



PI-1657

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Peer Review and Mentoring Grant

Uniform Grant Rubric

2024-25

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

III. Abstract

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** The abstract had a missing or incomplete summary of the target population, the key needs, and/or the planned implementation approach(es).
- ⇒ **Developing (1 point):** The abstract included the necessary information but was vague in its descriptions of any of the following: the target population, summarized key needs, or summarized planned implementation approach(es).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (2 points):** The abstract summarized thoroughly the target population, the key needs, and the planned implementation approach(es).

VII. Readiness

1. Stakeholders

1a. Identification of Stakeholders and Stakeholder Roles

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** No stakeholders and/or stakeholder roles were identified.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The stakeholders or stakeholder roles were described vaguely.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The stakeholders and their roles were described, but there appeared to be little or no stakeholder representation from the target population or stakeholder roles did not necessarily support the grant program.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The stakeholders and corresponding roles were clearly described. The identified stakeholders represent the target population (mentors, mentees, district administrators, teachers, principals, or others). Described stakeholder roles support implementation of the grant program.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The stakeholders and corresponding roles were described in-depth. The identified stakeholders represent the target population (mentors, mentees, district administrators, teachers, principals, or others), includes community stakeholders (such as parents), and takes into account historically marginalized populations among stakeholders. Described stakeholder roles directly support implementation of the grant program.

1b. Stakeholder Input on Proposed Grant Project

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** No stakeholder input to inform the proposed grant project was described.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** Stakeholder input was described but few details were provided.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Stakeholder input was described but how this input informed the project was not clear.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Stakeholder input was described, and the description highlighted how the stakeholder input was used to inform the grant project. Stakeholder input from teachers contributed to the development of the grant program.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description of stakeholder engagement which ultimately elicited detailed input that informed the proposed grant project. Stakeholder input from teachers contributed to the development of the grant program to a great extent.

VIII. Plan

1. Demonstration of Need

1a. Identify overall need and corresponding supporting data

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was no overall need or supporting data included.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was no corresponding supporting data cited, and the description of the need was limited.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a limited amount of supporting data cited, and the supporting data did not address whether applicant(s) met PI 34 mentoring and induction requirements. The description of need was also limited.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Applicable supporting data was cited, including data related to the requirements of school districts in Wis. Admin. Code PI 34.040(5) to provide mentoring and induction, and the described need was supported by the data.
 - If the supporting data related to PI 34 requirements demonstrated that the applicant(s) did *not* meet all legal requirements, then the described need must address these incomplete requirements.
 - If the supporting data related to PI 34 requirements demonstrated that the applicant(s) *did* meet all legal requirements, then the described need may address other peer review and mentoring needs supported by data cited by applicant(s).
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The applicable supporting data cited met all the requirements of **Accomplished**, and demonstrated that applicant(s) connected relevant data to a clear analytic approach yielding findings that backed the identified needs.

1b. Likely root cause(s) contributing to the need(s) to be addressed

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was no root cause(s) listed.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** A root cause(s) was identified, but was not connected to the outlined need(s) or supporting data from question 1a.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** A root cause(s) was identified, but it was only partially aligned to the outlined need(s) and supporting data from question 1a.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** A root cause(s) was identified and closely aligned with the outlined need(s) and supporting data from question 1a.

1c. Priority Area(s) or Statement(s) to address the root cause(s).

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was no priority area(s) or statement(s) included.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a priority area(s) or statement(s) but it did not address the root cause(s).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a priority area(s) or statement(s) included but only vaguely addressed the root cause(s).
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The priority area(s) or statement(s) was included and partially addressed the outlined root cause(s).
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The priority area(s) or statement(s) was included and it fully addressed the outlined root cause(s).

IX. Do (Action Plan)

1. Action Plan's SMART Goal(s)

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was not a SMART goal to address the priority statement from Section VIII. Plan 1.c.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a goal but it does not meet all SMART goal criteria. Or it is a SMART goal that does not directly address the priority statement.

- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** The goal does not meet all SMART goal criteria but does address the priority statement.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The goal met all SMART goal criteria, and the SMART goal addressed the priority statement.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** The goal met all SMART goal criteria and was written clearly, and the SMART goal addressed the priority statement.

