

Transcript

September 6, 2024, 6:38PM

□ **Stein, Jessica** started transcription

BM Bentley-Memon, Millicent 0:08

Hello, and welcome everyone to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Migrant Education's pre application webinar for the fiscal year 2025 High School Equivalency Program, or HEP, and the College Assistance Migrant Program, or CAMP, competitions. I'm Millie Bentley-Memon, Group Leader for HEP and CAMP in the Office of Migrant Education at the US Department of Education.

And I'm very pleased to be joined by Dylan Hart-Medina, HEP and CAMP Team Lead, Jessica Stein, HEP and CAMP Program Officer, and Katrina Ballard, Office of Migrant Education Subject Matter Expert on Data and Evaluation.

Before we dive in, a word of caution about this webinar. This webinar is a review of some items in the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIAs, and application packages, but not all of the information will be covered.

This webinar will not focus on specific application submission instructions, so please be sure to read the common instructions for applicants on the page.

Also, I cannot overemphasize how important it is to read the complete Notice Inviting Applications, application package, application submission instructions, and all other references or related statutes, regulations, instructions, et cetera.

We also want to emphasize and encourage you to start your application early to avoid any submission issues.

Please note that the best way to get help with the actual submission of your application and work on grants.gov is to go directly to the source.

Please call this number or email this mailbox with any grants.gov questions or issues. The hours of operation for grants.gov are listed on this slide. This presentation will be posted on the HEP and CAMP application pages. Further, if you have any questions regarding the webinar or any other competition related questions, please email the mailbox at HEPCAMPFY25@ed.gov.

Here are the sections of the notice inviting applications.

Funding opportunity numbers. Although you can find the grant by doing a keyword search on grants.gov on my grant, the more direct route is to search by the funding

opportunity number, the funding opportunity number for each page is listed on this slide.

Application submission deadline. The application deadline will be November 13th, 2024 at 11:59 PM EST. Please note that there are no exceptions to this deadline, so please submit applications early to account for any unexpected delays or issues.

Let's begin with the foundation of our work, which is our office's mission.

The mission of the office of Migrant Education is to provide excellent leadership, technical assistance, and financial support to improve the educational opportunities and academic success of migratory children, youth, agricultural workers, fishers, and their families.

This slide shows the purposes of HEP and CAMP. CAMP is designed to assist migratory or seasonal farm workers or immediate family members of such workers who are enrolled or who are admitted for enrollment on a full-time basis at an institution of higher education, or IHE, to complete their first academic year. HEP is designed to assist migratory or seasonal farmworkers or immediate family members of such workers to obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain improved employment, enter military service, or be placed in an institution of higher education or other postsecondary education or training.

The authorizing legislation is shown on this slide. Please note that more information on the text of the CAMP and HEP sections of the Higher Education Act and the corresponding program regulations can be found in the notice inviting applications and application packages.

The OMB guidance for Federal Financial Assistance, which was formerly called Office of Management and Budget Guidance for Grants and Agreements, amends 2 CFR Part 200 effective October 1st, 2024. HEP and CAMP applicants should follow the requirements in the updated 2 CFR part 200.

For more information about these updated regulations, please visit the website on this slide.

Next, I'll turn it over to Dylan Hart-Medina, HEP and CAMP Team Lead.

 **Hart Medina, Dylan** 5:41

Thank you, Millie.

Estimated award amounts. The administration has requested \$6,650,000 for new awards for HEP for fiscal year 2025 and 5,225,000 for new awards for CAMP for fiscal year 2025.

The actual level of funding, if any, depends on final congressional action. However, we are inviting applications to allow enough time to complete the grant process. If Congress appropriates funds for this program, the range of awards for both HEP and CAMP are \$180,000 to \$475,000.

The minimum award for each year of each grant is \$180,000.

The estimated awards for CAMP is 11 and the estimated awards for HEP is 14.

Minimum and maximum award reminders.

Make sure your application reflects a budget of at least \$180,000 minimum in all five project years.

The Department will not make an award for less than the amount of \$180,000 for a single budget period of 12 months.

