2024

2024-25 Peer Review and Mentoring Grant

Guidance for Applicants

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Jill Underly, PhD, State Superintendent

Licensing, Educator Advancement and Development
Liz Barbarick
Jacob Hollnagel

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 266-3275

https://dpi.wi.gov/education-workforce/develop-retain/induction-mentoring/peer-review-mentor-grant

March 2024
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Table of Contents

General Program Information

Program Overview

The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant program is authorized under Wis. Stat. sec. 115.405 "to provide technical assistance and training for teachers... to implement peer review and mentoring programs" (Wis Stat. sec 115.405(1)(a)).

Grantees must be eligible applicants, and individual school districts or independent charter schools must apply in consortium with at least one other eligible applicant. Cooperative educational service agencies (CESAs) may apply individually. See "Funding Eligibility and Distribution" under the "Competition Summary" section for more information about entities eligible to apply.

Awards may not exceed more than $25,000 in a single grant period. Awardees must match at least 20 percent of the award with local funding. In addition to standard state grant assurances, awardees must provide additional assurance that: a) "the grant awarded under this subchapter will not be used to supplant or replace funds otherwise available for professional development," b) "program information and related materials under this subchapter will be made available to interested schools and other educational institutions at a reasonable cost" and c) "A mentor shall have input into the confidential formative assessment of the initial educator and may not be included as part of the school district's formal evaluation of an initial educator. (Wis. Admin. Code PI 38.03(3) & 38.04).

Purpose of the Funding

The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant program funds the development of peer review and mentoring programs for beginning teachers in Wisconsin public schools. Research shows that peer review (observation of practice by a peer educator) and mentoring, when well implemented, can improve educator practice and, thereby, student outcomes. Peer review and mentoring programs are especially important and effective for educators in the beginning years of their career (Gray, L., and Taie S. 2015; Haynes, Mariana. PhD. 2014).

Further, Wisconsin law requires that schools provide to Wisconsin educators specific components of a peer review and mentoring program, including:
- "Ongoing orientation and support which is collaboratively developed by teachers, administrators, and other school district stakeholders, and
- A licensed mentor who successfully completed a mentor training program approved by the department" (Wis. Admin. Code sec. PI 34.040(5)).

Authorizing Statute

The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant program is authorized under Wis. Stat. sec. 115.405 "to provide technical assistance and training for teachers… to implement peer review and mentoring programs" (Wis Stat. sec 115.405(1)(a)).

Requirements at a Glance

Eligible Applicants
- A CESA.
- A consortium consisting of 2 or more school districts, including independent charter schools under 2(r) and 2(x).
- A consortium consisting of 2 or more CESAs.
- A combination of any of the above.

Due date of application	May 1, 2024 No late applications will be accepted.
Notification date (if known)	Summer 2025
Award amount(s)	Up to $25,000
Duration of grant awards	One fiscal year: July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025 No carryover is allowed.
Program contact	Liz Barbarick leadgrants@dpi.wi.gov (608) 267-9200
Purpose of funding	The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant program funds the development of peer review and mentoring programs for beginning teachers in Wisconsin public schools.

Competition Summary

Funding Eligibility and Distribution

Who is eligible?

The following organizations are eligible applicants:

- A CESA.
- A consortium consisting of two (2) or more school districts, including independent charter schools under Wis. Stat. § 118.40 2(r) or 2(x).
- A consortium consisting of two (2) or more CESAs.
- A combination of any of the above.

No other entities are eligible to apply.

Award amounts

Applicants are eligible for up to $25,000, annually.

Applicants must agree to match at least 20 percent of the requested amount or final award. Local match may be in the form of money or in-kind services or both.

Competition Timeline

Date Application Opens	Friday, March 15, 2024
Application Due Date	11:59 PM, May 1, 2024 No late applications will be accepted.
Notification of Award	Summer 2024
Grant Period (period during which grant funds can be used)	July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025

Grant Administration

Program Services and Activity Requirements

Required Activities

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 applies to Tier I special education and Tier I guest license holders under Wis. Admin. Code sections PI 34.039(2) and PI 34.030.

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System recommends peer review as a best practice of the evaluation process. Educators must meet with peers to discuss both student learning objectives (SLOs) and professional practice goals (PPGs) during their supporting years (Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System Process User Guide for Teachers, 9).

