

(b) *Key personnel.* (Total: 20 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of key personnel to be involved in the project based on the extent to which—

(1) The past experience and training of key personnel such as the project coordinator and persons who have key roles in the planning process are suitable to the tasks to be performed (10 points); and

(2) The time commitments of key personnel are adequate (10 points).

(c) *Project Management.* (Total: 15 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the plan to manage the project effectively based on the extent to which—

(1) The procedures for managing the project are likely to ensure effective and efficient project implementation (10 points); and

(2) The project coordinator has sufficient authority, including access to the president or chief executive officer, to conduct the project effectively (5 points).

(d) *Budget.* (Total: 5 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the extent to which the proposed project costs are necessary and reasonable.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1840-0114)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1057-1059, 1066-1069)

§ 607.22 What are the selection criteria for development grants?

The Secretary uses the following criteria to evaluate applications for development grants:

(a) *Quality of the applicant's comprehensive development plan.* (Total: 30 points) The extent to which—

(1) The strengths, weaknesses, and significant problems of the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability are clearly and comprehensively analyzed and result from a process that involved major constituencies of the institution. (12 points);

(2) The goals for the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability are realistic and based on comprehensive analysis. (5 points);

(3) The objectives stated in the plan are measurable, related to institu-

tional goals, and, if achieved, will contribute to the growth and self-sufficiency of the institution (5 points);

(4) The plan clearly and comprehensively describes the methods and resources the institution will use to institutionalize practice and improvements developed under the proposed project, including, in particular, how operational costs for personnel, maintenance, and upgrades of equipment will be paid with institutional resources (8 points).

(b) *Quality of activity objectives.* (Total: 10 points) The extent to which the objectives for each activity are—

(1) Realistic and defined in terms of measurable results (5 points); and

(2) Directly related to the problems to be solved and to the goals of the comprehensive development plan (5 points).

(c) *Quality of implementation strategy.* (Total: 25 points) The extent to which—

(1) The implementation strategy for each activity is comprehensive (10 points);

(2) The rationale for the implementation strategy for each activity is clearly described and is supported by the results of relevant studies or projects (10 points); and

(3) The timetable for each activity is realistic and likely to be attained (5 points).

(d) *Quality of key personnel.* (Total: 10 points) The extent to which—

(1) The past experience and training of key professional personnel are directly related to the stated activity objectives (7 points); and

(2) The time commitment of key personnel is realistic (3 points).

(e) *Quality of project management plan.* (Total: 10 points) The extent to which—

(1) Procedures for managing the project are likely to ensure efficient and effective project implementation (5 points); and

(2) The project coordinator and activity directors have sufficient authority to conduct the project effectively, including access to the president or chief executive officer (5 points).

(f) *Quality of evaluation plan.* (Total: 10 points) The extent to which—

(1) The data elements and the data collection procedures are clearly described and appropriate to measure the

§ 607.23

34 CFR Ch. VI (7-1-01 Edition)

attainment of activity objectives and to measure the success of the project in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan (5 points); and

(2) The data analysis procedures are clearly described and are likely to produce formative and summative results on attaining activity objectives and measuring the success of the project on achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan (5 points).

(g) *Budget.* (Total: 5 points) The extent to which the proposed costs are necessary and reasonable in relation to the project's objectives and scope.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1840-0114)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1057-1059, 1066-1069f)

[59 FR 41924, Aug. 15, 1994]

§ 607.23 What special funding consideration does the Secretary provide?

(a) If funds are available to fund only one additional planning grant and each of the next fundable applications has received the same number of points under § 607.21, the Secretary awards additional points, up to a maximum of two points, to any of those applicants that—

(1) Has an endowment fund of which the current market value, per full-time equivalent enrolled student, is less than the average current market value of the endowment funds, per full-time equivalent enrolled student, at similar type institutions; (one point) or

(2) Has expenditures for library materials per full-time equivalent enrolled student which is less than the average expenditure for library materials per full-time equivalent enrolled student at similar type institutions. (one point)

(b) If funds are available to fund only one additional development grant and each of the next fundable applications has received the same number of points under § 607.22, the Secretary will award additional points, up to a maximum of three points, to any of those applicants that—

(1) Has an endowment fund of which the current market value, per full-time equivalent enrolled student, is less than the average current market value of the endowment funds, per full-time equivalent enrolled student, at com-

parable institutions that offer similar instruction; (one point)

(2) Has expenditures for library materials per full-time equivalent enrolled student which are less than the average expenditures for library materials per full-time equivalent enrolled student at comparable institutions that offer similar instruction (one point); or

(3) Propose to carry out one or more of the following activities—

(i) Faculty development;

(ii) Funds and administrative management;

(iii) Development and improvement of academic programs;

(iv) Acquisition of equipment for use in strengthening management and academic programs;

(v) Joint use of facilities; and

(vi) Student services. (one point)

(c) As used in this section, an endowment fund does not include any fund established or supported under 34 CFR part 628.

(d) Each year, the Secretary provides prospective applicants with the average expenditure of endowment funds and library materials per full-time equivalent student.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1057 *et seq.*)

[52 FR 30529, Aug. 14, 1987, as amended at 59 FR 41925, Aug. 15, 1994; 60 FR 15447, Mar. 23, 1995; 64 FR 70155, Dec. 15, 1999]

§ 607.24 How does the Secretary use an applicant's performance under a previous development grant when awarding a development grant?

(a)(1) In addition to evaluating an application under the selection criteria in § 607.22, the Secretary evaluates an applicant's performance under any previous development grant awarded under the Strengthening Institutions Program that expired within five years of the year when the development grant will begin.

(2) The Secretary evaluates whether the applicant fulfilled, or is making substantial progress toward fulfilling, the goals and objectives of the previous grant, including, but not limited to, the applicant's success in institutionalizing practices developed and improvements made under the grant.

(3) The Secretary bases the evaluation of the applicant's performance on information contained in—