Please be aware of the maximum award amount of \$475,000 in each of the five project years.

If you go over this maximum, your application may be removed from the competition. The Department may reject any application that does not propose a five year project as indicated by the submitted budget information on the ED 524 form.

Eligible entities.

Who is eligible to participate as a grantee?

The eligible entities include an institution of higher education, or IHE, or a private nonprofit organization.

Each may apply for a grant to operate a HEP or CAMP project.

If a private nonprofit organization other than an IHE applies for a HEP or CAMP grant, that agency must plan the project in cooperation with an IHE and must propose to operate the project or, in the case of a HEP grant, some aspects of the project with the facilities of that IHE.

The HEP has one competitive preference priority and two invitational priorities.

The competitive preference priority is consideration of prior experience, which is up to 15 points; one invitational priority for promoting multilingualism to equip participants with language skills necessary to thrive in a globalized world; and one invitational priority for meeting students' social, emotional, and academic needs.

The CAMP has one competitive preference priority and two invitational priorities.

The competitive preference priority is consideration of prior experience up to 15 points; one invitational priority for promoting multilingualism to equip participants with language skills necessary to thrive in a globalized world; and one Invitational priority for meeting students' social, emotional, and academic needs.

Just a note on the competitive preference priority for consideration of prior experience points.

These points are awarded by the Department based on the grantee's prior performance as determined by relevant data already collected by the Department. Applicants are not asked to respond to the competitive preference priority consideration of prior experience.

However, if applicants would like to include information about their prior experience implementing HEP or CAMP grant, they may do so under the abstract section, the project design section of the application, or another section of the project narrative as the applicant sees fit.

How the Department evaluates the HEP competitive priority for prior experience. The Secretary will consider the applicant's prior experience in implementing its expiring HEP project with respect to whether the applicant served the number of participants described in its approved application; the extent to which the applicant met or exceeded its funded objectives with regard to project participants, including the targeted number and percentage of participants who received a general educational development credential, GED; and GED credential recipients who were reported as entering postsecondary education programs, career positions or the military; and the extent to which the applicant met administrative requirements, including record keeping, reporting, and financial accountability under the terms of the previously funded award.

One additional note on the HEP competitive preference priority.

Although regulations refer to general education development, GED, credentials, the Department recognizes that there are multiple examinations through which high school equivalency, HSE, can be earned and for the purposes of this notice uses GED interchangeably with HSE.

HEP invitational priority for promoting multilingualism to equip participants with language skills necessary to thrive in a globalized world. Within a project designed to assist HEP participants obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma, we invite projects that recognize and increase awareness of the benefits of proficiency in more than one language to help participants attain good jobs that provide a living wage, access to full benefits, and equitable opportunities for advancement.

How the Department evaluates the CAMP competitive priority for prior experience. The Secretary will consider the applicant's prior experience in implementing its expiring CAMP project with respect to whether the applicant served the number of

participants described in its approved application; The extent to which the applicant met or exceeded its funding funded objectives with regard to project participants, including the targeted number and percentage of participants who successfully completed the first year of college and continue to be enrolled in postsecondary education after completing their first year of college; and the extent to which the applicant met administrative requirements, including record keeping, reporting and financial accountability under the terms of the previously funded award.

CAMP invitational priority for promoting multilingualism to equip participants with language skills necessary to thrive in a globalized world. Within a project designed to assist CAMP participants to complete their first academic year at an IHE, we invite projects that do one or both of the following: a) encourage the development of language skills and proficiency in an additional language recognizing the cognitive, economic, and cultural benefits of multilingualism; b) encourage and support CAMP participants, especially participants who have attained a Seal of Biliteracy, to explore careers in which there is a high demand for bilingual and multilingual professionals with the intention that participants will attain good jobs that provide a competitive wage, access to family sustaining benefits, and equitable opportunities for advancement.