While the PI 34 requirements are specific to teachers with 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 beginning teacher 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.

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 for facilitation by either a CESA or district. 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.

Allowable Activities

Many kinds of activities are allowable under the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant, including, but not limited to:

- Salary and fringe for teachers, peer reviewers, mentors, or other educators to attend training or engage in peer review and mentoring activities such as classroom observation or coaching conversations.
- Salary and fringe for administrators or other support staff to engage in training curriculum design or program management.
- Purchased services for training, coaching, or other services in support of peer review and mentoring grant programs.
- Non-capital objects (a.k.a. consumable resources) that support the peer review and mentoring grant program like professional learning books, resources, or supplies, etc.

Necessary and Prudent

Importantly, allowable activities and expenditures must meet a necessary and prudent test:

- Are the activities necessary to accomplish the goals of the program?
- Are the activities a prudent use of public resources?

For instance, attending training is an allowable activity, but attending a training out-of-state that also occurs in-state would be unnecessary and imprudent use of public resources.

Awardees are responsible for ensuring their activities are allowable, necessary, and prudent.

Unallowable Activities

Certain activities are strictly prohibited, including:

- Purchasing capital objects such as buildings, equipment, vehicles, 3D printers, etc. with state grant dollars (see the Budget Detail and Definitions appendix for more information).
- Providing "incentives" or "gifts" such as complimentary branded merchandise, free meals, or entertainment with state grant dollars.

Supplement, Not Supplant

Further, state grant dollars must be used to supplement, not supplant, local funds.

Supplanting occurs when grant funds are used to support programs or activities that otherwise would have been funded by local funds. In other words, funds are used to *supplement* when the activities or programs they support would not have occurred were it not for the grant funding.

An example of supplanting would be to use PRMG funds to purchase a professional organization membership for the purpose of accessing professional development opportunities that the district would have purchased using local funds anyway.

Fiscal Management Requirements

Local Match

Applicants agree to match at least 20 percent of the amount requested or final award with local dollars in support of the proposed grant program. Awardees must spend local match dollars in direct support of the program. Awardees may meet local match requirements in either the form of money or in-kind services or both.

See the Budget Detail and Definitions appendix of this guidance document for more information.

Indirect or Administrative Costs

State grant dollars may not be used to cover indirect or administrative costs of the grant. Instead, awardees may apply these costs to their local match requirement. See the Budget Detail and Definition appendix for more information.

Grant Period

The grant period follows the fiscal year: July 1 to June 30. Grant activities and encumbrances (a.k.a. "obligations") must occur during the grant period.

A liquidation period occurs for 90 days (July 1 through September 30) after the close of the grant period. Awardees may make final liquidations of existing obligations during this period but may not make new obligations.

Consortium Fiscal Guidance

Applicants applying as consortia should review the DPI fiscal agent policy and documentation tools available on the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant webpage.

DPI recommends consortia establish written agreements that lay out the responsibilities of all parties in the agreement under the grant.

Budget Modifications

Awardees may modify their grant programs and budget provided they notify DPI at least 30 days in advance of making any changes by completing the relevant budget modification form. The budget modification form will be made available on the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant webpage.

Awardees may make spending changes of less than 10 percent of the total award (i.e., $2,500 on an award of $25,000) to **previously approved budget items** without prior approval from DPI.

Claiming Funds

Awardees use the PI-1086 Program Fiscal Report to claim grant funds. The [PI-1086 webpage](#) has the form and instructions. Awardees may claim funds for approved grant activities after encumbering or expending the funds. Awardees may claim funds throughout the grant period, but not more than once every 30 days. The final deadline for grant claims is September 30, 2024, 90 days after the close of the grant period.

Application Detail and Instructions

General Instructions

Applicants *must* complete all pages and components of the application, including the budget details and summary pages.

Failure to submit a fully completed application by the deadline may result in rejection of the application from the competition.

Applicants must submit applications using the provided DPI form on the website.

DPI will *not* review attachments and appendices as part of the competition.

Applications must be submitted by email to LEADgrants@dpi.wi.gov using the subject line:

> PEER REVIEW AND MENTORING GRANT SUBMISSION 2025: <<Applicant Agency Name>>.

Applications must be submitted by 11:59 pm, May 1, 2024. Late applications will not be accepted. Failure to submit the application according to these instructions may result in the application being excluded from the competition.

