

**Appendix VII—Implementation of MSAP Projects:
Enabled Activities and ED Role**

Table A-VII-1
MSAP Projects That Included a Planning Year (1998-99)

Inclusion of planning year	freq	%
Yes	20	35.1%
No	37	64.9%
Total	57	100.0%

Source: Project Director Interview 1999-2000, Item 22

Table A-VII-2
Groups Involved in Planning Activities in 20 MSAP Projects (1998-99)

Group	freq	%
Community members	3	15.0%
District staff	3	15.0
Parents	12	60.0
Principals	5	25.0
Students	9	45.0
Teachers	14	70.0
Other	10	50.0
Not specified	3	15.0

n=20 projects

Source: Project Director Interview 1999-2000, Item 22

Table A-VII-3
Activities Undertaken During Planning Year in 20 MSAP Projects (1998-99)

Activity	freq	%
Acquire materials, equipment	1	5.0
Create community links	2	10.0
Communicate goals	1	5.0
Design curriculum	9	45.0
Develop advisory boards	1	5.0
Develop instruction	1	5.0
Find/prepare site	2	10.0
Inform, involve parents	2	10.0
Learn from outsiders (e.g., visit schools)	6	30.0
Plan, conduct recruitment of students	4	20.0
Provide professional development	11	55.0
Pursue other funding sources	1	5.0
Recruit, hire, organize staff	4	20.0
Refine goals, objectives	3	15.0
Unspecified or Conduct general planning activities	5	25.0

n=20 projects

Source: Project Director Interview 1999-2000, Item 22

**Table A-VII-4
MSAP District Strategies for Continuing Projects after Three-year MSAP Grant Ends**

Strategy	freq	%
District--support committed	18	31.6%
District--support sought	12	21.1
MSAP grant--reapplication	10	17.5
Other federal, state grants	15	26.3
Self-sustaining project	10	17.5
School reputation	2	3.5
Business support	7	12.2
Other—unspecified	11	19.3
Not clear/No response	5*	8.8

* Includes 3 projects with no other strategy

n=57 projects

Note: 33 projects cited only one strategy; 24 cited 2-4 strategies. Average: 1.6 strategies per project.

Source: Project Director Interview, 1999-2000, Item 23

**Table A-VII-5
Results of Reduced Budgets for MSAP Projects**

Result	freq	%
No major changes	15	26%
Staff positions reduced or eliminated	27	47
Equipment and materials purchased reduced	20	35
Activities or programs either delayed or cut in scope	15	26
Deficiency filled or partially filled by district	9	16
Grants from other sources obtained	9	16
Professional development reduced	6	11
All budget categories reduced by the same percentage	3	5

n=57 projects

Note: Some respondents reported multiple results.

Source: MSAP Project Director Interview 1999-2000, Item 1

**Table A-VII-6
Percentage of Direct Costs by Budget Category and Year, for 50 MSAP Projects**

Year	Staff & Fringe	Travel	Equipment	Supplies	Contractual	Construction	Other Direct	Training Stipends	Indirect Costs	Total
1998-1999	41.0%	0.8%	22.4%	18.4%	7.8%	0.2%	4.1%	2.0%	3.3	100.0%
1999-2000	46.2	0.7	19.1	19.0	7.0	0.1	3.0	1.6	3.3	100.0
2000-2001	49.1	0.7	18.0	18.0	6.7	0.1	2.8	1.4	3.2	100.0
Total, 3 yrs	45.5	0.7	19.8	18.5	7.2	0.1	3.3	1.7	3.3	100.0

n=50 projects

Source: U.S. Department of Education

Table A-VII-7**Budget Means and Percentages for 233 MSAP-supported Schools, by Budget Category and Year, Based on Total Direct Funds**

Year	Staff & Fringe	Travel	Equipment	Supplies	Contractual	Construction	Other Direct	Training Stipends	Indirect Costs	Total
1998-1999	\$124,227	\$2,162	\$79,422	\$63,611	\$21,511	\$603	\$12,460	\$6,483	\$3,431	\$313,910
1999-2000	139,552	1,760	67,795	65,346	18,413	359	8,114	4,769	3,392	309,500
2000-2001	143,687	1,505	61,698	59,534	16,494	344	7,437	3,105	3,236	297,040