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

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was significant information missing in the action step, timeline, evidence, and/or personnel sections.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** The Action Plan's action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and/or personnel responsible were partially incomplete.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** Some action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible were included, but were not all well-aligned to the SMART goal.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** The Action Plan's action step(s), timeline, evidence of completion, and personnel responsible were fully addressed. The action step(s) aligned to the SMART goal.

X. Study/Check

1. 1. Evaluation

1a. Process to collect grant specific data

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** No process is described for how grant specific data will be collected.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a reference to collecting data, but data sources were not specified.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description of the process for collecting data, but the data described is not necessarily specific to the proposed program.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description of both what and how data specific to the proposed program will be collected.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a description of both what and how data specific to the grant proposal will be collected. The described data could clearly be used in order to refine, improve, and strengthen the project.

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

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** No process was described for changing or making improvements to the action step(s).
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a vague description of the process for changing or making improvements to the action step(s).
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There is a description of the process for how changes and/or improvements to the action step(s) would occur.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description of whether and how changes or improvements to the action step(s) would occur based on a review of the data
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a description of whether and how changes or improvements to the action step(s) would occur based on a review of the data, including a detailed plan for implementing needed changes or improvements to the action step(s).

XI. Act

2. Coordination & Sustainability

1a. Coordinate with initiatives/programs to address outlined priorities

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was no description of any coordination with existing or available initiatives or programs in order to address the priorities defined in the Action Plan.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There is an incomplete description of coordination with existing or available initiatives or programs in order to address the priorities defined in the Action Plan. The description did not address the process for selecting, training, and defining the roles and responsibilities of mentors.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a brief description of coordination with existing or available initiatives or programs in order to address the priorities defined in the Action Plan, including the process for selecting, training, and defining the roles and responsibilities of mentors.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a thorough description of coordination with existing or available initiatives or programs in order to address the priorities defined in the Action Plan, including the process for selecting, training, and defining the roles and responsibilities of mentors.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was a thorough description of coordination with existing or available initiatives or programs, including an analysis of how these initiatives or programs could complement one another to best address the priorities outlined in the Action Plan, including the process for selecting, training, and defining the roles and responsibilities of mentors.

1b. Process for ongoing communication

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was no description of planned procedures or protocols for ongoing communication.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There are some planned procedures or protocols described for ongoing communication, but the description was not clear about how communication will take place and with what stakeholders.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description of how communications with some internal or external stakeholders will occur using planned procedures.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Plan describes how communications with key internal/external stakeholders will occur, defines the means of communication, and what processes would be used.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** Plan includes an in-depth description for how communications with key internal/external stakeholders will occur regularly, clearly defines the means of communication, and clearly defines the processes to be used for communication.

1c. Sustaining the grant project

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was no description of the applicant'(s) capacity to sustain the grant project after the grant period.
- ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a vague description of the applicant'(s) capacity to sustain the grant project after the grant period, but it did not address local resources and relied on future grant funding for sustaining the grant project.
- ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description of the applicant'(s) capacity to sustain the grant project after the grant period, but it only briefly described local resources and relied somewhat on future grant funding for sustaining the grant project.
- ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** There was a description of the applicant'(s) capacity to sustain the grant project after the grant period that addressed the use of local resources and did not rely on future grant funding.
- ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** There was an in-depth description of the applicant'(s) capacity to sustain the grant project after the grant period that addressed the use of local resources, including local funding and staff allocation, and did not rely on future grant funding.

XIII. Budget Narrative

Use of grant funds

- ⇒ **Incomplete (0 points):** There was no information submitted.
 - ⇒ **Beginning (1 point):** There was a brief description of the plan, but it provided almost no information about how funds will be used.
 - ⇒ **Developing (2 points):** There was a description but was not sufficient to determine how funds will address the identified SMART goal(s) during the grant cycle.
 - ⇒ **Accomplished (3 points):** Description included how all funds will be used to address the identified SMART goal(s) during the grant cycle, how all identified uses for these funds are allowable under the grant guidance, and how the funds generally align with needs presented in the needs assessment.
 - ⇒ **Exemplary (4 points):** Narrative included an in-depth description of how all funds will be used to address the identified SMART goal(s) during the grant cycle. Narrative indicated that funding will be aligned to the needs presented in the needs assessment and are clearly allowable uses of these funds as per the grant guidance.
-