Section-by-Section Application Description and Instructions

This section will identify each section of the application and describe the questions contained therein. Sections that require completion by applicants will be marked parenthetically with "(Requires Applicant Action)".

There are 13 sections on the 2024 Peer Review and Mentoring Grant application.

- I. General Information (Requires Applicant Action)
- II. Overview
- III. Abstract (Requires Applicant Action)
- IV. State General Assurances
- V. Program Specific Assurances
- VI. Certification/Signature (Requires Applicant Action)
- VII. Readiness (Requires Applicant Action)
- VII. Plan (Requires Applicant Action)
- IX. Do (Requires Applicant Action)
- X. Study/Check (Evaluation) (Requires Applicant Action)
- XI. Act (Requires Applicant Action)
- XII-a. Budget Detail (Requires Applicant Action)
- XII-b. Budget Summary (Requires Applicant Action)

- XIII. Budget Narrative (Requires Applicant Action)
- XIV. Consortium Verification Form (Requires Applicant Action)

I. General Information (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to provide basic information related to their request including:

- The applicant agency (i.e., the agency submitting the application).
- Project contact information (i.e., the person responsible for receiving and disseminating grant information within the applicant agency).
- Fiscal contact information (i.e., the person responsible for managing the fiscal aspects of the grant, including budgets and claims).
- Total funds requested and local match.
- The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant requires a match of at least 20 percent of the amount requested or awarded. A space for describing how the match will be allocated is provided at the end of the application.
- Indication as to whether the applicant is applying as an administering agency for a consortium. If the applicant agency intends to apply as an administering agency for a consortium, the applicant must submit the PI-1500 Consortium Verification form as an addendum to the application with signatures from all consortium partners.

II. Overview

This section provides a brief overview of the grant program's purpose and requirements. This section links to the guidance webpage on the DPI website and this written guidance document. Applicants do not take any action on this section.

III. Abstract (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to provide a summary of the grant project proposal. Applicants might consider completing this section last, to effectively summarize details of their proposed grant project. Abstracts should summarize the following information:

- Who is the target population for the proposed grant program (teachers, mentors, etc.)?
- What need(s) are being addressed by the proposed program?
- What action(s) will be implemented by the proposed program to address the need?

Be brief but respond to each question posed above.

IV. State General Assurances

This section lists the general assurances that applicants, *including consortium partners*, agree to when applying. Applicants should read and understand these assurances. Failure

to comply with assurances may result in financial or legal consequences for the applicants.

V. Program Specific Assurances

This section lists the program specific assurances related to the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant. State law requires these assurances, but they apply only to this program. Applicants should read and understand these assurances in addition to the general assurances. Failure to comply with assurances may result in financial or legal consequences for the applicants.

VI. Certification/Signature (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks the applicant agency to provide a valid signature for an Agency Authorizer. An Agency Authorizer is an individual who has been authorized by the agency's board of control (such as a school board) to enter into legal agreements on behalf of the agency.

VII. Readiness (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to respond to 2 questions about stakeholder engagement in the project.

The Peer Review and Mentoring Grant *requires* that applications be developed with *significant* input from teachers.

The applicant should include information about input from teachers in this section, especially question b.

VIII. Plan (Needs Assessment) (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to respond to 3 questions about Demonstration of Need.

  a. Applicants must identify the need(s) being addressed by the proposed grant project and describe the supporting data used to determine the need(s). The need being addressed should be something directly related to the grant program. Wisconsin law requires these three things of WI districts related to their mentoring and induction program: 1) All beginning teachers have an assigned mentor, 2) Mentors have completed department-approved mentor training, and 3) Beginning teachers receive ongoing orientation and support. Applicants not currently meeting these requirements must focus their application on which of these is not currently met.
  b. Applicants must identify the root cause(s) contributing to the need(s) addressed by this grant project. A root cause is an underlying condition which is the source of the need. Applicants should identify and address root causes that are relevant to the grant and can be improved by the grant.

c. Applicants must define the Priority Area(s) or Statement(s) to address the root cause of the needs. Describe how the program will assist initial educators and enhance student instruction. The Priority Area or Statement describes the general approach the applicants will take to address the need and root cause using the grant.

