

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>

© March 2020 Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

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**
- Purpose4
- Evidence Supporting Comprehensive Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction.....4
- Evidence Supporting Comprehensive Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction in Wisconsin..... 4
- Evidence Supporting Comprehensive Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction from across the nation 5
- High Quality Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction based on Evidence-based Program Components and Practices 5
- Wisconsin Requirements for Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction 6
- Educational Equity Priority6**
- State Resources for Mentoring and Induction7**
- General Guidelines7
- Application Timeline8
- Review Timeline9
- Application Instructions 10**
- Changes to 2020-21 Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Application..... 10
- Application Sections..... 10
- Completing Section X. Program Plan 13
- Measurable Objectives14
- Program Activities 15
- Timeline 15
- Evaluation Activities 15
- Completing Section XIVa. Budget Detail and XIVb. Budget Summary 15**
- Budget Detail.....16
- Budget Summary17
- Local Match17
- Definitions..... 18**
- References 19**

Program Description

Purpose

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

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

Applicants that do not have an existing peer review, 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 peer review, mentoring and induction programs should consider how best to use the grant to support, redesign, or expand the capacity of local programs.

Evidence Supporting Comprehensive Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction

Evidence shows that implementing comprehensive peer review, mentoring and induction programs with accurate and effective feedback 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 in Wisconsin

Evidence from the ongoing evaluation of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System suggests high quality feedback to educators and the opportunity to use it is associated with improved student achievement and teacher retention.

Evidence of Improved Student Outcomes

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Research Partnership's (WEERP) evaluation of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System found that "[s]chools that increased opportunities for teacher to use feedback demonstrated improved Math and English Language (ELA) achievement results" and "[s]chools that increased the amount teachers used feedback to improve" also demonstrated improved student achievement results (Jones, Gilman, Pyatigorsky, 2019, 4-5).

Evidence of Improved Teacher Retention

WEERP's evaluation of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System found that new teachers that received more useful and more accurate feedback were more likely to have higher trust and belief in their principal's effectiveness. Teachers that

had greater trust in their principals were more likely to be satisfied with their jobs, committed to their schools, and therefore more likely to remain at their school. These findings suggest that the support and feedback aspects of the Educator Effectiveness System support teacher retention. (Jones, C., Cain, E., and Gilman, L., 2019, 3-5).

Evidence Supporting Comprehensive Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction from across the nation

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).

High Quality Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction based on Evidence-based Program Components and Practices

Rigorous peer review, mentoring and induction programs require thoughtful design and sustained effort to build and maintain. While Wisconsin law requires public schools to provide some aspects of high quality peer review, mentoring and induction programs, numerous resources exist to guide schools and districts in their design and implementation of more comprehensive, high quality programs. For instance, [the New Teacher Center \(NTC\)](#) provides [evidence-based resources](#) that can inform schools and districts designing and sustaining high quality programs, rather than just compliance-oriented programs. Schools and districts should not expect to see educator practice or student achievement gains by only implementing minimum requirements of state law.

Further, high quality peer review, mentoring and induction does not occur in a vacuum. Comprehensive programs rely on “intensive and specific guidance.” Guidance and feedback delivered through peer reviewers and mentors should be based on evidence of practice and student achievement “gathered through classroom observations and student work” (High Quality Mentoring & Induction Practices, NTC, 2016). Peer reviewers and mentors should deliver feedback and gather evidence in accordance with existing policies and practices in the school and district, in particular using the same framework for Educator Effectiveness used locally.

When developing measurable objectives or program activities, applicants should reference relevant model program or practice standards, such as the New Teacher Center’s [Mentor Practice](#) or [Induction Program Standards](#) or the [Wisconsin Coaching](#)

[Competency Practice Profile](#), to identify potential program components, activities, or practices that may improve their local peer review, mentoring and induction programs.

Wisconsin Requirements for Peer Review, Mentoring and Induction

Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter [PI 34.040\(5\)](#) specifically requires: “A school district employing a tier II license holder who has less than three years of full-time teaching experience shall provide all of the following:

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.”

This requirement also applies to school districts employing Tier I special education and Tier I guest license holders under section [PI 34.039\(2\)](#) and [PI 34.030](#).

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System 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 (Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System Process User Guide for Teachers, 2).

While the PI 34 requirements are specific to teachers holding a Tier II provisional license or Tier I special education 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 initial educator peer review, mentoring, and induction programs is essential to overall program success. Activities that support these other essential aspects of comprehensive peer review, mentoring, and induction programs may be supported by the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant.

Educational Equity Priority

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 demonstrate a clear focus on closing achievement gaps across student groups.

