§ 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 project 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.

§ 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—