IX. DO (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to create an Action Plan for accomplishing the proposed grant project. A table is provided where applicants can address the components of the Action Plan including:

- Action Steps
- Timeline
- Evidence of Completion
- Personnel Responsible

Applicants must create a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Appropriate, Realistic and Timely) goal that aligns with the practice and student outcome priority statement. Review the SMART Goal Example and Guide appendix in this document for more information.

> *Example: By the end of the 2024-25 school year, beginning special education teachers will increase proficiency with science-based literacy instruction techniques as measured by the Danielson Framework for Teaching components 1a: Applying Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, 1d: Using Resources Effectively 1e: Planning Coherent Instruction, and 1f: Designing and Analyzing Assessments to at least Proficient using evidence collected via observations or artifacts.*

The Action Plan Template calls for the applicant to reiterate the priority statement. The priority statement will not auto-populate based on prior responses and the applicant will have to copy and paste.

Action steps should be bite-sized actions that will bring the SMART goal closer to accomplishment over time. Action steps will identify the timeline for completion of the action step, what evidence will be collected to indicate completion, and identify the personnel responsible for carrying out or overseeing the action step and ensuring completion.

X. Study/Check (Evaluation) (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to:

- Describe what data will be collected to monitor the action steps, and
- In the event data indicates a need for change, to describe the process for changing or making improvements to the action steps.

DPI evaluates the effectiveness of PRMG at the state level. As part of that evaluation, DPI requires collaboration of applicants and applicants agree to collaborate with DPI as part of the State General Assurance number 7. Awardees must retain and provide to DPI and external evaluators upon request:

- The number of mentors trained under the grant.
- The number of new teachers (first three years of employment) served by mentors under the grant.
- The names, titles, and professional contact information of mentors and new teachers participating in activities under the grant.

XI. ACT (Coordination & Sustainability) (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to describe:

a. How will grant activities be coordinated with existing programs to maximize support for new educators, specifically asking applicants to describe the process for selecting, training, and defining the roles and responsibilities of mentors within the grant project?

Mentoring and induction programs don't operate in isolation. Coordinating across programs helps ensure effective use of funds. Coordinating could include or look like training mentors on the effectiveness rubrics so they can give effective feedback to teachers, training mentors or coaches in implementing new curriculum so they can help teachers implement the curriculum.

b. How grant progress will be communicated and results shared with internal and external stakeholders?
c. How will funding enhance and sustain the mentoring and induction programs?

Because the Peer Review and Mentoring Grant is competitive, sustainability is an important feature for applicants. Programs that embed knowledge and structures in applicants peer review and mentoring programs, by training staff, revising materials or creating structures, ensure sustainability across time.

XII-a. Budget Details (Requires Applicant Action)

There are three (3) pages in this section that will detail the specifics of the budget for the grant proposal's use of state grant dollars.

This cannot be skipped.

Do *not* include the local match spending on the budget detail pages. Applicants will provide the details of their local match spending on the Budget Narrative section. Use budget detail pages to account for spending of state grant dollars only.

This section must be completed with the relevant budget information including:

- The date of the request

Once completed on the Personnel Summary page of the Budget Detail section, this will auto-populate through the rest of the Budget Detail section.

- The WUFAR ([Wisconsin Uniform Financial Accounting Requirements](#)) Function codes

Applicants must select the appropriate WUFAR function codes for each line item in the budget detail section for the budget details to be matched to the budget summary. This cannot be skipped.

- The personnel/item names, position/titles, types of services, vendors, and quantities being budgeted

    Applicants may not know this information precisely, and it can be subject to change. For example, the total number of supplies being purchased may change.

    Estimations are acceptable, but the estimated information *must* be provided.

- Date(s) of service(s) to be provided

    Like the names, vendors, or quantities, the specific dates may be subject to change.

    Applicants can provide the estimated date or a date range, depending on what is appropriate. However, the information *must* be provided.

- Cost

    Like the specific staff names, vendors, quantities, or dates, the final cost may be subject to change.

    Applicants *must* provide estimates for the cost, even if the final cost is unknown. Costs should be estimated to the nearest dollar.

    Costs will automatically calculate in the "Total" row of each subsection of the Budget Detail. Use the Tab key to ensure you move between each fillable field. Using Tab to move between fillable fields should ensure that tabulations occur properly.

See the Fiscal Management section of this guidance for more information about proper budgeting.

