

of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(f) *Quality of the Management Plan* (10 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The likelihood of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, time lines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.

(g) *Quality of the Project Evaluation* (15 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the project evaluation. In determining the quality of the project evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible; and

(2) The extent to which the evaluation meets the reporting requirements of section 1705(f) of the authorizing statute.

Competitive Priorities: These priority points are in addition to any points the applicant earns under the selection criteria. The selection criteria will not be used to evaluate these priorities. The Secretary may select an application that meets a priority over an application of comparable merit that does not meet the priority. The maximum number of points an application may earn based on the priority points and the selection criteria is 145 points.

Statutory Priorities

In accordance with the requirements of section 1705(c) of the authorizing statute and section 75.105(c)(2)(i) of EDGAR, the Secretary will award applications a total of up to twenty-five (25) additional points for addressing the following statutory priorities:

(1) Up to twenty (20) points for demonstrating a pervasive need for the development of pre-advanced placement or advanced placement courses for middle or high schools where there are few or no advanced placement courses currently available; and

(2) Up to five (5) points for demonstrating one or more of the following:

- Involvement of business and community organizations in the activities assisted;
- Availability of matching funds from State, local, or other sources to pay for a portion of the cost of activities to be assisted; or
- Intent to carry out activities to increase the availability of, and participation in, on-line advanced placement courses.

Evaluation Priority

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i), the Secretary will award a total of up to twenty (20) additional priority points to applicants that propose to conduct evaluation activities designed to assess the effectiveness of this program in one or more areas. The project is designed to determine whether the program implemented produces meaningful effects on student achievement or teacher performance through a rigorous evaluation. The evaluation preferably uses an experimental design. For the API program, an evaluation using an experimental design is one where subjects at the school or district level are randomly assigned to receive the program being evaluated or to be in a control group that does not receive the program. Evaluations using an experimental design will receive up to twenty (20) points.

If random assignment is not feasible, the project may employ a quasi-experimental design with carefully matched comparison conditions. This alternative design attempts to approximate a randomly assigned control group by matching subjects (students, teachers, classrooms or schools) with non-participants possessing similar pre-program characteristics. Evaluations using a quasi-experimental design will receive up to fifteen (15) points.

Proposed evaluations that use neither experimental designs with random assignment nor quasi-experimental designs using matched comparison groups will receive no points under this competitive priority.

Data from reliable and valid measures of the intervention that the program intends to implement and of the outcomes that the program intends to

effect should be collected before and after participation in the program or the comparison condition.

Points awarded under this priority will be determined by the quality of the proposed evaluation. In determining the quality of the evaluation, we will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a feasible, credible plan that includes:

(1) The type of design to be used (random assignment or matched comparison);

(2) Outcomes to be measured;

(3) A discussion of how schools or districts will be assigned to the program or matched for comparison with other schools or districts; and

(4) A proposed evaluator, preferably independent, with the necessary background and technical expertise to carry out the proposed evaluation.

Definitions

The following definitions and other provisions are taken from the API program authorizing statute, in Title I, Part G of the ESEA. They are repeated in this application notice for the convenience of the applicant.

As used in this section:

(a) The term *advanced placement test* means an advanced placement test administered by the College Board or approved by the Secretary.

Note: In addition to advanced placement tests administered by the College Board, the Department has approved advanced placement tests administered by the International Baccalaureate Organization. As part of the grant application process, applicants may request approval of tests from other educational entities that provide comparable programs of rigorous academic courses and testing through which students may earn college credit.

(b) The term *high concentration of low-income students*, used with respect to a school, means a school that serves a student population at least 40 percent or more of whom are low-income individuals.

(c) The term *low-income individual* means an individual who is determined by a State educational agency or local educational agency to be a child from a low-income family on the basis of data used by the Secretary to determine allocations under section 1124 of the ESEA, data on children eligible for free or reduced-price lunches under the National School Lunch Act, data on children in families receiving assistance under Part A of Title IV of the Social Security Act, or data on children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act, or through an alternate method that