

the Secretary establishes the following competitive preferences under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2). We will award an applicant, in addition to any points that it earns under the selection criteria for the category 1 awards, up to five additional points for addressing each preference (for a total of up to 10 preference points):

*Competitive preference (1)*—The grantee will provide detailed, high-quality information and technical assistance that will enable States, districts, and schools to select among multiple CSR providers, rather than provide such information or assistance concerning only one provider.

*Competitive preference (2)*—The grantee will assist urban and rural LEAs and schools in more than one State.

*Invitational Priority for Category 1 Applicants:* Under the Category 1 Competition, the Secretary is particularly interested in receiving applications from applicants that meet the following invitational priority:

The grantee will focus its efforts on providing States, LEAs, and schools with practical and useful information regarding the evidence of the success and effectiveness of widely-used comprehensive school reform models. The grantee will disseminate the findings of the reviews in a timely manner. Additionally, the grantee will provide direct technical assistance to States, LEAs, and schools in order to facilitate informed decision-making in the selection of models.

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(1) the Secretary does not give an application that meets the invitational priority a competitive or absolute preference over other applications.

*Invitational Priority for Category 2 Applicants:* For the Category 2 Competition there is no absolute priority, or competitive preference. However, the Secretary is particularly interested in applications from applicants that meet the following invitational priority:

The applicant has a demonstrated record of success in fostering the development and sustainability of multiple providers of comprehensive school reform models and services.

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(1) the Secretary does not give an application that meets this invitational priority a competitive or absolute preference over other applications.

*Selection Criteria:* We will use different selection criteria to evaluate the category 1 and category 2 applications.

### (I) Selection Criteria for Category 1 Applicants

We will use the following selection criteria and factors from the regulations at 34 CFR 75.210 in evaluating applications for grants under Category 1 “Technical Assistance in Making Informed Decisions. The maximum score for each criterion is indicated in parenthesis. Within each criterion, we will evaluate each factor equally.

The maximum score for all of the criteria is 100 points. Thus, the maximum score for this competition is 110 points (100 points under the selection criteria and 10 points under the competitive preferences).

(a) *Need for Project.* (15 points) In determining the need for the proposed project, we consider—

(1) The magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps and weaknesses.

(b) *Significance.* (5 points) In determining the significance of the proposed project, we consider—

(1) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to build local capacity to provide, improve, or expand services that address the needs of the target population.

(c) *Quality of the Project Design.* (35 points) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we consider—

(1) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.

(2) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project.

(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.

(d) *Quality of Project Personnel.* (30 points) In determining the quality of the personnel who will carry out the

proposed project, we consider the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

In addition, we consider—

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director; and

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.

(a) *Quality of the Project Evaluation.* (15 points) In determining the quality of the evaluation of the proposed project, we consider—

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the context within which the project operates.

### (II) Selection Criteria for Category 2 Applicants

We will use the following selection criteria and factors from the regulations at 34 CFR 75.210 in evaluating applications for grants under Category 2—Model Development and Capacity Building. The maximum score for each criterion is indicated in parenthesis. Within each criterion, we will evaluate each factor equally. The maximum score for all of the criteria is 100 points.

(a) *Need for the Project.* (15 points) In determining the need for the proposed project, we consider the extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps and weaknesses.

(b) *Significance.* (5 points) In determining the significance of the proposed project, we consider—

(1) The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(2) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

(3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.