XII-b. Budget Summary (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks the applicant to summarize the Budget Detail information according to the appropriate WUFAR function series: Instruction (100 000's), Support Services—Pupil and Instructional Staff Services (210/220 000's), and Support Services—Administration (230 000's and above).

The WUFAR code provided in the budget detail section is the guide to calculating the totals for each WUFAR object and function series on this page.

Do not simply lump all budget detail totals into the Instruction series.

Applicants **_must_** complete this section, including the date of the initial request.

XIII. Budget Narrative (Requires Applicant Action)

This section asks applicants to describe the budget in a narrative format. Applicants should narratively tie the budget to the accomplishment of the SMART goal(s) during the grant cycle.

This section also asks applicants to describe narratively the plan to meet the required 20 percent local match and support the accomplishment of the grant proposal's SMART goal(s).

This section is required and cannot be skipped.

Consortium Verification Form (Requires Applicant Action)

If the applicant agency intends to apply as an administering agency for a consortium, the applicant must submit the PI-1500 Consortium Verification form as an addendum to the application with signatures from all consortium partners.

This form asks the applicant to verify their consortium by collecting the signatures of Agency Authorizers for other partner institutions. Consortium partners agree to the terms of the grant application and assurances when they sign the consortium verification.

Application Review Process

All complete applications received by email at LEADgrants@dpi.wi.gov by 11:59 p.m. on May 1, 2024, will be reviewed. The review process takes place in two phases: external review and internal review.

Description of the external process

A group of external volunteer reviewers from the education community will review grant applications using the same rubric and guidance provided to applicants and internal reviewers. However, external reviewers do not make recommendations on budgets or award amounts. The external review is focused on the merits of the proposal narrative.

Description of the internal review process

DPI staff will review the projects to confirm ratings and approve or make modifications/revisions in the plans or budgets to fund as many projects as possible and ensure activities and budget items are approvable. All recommendations are presented to the state superintendent for final approval. Past performance and available data will be used in determining final awards.

Appeals

Applicants may appeal the decision to decline an award in this grant competition within 30 days of the DPI's decision. In order to be considered, an appeal must meet the requirements of Wis. Admin. Code § PI 1.03. The DPI shall review an appeal using the procedures specified under Wis. Admin. Code § PI 1.04. If an appeal meets the preceding requirements, the DPI shall issue a decision under Wis. Admin. Code § PI 1.08.

<u>Appendices</u>

This page is left intentionally blank.

Application Definitions and Terms

Educational Equity: Every student has access to the educational resources and rigor they need at the right moment in their education across race, gender, ethnicity, language, ability, sexual orientation, family background and/or family income.

Applicant Agency Authorizer: An individual who has been authorized by the agency's board of control (such as a school board) to enter into legal agreements on behalf of the agency.

Beginning Educator: An individual working in a licensed educational role within the first three (3) 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 their teaching career.

Induction: refers to a program of ongoing orientation and support implemented for beginning educators in a public school, including:
  a) An ongoing orientation for initial educators that is collaboratively developed and delivered by administrators, teachers, support staff and parents.
  b) Seminars that meet the needs and concerns of the initial educator and reflect the Wisconsin standards for teacher development and licensure.

Multi-year mentoring is one aspect of an induction program.

Initial Educator: An individual who fulfills any of the following:
  a) Holds a tier I guest teacher license under s. PI 34.030.
  b) Is employed as a tier I license holder in special education subject to the requirements under s. PI 34.039.
  c) Holds a tier II provisional educator license under s. PI 34.040 and has less than 3 years of experience.

Mentor: 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 of whom they are a peer. They have input into the confidential, formative assessment of a peer beginning educator, but that input is not considered a part of the formal evaluation process of the beginning educator.

Peer Review: The confidential, formative assessment provided to initial educators by peers outside of their formal evaluation, as per PI 38.04.

Student Outcome Priority Statement: A student outcome priority statement identifies the need(s) of the target population for this grant project. It includes specific supporting data (e.g., interim and summative student data, including disaggregated data for relevant

student subgroups; qualitative data, educator practice data, formative assessment data, etc.) used to determine need.

Example for a multi-year grant project: Based on the state Forward English Language Arts (ELA) exam in grades 3-8 in 2015-16 through 2017-18, students with disabilities (SwD), who make up over 21% of the student population—more than the average of 14%—are underachieving in ELA persistently each year, as compared to their non-disabled counterparts (SwoD).

