2019: Application due to DPI
- May 1 to June 30, 2019: External and internal review process
- Summer 2019: Grant Awards Notifications sent to awardees
- July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020: Awardees engage in grant activities and expend funds during the period of the grant
- June 30, 2020: Deadline to encumber funds and perform activities
- September 30, 2020: Deadline to submit final PI-1086 form claim to DPI

Review Timeline

The state superintendent shall review the applications submitted and determine which applications will receive grants based on the following criteria:

- a. The extent to which teachers are involved in program development and activities.

- b. The extent to which the goals and objectives relate to the purpose and priorities of the program.
- c. The extent to which the program activities are appropriate to the goals and objectives of the program.
- d. The adequacy of the timeline for completion of each major activity and the extent to which continuation of program activities is ensured after the grant period is completed.
- e. The extent to which the program activities will enhance instruction and ultimately enhance student achievement.

The timeline of the review is as follows:

- May 1, 2019: Application due to DPI
- May 1 to May 31, 2019: External and internal review teams read and rate applications
- June 2019: The state superintendent awards grants to applicants recommended by the review
- By June 30, 2019: Notification of grant awards sent to awarded applicants

Application Instructions

Application Sections

The PI-1657 PRMG application includes the following sections:

- I. **General Information:** This section collects general information for the applicant agency and persons responsible for filling out and submitting the application. Please fill out as much information as possible at the time of submitting the application. The contact person and program coordinator will be the point of contact for DPI for future updates regarding the application and grant.
- II. **Abstract:** This section provides a brief description of basic information related to the application.
- III. **General Assurances:** This section lists grant assurances to which the applicant must agree. Failure to agree or comply with these assurances may result in loss of funding.
- IV. **Program Specific Assurances:** This section lists assurances specific to the PRMG. Like the General Assurances section, applicants must agree and comply with these assurances.
- IVa. **Certification/Signatures:** The signature of an authorized individual from the applicant agency certifies that the information in the application is true and that the assurances will be met.
- V. **Certification Covering Debarment:** Applicants must certify they are not prevented from engaging in grants with the federal government or with DPI.
- VI. **Consortium Verification:** The applicant agency certifies as the “Administering Agency” or “fiscal agent,” and consortium partners verify their participation in the application. See the Definitions section of this document for more information on consortia and fiscal agents.
- VII. **Statement of Need:** The applicant answers a series of questions of specific baseline measures related to peer review, mentoring, and induction programs. The questions are separated into two (2) categories:
 1. Required Mentoring and Induction Program Components, and
 2. Comprehensive Mentoring and Induction Program Components.

Applicants must answer all questions. These questions provide baselines against DPI-identified target goals. The target goals provide reference for applicants and the state-level evaluation. Applicants are not required to meet the target goals in the period of one PRMG award. Rather, the target goals provide focus for applicants.

Next, the applicant will summarize the local peer review, mentoring, or induction program need addressed in the application.

Example Application: By way of example, imagine that a set of two districts apply for the PRMG. In both districts, survey data of beginning teachers found that beginning teachers were dissatisfied with mentoring provided by local mentors. In both districts, several well-respected, veteran teacher leaders voluntarily serve as mentors. When completing the Statement of Need portion of the PRMG application, the districts discover that only a couple of mentors in each district have attended any training on mentoring beginning teachers or instructional coaching.

From their needs assessment, the hypothetical applicants write the following Statement of Need:

Example Statement of Need: “This application will address the need to train existing mentors in mentoring and instructional coaching techniques to strengthen delivery of mentoring services.”

The applicant will then identify as either a New Applicant or a Returning Applicant by responding to the appropriate question. All applicants will summarize the needs assessment process they used. Returning Applicants will also summarize the success of their prior applications.

Applicants should ensure they consult relevant stakeholders to the program, including beginning teachers, mentors, coaches, or other educators when conducting the needs assessment and developing the application.

VIII. Goals: The applicant will select the appropriate goal from the dropdown. The pre-determined goals include:

1. Move toward compliance with requirements.
 - a. Applicants that have significant gaps between the target goals and their local baseline for 1. Required Mentoring and Induction Program Components in section VII. Statement of Need **must** select this goal and focus on meeting state requirements.
2. Move towards full compliance and comprehensive.
 - a. Applicants that are close to meeting the target goals 1. Required Mentoring and Induction Program Components in section VII. Statement of Need should select this goal. These applicants may also benefit from writing objectives to move closer towards a comprehensive peer review, mentoring and induction program.
3. Move towards comprehensive.
 - a. Applicants that meet the target goals 1. Required Mentoring and Induction Program Components in section VII. Statement of Need should select this goal.

