the rationale for each eligible participating institution's decision to request grant funds as part of a cooperative arrangement rather than as an individual grantee.

(b) If the application is for a development grant, the application must contain—

(1) Each participating institution's comprehensive development plan;

(2) The information required under § 607.11; and

(3) An explanation from each eligible participating institution of why participation in a cooperative arrangement grant rather than performance under an individual grant will better enable it to meet the goals and objectives of its comprehensive development plan at a lower cost.

(4) The name of the applicant for the group that is legally responsible for—

(i) The use of all grant funds; and

(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) The Secretary informs applicants of the maximum possible score for each criterion in the application package or in a notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(c)(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 (c)(1) of this section, an institution that is a recipient of a cooperative arrangement grant is not an individual grantee under this part.

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

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

(2) 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; 70 FR 13373, Mar. 21, 2005]

§ 607.21 What are the selection criteria for planning grants?

The Secretary evaluates an application for a planning grant on the basis of the criteria in this section.

(a) *Design of the planning process.* 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;

(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;

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

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

(b) *Key personnel.* 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; and

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

(c) *Project Management.* 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; and

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

(d) *Budget.* 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)

[52 FR 30529, Aug. 14, 1987, as amended at 70 FR 13374, Mar. 21, 2005]

§ 607.22 What are the selection criteria for development grants?

The Secretary evaluates an application for a development grant on the basis of the criteria in this section.

(a) *Quality of the applicant's comprehensive development plan.* 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;

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

(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; and

(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.

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

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

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

(c) *Quality of implementation strategy.* The extent to which—

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

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

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

(d) *Quality of key personnel.* The extent to which—

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

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

(e) *Quality of project management plan.* The extent to which—

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

(2) The project coordinator and activity directors have sufficient authority