Practice Priority Statement: A practice priority statement explains what the applicant hopes to accomplish (based on needs assessment). This may include adult practices and/or system changes. It is possible for an applicant to identify more than one student outcome priority statement. Practice priority statements use a format such as "we believe we can improve…. if we…."

Example for multi-year grant project: We believe we can begin to close the gap between the proficiency rates of SwD and SwoD if we create a consistent literacy framework. This framework will be created with input from literacy expertise and leadership to use for universal and supportive instruction and teacher professional development.

Root Cause(s): The reason(s) a problem exists.

Root Cause Analysis: A method of analysis designed to uncover the deepest root and most basic reasons for identified concerns.

Resource Inequities: The inequitable distribution of resources to support students. Resource inequities may contribute to or be the root cause(s) of the identified needs.

Theory of Action: A connected set of propositions; a logical chain of reasoning that explains how change will lead to improves practices.

Continuous Improvement Process (CIP): Continuous improvement is an ongoing cycle through readiness, plan, do, study/ check, and act. DPI has developed a CIP Rubric: https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/continuous-improvement/pdf/CIP_rubric_draft.pdf as a tool to assist LEAs and educational agencies in learning about the continuous improvement process. To learn more about the CIP, applicants are encouraged to talk to their CESA's TA Network contact: https://dpi.wi.gov/continuous-improvement/resources-supports/ta-network. For more resources on continuous improvement, applicants may also visit: https://dpi.wi.gov/continuous-improvement/resources-supports.

Data Inquiry Journal (DIJ): The DIJ is an interactive tool to lead educators through data inquiry and improvement planning. For more information on the DIJ, visit: https://dpi.wi.gov/continuous-improvement/resources-supports or the DIJ at a glance document: https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/continuous-improvement/pdf/DIJ_At-A-Glance_Update_5-16-19.pdf.

Budget Detail and Definitions

Consult your business office staff for support with Wisconsin Uniform Financial Accounting Requirements (WUFAR) prior to submitting for a grant. Coding is specific to the intent of the project being submitted. A complete handbook can be found here: https://dpi.wi.gov/sfs/finances/wufar/overview

WUFAR Function

Instruction (*WUFAR Function Coding 100 000 series*) - Activities dealing directly with the interaction between instruction staff and students.

Support Services

Pupil and Instruction Staff Services (*WUFAR Function Coding 210 000 and 220 000 Series*) - This includes support services that facilitate and enhance instruction or other components of the grant. This includes staff development, supervision and coordination of grant activities.

Administration (*WUFAR Function Coding 230 000 and above*) - This includes general: building; business; central service administration.

Indirect cost - Costs that are not readily identified with the activities funded by the federal grant or contract but are nevertheless incurred for the joint benefit of those activities and other activities and programs of the organization. Examples of such costs are accounting, auditing, payroll, personnel, budgeting, purchasing and maintenance and operation of facility. See DPI's website for more information on approved indirect cost rates: https://dpi.wi.gov/sfs/aid/grant-programs/indirect-cost-information

WUFAR Object

Salaries (WUFAR *Object Coding 100s*) - The funds dedicated to paid staff employed to carry out project services.

Fringe (WUFAR *Object Coding 200s*) - The costs for insurance and other employee benefit associated with salaries.

Purchased Services (*WUFAR Object Coding 300s*) - Appropriate costs associated with any contracted service that is paid from the grant. This includes: travel for people in the project, postage provided by UPS, phone charges, consultants, having something printed or duplicated, subscriptions, field trips, guest speakers, trainings and conferences. Stipends are also included in the category.

Non-Capital Objects (*WUFAR Object Coding 400s*) - Costs that are considered consumables. Included in this category are: workbooks, textbooks, food supplies, educational materials and supplies for project use (e.g., curriculum packages, books, etc.),

and professional resource materials (e.g., magazine subscriptions), reference materials, and informational materials for student programs.

Capital Objects (*WUFAR Object Coding 500s)* - Costs associated with equipment exceeding $5,000 or local capital objects threshold, if less than $5,000.

Other Objects *(WUFAR Object Coding 900s)* - Costs associated with memberships in professional or other organizations. Entrance fees and field trip fees.