As discussed above, in Wisconsin, students from historically disadvantaged backgrounds are less likely to be taught by experienced, high quality teachers. New, inexperienced, and teachers from non-teaching professional backgrounds are often employed in schools and districts and assigned to classrooms of students experiencing educational inequity at disproportional rates (Teacher Equitable Access Plan for Wisconsin, 9). Comprehensive, high quality peer review, mentoring and induction programs can alleviate some of these

effects by supporting new, inexperienced or teachers from non-teaching professional backgrounds with high quality feedback and professional development.

State Resources for Mentoring and Induction

DPI has developed a webpage dedicated to [Teacher Mentoring and Induction](#), including a [practice and policy guidebook for teacher mentoring and induction](#) and 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 delivering the training in-district. Peer Review and Mentoring Grant funds can support these efforts.

General Guidelines

- Applicants may only request 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 (postmarked by May 1, 2020), and
 - Completion (failing to adequately complete and answer all sections of the application).
- Allowable Expenditures: Most kinds of expenditures for professional development are allowable expenses under the PRMG: stipends or reimbursement for staff to attend professional development and training, travel to attend training, registration for conferences, etc. Funds can be used to support the time and effort of administrators, mentors, or teachers to develop peer review, mentoring and induction program components, such as ongoing orientation seminars. 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. 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. Local Match Description. Local match descriptions should clearly describe the activities being supported by the local match in what amounts, including for all consortium partners.

Application Timeline

- March 4, 2020: Application available on the DPI webpage.
- March 17, 2020: Webinar for interested applicants.
- May 1, 2020: Application due to Department of Public Instruction. Applications packets must be postmarked no later than May 1. A drop box will be made available at DPI headquarters for hand delivered applications.
- May 1 to June 30, 2020: External and internal review process.
- Summer 2020: Grant Awards Notifications sent to awardees.
- July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021: Period of the grant. Awardees that have received official notifications of award may begin encumbering and expending grant funds in accordance with approved budgets.

- June 30, 2021: Deadline to encumber funds and perform activities.
- September 30, 2021: Deadline to expend remaining funds (for instance issuing payment on a previously encumbered expense). Deadline to submit final PI-1086 claim form to the Department of Public Instruction.

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.

These criteria have been distilled into a rubric available on the Department of Public Instruction Peer Review and Mentoring Grant webpage.

The timeline of the review is as follows:

- May 1, 2020: Application due to Department of Public Instruction. Applications packets must be postmarked no later than May 1. A drop box will be made available at DPI headquarters for hand delivered applications.
- May 1 to May 31, 2020: External and internal review teams read and rate applications. The internal review team will create recommendations to be delivered to the state superintendent.
- June 2020: The state superintendent reviews recommendations from the review team. The state superintendent makes final decisions on awards.
- Summer 2020: The Department of Administration releases funds to agencies for fiscal year 2021. The Department of Public Instruction releases notification of grant awards once fiscal year 2021 funds are available.

Application Instructions

Changes to 2020-21 Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Application

The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant application remains largely the same in 2020-21 as it was in 2019-20, but there are some noteworthy changes.

- The Certification Covering Debarment has been removed.
- The Needs Assessment portion has been updated with an additional indicator and target goal related to the *quality* of feedback provided to initial educators. Previously included indicators related specifically to program components only.
- All text fields have had their character limits increased. All character limits are now indicated next to the field. All text fields now include default text to help indicate the location of the field.
- The Program Plan section no longer includes reference fields to prior responses for Statement of Need or Program Goal. These fields were superfluous and caused confusion and formatting issues.
- The Program Plan section no longer requires that applicants cite a relevant program standard.
- Fields have been created for all indicators of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-based, Time-bound) goal format to help applicants develop high quality measurable objectives. Be careful to follow the format.
- The Program Plan section has been reduced to one page that is applicable no matter what program goal is selected. Applicants that want to write more than one measurable objective should append additional Program Plan pages to their application.
- The Sustainability section has added additional detail to the prompt to help applicants fully answer the question.
- The Budget Description and Local Match Description sections have been separated and additional detail has been included in the prompt to help applicants fully answer the questions.

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. **Application Overview:** 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.
- V. **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.
- 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. **Needs Assessment:** This section is broken into parts VIIa. and VIIb. In VIIa, the applicant answers a series of questions of 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. Applicants are not required to meet the target goals in the period of one PRMG award. Rather, the target goals provide reference for applicants and the state-level evaluation.

In VIIb, the applicant will check the box indicating whether the consortium applying is new or returning. Then the applicant will summarize the needs assessment and root cause analysis process that was used to determine the need for the grant. This section provides the space for applicants to narratively explain their needs assessment processes, data, root causes, and rationales for applying.

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 initial 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 assessment portion of the PRMG application, the districts discover that only a couple of mentors assigned to initial educators in each district have attended any training on mentoring.

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 initial educators, mentors, coaches, or other educators when conducting the needs assessment and developing the application.

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

VIII. Statement of Need: The applicant provides a clear and concise statement of need, focusing on at least one identified root cause from the needs assessment summary.

