

§ 700.22

independently reevaluate and re-rate an application with appropriate changes made to the written comments.

(2) Reviewers are not convened to discuss an unsolicited application unless the Secretary determines that discussion of the application's strengths and weaknesses is necessary.

(d) Following discussion and any reevaluation and re-rating, reviewers shall independently place each application in one of three categories, either "highly recommended for funding," "recommended for funding" or "not recommended for funding."

(e) After the peer reviewers have evaluated, rated, and made funding recommendations regarding the applications, the Secretary prepares a rank order of the applications based solely on the peer reviewers' ratings.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(C))

§ 700.22 How are proposals for contracts evaluated?

(a) Each peer reviewer must be given a number of technical proposals to evaluate.

(b) Each peer reviewer shall—

(1) Independently evaluate each technical proposal;

(2) Evaluate and rate each proposal based on the reviewer's assessment of the quality of the proposal according to the technical evaluation criteria and the importance or weight assigned to those criteria; and

(3) Support the rating for each proposal with concise written comments based on the reviewer's analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal with respect to each of the applicable technical evaluation criteria.

(c) After each peer reviewer has evaluated each proposal independently, those reviewers who evaluated a common set of proposals may be convened to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of those proposals. Each reviewer may then independently reevaluate and re-rate a proposal with appropriate changes made to the written comments.

(d) Following discussion and any reevaluation and re-rating, reviewers shall rank proposals and advise the contracting officer of each proposal's acceptability for contract award as

34 CFR Ch. VII (7-1-02 Edition)

"acceptable," "capable of being made acceptable without major modifications," or "unacceptable." Reviewers may also submit technical questions to be asked of the offeror regarding the proposal.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(C))

Subpart D—Evaluation Criteria

§ 700.30 What evaluation criteria are used for grants and cooperative agreements?

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section, the Secretary announces the applicable evaluation criteria for each competition and the assigned weights in a notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER or in the application package.

(b) In determining the evaluation criteria to be used in each grant and cooperative agreement competition, the Secretary selects from among the evaluation criteria in paragraph (e) of this section and may select from among the specific factors listed under each criterion.

(c) The Secretary assigns relative weights to each selected criterion and factor.

(d) In determining the evaluation criteria to be used for unsolicited applications, the Secretary selects from among the evaluation criteria in paragraph (e) of this section, and may select from among the specific factors listed under each criterion, the criteria which are most appropriate to evaluate the activities proposed in the application.

(e) The Secretary establishes the following evaluation criteria:

(1) *National significance.* (i) The Secretary considers the national significance of the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the national significance of the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The importance of the problem or issue to be addressed.

(B) The potential contribution of the project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

(C) The scope of the project.

(D) The potential for generalizing from project findings or results.

(E) The potential contribution of the project to the development and advancement of theory and knowledge in the field of study.

(F) Whether the project involves the development or demonstration of creative or innovative strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(G) The nature of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) likely to result from the project and the potential for their effective use in a variety of other settings.

(H) The extent and quality of plans for disseminating results in ways that will allow others to use the information.

(2) *Quality of the project design.* (i) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) Whether the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.

(B) Whether there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed activities and the quality of that framework.

(C) Whether the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of research and development in the field, including a substantial addition to an ongoing line of inquiry.

(D) Whether a specific research design has been proposed, and the quality and appropriateness of that design, including the scientific rigor of the studies involved.

(E) The extent to which the research design includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for research activities, and the use of appropriate theoretical and methodological tools, including those of a variety of disciplines, where appropriate.

(F) The quality of the demonstration design and procedures for documenting project activities and results.

(G) The extent to which development efforts include iterative testing of products and adequate quality controls.

(H) The likelihood that the design of the project will successfully address the intended, demonstrated educational need or needs.

(I) How well and innovatively the project addresses statutory purposes, requirements, and any priority or priorities announced for the program.

(J) The quality of the plan for evaluating the functioning and impact of the project, including the objectivity of the evaluation and the extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project.

(3) *Quality and potential contributions of personnel.* (i) The Secretary considers the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The qualifications, including training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

(B) The qualifications, including training and experience, of key project personnel.

(C) The qualifications, including training and experience, of proposed consultants or subcontractors.

(4) *Adequacy of resources.* (i) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The adequacy of support from the lead applicant organization.

(B) The relevance and commitment of each partner in the project to the implementation and success of the project.

(C) Whether the budget is adequate to support the project.

(D) Whether the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project.

(E) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends.

(5) *Quality of the management plan.*

(i) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan of the proposed project.

§ 700.31

(ii) In determining the quality of the management plan of a proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the project, including the specification of staff responsibility, timelines, and benchmarks for accomplishing project tasks.

(B) The adequacy of plans for ensuring high-quality products and services.

(C) The adequacy of plans for ensuring continuous improvement in the operation of the project.

(D) Whether time commitments of the project director or principal investigator and other key personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet project objectives.

(E) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the project, including those of parents and teachers, where appropriate.

(F) How the applicant will ensure that persons who are otherwise eligible to participate in the project are selected without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

(G) The adequacy of plans for widespread dissemination of project results and products in ways that will assist others to use the information.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1850-0723)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(D)(ii))

§ 700.31 What additional evaluation criteria shall be used for grants and cooperative agreements?

In addition to the evaluation criteria established in § 700.30(e), the Secretary uses criteria or factors specified in the applicable program statute to evaluate applications for grants and cooperative agreements.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(D)(ii))

§ 700.32 What evaluation criteria shall be used for contracts?

(a) The evaluation criteria to be considered in the technical evaluation of contract proposals are contained in the FAR at 48 CFR 15.605. The evaluation criteria that apply to an acquisition and the relative importance of those

34 CFR Ch. VII (7-1-02 Edition)

factors are within the broad discretion of agency acquisition officials.

(b) At a minimum, the evaluation criteria to be considered must include cost or price and quality. Evaluation factors related to quality are called technical evaluation criteria.

(c) Technical evaluation criteria may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) Technical excellence.
- (2) Management capability.
- (3) Personnel qualifications.
- (4) Prior experience.
- (5) Past performance.
- (6) Schedule compliance.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(D)(ii))

Subpart E—Selection for Award

§ 700.40 How are grant and cooperative agreement applications selected for award?

(a) The Secretary determines the order in which applications will be selected for grants and cooperative agreement awards. The Secretary considers the following in making these determinations:

- (1) An applicant's ranking.
- (2) Recommendations of the peer reviewers with regard to funding or not funding.
- (3) Information concerning an applicant's performance and use of funds under a previous Federal award.
- (4) Amount of funds available for the competition.
- (5) Any other information relevant to a priority or other statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to the selection of applications for new awards.

(b) In the case of unsolicited applications, the Secretary uses the procedures in EDGAR (34 CFR 75.222(d) and (e)).

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6022(i)(2)(D)(i))

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6022(i)(2)(D)(i))

§ 700.41 How are contract proposals selected for award?

Following evaluation of the proposals, the contracting officer shall select for award the offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government considering cost or price and