Other Relevant Budget Definitions and Terms

Matching Costs (if applicable) - Describe the Source of Matching Funds (actual dollar amount) List all sources of matching funds. Matching funds may include in-kind facility, administrative support staff, and/or organizational costs (phone, laptop rental, etc.).

Direct costs - Costs that are incurred when the applicant agency spends money in excess of what is funded by the grant. As an example, perhaps $500 was approved for materials in the grant. If the applicant agency actually spent $700 for materials, the difference not paid by the grant may be used as matching funds.

In-kind costs - Typically services provided by the applicant agency or community that help to carry out approved grant activities. Such as, telephone use, computers, desks, staff volunteer hours, maintenance, and rent. These may also be used as matching funds.

SMART Goals Examples and Guide

Effective, useful evaluation begins with solid, measurable goals. Carefully defining your goals up front can make your work easier in the long run and lead to more positive results in your program. Goals should be based on identified need.

Characteristics of a Well Written Goal: SMART

S=Specific. Objectives should be specific and use only one action verb. Objectives with more than one verb are difficult to measure. Also, avoid verbs that may have vague meanings to describe intended outcomes (e.g., "understand" or "know") because they are too hard to measure. Instead, use verbs that allow you to document action (e.g., "At the end of the session, the students will list three concerns...") **Remember, the greater the specificity, the greater the measurability.**

M=Measurable. It is impossible to determine whether or not you met your objectives unless you can measure them. A benchmark from which to measure change can help. For example, if you found in your evaluation that 70 percent of high school students believe that their age protects them from alcoholism, you might write an objective that strives to decrease that percentage with faulty beliefs to 50 percent. Thus, you will have an objective with a benchmark from which to measure change and one which is specific enough to be evaluated quantitatively.

A=Appropriate. Your objective must be appropriate (e.g., culturally, developmentally, socially, linguistically) for your target population. To ensure appropriateness, objectives should originate from the needs of your target audience and not from a preconceived agenda of program planners. Conducting a solid needs-assessment (e.g., holding in-depth interviews with members of the target population) helps to ensure that your objectives will be appropriate. For example, an objective focusing on risk factors for an elementary school population may be inappropriate for a high school population.

R= Realistic. Objectives must be realistic. Countless factors influence human behavior. If program planners set their sights too high on achieving changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, or behavior change, they will likely fall short of reaching their objectives. While a program may have been very successful, it may not appear that way on the surface because the objectives were too ambitious. The following is an unrealistic ATODA objective:

• 100 percent of high school students participating in the N-O-T smoking cessation program will be smoke free 1 year after completing the program as measured by a follow-up survey. A more realistic objective might be 50 percent of high school students.

T=Time specific. It is important to provide a time frame indicating when the objective will be measured or a time by which the objective will be met. Including a time frame in your objectives can help in both the planning and the evaluation of a program.

Elements of a SMART Goal

SMART goals describe exactly how you expect your target audience to look after participating in your program. SMART goals can measure a variety of factors, including knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors, and protective factors. Always refer to changes you want to see in your data (rates, amounts, etc.).

Key elements of a goal can best be identified by answering the following question: *"Who will do how much of what by when as evidenced by what?"*

Who is your target population? How much change do you hope to see? What is your intended outcome? By when will your objective be met or measured? What will be used to measure your outcome?

Examples:

Knowledge/Skills –By June 2024, (BY WHEN), 80 percent (MEASURE POINT) of high school students completing the Project Northland curriculum will increase their knowledge of the risks associated with alcohol consumption (WHAT) by 30 percent (MEASURE POINT) as measured by pre-and post-tests (BY WHAT).

Assets/Protective Factors – By May 2024, (BY WHEN), as a result of implementing a teacher mentoring program, the number of middle school youth (WHO) who report feeling they have an adult at school they can talk to (WHAT) will increase by 10 percent (HOW MUCH) as measured by OYRBS (BY WHAT).

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. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015337.pdf.

Haynes, Mariana. PhD. 2014. On the Path to Equity: Improving the Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers. Washington, D.C., July. https://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/PathToEquity.pdf.

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. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Educator Effectiveness System User Guide for Teachers, Teacher Supervisors and Coaches. Retrieved March 11, 2019, from https://dpi.wi.gov/ee/resources-training.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. "Teacher Mentoring and Induction." Accessed March 11, 2019. https://dpi.wi.gov/education-workforce/develop-retain/induction-mentoring.

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