The HEP and CAMP invitational priority meeting students' social, emotional, and academic needs. Within a project designed to assist HEP and CAMP students, we invite projects that are designed to improve student social, emotional, academic, and career development through one or both of the following: a) creating a positive, inclusive and identity safe climate at IHEs through fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion for students who are migratory or seasonal farm workers or immediate family members of such workers. b) fostering partnerships, including across government agencies, local education agencies, community based organizations, adult learning providers, and postsecondary institutions to provide comprehensive services to students who are migratory or seasonal farmworkers or immediate family members of such workers and their families that support students' social, emotional, mental health and academic needs and that are inclusive with regard to race, ethnicity, culture, language, and disability status.

Application submission. Applicants are required to follow the Common Instructions for Applicants to the Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs.

This was published in the Federal Register on December 7th, 2022, and available at the link on the slide.

Applicants are also required to follow 34 CFR Section 206 that states what must be included in an application.

Those requirements are also available at the link on this page.

Application requirements. Applicants must provide a management plan that provides assurances that the staff have a demonstrated knowledge of and will be sensitive to the unique characteristics and needs of the migrant and seasonal farmworker population. Must also provide a management plan that provides provisions for staff in service training, training and technical assistance, staff travel, student travel, interagency coordination, and project evaluation.

Application requirements - additional assurances.

Applicants must provide assurance that the that the grantee will develop and implement a plan for identifying, informing, and recruiting eligible participants who are most in need of the academic and supporting services and financial assistance provided by the project, and additional assurances that the grantee will develop and implement a plan for identifying and using the resources of the participating IHE and the community to supplement and enhance the services provided by the project.

Now at this time, I'll turn it over to Jessica Stein.

SJ **Stein, Jessica** 18:52

Thank you, Dylan.

Now we will review the program performance targets for HEP.

The program performance measure one target is 69%.

This is the percentage of HEP participants exiting the program having received a high school equivalency known as an HSE diploma.

The program performance measure two target is 80%.

This is the percentage of HSE diploma recipients who enter postsecondary education or training programs, upgraded employment, or the military.

Next, we will review the program performance targets for CAMP.

The program performance measure one target is 86%.

This is the percentage of CAMP participants completing the first academic year of their postsecondary program.

The program performance measure two target is 92%.

This is the percentage of CAMP participants who, after completing the first academic year of college, continue their postsecondary education.

Next, we will review the project objectives.

Program performance measures are core objectives that apply to all grantees, and applicants must propose annual targets for these measures and establish annual student enrollment targets.

Projects may also establish their own goals within the scope of the program's authorizing legislation and regulations.

Program performance measures may not address all the needs that you have identified for your project.

There is no minimum or maximum for the number of project objectives you propose. However, you need to be mindful that you will be in competition with others and that you will be held to everything you propose.

Next, we will review the selection criteria.

Selection criteria determines the order and organization of the project narrative, the quality of the content is key.

However, errors in grammar and spelling may obscure your content.

Readers will use the information contained within all sections of the application to award points for relevant selection criteria responses.

Next, I will add a note on selection criteria.

The Department published updates to the Education Department General Administrative regulations known as EDGAR, including updates to selection criteria found in 34 CFR 75.210, which will become effective September 30th of 2024.

However, the selection criteria that applies to these competitions are the ones in effect on the date of publication of the NIA and are found in the NIA.

The selection criteria for FY 2025 HEP and CAMP will not be reflective of the updated EDGAR selection criteria.

Next, we will review the organization of the Project Narrative.

This is based on the six selection criteria, which include the need for the project 10 points, the quality of the project design, 24 points, the quality of project services, 24 points, the quality of project personnel, 10 points, the adequacy of resources, 12 points and the quality of the project evaluation, 20 points.

The total points possible for the selection criteria are 100.

Your project narrative should be organized in this way, and you must all address all subcriteria in the corresponding criteria.

Please remember that information submitted in response to the scoring criteria should be specific to your community and should not be identical or substantially similar to other applications. Identical or substantially similar applications are not

responsive to the scoring criteria.

Finally, applicants are free to interpret all of the selection criteria as you see fit, but within the context of the statute and regulations and purpose of the programs.

Next, we will review the need for the project. In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the magnitude of the need for the services to be provided or the activities to be carried out by the proposed project for up to 10 points.

