

**PART 700—STANDARDS FOR THE CONDUCT AND EVALUATION OF ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)—EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND PROPOSALS FOR CONTRACTS**

**Subpart A—General**

Sec.

- 700.1 What is the purpose of these standards?  
700.2 What activities must be governed by these standards?  
700.3 What additional activities may be governed by these standards?  
700.4 What definitions apply?  
700.5 What are the processes of open competition?

**Subpart B—Selection of Peer Reviewers**

- 700.10 When is the peer review process used?  
700.11 Who may serve as peer reviewers?  
700.12 What constitutes a conflict of interest for grants and cooperative agreements?  
700.13 What constitutes a conflict of interest for contracts?

**Subpart C—The Peer Review Process**

- 700.20 How many peer reviewers will be used?  
700.21 How are applications for grants and cooperative agreements evaluated?  
700.22 How are proposals for contracts evaluated?

**Subpart D—Evaluation Criteria**

- 700.30 What evaluation criteria are used for grants and cooperative agreements?  
700.31 What additional evaluation criteria shall be used for grants and cooperative agreements?  
700.32 What evaluation criteria shall be used for contracts?

**Subpart E—Selection for Award**

- 700.40 How are grant and cooperative agreement applications selected for award?  
700.41 How are contract proposals selected for award?

AUTHORITY: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i).

SOURCE: 60 FR 47810, Sept. 14, 1995, unless otherwise noted.

**Subpart A—General**

**§ 700.1 What is the purpose of these standards?**

(a) The standards in this part implement section 912(i) of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994.

(b) These standards are intended to ensure that activities carried out by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (the Office) meet the highest standards of professional excellence.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(1))

**§ 700.2 What activities must be governed by these standards?**

(a) The standards in this part are binding on all activities carried out by the Office using funds appropriated under section 912(m) of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994.

(b) Activities carried out with funds appropriated under section 912(m) of the Act include activities carried out by the following entities or programs:

- (1) The National Research Institutes.
- (2) The Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination.
- (3) The Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouses.
- (4) The Regional Educational Laboratories.
- (5) The Teacher Research Dissemination Demonstration Program.
- (6) The Goals 2000 Community Partnerships Program.
- (7) The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(1))

**§ 700.3 What additional activities may be governed by these standards?**

(a) The Secretary may elect to apply the standards in this part to activities carried out by the Department using funds appropriated under an authority other than section 912(m) of the Act.

(b)(1) If the Secretary elects to apply these standards to a competition for new grant or cooperative agreement awards, the Secretary announces, in a notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, the extent to which these standards are applicable to the competition.

**§ 700.4**

(2) If the Secretary elects to apply these standards to a solicitation for a contract award, the Secretary announces in the request for proposals the extent to which these standards are applicable to the solicitation.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i))

**§ 700.4 What definitions apply?**

(a) *Definitions in the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994.* The following terms used in this part are defined in 20 U.S.C. 6011(l):

Development	Office
Dissemination	National Research
Educational	Institute
Research	Technical Assistance

(b) *Definitions in Education Department General Administrative Regulations.* The following terms used in this part are defined in 34 CFR 77.1:

Applicant	Grant
Application	Project
Award	Secretary
Department	

(c) *Definitions in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.* The following terms used in this part are defined in 48 CFR chapter 1:

Contracting Officer	Proposal
Employee of an Agency	Solicitation

(d) *Other definitions.* The following definitions also apply to this part:

*Act* means the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994 (Title IX of Pub. L. 103-227, 108 Stat. 212).

*EDAR* means the Education Department Acquisition Regulation, 48 CFR chapter 34.

*EDGAR* means the Education Department General Administrative Regulations, 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85 and 86. *FAR* means the Federal Acquisition Regulation, 48 CFR chapter 1.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011)

**§ 700.5 What are the processes of open competition?**

The Secretary uses a process of open competition in awarding or entering into all grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts governed by these

**34 CFR Ch. VII (7-1-00 Edition)**

standards. The processes of open competition are the following:

(a) For all new awards for grants and cooperative agreements, the Secretary will make awards pursuant to the provisions of EDGAR with the exception of the provisions in 34 CFR 75.100(c)(5), 75.200(b)(3), (b)(5), 75.210, and 75.217(b)(1), (b)(2), (c), and (d); and

(b) For contracts, the Department will conduct acquisitions pursuant to this part in accordance with the requirements of the Competition in Contracting Act, 41 U.S.C. 253, and the FAR.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2); 41 U.S.C. 253)

