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Purpose

• Wisconsin school districts required to provide mentors to initial educators

• PRMG funds development and support of local mentoring programs

• A single, one-year PRMG award not sufficient to sustain a full mentoring program

• Consider how best to use funds to support mentoring efforts
General Guidelines and Eligibility

- One (1) year grant period
- Starts July 1, 2018; ends June 30, 2019
- Maximum award of $25,000 per consortium
- Awardees required to match 20 percent
- Districts and 2(r)/2(x) Charter schools must apply as a consortium; may partner with CESAs
- CESAs may apply independently
- An LEA can serve as a fiscal agent for only one grant per year
Eligible Uses of Funds

• Providing orientation and support seminars to educators and/or mentors

• Providing resources or support for professional learning communities (PLCs)

• Providing training to mentors of teachers, administrators, or pupil service professionals

• Providing direct mentoring support
The PRMG is an identified support for the Teacher Equitable Access Plan for Wisconsin: https://dpi.wi.gov/wi-equity-plan

Applications including 9 districts identified as most in need will receive priority

Applications addressing inequitable distribution of qualified teachers will also receive priority
Mentoring Essentials

- CESAs offer a statewide mentoring curriculum – Mentoring Essentials
- Mentoring Essentials designed to be high-quality and consistent, statewide
- Contact CESAs for Mentoring Essentials dates, costs, and registration information
Application Timeline and Process

- April 30, 2018: Applications Due
- May 1 – June 30: Internal and External Review
- By June 30: Notification of Grant Award
- July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019: Grant Period
- September 30: Final Claims Due
Completing the Application

The 2018-19 application has 5 questions:

VI-A: Statement of Need  What problem are you addressing and how did you decide?

VI-B: Theory of Action  How does your plan improve instruction and student outcomes?

VI-C: Program Plan  What are your planned activities? Timeline?

VI-D: Evaluation Plan  How will you know you were successful?

VI-E: Allocation  How do you plan to spend the money, including the required 20 percent match?
### VI-A: Statement of Need

#### Qualifying Criteria
- The statement of need describes the needs assessment process used to develop the need statement in detail, including background, methods, and conclusions.
- The statement of need cites multiple, relevant data sets and evidence (e.g., survey, I.E., staffing reports) to support the needs assessment and identified need.
- The identified need is directly related to mentoring and/or induction.
- Educators and mentor survey data and/or feedback was consulted when conducting the needs assessment.
- Educators and mentors provided direct input into the needs assessment and resulting program design. Examples include attending planning meetings and/or providing direct feedback.

#### VI-A. Statement of Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application meets none or only one (1) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets two (2) or three (3) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets all of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets all of the statement of need quality criteria and describes — in detail — a root cause analysis used to identify strength and growth areas in the topic areas of educator (instructional and/or school leadership) practice, pupil achievement, and/or district induction and retention policy for other exceptional criteria above and beyond &quot;Average&quot; criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI-B: Theory of Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI-B: Theory of Action</th>
<th>Quality Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The theory of action is directly related to mentoring and/or induction, as well as the applicant’s stated need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The theory of action cites relevant research or background information in support of the hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The theory of action provides a detailed hypothesis for how to improve instruction and/or school leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The theory of action connects improved instruction or school leadership to improved pupil achievements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI-B: Theory of Action</th>
<th>Rhetoric Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application meets none or only one (1) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets two (2) or three (3) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VI-C: Program Plan

### Quality Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI-C: Program Plan</th>
<th>Quality Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed program goals and objectives are written in SMART format (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-bound).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals and objectives of the proposed program relate directly to mentoring and the activities are appropriate given the goal(s) and objective(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals, objectives, and activities align to the needs assessment and support the theory of action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for each objective are described in detail, including a detailed timeline for the completion of all major program activities within the grant period (July 1 – June 30).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators and mentors participate directly in the majority of major program activities (for instance, seminars).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI-C: Program Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotic Levels</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application meets none or only one (1) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets two (2) or three (3) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets all of the quality criteria.</td>
<td>The application meets all of the program plan quality criteria and identifies necessary resources and staff responsible to effectively carry out the program activities (or other exceptional criteria above and beyond &quot;Average&quot; criteria).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI-D: Evaluation Plan

#### Quality Criteria

- The proposal’s evaluation plan includes success criteria for each goal and objective.
- The proposal’s evaluation plan relates directly to the application’s theory of action.
- The proposal’s evaluation plan uses multiple measures to assess the program outcomes.
- The proposal’s evaluation plan uses relevant measures for evaluating program outcomes. Examples include but are not limited to: Exit tickets for seminars, Educator Effectiveness data for teacher practices, benchmark data for student outcomes, or survey data for perceptions data.
- The application addresses the continuation and sustainability of the consortium’s program without ongoing PRMO funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI-D Evaluation Plan</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application meets none or only one (1) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets two (2) or three (3) of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets all of the quality criteria described above.</td>
<td>The application meets all of the evaluation quality criteria and describes how the evaluation results will be used to inform not only potential future grant applications, but also the overall mentoring program and/or induction and retention systems for other exceptional criteria above and beyond “Average” criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


VI-E: Allocation

• Not assessed with a rubric
• *Must* be completed, will be reviewed in the internal evaluation
• Should describe how the grant funds will be allocated by all consortium partners, not just how funds will be divided among partners
• Should also describe the allocation of the local match
Review Process

- External and internal reviewers will read each application twice
- When necessary and if possible, scores will be aligned if divergent
- Reviewers will not read applications for which they feel they cannot be objective
- External reviews are informational only; final decisions are made by DPI and the internal review
- Internal reviews will also assess budgets for appropriateness
Completing the Budget - Detail

• Work with your budget office when completing the grant budget
• Ensure you are using the correct WUFAR codes when budgeting (https://dpi.wi.gov/sfs/finances/wufar/overview)
• Your budget detail pages should match your budget summary
• Provide as much detail as possible!
### Completing the Budget – Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction (100 000s)</th>
<th>Support Services – Pupil and Staff Services (210 000s &amp; 220 000s)</th>
<th>Support Services – Administration (230 000s and Above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct instruction to students</td>
<td>Enhance instruction or grant activities</td>
<td>General administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Budget Summary should match the totals of the Budget Detail subsections
- The total budget should add up to no more than $25,000
- Do **not** include your local match in your budget summary
- The budget summary is the total grant dollars requested
Budget Modifications

• Awardees may modify their budgets in the event they need to make changes
• Awardees *do not need* DPI approval prior to making a spending change of less than 10 percent of a line item
• Budget modification requests should be made in writing 30 days before any planned spending changes. DPI will approve or deny in 30 days
Claiming Funds

• Use PI-1086 form, found on the DPI website: https://dpi.wi.gov/sms/fedaids/pi-1086

• Awardees claim funds after encumbering or expending the funds

• Claims can be made periodically, but not more frequent than every 30 days

• Final claims due September 30, 2019
• Reference the rubric when writing your grant! You can find it at on the PRMG webpage (https://dpi.wi.gov/educator-development-support/support-development/peer-review-mentoring-grants)

• Fiscal agents **CAN** include indirect costs at the approved restricted rate

• Write the budget from the perspective of the fiscal agent

• Be sure to accurately describe your consortium’s spending in VI-E: Allocation, including the required 20 percent match
Thank you for joining today!

- If you have questions about the PRMG or this webinar, you can contact me at: jacob.hollnagel@dpi.wi.gov
  
  Or

- (608) 266-5195

- You can find all this information on the PRMG webpage:
  
  https://dpi.wi.gov/educator-development-support/support-development/peer-review-mentoring-grants