

**IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM (CFDA NO: 84.367B)  
MINNESOTA OFFICE OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
PROPOSAL REVIEW FORM**

Proposal No. Title: Grade Level: Reviewer's ID Number _____	Funding Requested: Subject: Total Score _____	Institution:
Recommendation: (Check one) Highly Recommended ( <input type="checkbox"/> )    Recommended ( <input type="checkbox"/> )    Not Recommended ( <input type="checkbox"/> )		Addresses needs of high need school: Yes ( <input type="checkbox"/> )    No ( <input type="checkbox"/> )
<b>DEMONSTRATED NEED AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS (30 Points)</b>		<b>SCORE</b> _____
1. Planning involving all members of the partnership.		
Comments:		
2. Documentation on how needs of participating schools were determined.		
Comments:		
3. Proposed activities address documented, real needs of participants in high need, low performing schools.		
Comments:		
4. Project design provides a measurable improvement in participant's teaching and instruction in the targeted discipline and measurable improvement in student learning.		
Comments:		

5. Positive change is documented in participant's teaching and content knowledge from previous ITQ projects conducted by applicant.

Comment:

**PLAN OF OPERATION (30 Points)**

**SCORE** \_\_\_\_\_

1. Goals are reasonable and clearly linked to demonstrated needs.

Comments:

2. Proposed objectives reflect Minnesota Academic Standards and program funding priorities for content knowledge and teaching skills improvement.

Comments:

3. Proposed activities and project evaluation reflect project goals and objectives.

Comments:

4. Proposed activities are research based, reflective of effective professional development, and will have a demonstrable impact on student achievement and teacher distribution.

Comments:

5. Methods and practices will be used to help participants have specialized knowledge and skills to be effective with students from high need, low performing schools.

Comments:

6. The recruitment plan ensures participation by high need, low performing schools.

Comments:

**EVALUATION PLAN (15 Points)**

**SCORE \_\_\_\_\_**

1. The extent to which the proposed method of evaluation is objective, adequately measures achievement of goals and effectiveness of activities.

Comments:

2. The extent to which the proposed method of evaluation assesses the connection between teacher in-service and classroom practice and student outcomes.

Comments:

3. The extent to which the proposed method of evaluation assesses the project's impact on student achievement.

Comments:

<b>RESOURCE ADEQUACY, PARTNERSHIP'S COMMITMENT, QUALITY OF PERSONNEL (15 Points)</b>	<b>SCORE</b> _____
1. Resources are adequate to meet project's objectives.	
Comments:	
2. The proposing partnership demonstrates commitment to the project and documents a management plan to achieve the objectives on time.	
Comments:	
3. The project staff has qualifications and experience appropriate for their assignments.	
Comments:	
4. The staff size and time commitment are appropriate for a quality project.	
Comments:	
<b>BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS (10 Points)</b>	<b>SCORE</b> _____
1. The budget is clear, concise, and justified by the budget narrative.	
Comments:	

2. The budget is cost effective and reflective of RFP and project objectives.

Comments:

3. Additional resources are provided, such as in-kind support, school district support, and funds from other local, state, and national sources.

Comments:

**SUMMARY COMMENTS**

**Strengths in Relation to Improving Teacher Quality Program Priorities**

**Weaknesses in Relation to Improving Teacher Quality Program Priorities**

**If funding is recommended, are there conditions to be met prior to funding?**

**What are they?\***

\*use additional pages, if necessary