(ii) Ensuring that the project is carried out by the group in accordance with Federal requirements.

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

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1066 and 1069)

[52 FR 30529, Aug. 14, 1987, as amended at 59 FR 41924, Aug. 15, 1994]

### § 607.13 How many applications for a development grant may an institution submit?

In any fiscal year, an institution of higher education that meets the eligibility requirements under sections 311, 316, and 317 of the HEA may—

(a) Submit an application for a development grant authorized under sections 311, 316, and 317 of the HEA; and

(b) Be part of a cooperative arrangement application.

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

[59 FR 41924, Aug. 15, 1994, as amended at 64 FR 70155, Dec. 15, 1999]

## Subpart C—How Does the Secretary Make an Award?

### § 607.20 How does the Secretary choose applications for funding?

(a) The Secretary evaluates an application on the basis of the criteria in—

(1) Sections 607.21 and 607.23 for a planning grant; and

(2) Sections 607.22, 607.23, 607.24, and 607.25 for a development grant.

(b)(1) With regard to applicants that satisfy the requirements of paragraph (d) of this section, for each fiscal year, the Secretary awards individual development grants to applicants that are not individual development grantees under this part, before the Secretary awards an individual development grant to any applicant that is an individual grantee under this part.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (b)(1) of this section, an institution that is a recipient of a cooperative arrangement grant is not an individual grantee under this part.

(c)(1) The Secretary awards up to 100 points for the criteria in § 607.21 and up to 100 points for the criteria in § 607.22.

(2) The maximum possible score for each complete criterion is in parentheses.

(d)(1) The Secretary considers funding an application for a planning grant that scores at least 50 points under § 607.21.

(2) The Secretary considers funding an application for a development grant that—

(i) Scores at least 50 points under § 607.22;

(ii) Is submitted with a comprehensive development plan that satisfies all the elements required of such a plan under § 607.8; and

(iii) In the case of an application for a cooperative arrangement grant, demonstrates that the grant will enable each eligible participant to meet the goals and objectives of its comprehensive development plan better and at a lower cost than if each eligible participant were funded individually.

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

[59 FR 41924, Aug. 15, 1994, as amended at 60 FR 15447, Mar. 23, 1995; 64 FR 70155, Dec. 15, 1999]

### § 607.21 What are the selection criteria for planning grants?

The Secretary uses the following criteria to evaluate an application to determine whether the applicant will produce a good comprehensive development plan and a fundable Strengthening Institutions Program application:

(a) *Design of the planning process.* (Total: 60 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the planning process that the applicant will use to develop a comprehensive development plan and an application for a development grant based on the extent to which—

(1) The planning process is clearly and comprehensively described and based on sound planning practice (15 points);

(2) The president or chief executive officer, administrators and other institutional personnel, students, and governing board members systematically and consistently will be involved in the planning process (15 points);

(3) The applicant will use its own resources to help implement the project (10 points); and

(4) The planning process is likely to achieve its intended results (20 points).

(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 institutional 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