

(4) Include evaluation of effects on job advancement, job performance (including, for example, such elements as productivity, safety and attendance), and job retention;

(5) Are systematic throughout the project period and provide data that can be used by the project on an ongoing basis for program improvement; and

(6) Will yield results that can be summarized and submitted to the Secretary for review by the Department's Program Effectiveness Panel.

NOTE TO §472.22(f)(6): The Program Effectiveness Panel (PEP) is a mechanism the Department has developed for validating the effectiveness of educational programs developed by schools, universities, and other agencies. The PEP is composed of experts in the evaluation of educational programs and in other areas of education, at least two-thirds of whom are non-Federal employees who are appointed by the Secretary. Regulations governing the PEP are codified in 34 CFR parts 785-789. Specific criteria for PEP review are found in 34 CFR 786.12 or 787.12.

(g) *Budget and cost-effectiveness.* (7 points)

(1) The budget is adequate to support the project;

(2) Costs are reasonable and necessary in relation to the objectives of the project; and

(3) The applicant has minimized the purchase of equipment and supplies in order to devote a maximum amount of resources to instructional services.

(h) *Demonstration.* (5 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the applicant's plan, during the grant period, to disseminate the results of the project, including—

(1) Demonstrating promising practices used by the project to others interested in implementing these techniques;

(2) Conducting workshops or delivering papers at national conferences or professional meetings; and

(3) Making available material that will help others implement promising practices developed in the project.

(i) *Commitment.* (5 points) The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the applicant's plan to institutionalize learning in the workplace based on promising practices demonstrated in the project. In

making this determination, the Secretary considers—

(1) The general, but realistic, forecast of literacy needs of members of the partnership and the capacity of the partners;

(2) Activities that will increase, during the grant period, the capacity of partners to provide a coherent program of learning in the workplace; and

(3) Activities that will lead to the continued provision or expansion of work-based literacy services built on successful outcomes of the project. For example, the partners could—

(A) Integrate workplace literacy services into the long-term planning of partner organizations;

(B) Create and implement policies and practices that encourage worker participation in workplace literacy and other education and training opportunities;

(C) Provide training that will enable partners to build a capacity to furnish necessary workplace literacy services in the future;

(D) Establish relationships within the partnership or with other entities that will continue provision of necessary workplace literacy services after the project ends; or

(E) Plan, after the project has ended, to expand services to other locations, divisions, or suppliers of the business or industry partners or labor organizations.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control numbers 1830-0507 and 1830-0521)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1211(a))

[54 FR 34418, Aug. 18, 1989. Redesignated at 57 FR 24091, June 5, 1992, and amended at 59 FR 1443, Jan. 10, 1994]

§ 472.23 What additional factor does the Secretary consider?

In addition to the criteria in §472.22, the Secretary may consider whether funding a particular applicant would improve the geographical distribution of projects funded under this program.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1211(a))