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DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Innovation and Improvement; Overview Information; Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Program; Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.351D.

Dates:

Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: The Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination (AEMDD) Program supports the enhancement, expansion, documentation, evaluation, and dissemination of innovative, cohesive models that are based on research and have demonstrated that they effectively—(1) Integrate standards-based arts education into the core elementary and middle school curriculum; (2) strengthen standards-based arts instruction in these grades; and (3) improve students’ academic performance, including their skills in creating, performing, and responding to the arts. Projects funded through the AEMDD Program are intended to increase the amount of nationally available information on effective models for arts education that integrate the arts with standards-based education programs.

Priorities: This competition includes one absolute priority, one competitive preference priority, and five invitational priorities.

Absolute Priority: This priority is from the notice of final priority for Scientifically Based Evaluation Methods published in the Federal Register on January 25, 2005 (70 FR 3586). For FY 2010 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, this priority is a competitive preference priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i) we award up to an additional 20 points to an application, depending on how well the application meets this competitive preference priority. These points are in addition to any points the application earns under the selection criteria.

When using the priority to give competitive preference to an application, we will review the applications using a two-stage review process. In the first stage, we will review the applications without taking the competitive preference priority into account. In the second stage of the process, we will review the applications rated highest in the first stage of the process to determine whether they will receive the competitive preference points. We will consider awarding additional (competitive preference) points only to those applicants with top-ranked scores based on the selection criteria. We expect that approximately 50 applicants will receive these additional competitive preference points.

This priority is:
The Secretary establishes a priority for projects proposing an evaluation that is based on rigorous scientifically based research methods to assess the effectiveness of a particular education into the core elementary or middle school curriculum, (2) strengthening standards-based arts instruction in the elementary or middle school grades, and (3) improving the academic performance of students in elementary or middle school grades, including their skills in creating, performing, and responding to the arts.

In order to meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the model project for which it seeks funding (1) serves only elementary school or middle school grades, or both, and (2) is linked to State and national standards intended to enable all students to meet challenging expectations and to improve student and school performance.

Note: National standards refer to the arts standards developed by the Consortium of National Arts Education Association. The standards outline what students should know and be able to do in the arts. These are not Department standards.

Competitive Preference Priority: This priority is from the notice of final priority for Scientifically Based Evaluation Methods published in the Federal Register on January 25, 2005 (70 FR 3586). For FY 2010 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, this priority is a competitive preference priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i) we award up to an additional 20 points to an application, depending on how well the application meets this competitive preference priority. These points are in addition to any points the application earns under the selection criteria.

When using the priority to give competitive preference to an application, we will review the applications using a two-stage review process. In the first stage, we will review the applications without taking the competitive preference priority into account. In the second stage of the process, we will review the applications rated highest in the first stage of the process to determine whether they will receive the competitive preference points. We will consider awarding additional (competitive preference) points only to those applicants with top-ranked scores based on the selection criteria. We expect that approximately 50 applicants will receive these additional competitive preference points.
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This priority is:
The Secretary establishes a priority for projects proposing an evaluation that is based on rigorous scientifically based research methods to assess the effectiveness of a particular
intervention. The Secretary intends that this priority will allow program participants and the Department to determine whether the project produces meaningful effects on student achievement or teacher performance.

Evaluation methods using an experimental design are best for determining project effectiveness. Thus, when feasible, the project must use an experimental design under which participants—e.g., students, teachers, classrooms, or schools—are randomly assigned to participate in the project activities being evaluated or to a control group that does not participate in the project activities being evaluated.

If random assignment is not feasible, the project may use a quasi-experimental design with carefully matched comparison conditions. This alternative design attempts to approximate a randomly assigned control group by matching participants—e.g., students, teachers, classrooms, or schools—with non-participants having similar pre-program characteristics.

In cases where random assignment is not possible and participation in the intervention is determined by a specified cut-off point on a quantified continuum of scores, regression discontinuity designs may be employed.

For projects that are focused on special populations in which sufficient numbers of participants are not available to support random assignment or matched comparison group designs, single-subject designs such as multiple baseline or treatment-reversal or interrupted time series that are capable of demonstrating causal relationships can be employed.

Proposed evaluation strategies that use neither experimental designs with random assignment nor quasi-experimental designs using a matched comparison group nor regression discontinuity designs will not be considered responsive to the priority when sufficient numbers of participants are available to support these designs. Evaluation strategies that involve too small a number of participants to support group designs must be capable of demonstrating the causal effects of an intervention or program on those participants.