Reviewers will assess whether applicants have selected an appropriate goal and whether measurable objectives and program activities described in the program plan are appropriate for the goal.

Example Goals: The example applicants described above would select: “Goal 2: Move towards full compliance and comprehensive,” since they are close to addressing all the PI 34 requirements, but also have room to move towards best practice.

IX. Proposed Program: The applicant will submit answers to the main questions of the application here. DPI reviews and rates applications based on the applicant’s responses to the questions using a pre-determined rubric. See below for specific instructions for completing this section of the application.

X. Sustainability: Applicants will describe how the consortium will build capacity to sustain the local peer review, mentoring, and induction programs outside the one-year period of the grant.

The PRMG cannot fully fund a comprehensive peer review, mentoring, and induction program. Reviewers will assess proposed programs for their ability to improve the capacity of the consortium to sustain a comprehensive peer review and mentoring program. Applicants cannot satisfy this question by applying for future Peer Review and Mentoring Grants.

XI. Budget and Local Match Description: Applicants will describe how they will expend the requested state grant funds and the required local match. Local match may be in the form of money or in-kind services.

Completing Section IX. Program Plan

The Program Plan section makes up the bulk of the application. There are two tables which help applicants organize their responses to this portion of the application. Applicants should copy as many versions of each table as are necessary or desired in order to write the desired number of measurable objectives. Applicants **must** write at least one (1) measurable objective.

In order to complete this section, applicants will:

- Create measurable objectives,
- Align the objectives to relevant standards,
- Identify program activities to accomplish the objectives,
- Create a chronological timeline to complete the activities,
- Identify staff to complete the program activities, and
- Develop evaluation plans to measure successful accomplishment of the measurable objectives.

Measurable Objectives

Measurable objectives are tied to relevant baseline measures and program standards (list of standards here). Measureable objectives should be written in SMART goal format (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-based, and Time-bound). SMART stands for:

Specific: Identifies a clear focus.

Measurable: Identifies a clear evidence source relevant to the Baseline Measure and Target Goal.

Attainable: Reasonable to achieve based on the available resources and timeline.

Results-based: Identifies a target point for the baseline data which is measured using the identified evidence source.

Time-bound: Identifies a timeline for the completion of the Measurable Objective. All PRMG Measurable Objectives **must** be within the one (1) year period of the grant (July 1 to June 30) (Educator Effectiveness System User Guide for Teachers, Teacher Supervisors and Coaches, 2018, 15-16).

Measurable objectives should be developed to make reasonable progress towards the program goal, relevant baseline measures, and against the stated need. Reasonable progress is determined by the distance between the baseline measure and target goal, the resources available (both funds and personnel) and the time available to complete the activities.

The Program Plan section will automatically carry over responses to previous questions, including the statement of need, selected program goal, and responses to DPI-identified baseline measures from the Statement of Need section. Applicants should use these as reference to develop measurable objectives directly aligned to the applicants' stated need and program goal and any relevant baseline measures. Checkboxes allow the applicant to indicate which baseline measures the measurable objective intends to move.

Again, applicants that do not meet all the requirements from PI 34 **must** complete the first Program Plan table and create a measurable objective to make progress towards the PI 34 requirements.

Applicants that do or will be able to meet all PI 34 requirements may complete the second table in the Program Plan section and write measurable objective(s) to move towards a more comprehensive peer review, mentoring, and induction program.

Example Measurable Objective: Using our example applicants, with a need focused on training mentors and a goal of meeting compliance with movement towards comprehensive, our example applicants may choose to write two (2) measurable objectives.

Example Measurable Objective 1: "Our districts will send all 12 mentors serving beginning teachers to attend Mentoring Essentials training at our CESA by December 31." This objective is SMART because it is Specific (who will do what), Measurable (completion of training), Attainable (reasonable to achieve with the

resources available), Results-based (identifies a target), and Time-bound (identifies a deadline within the grant period).

The example applicants have a second measurable objective:

Example Measurable Objective 2: “The percent of beginning teachers that express they are satisfied with the mentoring they receive will improve from 50 percent to 75 percent by June 30, 2020.” This objective is SMART because it is Specific (who will do what), Measurable (assessing through a survey), Attainable (reasonable to achieve with the resources available), Results-based (identifies a target), and Time-bound (identifies a deadline within the grant period).