**Subpart B—Selection of Peer Reviewers**

**§ 700.10 When is the peer review process used?**

The Secretary uses a peer review process—

(a) To review and evaluate all applications for grants and cooperative agreements and proposals for those contracts that exceed \$100,000;

(b) To review and designate exemplary and promising programs in accordance with section 941(d) of the Act; and

(c) To evaluate and assess the performance of all recipients of grants from and cooperative agreements and contracts with the Office.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(B))

**§ 700.11 Who may serve as peer reviewers?**

(a) An individual may serve as a peer reviewer for purposes of reviewing and evaluating applications for new awards for grants and cooperative agreements and contract proposals if the individual—

(1) Possesses the following qualifications:

(i) Demonstrated expertise, including training and experience, in the subject area of the competition.

(ii) In-depth knowledge of policy or practice in the field of education.

(iii) In-depth knowledge of theoretical perspectives or methodological approaches in the subject area of the competition; and

(2) Does not have a conflict of interest, as determined in accordance with § 700.12.

(b) For each competition for new awards for grants and cooperative agreements—

(i) Department staff may not serve as peer reviewers except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Secretary; and

(ii) The majority of reviewers may be persons not employed by the Federal Government.

(2) For each review of an unsolicited grant or cooperative agreement application—

(i) Department employees may assist the Secretary in making an initial determination under 34 CFR 75.222(b); and

(ii) Department employees may not serve as peer reviewers in accordance with 34 CFR 75.222(c).

(c) To the extent feasible, the Secretary selects peer reviewers for each competition who represent a broad range of perspectives.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(B))

**§ 700.12 What constitutes a conflict of interest for grants and cooperative agreements?**

(a) Peer reviewers for grants and cooperative agreements are considered employees of the Department for the purposes of conflicts of interest analysis.

(b) As employees of the Department, peer reviewers are subject to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 208, 5 CFR 2635.502, and the Department's policies used to implement those provisions.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(B))

**§ 700.13 What constitutes a conflict of interest for contracts.**

(a) Peer reviewers for contract proposals are considered employees of the Department in accordance with FAR, 48 CFR 3.104-4(h)(2).

(b) As employees of the Department, peer reviewers are subject to the provisions of the FAR, 48 CFR part 3 Improper Business Practices and Personal Conflict of Interest.

(Authority: 41 U.S.C. 423)

**Subpart C—The Peer Review Process**

**§ 700.20 How many peer reviewers will be used?**

(a) Each application for a grant or cooperative agreement award must be reviewed and evaluated by at least three peer reviewers except—

(1) For those grant and cooperative agreement awards under \$50,000, fewer than three peer reviewers may be used if the Secretary determines that adequate peer review can be obtained using fewer reviewers; and

(2) For those grant and cooperative agreement awards of more than \$1,000,000, at least five reviewers must be used.

(b) Each contract proposal must be read by at least three reviewers unless the contracting officer determines that an adequate peer review can be obtained by using fewer reviewers.

(c) Before releasing contract proposals to peer reviewers outside the Federal Government, the contracting officer shall comply with FAR, 48 CFR 15.413-2(f).

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(B))

**§ 700.21 How are applications for grants and cooperative agreements evaluated?**

(a) Each peer reviewer must be given a number of applications to evaluate.

(b) Each peer reviewer shall—  
(1) Independently evaluate each application;

(2) Evaluate and rate each application based on the reviewer's assessment of the quality of the application according to the evaluation criteria and the weights assigned to those criteria; and

(3) Support the rating for each application with concise written comments based on the reviewer's analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the application with respect to each of the applicable evaluation criteria.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section, after each peer reviewer has evaluated and rated each application independently, those reviewers who evaluated a common set of applications are convened to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of those applications. Each reviewer may then

## § 700.22

independently reevaluate and re-rate an application with appropriate changes made to the written comments.

(2) Reviewers are not convened to discuss an unsolicited application unless the Secretary determines that discussion of the application's strengths and weaknesses is necessary.

(d) Following discussion and any reevaluation and re-rating, reviewers shall independently place each application in one of three categories, either "highly recommended for funding," "recommended for funding" or "not recommended for funding."

(e) After the peer reviewers have evaluated, rated, and made funding recommendations regarding the applications, the Secretary prepares a rank order of the applications based solely on the peer reviewers' ratings.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(C))

## § 700.22 How are proposals for contracts evaluated?

(a) Each peer reviewer must be given a number of technical proposals to evaluate.