The proposed evaluation plan must describe how the project evaluator will collect—before the project intervention commences and after it ends—valid and reliable data that measure the impact of participation in the program or in the comparison group.

Points awarded under this priority will be determined by the quality of the proposed evaluation method. In determining the quality of the evaluation method, we will consider the extent to which the applicant presents a feasible, credible plan that includes the following:

1. The type of design to be used (that is, random assignment or matched comparison). If matched comparison, include in the plan a discussion of why random assignment is not feasible.
2. Outcomes to be measured.
3. A discussion of how the applicant plans to assign students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to the project and control group or match them for comparison with other students, teachers, classrooms, or schools.
4. A proposed evaluator, preferably independent, with the necessary background and technical expertise to carry out the proposed evaluation. An independent evaluator does not have any authority over the project and is not involved in its implementation.

In general, depending on the implemented program or project, under a competitive preference priority, random assignment evaluation methods will receive more points than matched comparison evaluation methods.

**Invitational Priorities:** For FY 2010 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, these priorities are invitational priorities.

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(1) we do not give an application that meets these invitational priorities a competitive or absolute preference over other applications.

These priorities are:

1. **Invitational Priority 1.** Applications that support activities to enable students to achieve proficiency or advanced proficiency in mathematics.
2. **Invitational Priority 2.** Applications that support activities to enable students to achieve proficiency or advanced proficiency in reading.
3. **Invitational Priority 3.** Applications that support activities to enable students attending schools in corrective action or restructuring under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA) to achieve proficiency or advanced proficiency in reading and mathematics.
4. **Invitational Priority 4.** Applications that focus on increasing access to arts education for students who attend rural schools, as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics.
5. **Invitational Priority 5.** Applications that provide for the development and dissemination of grant products and results through Open Educational Resources (OER). OER are teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license that permits their free use or repurposing by others. This invitational priority encourages applications that describe how the applicants will make their AEMDD grant products and resources freely available online, in an effort to share arts content, proven teaching strategies, and lessons learned in implementing AEMDD projects with the wider community of educators.

**Note:** Each applicant addressing this priority is encouraged to include plans for how the applicant will disseminate resources, for example through a Web site that is freely available to all users. Each of these applicants is also encouraged to include plans specifying how the project will identify quality resources, such as lesson plans, primary source activities, reading lists, teacher reflections, and video of quality arts education teaching and student learning in action, for presentation to the wider community.

While we will not score applicants based on the invitational priorities, we encourage applicants to take advantage of the competitive preference priority if their model allows them to do so.

**Application Requirement**

To be eligible for AEMDD funds, applicants must propose to address the needs of low-income children by carrying out projects that serve at least one elementary or middle school in which 35 percent or more of the children enrolled are from low-income families (based on data used in meeting the poverty criteria in Title I, Section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (ESEA)).

**Definitions**

As used in the absolute priority in this notice—

**Arts** includes music, dance, theater, media arts, and visual arts, including folk arts.

**Integrating** means (i) encouraging the use of high-quality arts instruction in other academic/content areas and (ii) strengthening the place of the arts as a core academic subject in the school curriculum.

**Based on research,** 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 data available and is effective in improving student achievement and performance and other program objectives.

As used in the competitive preference priority in this notice—
Scientifically based research (section 9101(37) of the ESEA, 20 U.S.C. 7801(37));

(A) Means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs; and

(B) Includes research that—

(i) Employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;

(ii) Involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;

(iii) Relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;

(iv) Is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions and with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest, with a preference for random-assignment experiments, or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;

(v) Ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and

(vi) Has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.

Random assignment or experimental design means random assignment of students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to participate in a project being evaluated (treatment group) or not participate in the project (control group). The effect of the project is the difference in outcomes between the treatment and control groups.

Quasi-experimental designs include several designs that attempt to approximate a random assignment design.

Carefully matched comparison groups design means a quasi-experimental design in which project participants are matched with non-participants based on key characteristics that are thought to be related to the outcome.

Regression discontinuity design means a quasi-experimental design that closely approximates an experimental design. In a regression discontinuity design, participants are assigned to a treatment or control group based on a numerical rating or score of a variable unrelated to the treatment such as the rating of an application for funding. Eligible students, teachers, classrooms, or schools above a certain score (“cut score”) are assigned to the treatment group and those below the score are assigned to the control group. In the case of the scores of applicants’ proposals for funding, the “cut score” is established at the point where the program funds available are exhausted.