N=233 schools in 50 projects

Source: U.S. Department of Education

Table A-VII-8**Sources and Amounts of Other Funds Augmenting MSAP Grants**

	Federal Programs (non- MSAP)		State Programs		District Programs		Business and Foundations		In-Kind and Other		Total	
	f	\$	f	\$	f	\$	f	\$	f	\$	f	\$
Projects able to augment MSAP grant	5	3,360,000	5	6,646,231	1	2,120,000	12	1,177,565	5	Not provided	28*	13,303,796
Average, each category		672,000		1,329,246		2,120,000		98,130				665,190
Range		\$5,000 to 3,000,000		\$47,626 to 6,000,000				\$6,000 to 403,200				\$5,000 to 6,000,000

*Includes three projects receiving funds in two categories

n=25 projects

Source: 1999-2000 MSAP Project Survey, Item 23

Table A-VII-9**Activities and Resources Enabled by MSAP Grant and Otherwise Not Possible, from School Principal Perspective**

Using funds for:	Most Important	2nd Most Important	3rd Most Important	Blank/ Missing	Total
Additional staff	32.4	18.3	12	37.3	100.0
Professional development	15.8	24.5	16.2	43.5	100.0
Acquisition/use of computers	27.4	13.7	14.1	44.8	100.0
Specialized learning centers	8.3	7.1	5.4	79.2	100.0
Books, supplies, materials	11.6	17.8	25.3	45.2	99.9
Design, plan of magnet	7.1	7.9	11.2	73.8	100.0
Teacher collaboration	4.1	6.2	4.1	85.5	99.9
Student activities beyond school day	7.1	9.5	7.1	76.3	100.0
Other	1.7	0.8	2.5	95	100.0

n=241 principals

Source: Principal Survey, 1999-2000, Item 33

Table A-VII-10
Frequency and Usefulness of Assistance Requested from MSAP and Other Agencies and Organizations

Organization and Frequency of Request for Assistance	Not very useful		Somewhat useful		Very useful		Blank or N/A	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
MSAP Office:								
Assistance often requested	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	34.6%	0	0.0%
Assistance sometimes requested	0	0.0	2	3.8	30	57.7	1	1.8
Assistance rarely requested	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0
Frequency not noted	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1.8
Assistance not requested	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1.8
							(1)	(1.8)
<i>Total</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>94.2</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>7.2</i>
Office for Civil Rights:								
Assistance often requested	0	0.0	1	1.9	9	17.3	0	0.0
Assistance sometimes requested	0	0.0	5	9.6	15	28.8	0	0.0
Assistance rarely requested	0	0.0	1	1.9	4	7.7	0	0.0
Frequency not noted	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	3.6
							(2)	(3.6)
Assistance not requested	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	30.3
<i>Total</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>13.4</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>53.8</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>37.5</i>
Equity Assistance Centers:								
Assistance often requested	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Assistance sometimes requested	0	0.0	4	7.7	10	19.2	0	0.0
Assistance rarely requested	2	3.8	1	1.9	4	7.7	1	1.8
Frequency not noted	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0.0
							(3)	(5.4)
Assistance not requested	--	--	--	--	--	--	31	55.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>25.0</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>62.5</i>
Other ED Agencies:								
Assistance often requested	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0
Assistance sometimes requested	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.7	0	0.0
Assistance rarely requested	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Frequency not noted	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	(0.0)
							(21)	(37.5)
Assistance not requested	--	--	--	--	--	--	32	57.1
<i>Total</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2.9</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>94.6</i>
Magnet Schools of America:								
Assistance often requested	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	13.7	0	0.0
Assistance sometimes requested	1	2.0	12	23.5	4	7.8	1	1.8
Assistance rarely requested	0	0.0	5	9.8	2	3.9	0	0.0
Frequency not noted	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	3.6
							(2)	(3.6)
Assistance not requested	--	--	--	--	--	--	20	35.7
<i>Total</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>30.3</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>25.4</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>44.7</i>

