

characteristics. Evaluations of this type will receive up to 15 points in addition to any points the application earns under the selection criteria.

Proposed evaluations that use neither experimental designs with random assignment nor quasi-experimental designs using a matched comparison group will receive 0 points under this competitive preference priority.

Before and after participation in the program or the comparison condition, the project evaluator should collect—before the program commences and after it ends—valid and reliable data that measure the impact of participation in the program or in the comparison group.

We determine points under this priority by the quality of the proposed evaluation. We will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a feasible, credible plan that includes the following:

- The type of design to be used (that is, random assignment or matched comparison).
- Outcomes to be measured.
- A discussion of how the applicant plans to assign students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to the program or match them for comparison with other students, teachers, classrooms, or schools.
- A proposed evaluator, preferably independent, with the necessary background and technical expertise to carry out the proposed evaluation.

Definitions: In addition to definitions in the statute and EDGAR, the following definitions apply:

Inner-City Community, for the purpose of this program, is any place that fits code 1, 2 or 3 of the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) locale codes. The locale codes are:

1. Central city of a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) or Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) with population of 250,000 or more or a population.
2. Central city of a CMSA or MSA but not designated as a large central city.
3. Place within the CMSA or MSA of a large central city.
4. Place within the CMSA or MSA of a mid-size central city.
5. Place not within a CMSA or MSA but with population of 25,000 or more and defined as urban.
6. Place not within a CMSA or MSA with a population of at least 2,500 but less than 25,000.
7. Place not within a CMSA or MSA and designated as rural.
8. Place within a CMSA or MSA designated as rural (this code not available prior to 1998).

Research-based, when used with respect to an activity or a program,

means that, to the extent possible, the activity or program is based on the most rigorous theory, research, and evaluation available and is effective in improving student achievement and performance and other program objectives.

Rural, for the purpose of this program, is any place that fits 6, 7 or 8 of the NCES locale codes. Please see the list under the definition of Inner-City Community.

Waiver of Proposed Rulemaking: In accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553), it is the practice of the Secretary to offer interested parties the opportunity to comment on proposed rules. Section 437(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), however, allows the Secretary to exempt from rulemaking requirements rules governing the first grant competition under a new or substantially revised program authority (20 U.S.C. section 1232(d)(1)). This program is the first Model Arts competition under the program as reauthorized by Public Law 107–100, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and therefore qualifies for this exemption. The Secretary, in accordance with section 437(d)(1) of GEPA has decided to forego public comment in order to ensure timely grant awards. These rules will apply for the FY 2003 competition only.

Selection Criteria: The Secretary uses the following selection criteria to evaluate applications for grants under this competition. In all instances where the word “project” appears in the selection criteria, the reference to an Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination grant program should be made.

The maximum composite score for all of these criteria is 100 points. The maximum score an applicant may receive is 125 if they fully meet both of the competitive priorities.

The maximum score for each criterion is indicated in parentheses. Within each criterion, the Secretary evaluates each factor equally.

(a) *Need for project.* (10 points)

In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the model addresses specific needs of students at risk of educational failure.

(ii) The extent to which specific gaps, weaknesses, or opportunities have been identified in effectively integrating arts into the core curricula, strengthening arts instruction and improving students' academic performance, including skills in creating, performing, and responding to the arts. Also, the nature and

magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses and the degree to which they will be addressed by the proposed model.

(b) *Significance.* (20 points)

In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The potential contribution of the proposed project to increased knowledge or understanding of effective strategies for strengthening the use of high-quality arts in the course of other academic instruction and/or strengthening the place of arts as a core academic subject in the regular school curricula.

(ii) The likely utility and replicability of the proposed model and the extent to which its products (including information, materials, processes, or techniques) will be effective in a variety of settings.

(c) *Quality of the project design.* (30 points)

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved over the proposed project period are clearly specified and measurable.

(ii) The extent to which the proposed model is based on reliable research, effective practice, and/or coherent theory as a means for strengthening the use of high-quality arts in the course of other academic instruction and/or strengthening the place of arts as a core academic subject in the regular school curricula.

(iii) The extent to which the proposed model aims to strengthen the academic performance of students in creating, performing, and responding to the arts, and in the rest of the core curriculum.

(iv) The extent to which the project will document and evaluate the success of the model and disseminate relevant information.

(d) *Quality of the management plan.* (15 points)

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, relevant contributions and commitment from partners, timelines, continuous improvement strategies, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience of key project personnel, major partners,