Example Statement of Need: “Initial educators in our consortium identified the quality of mentoring as less than satisfactory. We believe the root cause of this finding is that our mentors have not been trained to provide high quality mentoring, despite their best efforts. This application will address the need to train existing mentors in mentoring and coaching techniques to strengthen delivery of mentoring services to initial educators, thereby supporting improved student outcomes.”

IX. Goal: 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 VIIa. Needs Assessment ***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 VIIa. Needs Assessment but may also benefit from moving beyond compliance may select this goal.
3. Move towards a comprehensive program.
 - a. Applicants that meet the target goals 1. Required Mentoring and Induction Program Components in section VIIa. Needs Assessment 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.

X. Program Plan: The applicant will identify at least one measurable objective, written in SMART format, and develop a chronological list of related program activities and timelines for completion. See the next section for specific instructions on this portion of the application.

XI. 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.

Example Sustainability: The example applicant might say: “The consortium will sustain the program by implementing a train-the-trainer model for the Mentoring Essentials curriculum in our districts. Our mentoring program coordinator will get training—through local match in this year’s grant—in the Mentoring Essentials curriculum and incorporate the curriculum into our annual professional development for local mentors.”

XII. Budget Description: Applicants will describe how they will expend the requested state grant funds for all consortium partners *to the dollar*. Please round to the nearest dollar. Budgeted items should reflect program activities (i.e., if program activities are sending mentors to training, then described items should reflect training costs such as time, registration, travel, etc.)

Example Budget Description:

“District A: Stipends for Mentors to Attend Training—\$1,000.

District B: Stipends for Mentors to Attend Training—\$1,000.”

XIII. Local Match Description: Applicants will describe how they will expend the required local for all consortium partners *to the dollar*. Please round to the nearest dollar. Local match may be in the form of money or in-kind services.

Example Local Match Description:

“District A: Stipends for mentor program coordinator to Attend Training—\$100.

District B: Stipends for mentor program coordinator to Attend Training—\$100.”

Completing Section X. Program Plan

The Program Plan section helps applicants organize their responses to this portion of the application. Applicants may 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,
- 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 addressing the stated need.

Again, applicants that do not meet all the requirements from PI 34 **must** 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 additionally write measurable objective(s) to move towards more comprehensive peer review, mentoring, and induction programs by completing the Program Plan section for each additional measurable objective.

This section provides space for applicants to develop a measurable objective related to their goal. The measurable objective should be directly related to addressing the root cause(s) laid out in the Statement of Need. The measurable objective portion is split into several areas related to the SMART format.

a. **Example Specific response**: “Mentors will provide better mentoring after attending Mentoring Essentials training...”

b. **Example Measurable response**: “As measured by responses of initial

educators to our annual mentoring survey...”

c. **Example Results-based & Attainable response:** “More than 50 percent of initial educators will indicate satisfactory or better mentoring...”

d. **Example Time-bound response:** “by the end of second semester of the 2020-21 school year...”

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, 2020.”

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 initial educators’ satisfaction with mentoring activities or observations of mentors implementing new strategies).

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

Completing Section XIVa. Budget Detail and XIVb. Budget Summary

The applicant will provide a budget for the proposed program in this section. The section is broken into two (2) sub-sections—XIVa. Budget Detail and XIVb. 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 XIVb. 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 administering 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 working in a licensed teacher or principal role within 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.

“**Initial Educator**” means an individual who holds an initial license under PI 34.

“**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. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. Accessed March 11, 2019. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

Haynes, Mariana. PhD. 2014. On the Path to Equity: Improving the Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers. Washington, D.C., July.

Ingersoll, Richard, and Michael Strong. 2011. The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs: A Critical Review of the Research. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: GSE Publications, June 1. Accessed February 27, 2020. doi:10.3102/0034654311403323.

Jones, Curtis J., Elizabeth Cain, and Leon Gilman. 2019. The Impact of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Process on New Teacher Turnover. Milwaukee, September. Accessed February 26, 2020. <https://uwm.edu/sreed/wp-content/uploads/sites/502/2019/10/WEERP-New-Teacher-Retention-Brief-September-2019.pdf>.

Jones, Curtis J., Leon Gilman, and Mikhail Pyatigorsky. 2019. The Impact of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Process on Student Achievement. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness Research Partnership. Accessed February 2020. <https://uwm.edu/sreed/wp-content/uploads/sites/502/2019/10/WEERP-EE-Student-Achievement-Brief-August-2019-1.pdf>.

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. "Equity." Accessed March 11, 2019. <https://dpi.wi.gov/rti/equity>.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. "Teacher Equitable Access Plan." Accessed February 27, 2020. https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/wi-equity-plan/_files/wiequityplan060115.pd_.pdf.

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>.

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>.