One important note for this section is that magnitude of need does not necessarily mean pure numbers.

In other words, a project proposing to serve 100 students may not necessarily score higher than a project proposing to serve 50 if the second project adequately describes the magnitude of need in the context of that project.

Next, we will review the quality of the project design.

This is the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable for up to seven points.

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 for up to five points. The extent to which the proposed project will establish linkages with other appropriate agencies and organizations, providing services to the target population for up to five points. And, the extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale for up to seven points.

Next, we will review demonstrates a rationale. Demonstrates a rationale means a key project component included in the project's logic model is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest the project component is likely to improve relevant outcomes.

Project component is an activity strategy, intervention, process, product, practice, or policy included in a project.

For example, tutoring, counseling, advising, health services, housing assistance, and student stipends.

A relevant outcome is the students outcomes or other outcomes the key component is designed to improve consistent with the specific goals of the program.

Next, I will turn it over to Katrina Ballard.

BK

Ballard, Katrina 25:32

Thanks, Jessica.

So what is the logic model? Logic model, also referred to as a theory of action, means a framework that identifies key project components of the proposed project. Essentially, the active ingredients that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes, and describes the theoretical and operational relationships among the key project components and relevant outcomes.

These are the basic components of a logic model.

The first are resources.

These are the materials to create the program, implement its activities, and attain desired outputs and outcomes.

Examples include material or non-material resources such as facilities, funding, curricula, community support, and time.

Next, activities are the processes, actions, and events through which the program resources attain the intended outcomes.

So in other words, they're the steps for program implementation.

Examples include conducting training and analyzing student data.

Outputs are process oriented results or products of the program, typically expressed in numbers like the number of students tested, or the number of teachers or parents trained.

They don't tell you if a change occurred from the program.

Finally, impacts on outcomes include long term outcomes and represent changes in program participants, knowledge, beliefs, or behavior, such as higher achievement rates, higher graduation rates, and higher college acceptance rates.

One can see how these components correspond to selection criteria in the HEP and CAMP competition.

Not only in the categories of adequacy of resources, project design, and project evaluation, but also in the management plan and services.

Quality of project services. The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project. In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability, up to three points.

In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors: the extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are appropriate to the needs of the intended recipients or beneficiaries of those services up to seven points. The extent

to which the services to be provided by the proposed projects involved the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services up to seven points. And, the likely impact of the services to be provided by the proposed project on the intended recipients of those services up to seven points. Quality of project personnel. The Secretary considers the quality of the project personnel that would carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability, up to three points.

In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel, up to seven points.

Notes on project personnel.

Please note that applicants are responsible for defining and identifying all key personnel positions in their applications. An external evaluator is not required and OME cannot say that one manner of evaluation is preferred over another. Applicants should conduct its evaluation in the manner that it determines to be most effective for the project.

Anecdotally, many grantees find an outside evaluator to be an effective practice.

Adequacy of resources.

This is the adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization, up to four points.

The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project up to four points. And, the extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project, up to four points.

Please note, when addressing this criterion, applicants may want to consider program regulations, which require applicants to develop and implement a plan for identifying and using the resources of the participating IHE and the community to supplement and enhance the services provided by the project.

If some of these are provided through non-federal funds, you still must address them here. Furthermore, you must address them in the budget narrative that explains how you will use both federal and non-federal funds.

The quality of the project evaluation.

This is the extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project, up to 10 points. The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes, up to five points. The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce promising evidence about the project's effectiveness, up to five points.

Please note a strong evaluation plan should be included in the application narrative and should be used as appropriate to shape the development of the project from the beginning of the grant period.

The plan should include benchmarks to monitor progress towards specific policy project objectives and outcome measures to assess the impact on important outcomes for project participants.

More specifically, the plan should identify the individual and or organization that has agreed to serve as an evaluator for the project and describe the qualifications of that evaluator.

As always, please refer to the NIA and application package for additional details.