Table A-VII-10 (continued)
Frequency and Usefulness of Assistance Requested from MSAP and Other Agencies and Organizations

Organization and Frequency of Request for Assistance	Not very useful		Somewhat useful		Very useful		Blank or N/A	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
State Organizations:	0	0.0	1	2.0	6	11.8	0	0.0
Assistance often requested								
Assistance sometimes requested	0	0.0	1	2.0	6	11.8	0	0.0
Assistance rarely requested	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Frequency not noted	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1.8
							(36)	(64.3)
Assistance not requested	--	--	--	--	--	--	14	25.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>23.6</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>73.2</i>

n=56 projects

Source: MSAP Project Survey, Item 25

Table A-VII-11
Purpose of Technical Assistance Requested from MSAP and Other Agencies and Other Organizations

Purpose and Organization	Sought		Not Sought		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
MSAP Office						
Preparing an MSAP application	41	73.2%	15	26.8%	56	100.0%
Developing a desegregation plan	14	25.0	42	75.0	56	100.0
Designing a selection process	19	33.9	37	66.1	56	100.0
Choosing magnet theme/approach	12	21.4	44	78.6	56	100.0
Planning district supports	9	16.1	47	83.9	56	100.0
Dealing with implementation problems	38	67.9	18	32.1	56	100.0
Completing MSAP reports	42	75.0	14	25.0	56	100.0
Identifying other sources of assistance	14	25.0	42	75.0	56	100.0
Office for Civil Rights						
Preparing an MSAP application	12	21.4	44	78.6	56	100.0
Developing a desegregation plan	28	50.0	28	50.0	56	100.0
Designing a selection process	23	41.1	33	58.9	56	100.0
Choosing magnet theme/approach	0	0.0	56	100.0	56	100.0
Planning district supports	2	3.6	54	96.4	56	100.0
Dealing with implementation problems	12	21.4	44	78.6	56	100.0
Completing MSAP reports	9	16.1	47	83.9	56	100.0
Identifying other sources of assistance	2	3.6	54	96.4	56	100.0
Equity Assistance Centers						
Preparing an MSAP application	9	16.1	47	83.9	56	100.0
Developing a desegregation plan	8	14.3	48	85.7	56	100.0
Designing a selection process	13	23.2	43	76.8	56	100.0
Choosing magnet theme/approach	1	1.8	55	98.2	56	100.0
Planning district supports	8	14.3	48	85.7	56	100.0
Dealing with implementation problems	8	14.3	48	85.7	56	100.0
Completing MSAP reports	4	7.1	52	92.9	56	100.0
Identifying other sources of assistance	4	7.1	52	92.9	56	100.0

Table A-VII-11 (continued)

Purpose of Technical Assistance Requested from MSAP and Other Agencies and Other Organizations

Purpose and Organization	Sought		Not Sought		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Other Education Agencies						
Preparing an MSAP application	1	1.8	55	98.2	56	100.0
Developing a desegregation plan	2	3.6	54	96.4	56	100.0
Designing a selection process	1	1.8	55	98.2	56	100.0
Choosing magnet theme/approach	1	1.8	55	98.2	56	100.0
Planning district supports	0	0.0	56	100.0	56	100.0
Dealing with implementation problems	1	1.8	55	98.2	56	100.0
Completing MSAP reports	1	1.8	55	98.2	56	100.0
Identifying other sources of assistance	1	1.8	55	98.2	56	100.0
Magnet Schools of America						
Preparing an MSAP application	17	30.4	39	69.6	56	100.0
Developing a desegregation plan	7	12.5	49	87.5	56	100.0
Designing a selection process	6	10.7	50	89.3	56	100.0
Choosing magnet theme/approach	18	32.1	38	67.9	56	100.0
Planning district supports	5	8.9	51	91.1	56	100.0
Dealing with implementation problems	17	30.4	39	69.6	56	100.0
Completing MSAP reports	5	8.9	51	91.1	56	100.0
Identifying other sources of assistance	12	21.4	44	78.6	56	100.0
State Agencies						
Preparing an MSAP application	6	10.7	50	89.3	56	100.0
Developing a desegregation plan	4	7.1	52	92.9	56	100.0
Designing a selection process	5	8.9	51	91.1	56	100.0
Choosing magnet theme/approach	4	7.1	52	92.9	56	100.0
Planning district supports	6	10.7	50	89.3	56	100.0
Dealing with implementation problems	7	12.5	49	87.5	56	100.0
Completing MSAP reports	2	3.6	54	96.4	56	100.0
Identifying other sources of assistance	5	8.9	51	91.1	56	100.0