(b) Each peer reviewer shall—

(1) Independently evaluate each technical proposal;

(2) Evaluate and rate each proposal based on the reviewer's assessment of the quality of the proposal according to the technical evaluation criteria and the importance or weight assigned to those criteria; and

(3) Support the rating for each proposal with concise written comments based on the reviewer's analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal with respect to each of the applicable technical evaluation criteria.

(c) After each peer reviewer has evaluated each proposal independently, those reviewers who evaluated a common set of proposals may be convened to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of those proposals. Each reviewer may then independently reevaluate and re-rate a proposal with appropriate changes made to the written comments.

(d) Following discussion and any reevaluation and re-rating, reviewers shall rank proposals and advise the contracting officer of each proposal's acceptability for contract award as

## 34 CFR Ch. VII (7-1-00 Edition)

"acceptable," "capable of being made acceptable without major modifications," or "unacceptable." Reviewers may also submit technical questions to be asked of the offeror regarding the proposal.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(C))

### Subpart D—Evaluation Criteria

#### § 700.30 What evaluation criteria are used for grants and cooperative agreements?

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section, the Secretary announces the applicable evaluation criteria for each competition and the assigned weights in a notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER or in the application package.

(b) In determining the evaluation criteria to be used in each grant and cooperative agreement competition, the Secretary selects from among the evaluation criteria in paragraph (e) of this section and may select from among the specific factors listed under each criterion.

(c) The Secretary assigns relative weights to each selected criterion and factor.

(d) In determining the evaluation criteria to be used for unsolicited applications, the Secretary selects from among the evaluation criteria in paragraph (e) of this section, and may select from among the specific factors listed under each criterion, the criteria which are most appropriate to evaluate the activities proposed in the application.

(e) The Secretary establishes the following evaluation criteria:

(1) *National significance.* (i) The Secretary considers the national significance of the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the national significance of the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The importance of the problem or issue to be addressed.

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

(C) The scope of the project.

(D) The potential for generalizing from project findings or results.

(E) The potential contribution of the project to the development and advancement of theory and knowledge in the field of study.

(F) Whether the project involves the development or demonstration of creative or innovative strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.

(G) The nature of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) likely to result from the project and the potential for their effective use in a variety of other settings.

(H) The extent and quality of plans for disseminating results in ways that will allow others to use the information.

(2) *Quality of the project design.* (i) The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) Whether the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the project are clearly specified and measurable.

(B) Whether there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed activities and the quality of that framework.

(C) Whether the proposed activities constitute a coherent, sustained program of research and development in the field, including a substantial addition to an ongoing line of inquiry.

(D) Whether a specific research design has been proposed, and the quality and appropriateness of that design, including the scientific rigor of the studies involved.

(E) The extent to which the research design includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for research activities, and the use of appropriate theoretical and methodological tools, including those of a variety of disciplines, where appropriate.

(F) The quality of the demonstration design and procedures for documenting project activities and results.

(G) The extent to which development efforts include iterative testing of products and adequate quality controls.

(H) The likelihood that the design of the project will successfully address the intended, demonstrated educational need or needs.

(I) How well and innovatively the project addresses statutory purposes, requirements, and any priority or priorities announced for the program.

(J) The quality of the plan for evaluating the functioning and impact of the project, including the objectivity of the evaluation and the extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the project.

(3) *Quality and potential contributions of personnel.* (i) The Secretary considers the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The qualifications, including training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

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

(C) The qualifications, including training and experience, of proposed consultants or subcontractors.

(4) *Adequacy of resources.* (i) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The adequacy of support from the lead applicant organization.

(B) The relevance and commitment of each partner in the project to the implementation and success of the project.

(C) Whether the budget is adequate to support the project.

(D) Whether the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project.

(E) The potential for continued support of the project after Federal funding ends.

(5) *Quality of the management plan.*

(i) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan of the proposed project.

## § 700.31

(ii) In determining the quality of the management plan of a proposed project, the Secretary may consider one or more of the following factors:

(A) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the project, including the specification of staff responsibility, timelines, and benchmarks for accomplishing project tasks.

(B) The adequacy of plans for ensuring high-quality products and services.

(C) The adequacy of plans for ensuring continuous improvement in the operation of the project.

(D) Whether time commitments of the project director or principal investigator and other key personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet project objectives.

(E) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the project, including those of parents and teachers, where appropriate.