Promising evidence. Promising evidence means that there is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project component in improving a relevant outcome based on a relevant finding from one of the following: practice guide prepared by the What Works Clearinghouse reporting a strong evidence base or moderate evidence base for the corresponding practice guide recommendation; an intervention report prepared by the What Works Clearinghouse, reporting a positive effect or potentially positive effect in a relevant outcome with no reporting of a negative effect or potentially negative effect on a relevant outcome; or a single study assessed by the Department, as appropriate, that a) is an experimental study of quasi experimental design study or well designed and well implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias, such as a study using regression methods to account for differences between a treatment group and a comparison group; and b) includes at least one statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect on a relevant outcome.

There are regulatory definitions for phrases in promising evidence, such as correlational study, quasi experimental study, and experimental study.

These are some of the key terms from the promising evidence definition.

Understanding them will help you understand how to design your evaluation to build the evidence base for your work.

A correlational study looks at the relationship between an intervention and an outcome. This type of study shows how outcomes may vary with the receipt of the intervention.

Note that intervention is a general term that can refer to any critical component of a project as well as a group of critical components. An intervention can be a process, product, strategy, practice, program, or policy.

Statistical controls for selection bias are the methods researchers use to compare subjects, such as students who are similar except one group, the treatment group, received the intervention and another group, the comparison group, did not.

The risk of selection bias is a concern because if the groups being compared aren't similar, then the differences between the groups might not be due to the intervention, but due to something else.

Here we see the two evidence levels referenced in the NIA. Applications will be evaluated based on the use of these levels of evidence upon entry and upon exit.

Evidence upon entry requires the project demonstrates a rationale, which again means the applicant has identified a key component in the project that, based on high quality research, the applicant hypothesizes is critical to achieving the relevant outcomes.

Exit evidence describes relationships between the key project components and the relevant outcomes.

This helps with making connections between activities or strategies in the project and the outcomes you plan to measure in your evaluation.

We expect to see applications that propose evaluations that can build evidence around project components at the promising evidence level.

It might be helpful to distinguish the difference between demonstrates a rationale and promising evidence. When applicants are discussing demonstrates a rationale, that is the theory of action for their entire project, using a logic model to help describe why they designed it in the way that they did. In the section describing promising evidence, we expect to see applicants describe how they will design a study based on at least one critical component and one relevant outcome in their logic model that meets the definitions described previously.

In this case, evidence is the desired output.

If you'd like more information about demonstrates a rationale and promising

evidence, you may visit the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) website, which gives technical assistance on both topics. Through the NCEE, you'll find resources available at the What Works Clearinghouse, regional educational laboratories, evaluation studies, and the education resources information center, or Eric. You may also view HEP and CAMP technical assistance resources available on the HEP and CAMP websites identified on the last slide of this presentation.

Now in the back to Jessica.

SJ **Stein, Jessica** 37:03

Thank you, Katrina.

Now that we've discussed the selection criteria, we'll now go over each part of the application.

This slide lists each part of the application will begin with part 1, standard documents.

In order to expedite the review process, it is recommended that your electronic application be organized in the following manner and include the following parts. Instructions for all parts and forms of the application are found either on the following pages of the application package or individually for each form on grants.gov.

The application for federal assistance that is form SF 424 and the ED supplemental form SF 424 require basic identification identifying information about the applicant and the application.

Please provide all requested applicant information, including your name, address, email address, unique entity identifier, that is the UEI, and a taxpayer identification number, that is the TIN.

When applying electronically via grants.gov, you will need to ensure that the UEI number you enter on your application is the same as the UEI number your organization used when it registered with sam.gov.

Please do not attach any narratives supporting files or application components to the standard form, that is SF 424. Although this form accepts attachments, the Department will only review materials and files attached in accordance with the instructions provided within this application.

Lastly, for number 18 in the SF 424, please enter the amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding and budget period by each contributor.

The value of in kind contribution should be included on appropriate lines, as applicable.

It's important to note that applications may request at the most \$475,000 for a HEP award and \$475,000 for a CAMP award.

Additionally, the minimum amount to apply for either HEP or CAMP grant is \$180,000.