Single subject design means a design that relies on the comparison of treatment effects on a single subject or group of single subjects. There is little confidence that findings based on this design would be the same for other members of the population.

Treatment reversal design means a single subject design in which a pre-treatment or baseline outcome measurement is compared with a post-treatment measure. Treatment would then be stopped for a period of time, a second baseline measure of the outcome would be taken, followed by a second application of the treatment or a different treatment. For example, this design might be used to evaluate a behavior modification program for disabled students with behavior disorders.

Multiple baseline design means a single subject design to address concerns about the effects of normal development, timing of the treatment, and amount of the treatment with treatment-reversal designs by using a varying time schedule for introduction of the treatment and/or treatments of different lengths or intensity.

Interrupted time series design means a quasi-experimental design in which the outcome of interest is measured multiple times before and after the treatment for program participants only.


Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administration Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98, and 99. (b) The notice of final priority, requirements, and definitions for this program, published in the Federal Register on March 30, 2005 (70 FR 16234). (c) The notice of final priority for Scientifically Based Evaluation Methods, published in the Federal Register on January 25, 2005 (70 FR 3586).

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 79 apply to all applicants except Federally recognized Indian Tribes.

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 86 apply to institutions of higher education only.

II. Award Information

Type of Award: Discretionary grants.

Estimated Available Funds: $7,700,000.00.

Contingent upon the availability of funds and the quality of applications, we may make additional awards in FY 2011 from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition.

Estimated Range of Awards: $250,000–$300,000 for the first year of the project. Funding for the second, third, and fourth years is subject to the availability of funds and the approval of continuation awards (see 34 CFR 75.253).

Estimated Average Size of Awards: $275,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: 28.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project Period: Up to 48 months.

Note: The first 12 months of the project period may be used to build capacity to effectively carry out the comprehensive activities involved in the evaluation plan described in the competitive preference priority.

III. Eligibility Information

1. Eligible Applicants

(1) One or more local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools that are considered LEAs under State law and regulations, that may work in partnership with one or more of the following:

• A State or local non-profit or governmental arts organization.
• A State educational agency (SEA) or regional educational service agency.
• An institution of higher education.
• A public or private agency, institution, or organization, such as a community- or faith-based organization; or

(2) One or more State or local non-profit or governmental arts organizations that must work in partnership with one or more LEAs and may partner with one or more of the following:

• An SEA or regional educational service agency.
• An institution of higher education.
• A public or private agency, institution, or organization, such as a community- or faith-based organization.

Note: If more than one LEA or arts organization wishes to form a consortium and jointly submit a single application, they must follow the procedures for group applications described in 34 CFR 75.127 through 75.129 of EDGAR.

2.a. Cost Sharing or Matching: This program does not require cost sharing or matching.
b. Supplement-Not-Supplant: This program involves supplement-not-supplant funding requirements. Under section 5551(f)(2) of the ESEA, the Secretary requires that assistance provided under this program be used only to supplement, and not to supplant, any other assistance or funds made available from non-Federal sources for the activities assisted under this program. This restriction also has the effect of allowing projects to recover indirect costs only on the basis of a restricted indirect cost rate, according to the requirements in 34 CFR 75.563 and 34 CFR 76.564 through 76.569. As soon as they decide to apply, applicants are urged to contact the ED Indirect Cost Group at (202) 377–3840 for guidance about obtaining a restricted indirect cost rate to use on the Budget Information form (ED Form 524) included with the application package.

3. Coordination Requirement: Under section 5551(f)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary requires that each entity funded under this program coordinate, to the extent practicable, each project or program carried out with funds awarded under this program with appropriate activities of public or private cultural organizations, including museums, arts and cultural activities of public or private cultural organizations, including museums, arts and cultural groups at (202) 377–3840 for guidance about obtaining a restricted indirect cost rate to use on the Budget Information form (ED Form 524) included with the application package.

IV. Application and Submission Information

1. Address To Request Application Package: You can obtain an application package via the Internet, from the Education Publications Center (ED Pubs), or from the program office. To obtain a copy via the Internet, use the following address: http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/grantapps/index.html. To obtain a copy from ED Pubs, write, fax, or call the following: Education Publications Center, P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794–1398. Telephone, toll free: 1–877–433–7827. FAX: (301) 470–1244. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call, toll free: 1–877–576–7734.