(F) How the applicant will ensure that persons who are otherwise eligible to participate in the project are selected without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

(G) The adequacy of plans for widespread dissemination of project results and products in ways that will assist others to use the information.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1850-0723)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(D)(ii))

### **§ 700.31 What additional evaluation criteria shall be used for grants and cooperative agreements?**

In addition to the evaluation criteria established in § 700.30(e), the Secretary uses criteria or factors specified in the applicable program statute to evaluate applications for grants and cooperative agreements.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(D)(ii))

### **§ 700.32 What evaluation criteria shall be used for contracts?**

(a) The evaluation criteria to be considered in the technical evaluation of contract proposals are contained in the FAR at 48 CFR 15.605. The evaluation criteria that apply to an acquisition and the relative importance of those

## 34 CFR Ch. VII (7-1-00 Edition)

factors are within the broad discretion of agency acquisition officials.

(b) At a minimum, the evaluation criteria to be considered must include cost or price and quality. Evaluation factors related to quality are called technical evaluation criteria.

(c) Technical evaluation criteria may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) Technical excellence.
- (2) Management capability.
- (3) Personnel qualifications.
- (4) Prior experience.
- (5) Past performance.
- (6) Schedule compliance.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(D)(ii))

## **Subpart E—Selection for Award**

### **§ 700.40 How are grant and cooperative agreement applications selected for award?**

(a) The Secretary determines the order in which applications will be selected for grants and cooperative agreement awards. The Secretary considers the following in making these determinations:

- (1) An applicant's ranking.
- (2) Recommendations of the peer reviewers with regard to funding or not funding.
- (3) Information concerning an applicant's performance and use of funds under a previous Federal award.
- (4) Amount of funds available for the competition.
- (5) Any other information relevant to a priority or other statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to the selection of applications for new awards.

(b) In the case of unsolicited applications, the Secretary uses the procedures in EDGAR (34 CFR 75.222(d) and (e)).

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6022(i)(2)(D)(i))

### **§ 700.41 How are contract proposals selected for award?**

Following evaluation of the proposals, the contracting officer shall select for award the offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government considering cost or price and

the other factors included in the solicitation.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(D)(i))

**PART 701—STANDARDS FOR CONDUCT AND EVALUATION OF ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)—DESIGNATION OF EXEMPLARY AND PROMISING PROGRAMS**

**Subpart A—General**

Sec.

- 701.1 What is the purpose of these standards?
- 701.2 What definitions apply?
- 701.3 Who is eligible to submit an educational program for review?
- 701.4 What must a program sponsor submit for review?
- 701.5 What are the procedures for submitting an educational program for review by an expert panel?

**Subpart B—Selection of Panel Members**

- 701.10 How are panels established?
- 701.11 How is the membership of expert panels determined?

**Subpart C—The Expert Panel Review Process**

- 701.20 How does an expert panel evaluate programs?
- 701.21 What is the difference between an exemplary and a promising program?
- 701.22 What criteria are used to evaluate programs for exemplary or promising designation?

AUTHORITY: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i), unless otherwise noted.

SOURCE: 62 FR 61430, Nov. 17, 1997, unless otherwise note.

**Subpart A—General**

**§ 701.1 What is the purpose of these standards?**

- (a) The standards in this part implement section 941(d) of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994.
- (b) These standards are intended to provide quality assurance that educational programs designated by the U.S. Department of Education as either exemplary or promising have met cri-

teria that will allow educators, professional organizations, and others to use these programs with confidence.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(B)(iii) and (E), 6041(d))

**§ 701.2 What definitions apply?**

The following definitions apply to this part:

*Assistant Secretary* means the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

*Educational programs* mean educational policies, research findings, practices, and products.

*Program sponsor* means a party submitting an educational program for designation by the Secretary as either promising or exemplary.

*Secretary* means the Secretary of the Department of Education or an official or employee of the Department acting for the Secretary under a delegation of authority.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(B)(iii) and (E), 6041(d))

**§ 701.3 Who is eligible to submit an educational program for review?**

Any public or private agency, organization or institution, or an individual may submit an educational program for review.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(B)(iii) and (E), 6041(d))

**§ 701.4 What must a program sponsor submit for review?**

- (a) To have an educational program considered for designation as exemplary or promising, a sponsor must submit to the Secretary a description of the program, program materials, and a discussion of the program that is responsive to the criteria in § 701.22.
- (b) Information submitted must include, to the extent relevant to the particular program,—

- (1) A program abstract of 250 words or less;
- (2) A description of the salient features of the program;
- (3) A description of the program's philosophy and history;
- (4) Site information, including demographics;
- (5) A description of evaluation results;