Relevant Program Standards

Applicants should identify relevant standards for each measurable objective, such as Wisconsin educator standards ([Educator](#), [Administrator](#), or [Pupil Services](#), or Danielson Framework for Teaching or Wisconsin Framework for Principal Leadership components) or model program standards ([NTC Mentor Practice Standards](#), [NTC Induction Program Standards](#), or [NTC Instructional Coaching Standards](#)). The New Teacher Center publishes model standards for mentor practice, instructional coaching, and induction programs. DPI recommends applicants tie their measurable objectives to these research-based resources.

Program Activities

Program activities should describe the activities the applicant will perform to accomplish the relevant measurable objective. Applicants should list all relevant activities in chronological order. Applicants should align the list of activities to the timeline, directly across from each other in the table.

Example Program Activity: “Mentors will complete Mentoring Essentials Training at CESA.”

Timeline

Applicants should identify the timeline for completing the chronological list of program activities. The Timeline field is next to the Program Activities field in each table to facilitate an easy alignment of the activity and timeline.

Example Timeline: “All mentors will complete training by December 31, 2019.”

Note: All program activities **must** occur within the one-year period of the grant—July 1 through June 30.

Evaluation Activities

Evaluation activities should be written to measure the accomplishment of the relevant measurable objective. Evaluation activities that merely measure the accomplishment of program activities are not sufficient. Evaluation activities should both:

Measure the effectiveness of individual program activities (e.g., exit tickets of seminars), and

Measure progress towards the Measurable Objective (e.g., a survey of beginning teachers' satisfaction with mentoring activities or observations of mentors implementing new strategies).

Evaluation activities should also measure progress against relevant baseline measures.

Example Evaluation Activity: “The Director of C&I will administer a mentoring survey to beginning teachers to assess newly trained mentors’ successful implementation of skills learned in training.”

Completing Section XII. Budget Detail and VII. Budget Summary

The applicant will provide a budget for the proposed program in this section. The section is broken into two (2) sub-sections—XIIa. Budget Detail and XIIb. Budget Summary. *Applicants should be careful to complete both sections with as much detail as possible.* Failure to provide a sufficiently complete budget section may result in the rejection of the application. Applicants should reference the [Wisconsin Uniform Financial Accounting Requirements](#) (WUFAR) manual when completing the budget.

Budget Detail

The budget detail section lists individual expenditures. Applicants should provide *as much detail as possible*, including staff names, vendors, product names, quantities, time periods, etc. The budget detail section provides tables to summarize the proposed expenditures across the various WUFAR object categories:

- Salaries (100s): this object captures salaries and stipends for staff employed directly by the fiscal agent administering the grant in the execution of grant activities. ***Be careful not to supplant local funds with grant dollars if making salary expenditures.*** Expenditures should be related to activities undertaken to execute the proposed program, not activities that the school or district would typically pay for with local dollars.
- Fringe (200s): this object captures benefits (e.g., health insurance or Wisconsin Retirement System payments) for staff employed directly by the fiscal agent administering the grant in the execution of grant activities. ***Be careful not to supplant local funds with grant dollars if making salary expenditures.*** Expenditures should be related to activities undertaken to execute the proposed program, not activities that the school or district would typically pay for with local dollars.
- Purchased Services (300s): this object captures expenditures for contracted services made directly by the fiscal agent.

- Non-capital Objects (400s): this object captures the purchase of non-capital objects, such as general supplies.
- Capital Objects (500s): this object captures the purchase of capital equipment. **Capital objects are not eligible expenditures for the PRMG.** Expenditures in this object will not be approved and budgeting for these objects may result in rejection of the application.
- Other Objects (900s): this object captures fees and other objects not captured in other object codes. Note: state Grants Transited to Others (935) should be used to account for PRMG dollars transited to consortium partners to expend on their portions of the program.

Each table in the budget detail sections provides a space to list the appropriate WUFAR function code. WUFAR function codes are necessary to match budget detail expenditures with the totals on the XIIb. Budget Summary page. A list of common PRMG WUFAR function codes follows:

- 221300 Instructional Staff Training: this is the most commonly appropriate WUFAR function code. This function captures most activities designed to improve the professional growth of instructional staff. Costs associated with providing substitutes so that teachers may attend professional development are also captured here.
- 221400 Professional Library: this function captures expenditures for items such as books for professional development.
- 491000 Revenue Transited to Others: this function captures funds transited to other consortium partners for local expenditure.

