require a Master's degree or fifth-year requirement before an individual can be certified or licensed as a teacher. These students would be eligible to participate as long as their training meets the requirements for full State certification or licensure as a teacher.

(2) Pre-service administrator training. This priority provides—

(i) Support and training to Indian individuals to complete a master’s degree in education administration that is provided before the end of the award period and that allows participants to meet the requirements for State certification or licensure as an education administrator; and

(ii) One year of induction services, during the award period, to participants after graduation, certification, or licensure, while they are completing their first year of work as administrators in schools with significant Indian student populations.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7442 and 7473)

§ 263.6 How does the Secretary evaluate applications for the Professional Development program?

The following criteria, with the total number of points available in parenthesis, are used to evaluate an application for a new award:

(a) Need for project (5) points. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel in specific fields in which shortages have been demonstrated; and

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the community or region have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

(b) Significance (10) points. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following:

(1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increase effective strategies for teaching and student achievement;

(2) The likelihood that the proposed project will build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population; and

(3) The likelihood that the proposed project will result in system change or improvement.

(c) Quality of the project design (15) points. The Secretary considers the following factors in determining the quality of the design of the proposed project:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable;

(2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from scientifically-based research and effective practices on how to improve teaching and learning to support student proficiency in meeting rigorous academic standards;

(3) The extent to which performance feedback and continuous improvement of participant performance are integral to the design of the proposed project; and

(4) The extent to which the proposed project will establish linkages with other appropriate agencies and organizations providing educational services to the population of students to be served by the participants.

(d) Quality of project services (15) points. The Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge of scientifically-based research and effective practice;

(2) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in the achievement of students as measured against rigorous academic standards; and

(3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of the training and project services provided.

(e) Quality of project personnel (15) points. The Secretary considers the following factors when determining the
quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project:
(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director;
(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel; and
(3) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.

(f) Adequacy of resources (10) points. In determining the adequacy of support for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(1) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project;
(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the design of the program, program objectives, number of persons to be served, and the anticipated results and benefits; and
(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(g) Quality of the management plan (15) points. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(1) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the performance of program participants in meeting the needs of the population they are to serve;
(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project during the award period, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks; and
(3) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and other key personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

(h) Quality of the project evaluation (15) points. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the context within which the project operates and the effectiveness of project implementation strategies;
(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback on participants and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving the intended outcomes; and
(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective output measures that are directly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce both quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1810–0580)
(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7442)