n=56 projects

Source: MSAP Project Survey, Item 26

How MSAP Grants Are Awarded

When Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) awards are made for a new grant cycle, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) publishes a notice in the Federal Register inviting MSAP applications. The notice establishes the date by which applications must be submitted; provides information about the estimated funds available, program priorities, desegregation plan requirements; and tells how copies of the MSAP application package can be obtained. Available to applicants in either print form or electronically through ED's website, the application package has detailed information on how to apply and what information must be included in the application.

Prior to the date that applications are due, ED staff are involved in two types of activities: (1) providing technical assistance to applicants in response to their questions about the program and application requirements; and (2) preparing for the panel review of applications. Prospective panel members are recruited by ED by soliciting volunteers through small-scale promotion at conferences and other magnet-related events. In addition, prospective reviewers may be referred to the magnet program by staff who administer other ED discretionary grant programs, and persons who are interested in serving as application reviewers may volunteer their services without solicitation. Additionally, ED staff directly solicit prospective reviewers with strong backgrounds and experience directly related to the planning and implementation of magnet schools.

Application Screening

The review process begins with application screening. During this phase of the review, applications are screened to identify any applications that should not be included in the panel review process. Applications are checked against the "Lists of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement or Nonprocurement Programs." Any applicant on those lists is considered ineligible and eliminated from further consideration. Additionally, each application is checked to determine that it has been submitted by a local educational agency. Any application submitted by an agency other than a local educational agency is eliminated from further consideration. Applications are checked for completeness to determine that the application contains an application face page, a budget, a program narrative, and desegregation plan information. Any application missing one or more of these components is also eliminated from further consideration.

Selection of Panel Reviewers

Three-person panels, consisting of people who are not Federal employees, are used. Each three-person panel is expected to review eight or nine applications. The number of reviewers used thus depends on the number of applications received. Once the number of panels that will be needed has been determined, ED selects reviewers from among the pool of prospective panel members that has been recruited.

Each reviewer is expected to have an educational background or experience in one or more of the following areas: elementary education; secondary education; educational administration; curriculum development; staff development; school desegregation; magnet school planning and implementation; school finance; parent, business or community involvement; vocational programs; minority education; and the use of technology in education. To the extent possible, panelists are selected so that each review panel will have at least one person with a strong background in desegregation and magnet schools

strategies, one person with a strong background in curriculum development or educational reform, and one person with a strong background in educational administration. ED also seeks reviewers who represent the nation's diversity and all of its levels of education. Anyone who has served as a reviewer for the MSAP for three consecutive application review cycles is ineligible.

Reviewers are required to sign a conflict of interest certification prior to reviewing applications. This certification describes the types of relationships which create a conflict of interest. The certification also requires the reviewer to maintain confidentiality regarding the reviewer's work as an application reviewer for the program.