You can contact ED Pubs at its Web site, also: http://www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html or at its e-mail address: edpubs@inet.ed.gov.

If you request an application from ED Pubs, be sure to identify this program as follows: CFDA number 84.351D.

To obtain a copy from the program office, contact: Diane Austin, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 4W223, Washington, DC 20202–5950.

Phone: (202) 260–1280 or by e-mail: artsdemo@ed.gov. If you use a TDD, call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1–800–877–8339.

Individuals with disabilities can obtain a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) by contacting the program contact person listed in this section.

2. Content and Form of Application Submission: Requirements concerning the content of an application, together with the forms you must submit, are in the application package for this program.

Notice of Intent To Apply: The Department will be able to develop a more efficient process for reviewing grant applications if it has a better understanding of the number of entities that intend to apply for funding under this program. Therefore, the Secretary strongly encourages each potential applicant to notify the Department by sending a short e-mail message indicating the applicant’s intent to submit an application for funding. The e-mail need not include information regarding the content of the proposed application, only the applicant’s intent to submit it. This e-mail notification should be sent to Diane Austin at artsdemo@ed.gov.

Applicants that fail to provide this e-mail notification may still apply for funding.

Page Limit: The application narrative is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your application. Applicants are strongly encouraged to limit the application narrative (Part III) to the equivalent of no more than 40 single-sided pages, using the following standards:

A “page” is 8.5” x 11”, on one side only, with 1” margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.

• Double space (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 in charts, tables, figures, and graphs.

• Use a font that is either 12 point or larger or no smaller than 10 pitch (characters per inch).

• Use one of the following fonts: Times New Roman, Courier, Courier New, or Arial. An application submitted in any other font (including Times Roman or Arial Narrow) will not be accepted.

The page limit does not apply to Part I, the cover sheet; Part II, the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; Part IV, the assurances and certifications; or the one-page abstract, the résumé, the bibliography, or the letters of support. However, the page limit does apply to all of the application narrative section (Part III).


Deadline for Notice of Intent To Apply: February 16, 2010.


Applications for grants under this competition must be submitted electronically using the Electronic Grant Application System (e-Application) accessible through the Department’s e-Grants site. For information (including dates and times) about how to submit your application electronically, or in paper format by mail or hand delivery if you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, please refer to section IV. 6. Other Submission Requirements of this notice.

We do not consider an application that does not comply with the deadline requirements.

Individuals with disabilities who need an accommodation or auxiliary aid in connection with the application process should contact the person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT in section VII of this notice. If the Department provides an accommodation or auxiliary aid to an individual with a disability in connection with the application process, the individual’s application remains subject to all other requirements and limitations in this notice.


4. Intergovernmental Review: This competition is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. Information about Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs under Executive Order 12372 is in the application package for this competition.

5. We reference regulations outlining funding restrictions in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice.

6. Other Submission Requirements. Applications for grants under this competition must be submitted electronically unless you qualify for an exception to this requirement in accordance with the instructions in this section.

a. Electronic Submission of Applications

Applications for grants under the Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Grant Program—CFDA Number 84.351D must be submitted electronically using e-Application, accessible through the Department’s e-

We will reject your application if you submit it in paper format unless, as described elsewhere in this section, you qualify for one of the exceptions to the electronic submission requirement and submit, no later than two weeks before the application deadline date, a written statement to the Department that you qualify for one of these exceptions. Further information regarding calculation of the date that is two weeks before the application deadline date is provided later in this section under Exception to Electronic Submission Requirement.

While completing your electronic application, you will be entering data online that will be saved into a database. You may not e-mail an electronic copy of a grant application to us.

Please note the following:

- You must complete the electronic submission of your grant application by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.
- Application will not accept an application for this program after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.
- Therefore, we strongly recommend that you do not wait until the application deadline date to begin the application process.
- The hours of operation of the e-Grants Web site are 6:00 a.m. Monday until 7:00 p.m. Wednesday; and 6:00 a.m. Thursday until 8:00 p.m. Sunday, Washington, DC time. Please note that, because of maintenance, the system is unavailable between 8:00 p.m. on Sundays and 6:00 a.m. on Mondays, and between 7:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and 6:00 a.m. on Thursdays, Washington, DC time. Any modifications to these hours are posted on the e-Grants Web site.
- You will not receive additional point value because you submit your application in electronic format, nor will we penalize you if you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, as described elsewhere in this section, and submit your application in paper format.
- You must submit all documents electronically, including all information you typically provide on the following forms: the Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424), the Department of Education Supplemental Information for SF 424, Budget Information—Non-Construction Programs (ED 524), and all necessary assurances and certifications. You must attach any narrative sections of your application as files in a .DOC (document), .RTF (rich text), or .PDF (Portable Document) format. If you upload a file type other than the three file types specified in this paragraph or submit a password protected file, we will not review that material.
- Your electronic application must comply with any page limit requirements described in this notice.
- Prior to submitting your electronic application, you may wish to print a copy of it for your records.
- After you electronically submit your application, you will receive an automatic acknowledgment that will include a PR/Award number (an identifying number unique to your application).
- Within three working days after submitting your electronic application, fax a signed copy of the SF 424 to the Application Control Center after following these steps:
  1. Print SF 424 from e-Application.
  2. The applicant’s Authorizing Representative must sign this form.
  3. Place the PR/Award number in the upper right hand corner of the hard-copy signature page of the SF 424.
  4. Fax the signed SF 424 to the Application Control Center at (202) 245–6272.
- We may request that you provide us original signatures on other forms at a later date.

**Application Deadline Date Extension in Case of e-Application Unavailability:**

If you are prevented from electronically submitting your application on the application deadline date because e-Application is unavailable, we will grant you an extension of one business day to enable you to transmit your application electronically, by mail, or by hand delivery. We will grant this extension if—

1. You are a registered user of e-Application and you have initiated an electronic application for this competition; and
2. (a) E-Application is unavailable for 60 minutes or more between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date; or
   (b) E-Application is unavailable for any period of time between 3:30 p.m. and 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.

We must acknowledge and confirm these periods of unavailability before granting you an extension. To request this extension or to confirm our acknowledgment of any system unavailability, you may contact either (1) the person listed elsewhere in this notice under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT or (2) the e-Grants help desk at 1–888–336–8930. If e-Application is unavailable due to technical problems with the system and, therefore, the application deadline is extended, an e-mail will be sent to all registered users who have initiated an e-Application. Extensions referred to in this section apply only to the unavailability of e-Application.

**Exception to Electronic Submission Requirement:** You qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, and may submit your application in paper format, if you are unable to submit an application through e-Application because—

1. You do not have access to the Internet; or
2. No later than two weeks before the application deadline date (14 calendar days or, if the fourteenth calendar day before the application deadline date falls on a Federal holiday, the next business day following the Federal holiday), you mail or fax a written statement to the Department, explaining which of the two grounds for an exception prevents you from using the Internet to submit your application. If you mail your written statement to the Department, it must be postmarked no later than two weeks before the application deadline date. If you fax your written statement to the Department, we must receive the faxed statement no later than two weeks before the application deadline date.

Address and mail or fax your statement to: Diane Austin, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 5W229, Washington, DC 20202–5900. FAX: (202) 205–5630.

Your paper application must be submitted in accordance with the mail or hand delivery instructions described in this notice.

**b. Submission of Paper Applications by Mail**

If you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, you may mail (through the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier) your application to the Department. You must mail the original and two copies of your application, on or before the application deadline date, to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education, Application Control Center, Attention: [CFDA Number 84.351D], LBJ Basement Level 1, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20202–4260.

You must show proof of mailing consisting of one of the following:

1. A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark.
Each criterion also includes the factors that the reviewers will consider in determining how well an application meets the criterion. The Note following selection criterion (6) is guidance to help applicants in preparing their applications and is not required by statute or regulations. The selection criteria are as follows:

1. Need for project (15 points). The Secretary considers the need for the proposed project by considering the following factors:
   (a) The extent to which the proposed project will provide services or otherwise address the needs of students at risk of educational failure.
   (b) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

2. Significance (10 points). The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project by considering the following factor:
   The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.

3. Quality of the project design (25 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project by considering the following factors:
   (a) The extent to which the design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practices.
   (b) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
   (c) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

4. Quality of project personnel (10 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will 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 traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.