Budget Summary

The Budget Summary captures all the individual expenditures described in the budget detail section. The Budget Summary summarizes the Budget Detail information across WUFAR function codes. WUFAR functions are organized by the purpose of the spending, not what the particular expenditure or recipient was. WUFAR functions on the Budget Summary breakdown in three broad categories:

- Instruction (100 000s): this function area captures expenditures that are related directly to the instruction of students in the school.
- Support Services-Pupil and Instructional Staff Services (210/220 000s): this function area captures expenditures which enhance instruction and pupil services. **Note: this is the most commonly appropriate WUFAR function area for PRMG activities.**

- Support Services-Administration (230 000s and above): this function area captures expenditures related to administrating local activities, such as grant administration, revenue transits, etc. **Note: revenue transited to others (491 000) would be accounted for in this WUFAR function area.**

The total budget should equal no more than \$25,000.

Local Match

Local match is not documented in the budget detail or the budget summary, but rather in Section XI. Budget and Local Match Description.

Definitions

“**Beginning Educator**” refers to an individual with a Tier I or Tier II professional educator license in the first three years of their career.

“**Beginning teacher**” has a similar meaning to “initial educator” and “inexperienced teacher”—an individual who has successfully completed, for the first time, an approved educator preparation program in the teacher professional category and within their first three (3) years of teaching.

“**Mentor**” means a licensed educator who has successfully completed state-approved mentor training who demonstrates exemplary classroom practice and the effective collaborative qualities necessary to work with beginning educators. They have input into the confidential, formative assessment of the educator but are not considered a part of the formal evaluation process. The Mentoring Essentials Series is a state-approved, foundational mentor training.

“**Peer Review**” refers to the confidential, formative assessment provided to initial educators by peers outside of their formal evaluation, as per [PI 38.04](#).

“**Induction**” refers to a program of ongoing orientation and support implemented for beginning educators in a public school. Multi-year mentoring is one aspect of an induction program.

“**Consortium**” refers to a group of eligible applicants that jointly apply and agree to the terms of the application. School districts and independent public charter schools must apply as part of a consortium of two (2) or more eligible applicants. CESAs may apply separately or as members of a consortium.

“**Fiscal Agent**” refers to the member of a consortium that agrees to administer the grant on behalf of the other consortium members. Fiscal Agents should be the “Applicant Agency” on the first page of the grant. DPI will only issue grant awards to the identified fiscal agent in the Consortium Verification section of the grant. **Awardees cannot switch fiscal agents in the middle of the grant period.** Fiscal agents are responsible for claiming and disbursing all funds and maintaining all required documentation. Fiscal agents should refer to the DPI fiscal agent policy for further guidance.

References

Gray, L., and Taie, S. (2015). Public School Teacher Attrition and Mobility in the First Five Years: Results From the First Through Fifth Waves of the 2007–08 Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study (NCES 2015-337). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved March 11, 2019, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

Haynes, M. PhD. (2014). On the Path to Equity: Improving the Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers. Retrieved March 11, 2019, from Alliance for Excellent Education website: <https://all4ed.org/reportsfactsheets/path-to-equity/>.

Ingersoll, R., & Strong, M. (2011). The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research. Retrieved March 11, 2019, from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/127.

New Teacher Center (2016). High Quality Mentoring and Induction Practices. Retrieved March 11, 2019, from New Teacher Center website: https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/high-quality-mentoring_induction-resource.pdf

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (2017). Educator Effectiveness System User Guide for Teachers, Teacher Supervisors and Coaches. Retrieved March 11, 2019, from <https://dpi.wi.gov/ee/process-manuals-forms-guides>.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. “Peer Review and Mentoring Grants.” Accessed March 11, 2019. <https://dpi.wi.gov/educator-development-support/support-development/peer-review-mentoring-grants>.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. “Equity.” Accessed March 11, 2019. <https://dpi.wi.gov/rti/equity>.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. “Teacher Mentoring and Induction.” Accessed March 11, 2019. <https://dpi.wi.gov/educator-development-support/support-development/teacher-mentoring-induction>.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. “Uniform Grant Guidance.” Accessed March 11, 2019. <https://dpi.wi.gov/wisegrants/uniform-grant-guidance>.