Applications that request more than the maximum may be rejected, and applications that request less than the minimum amount will be rejected.

Applications must provide sufficient detail for use of federal and non-federal funds in the budget narrative and include line item detail for budget expenses for all non-federal funds.

All blank answers will be interpreted as zero and would be considered below the minimum in the federal funds table.

Please refer to this slide for additional information on form ED 524.

Next, we will review the indirect cost information on the ED 524 form section A.

This section is to be completed by the business office of your organization.

The organization should have a current indirect cost rate agreement, that is ICRA, with the federal government, if they claim indirect costs. The ICRA should include the cognizant government agency.

If there is no ICRA or the ICRA is out of date, the entity has 90 days to submit evidence that the applicant is seeking an ICRA. HEP and CAMP are training programs that are limited to an 8% or lower indirect cost rate.

Next, we will review the activities and costs.

All activities and costs associated with those activities for the proposed projects are reviewed by OME staff to determine if they are reasonable, allowable, and allocable.

See the Education Department General Administrative Regulations and OMB Guidance for Federal Financial Assistance.

If activities and costs are found to be unreasonable, unallowable, or not allocable, they may be reduced or removed from your grant.

Next, we will review cost sharing.

Neither the HEP or CAMP program statute nor regulations require cost sharing or matching.

Any applicant that proposes to use non-federal funds in its application and is awarded a grant must provide those funds for each year that the funds are proposed.

Non-federal funds must be non-federal and cannot come from another federally

funded source.

If you list the funds in Part B of ED 524, you must explain the funds in a separate part C for non-federal funds.

The same cost principles that apply to federal funds apply to non-federal funds.

If you propose non-federal funds, you will be required to provide those non-federal funds for each year of the grant that you proposed them.

This is necessary to maintain the integrity of the competition since readers consider these non-federal contributions when scoring applications.

Next, we will review the project abstract.

This is part three.

The project abstract should include a concise (that is 1 double spaced page) description of the following information, preferably in the following order.

The goals and expected outcomes. The primary activities to be accomplished by the grant recipient. The number and location of proposed sites. Whether the applicant has a current HEP or CAMP grant. How the invitational preference priorities are being addressed, as applicable.

Next, we will review part four, the project narrative.

The Department recommends that applicants limit the application narrative to no more than 25 pages.

The recommended page limit does not apply to the cover sheet, the budget section, including the narrative budget justification, the assurances and certifications, the one page abstract, the resumes, the bibliography, or the letters of support. An application will not be disqualified if it exceeds the recommended page limit.

There are no selection criteria associated with page limits.

Please also note that appendices should contain the job descriptions, duties, and minimum qualifications for key personnel positions.

Applicants should provide resumes of key personnel in the attachments and appendices section.

These again are not included in the 25 page length.

As a note, an application will not be disqualified if it exceeds the recommended page limit, and there are no selection criteria associated with page limits.

Next, we will review part four.

This is the recommended formatting of project narratives and abstracts.

A page is 8.5 inches by 11 inches on one side only with one inch margins at the top, bottom and both sides double spaced.

That is no more than three lines per vertical inch.

All text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, references and captions, as well as all text and charts, tables, figures, and graphs.

Use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch, that is characters per inch and use one of the following fonts: either times New Roman Courier, Courier New or Aerial.

Next, I will turn it over to Dylan.

HD **Hart Medina, Dylan** 44:40

Thank you, Jessica.

Part five of the application is the budget narrative. The budget narrative is an itemized budget breakdown for each project year. It identifies the nature and amount of the proposed expenditures. Applicants should provide sufficient detail to enable reviewers and project staff to understand how requested funds will be used, how much will be expended and the relationship between the requested funds and project activities and outcomes. Department of Education staff will perform a cost analysis of each recommended project to ensure that the costs relate to the activities and objectives of the project and are reasonable, allowable, and allocable. The Department may delete or reduce costs from the budget during this review.

One additional note on the budget is that the administration's Good Jobs Initiative, led by the Department of Labor, is focused on providing information to workers, employers, and government to promote good jobs for all workers.