Responsibilities of Panelists

Panelists have the following responsibilities:

- To read each application assigned to their panel
- To be adequately prepared for and participate in discussions of the strengths and weaknesses of each application in relation to the criteria and priorities
- To provide a numerical score for each criterion and priority
- To provide statements of strengths and weaknesses that (1) justify the score awarded for the criterion or priority; and (2) are consistent with the criterion or priority being rated. If a panelist finds that there are no strengths (or no weaknesses) for a selection criterion or statutory priority, the panelist may simply indicate "None" in the appropriate space; however, a panelist may not leave a strengths or weaknesses section blank.
- To complete and submit review forms in a timely manner
- To participate in the panel's scheduled meetings, including review sessions

Panel Review of Applications

Once three-person review panels have been formed and applications have been assigned to panels, the applications, instructions, orientation materials and application review worksheets are mailed to each panelist. During this time, approximately two weeks before the panel review, each panelist reads the applications assigned to him or her; and, using the application review worksheets, make a preliminary identification of strengths and weaknesses for each application. Panelists return the applications to ED but and keep the review worksheets they have completed and bring them to the panel meetings in Washington, DC.

When panels convene in Washington, panelists evaluate each application on the basis of the selection criteria and statutory priorities. Panel discussion meetings are convened to review the strengths and weaknesses that each panel member has identified, before each panel member scores the application and completes a Panelist Evaluation Form. The panel meeting is conducted by a neutral facilitator (who is not a panel member). Panelists are not asked to reach consensus; however, a panelist may refine or modify his or her views on the basis of the panel discussion.

Following the panel review, program staff check the accuracy of panel comments against actual application contents to ensure that no factual misunderstanding of an application has occurred that results in an improper and indefensible evaluation of that application. In the event that such a factual misunderstanding is found, the reader (or, if appropriate, review panel) is contacted by a staff member to revise affected comments or scores, or both, as necessary.

Each of the selection criteria and priorities used in the panel review has a weighted value that determines the maximum number of points that can be awarded for providing a complete and high-quality response to that criterion or priority. A panelist's score for an application is determined by adding together the score provided for each criterion and each priority. The maximum score that an application may receive from a panelist is 145 points.

<u>Selection Criterion</u>	<u>Maximum Points</u>
Plan of Operation	25 Points
Quality of Personnel	10 Points
Quality of Project Design	35 Points
Budget and Resources	5 Points
Evaluation Plan	15 Points
Commitment and Capacity	10 Points

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Maximum Points</u>
Need for Assistance	5 Points
New or Revised Magnet Schools	10 Points
Selection of Students	15 Points
Innovative Approaches and Systemic Reforms	10 Points
Collaborative Efforts	5 Points

The Panelist Review Form also provides panelists with general guidance to help them determine whether the scores they are providing are consistent with their overall assessment of the quality of an application. The guidance breaks applications into four general categories based on score.

140-145 Points

Applications that are characterized by "overall excellence" and that you would recommend for funding without reservation.

130-139 Points

Applications that are of generally very good quality that are worthy of consideration for funding, are likely to demonstrate excellence in many aspects of their program but fall short of demonstrating overall excellence.

115-129 Points

Applications with good ideas, perhaps fairly strong in some areas, but with substantial deficiencies or areas of weakness that need to be resolved before the proposed project is considered for an award.

0-114 Points

Applications that need substantial redesign or improvement in many or most areas of the project and therefore should not be considered for funding at this time.

As soon as the application review has been completed, applications are ranked so that a preliminary assessment of which applications are most likely to receive awards can be made. Applications identified as most likely to receive awards based on their ranking then receive concurrent reviews by MSAP program staff and by ED's Office for Civil Rights (OCR).

Application Ranking and Selection of Application for Awards

The score used to rank an application is determined by averaging the scores provided by each of the three panel reviewers who evaluated the application. A separate rank order list is created for each review panel. If two applications have an identical average score, an application that proposes to use a significant portion of the program funds it would receive to address substantial problems in an Empowerment Zone (including a Supplemental Empowerment Zone or an Enterprise Community) is ranked over an application that did not meet this competitive priority.

For the first \$75 million in funds available for grants in the FY 1998 competition, applications were selected in the following manner: First, the highest ranking application from each panel was recommended for an award. Additional applications were then recommended beginning with the highest ranking remaining application from among all panels and continuing until the first \$75 million was allocated, subject to the following limitations: (a) no more than six applications from any one panel were recommended for awards from the first \$75 million; and (b) no application that receives an average score of less than 115 points would be recommended for an award.

