(b) Be part of a cooperative arrangement application.

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


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.


(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)

§ 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 to conduct the project effectively, including access to the president or chief executive officer.

(f) Quality of evaluation plan. The extent to which—

(1) The data elements and the data collection procedures are clearly described and appropriate to measure the attainment of activity objectives and to measure the success of the project in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan; 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 in achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan.

(g) Budget. The extent to which the proposed costs are necessary and reasonable in relation to the project’s objectives and scope.


§ 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