The Department encourages applicants for grants under this program to consider in their budget and personnel planning for the proposal of the use of funds in ways that would improve job quality and create access to good jobs for all working people.

Additional information about the Good Jobs Initiative and the Department's Good Jobs Principles for Education is available at the link shown on this slide.

Part six is other attachments. If the project director and key personnel have been selected and identified in the application, applicants will provide job descriptions with minimum required qualifications and brief resumes that describe the unique qualifications for the responsibilities the key personnel will carry out under the project. If the project director and key personnel have not been selected, applicants simply provide the job descriptions with the minimum required qualifications for key personnel positions. The Department will review these job descriptions when

approving key personnel changes.

The other attachment section is also where applicants will include a copy of their indirect cost rate agreement.

Applicants may also provide letters of support from organizations specifically referenced in the project narrative that will provide significant collaboration to the project.

And finally, applicants may also include references and bibliographies, though this is optional.

Part seven assurances and certifications. Applicants should be certain to complete all required assurances and certifications in grants.gov and include all required information in the appropriate place on each form.

The assurances and certifications required for this application are the disclosure of lobbying activities, the grants.gov certification regarding lobbying, and the GEPA form, as well as the assurances that we've already discussed on previous slides. Please be sure to read the full text of the NIA and the application package for additional information.

One note on the GEPA changes is that the Department released a new GEPA form that went live on grants.gov on April 3rd, 2023.

This updated form includes four questions and their responses.

Applicants have the flexibility to determine and define the barriers to equitable access and equitable participation. Applicants are also required to provide a timeline, including targeted milestones for addressing the barriers.

Part eight of the application is the intergovernmental review of federal programs. The HEP and CAMP programs fall under the rubric of the executive order 12372 and federal regulations 34 CFR part 79. These require that grant applicants contact state single points of contact for information on how this works.

Multi state applicants should follow procedures specific to each state.

Further information can be found in the application package.

Other factors in selecting the awards. Now that we've gone over the selection criteria in the application itself, we would like to note that in reviewing applications in any discretionary grant competition, the Secretary may consider, the past performance of the applicant and carrying out previous award, such as the applicants use of funds, achievement of project objectives and compliance with grant conditions, as well as whether the applicant failed to submit a timely performance report or submitted a report of unacceptable quality.

Additionally, the Secretary may impose specific conditions on a grant if the applicant is not financially stable, has a history of unsatisfactory performance, has a financial or other management system that does not meet the regulatory standards, has not fulfilled the conditions of a prior grant, or is otherwise not responsible.

Geographic distribution and remainder of funds.

Because the HEP and CAMP programs may receive more than \$40 million in appropriations for FY 2025, there are two additional factors that may affect the number and distribution of grades.

The first is that after awarding 45% of the appropriated funds to each program, the US Department of Education will award the remainder of the available funds to HEP and CAMP projects based on the number, quality, and promise of the applications.

The second is that in making awards under this program, the Secretary may take into consideration the need for geographic distribution of projects when making awards.

The Secretary may consider the need to provide equitable geographic distribution of HEP and CAMP programs when two or more applicants receive the same score at the funding cutoff for this competition, the Secretary determines that a geographic region is overserved by current HEP or CAMP projects, the Secretary determines that a geographical region is underserved by current HEP or CAMP projects, or two or more applicants proposed to operate similar HEP or CAMP projects in the same geographical region.

At this time, we'd like to reemphasize a couple components on this side.

You'll find funding opportunity numbers as well as the grants.gov support information for any questions on the uploading and submission of your application. We'd like to again encourage you to start your application early and carefully check your ED 524 forms.

The application submission deadline is November 13th, 2024 and there are no exceptions to this deadline, so please be sure to account for any unexpected delays or issues.

Thank you so much for attending the FY 2025 HEP and CAMP pre-application webinar.

This webinar, along with other competition related items, will be posted on each program's application pages at the link on this slide.

Should you have any questions regarding this webinar or competition related questions, please feel free to email HEPCAMPFY25@ed.gov

Thank you again.

□ **Stein, Jessica** stopped transcription