After the first \$75 million in appropriated funds was allocated, 10 special priority points were added to the score of each applicant that (a) did not receive an MSAP award in the FY 1995 cycle, and (b) was not recommended for an award from the first \$75 million in this grant competition. Using the scores that take these priority points into consideration, all applications not recommended for funding in competition for the first \$75 million were re-ranked. For funds in excess of \$75 million, applications were then recommended for funding beginning with the highest ranking application from any panel that had less than two of its applications recommended for an award from the first \$75 million. Additional applications were then recommended on the basis of score (including special priority points), regardless of panel, and continuing until all remaining funds were allocated, except that no more than six applications from any one panel were recommended for awards (including those recommended in competition for the first \$75 million).

ED Program Staff Review

Since 1998 grants under the MSAP averaged more than \$1 million per year, ED grant review policies required program staff to review the project plan and analyze the proposed project to identify program and budget issues, including areas where clarifications are necessary, for each project to be funded. Staff considered the results of the panel reviews, program regulations, information in the Federal Register notice announcing the grant competition regarding funding, and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Cost Principles for State and Local Governments (OMB Circular A-87) in the development of funding recommendations for each of the three years of each projects. Three two-person

teams conducted these reviews. These teams were made up of program office staff, with more experienced staff members teamed with staff who had less experience with the MSAP. Several of the team members had grants management experience from previous work in the grants management office.

Differences in grant award amounts were attributable to a variety of factors, including the amount that an applicant requested, the size and scope of the proposed project, and individual project and school budgets. In arriving at a recommended funding level for each project, review teams exercised professional judgement in relation to application information based on the requirements of the program regulations, OMB Circular A-87 and other relevant guidelines.

The statute limits the amount that a school district may receive to no more than \$4 million per year. Further, in the Federal Register notice announcing the MSAP grant competition, ED indicated that it intended to make awards that ranged in size between \$200,000 and \$3,000,000 per year. All grants were approved at funding levels that fell within these established limits.

OCR Review

ED's Office for Civil Rights conducted a review with two components: certification that civil rights assurances are being met; and determination that the applicant's desegregation plan meets eligibility standards contained in MSAP regulations.

As soon as it was available, a list of all 1998 applicants was forwarded to OCR. OCR used this list to check with other agencies (e.g., Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Department of Justice) regarding whether or not there are findings of civil rights violations against any applicant.

OCR also reviewed the desegregation plans of likely grant recipients based on the rank-order list to determine whether the desegregation plan met eligibility standards. In the case of required plans, such as Federal court orders, OCR must determine that the approving authority for the plan had approved the magnet schools for which the applicant was seeking assistance. In the case of voluntary plans, OCR must determine that the plan is adequate under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. To make this determination, OCR reviewed each plan to see that it proposed to reduce, eliminate, or prevent minority group isolation in targeted schools, and that the use of race in the student selection process for the magnet schools was narrowly tailored.

Making MSAP Awards

Awards were made to eligible applicants based on their ranking, as above, and the amount recommended for their award, until all available funds were obligated. Consistent with the statutory requirement in §5106(c), no award under the MSAP is made if the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights is unable to determine that an applicant will meet the non-discrimination assurances in the MSAP statute, regardless of how high that applicant might rank based the quality of its proposed project. Additionally, if a determination was made that one or more of the schools in the proposed project were not part of the approved desegregation plan, the amount recommended for the award was adjusted to reflect the elimination of the school(s) from the project that was finally approved

Performance Indicators

Performance indicators for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program were developed just prior to the application period for 1998 awards. To assist with the performance indicators, ED provided a guidebook for MSAP applicants and grantees and included information about them in the Federal Register announcement. ED staff state that performance indicators were not intended to cause a radical shift in the application process. The 1998 applications were not evaluated on the extent to which performance indicators were incorporated, and no points were given or taken away on the basis of performance indicators. ED staff report that performance indicators did assist applicants in writing more concise and consistent applications in terms of the results grantees should try to achieve and the information that they should be providing.