

Supplemental Instructions for the Project Narrative

Note: If you choose to respond to one of the Competitive Preference Priorities, please include a separate bold heading. The applicant may choose where to include the competitive preference priority response within the project narrative.

Applicants MUST address each of the following HSI selection criteria:

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| a. Quality of Comprehensive Development Plan (34 CFR 606.22 (a)) | (20 points) |
| b. Quality of the Project Design (34 CFR 75.210) | (5 points) |
| c. Quality of the Activity Objectives (34 CFR 606.22 (b)) | (15 points) |
| d. Quality of the Implementation Strategy (34 CFR 606.22 (c)) | (15 points) |
| e. Quality of the Project Management Plan (34 CFR 606.22 (e)) | (10 points) |
| f. Quality of the Key Personnel (34 CFR 606.22 (d)) | (5 points) |
| g. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (34 CFR 606.22 (f)) | (15 points) |
| h. Quality of the Budget (34 CFR 606.22 (g)) | (5 points) |

Total Maximum Score for Selection Criteria points	90
--	-----------

Total Maximum Score for Competitive Preference Priority points	10
---	-----------

<u>TOTAL POSSIBLE SCORE PER APPLICATION POINTS</u>	<u>100</u>
---	-------------------

The following guidance may assist you in addressing the questions that will be used to evaluate your responses to the selection criteria:

(a) Quality of the applicant's comprehensive development plan. (Up to 20 points)

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; (up to 5 points)

(2) The goals for the institution's academic programs, institutional management, and fiscal stability are realistic and based on comprehensive analysis; (up to 5 points)

(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 (up to 5 points)

(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. (Up to 5 points)

(b) Quality of the project design. (Up to 5 points)

The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which the proposed project is supported by strong theory (as defined in the Notice).

(c) Quality of the activity objectives. (Up to 15 points)

The extent to which the objectives for each activity are--

(1) Realistic and defined in terms of measurable results; (up to 5 points) and

(2) Directly related to the problems to be solved and to the goals of the comprehensive development plan. (up to 10 points)

(d) Quality of the implementation strategy. (Up to 15 points)

The extent to which--

(1) The implementation strategy for each activity is comprehensive; (up to 5 points)

(2) The rationale for the implementation strategy for each activity is clearly described and is supported by the results of relevant studies or projects; (up to 5 points) and

(3) The timetable for each activity is realistic and likely to be attained. (up to 5 points)

(e) Quality of the project management plan. (Up to 10 points)

The extent to which--

(1) Procedures for managing the project are likely to ensure efficient and effective project implementation; (up to 5 points) 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. (up to 5 points)

(f) Quality of the key personnel. (Up to 5 points)

The extent to which--

(1) The past experience and training of key professional personnel are directly related to the stated activity objectives; (up to 2 points) and

(2) The time commitment of key personnel is realistic. (up to 3 points)

(g) Quality of the evaluation plan. (Up to 15 points)

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; (up to 5 points)

(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 on achieving the goals of the comprehensive development plan; (up to 5 points) and

(3) The evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings. (up to 5 points)

(h) Quality of the Budget. (up to 5 points)

The extent to which the proposed costs are necessary and reasonable in relation to the project's objectives and scope.

Invitational Priority: The Department is inviting applicants to focus on the various aspects of the teacher preparation pipeline. If applicable, address within the Project Narrative. Use a **bold** heading. Although this is the invitational priority this year, projects can vary. (Response is optional, not required.)

Competitive Preference Priorities: If applicable, include your response within the Project Narrative. Use a **bold** heading.

- **Competitive Preference Priority 1 (up to 10 (ten) additional points):** Projects that establish or enhance a program of teacher education designed to qualify teacher candidates to teach in public elementary schools and secondary schools.

- **Competitive Preference Priority 2 (up to 10 (ten) additional points):** Projects that develop or enhance articulation agreements and/or student support programs designed to facilitate the transfer from 2-year to 4-year institutions.