5. Quality of the management plan (20 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project by considering the following factors:
   (a) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
   (b) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.
   (c) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

6. Quality of the project evaluation (20 points). The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project by considering the following factors:
   (a) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
   (b) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

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 evaluation plan should include benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives and also outcome measures to assess the impact on teaching and learning, or other important outcomes for project participants. More specifically, the plan should identify the individual or organization that has agreed to serve as evaluator for the project and describe the qualifications of that evaluator. The plan should describe the evaluation design, indicating: (1) What types of data will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) what methods will be used; (4) what instruments will be developed and when these instruments will be developed; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the applicant will use the information collected through the evaluation to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and about effective strategies for replication in other settings. Applicants are encouraged to devote an appropriate level of resources to project evaluation.
VI. Award Administration Information
1. Award Notices: If your application is successful, we notify you of your U.S. Representative and U.S. Senators and send you a Grant Award Notification (GAN). We may notify you informally, also.

2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements: We identify administrative and national policy requirements in the application package and reference these and other requirements in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice.

We reference the regulations outlining the terms and conditions of an award in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice and include these and other specific conditions in the GAN. The GAN also incorporates your approved application as part of your binding commitments under the grant.

3. Grant Administration: Applicants should budget for a three-day meeting for project directors to be held in Washington, DC.

4. Reporting: At the end of your project period, you must submit a final performance report, including financial information, as directed by the Secretary. If you receive a multi-year award, you must submit an annual performance report that provides the most current performance and financial expenditure information as directed by the Secretary under 34 CFR 75.118. The Secretary may also require more frequent performance reports under 34 CFR 75.720(c). For specific requirements on reporting, please go to http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html.

5. Performance Measures: The Department has established the following Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) performance measures for the Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Grant Program: (1) The percentage of students participating in arts model projects funded through the AEMDD Program who demonstrate proficiency in mathematics compared to those in control or comparison groups and (2) the percentage of students participating in arts model projects who demonstrate proficiency in reading compared to those in control or comparison groups.

These measures constitute the Department’s indicators of success for this program. Consequently, we advise an applicant for a grant under this program to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed project. Each grantee will be required to provide, in its annual performance and final reports, data about its progress in meeting these measures.

VII. Agency Contact
FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Austin, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 4W223, Washington, DC 20202–5950. Telephone: (202) 260–1280 or by e-mail: artsdemo@ed.gov.

If you use a TDD, call the FRS, toll free, at 1–800–877–8339.

VIII. Other Information
Accessible Format: Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document and a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the program contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT in section VII of this notice.

Electronic Access to This Document: You can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site: http://www.ed.gov/news/fedregister. To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site.


Dated: January 12, 2010.

James H. Shelton, III,
Assistant Deputy Secretary for Innovation and Improvement.

[FR Doc. 2010–702 Filed 1–14–10; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Notice of Public Hearing
ACTION: Notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The National Assessment Governing Board is announcing a public hearing on January 28, 2010 to obtain comment on the draft Technological Literacy Assessment Framework for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Public and private parties and organizations are invited to present written and/or oral testimony. The hearing will be held at the Washington Court Hotel, 525 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20001 from 9:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. EST.

This notice sets forth the schedule and proposed agenda of a forthcoming public hearing of the National Assessment Governing Board. This notice also describes the functions of the Board. Notice of this meeting is required under Section 10 (a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This document is intended to notify members of the general public of their opportunity to provide comment.

Individuals who will need special accommodations in order to attend the hearing (such as interpreting services, assistive listening devices, materials in alternative format) should notify Munira Mwalimu at 202–357–6938 or at Munira.Mwalimu@ed.gov no later than January 21, 2010. We will attempt to meet requests after this date, but cannot guarantee availability of the requested accommodation. The meeting site is accessible to individuals with disabilities.


Location: Washington Court Hotel, 525 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001.

Time: 9:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. EST

Background: Under Public Law 107–279, the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) is responsible for determining the content and methodology of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The assessment is required to provide a fair and accurate measurement of student academic achievement through a random sampling process that produces representative data for the nation, the states, and other participating jurisdictions. The Board’s responsibilities include selecting subject areas to be assessed, developing assessment specifications and frameworks, designing the methodology of the assessment, developing appropriate student achievement levels for each grade and subject tested, developing standards and procedures for interstate and national comparisons, developing guidelines for reporting and disseminating results, and releasing initial NAEP results to the public.

In preparation for a new assessment in the area of Technological Literacy, the Governing Board has contracted with WestEd to convene broad-based panels of policymakers, business representatives, educators, engineers, information communication experts, and others to recommend student knowledge and skills at the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades for a planned assessment of