been adapted from guidelines developed by the Department of Education’s Office of Postsecondary Education for its “Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE).” This information is intended to aid institutions in the development of proposals and to provide guidance concerning the criteria that may be used in reviewing and evaluating proposals.

(a) The grants to institutions program will be administered by the National Security Education Program Office (NSEPO). However, the NSEPO will function as an administrative office much in the same manner as the Institute of International Education and the Academy for Educational Development function in administering NSEP scholarship and fellowship programs, respectively. The NSEPO will not review or evaluate proposals. The proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by national screening panels.

(b) The NSEP will use a two-stage review process in order to evaluate a broad range of proposal ideas. In the first stage, applicants will submit a five-page summary (double-spaced) of their proposal. An institution may submit more than one proposal, but each proposal should be submitted and will be evaluated separately and independently.

(c) NSEP expects competition for grants to be intense. By implementing a two-stage process, potential grantees are given an opportunity to present their ideas without creating a paperwork burden on both the proposal authors and the reviewers.

(d) The preliminary review process. The review of preliminary proposals will be undertaken by panels of external reviewers, not members of the NSEPO. Panels of not less than three will be assembled to review preliminary proposals. Panel members will be drawn primarily from faculty and administration in higher education but might also include representatives from the research, business, and government communities. Every effort will be made to ensure balance (geographical, ethnic, gender, institutional type, subject matter) across the entire competition.

(e) Panel members will reflect the nature of the grants program. Each panel will include a recognized expert in a field of international education. Other panelists may include experts in area studies, foreign language education, and other fields and disciplines with an international focus.

(f) Preliminary proposals will be reviewed according to a set of criteria developed in consultation with representatives from higher education, and provided to the panels. The applicant shall, at a minimum, deal with the following issues in the preliminary proposal:

1. How the proposal addresses issues of national capacity in international education.
2. What area(s), language(s), and discipline(s) the proposal addresses and the importance of these to U.S. national capacity.
3. What the applicant is proposing to do.
4. How the proposal deals with the key characteristics of the NSEP.
5. Demonstration of thorough knowledge of the state of the art in the particular area of the proposal and how this proposal develops or builds capacity, not duplicates existing capacity.

(g) The applicant must also include a budget estimate. This budget estimate, for the first year of the proposal, must include the following:

1. A summary of anticipated direct costs including professional salaries, funds for students, travel, materials and supplies, consultants, etc., and how or why these costs are needed.
2. An estimate of institutional indirect costs. The budget estimate must also indicate whether funding is also being requested for a second year and, if so, an estimate of the amount to be requested.

(h) Panelists will review and rank proposals and forward their recommendations to the NSEPO. NSEPO will review and analyze these recommendations and inform all applicants of decisions.

§ 206.5 Final proposal process.

NSEPO will provide detailed comments on proposals to all applicants who are invited to prepare a final proposal.

(a) Final proposals should be limited to no more than 25 double-spaced pages. Proposals will be reviewed by
national panels constructed similarly to those designed to review preliminary proposals. In addition to a field review process, panelists will be assembled in Washington D.C. to discuss and review the independent and competing merits of proposals.

(b) Proposals will be evaluated in two basic categories:
(1) Proposals that address study abroad infrastructure and
(2) Proposals that address domestic infrastructure. Should proposals deal with both of these issues, they will be evaluated in a third category. This grouping of proposals will ensure that all categories of proposals receive funding consideration.

(c) In general, final proposals will be considered on the following selection criteria:
(1) Importance of the problem. Each proposal will be evaluated according to the merit of how it addresses issue(s) of national capacity. The proposal must articulate the importance of the problem it addresses, how the proposal addresses issues of national capacity in international education, and how it is consistent with the objectives of the NSEP.
(2) Importance of proposed foreign language(s), foreign area(s), field(s) or discipline(s). The proposal will be evaluated according to how well it articulates the need for programs in the proposed areas, languages, fields, or disciplines.
(3) Identification of need and gaps/shortfalls. The proposal will be evaluated according to its persuasiveness in identifying where the needs exist and where serious shortfalls exist in the capacity to fill the need. The proposal should clearly identify why these gaps exist and provide a strong indication of familiarity with the state of the field in the proposal area.
(4) Cost effectiveness. Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of ‘‘educational value for the dollar.’’ NSEP is interested in funding proposals in areas where other funding is limited or in areas where NSEP funding can significantly augment or complement other sources. NSEP is not interested in replacing funds available from other sources or in duplicating other efforts. Also, NSEP is interested in projects whose dollar levels and long-range budget plans provide for realistic continuation by the grantee institution and adaptation by other institutions. NSEP is interested in proposed approaches to leveraging other funds against the proposed project.

(5) Evaluation plans. Proposals will be evaluated on their approach to measuring impact. What impact will the proposed program have on national capacity? How will the proposed program deal with assessing language and foreign cultural competency? In the case of study abroad programs, how will the success and impact of study abroad experiences be assessed. Proposals should not defer the consideration of these issues to a latter stage of the effort. Evaluation and assessment should be an integral part of the entire proposal effort.

(6) Prospects for wider impact. Proposals must address national needs and will be evaluated according to how well they are likely to address these needs. What component of the higher education community does the proposal address? How diverse a student population will the proposed program address? What applications to other institutions will be made available, either directly or indirectly, because of the proposed program?

(7) Capacity and commitment of the applicant. The proposal will be evaluated according to the evidence provided on the commitment of the institution, and other institutions, to the proposed project. What other institutions are involved and what is their commitment? If there are commitments from foreign institutions, what is the evidence of this commitment? Are their plans for the institution to integrate the efforts of the proposed program into the educational process? What plans are there for eventual self-support? As with many other similar programs, NSEP is particularly interested in the degree to which the institution is willing to bear a reasonable share of the direct and indirect costs of the proposed project.

(d) Applicants should also indicate if they currently receive or are seeking support from other sources. Applicants should indicate why support from NSEP is appropriate, if other sources are also being sought.
PART 210—ENFORCEMENT OF STATE TRAFFIC LAWS ON DOD INSTALLATIONS
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SOURCE: 46 FR 58306, Dec. 1, 1981, unless otherwise noted.

§ 210.1 Purpose.
This part establishes policies pursuant to the requirements of DoD Directive 6055.4,1 “Department of Defense Traffic Safety Program,” November 7, 1978, and to authority delegated to the Secretary of Defense under Enclosure 1 for the enforcement, on DoD military installations, of those state vehicular and pedestrian traffic laws that cannot be assimilated under U.S.C., Title 18, section 13.


§ 210.2 Applicability and scope.
(a) The provisions of this part apply to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Military Departments, the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the Defense Agencies.
(b) The provisions encompass all persons who operate or control a motor vehicle or otherwise use the streets of a military installation over which the United States exercises exclusive or concurrent legislative jurisdiction.
(c) The provisions govern only vehicular and traffic offenses or infractions that cannot be assimilated under U.S.C., Title 18, section 13, thereby precluding application of state laws to traffic offenses committed on military installations.


§ 210.3 Policy.
(a) It is the policy of the Department of Defense that an effective, comprehensive traffic safety program be established and maintained at all military installations as prescribed in DoD Directive 6055.4.
(b) State vehicular and pedestrian traffic laws that are now or may hereafter be in effect shall be expressly adopted and made applicable on military installations to the extent provided by this part. All persons on a military installation shall comply with the vehicular and pedestrian traffic laws of the state in which the installation is located.
(c) Pursuant to the authority established in the Enclosure 1 to DoD Directive 5525.4, installation commanders of all DoD installations in the United States and over which the United States has exclusive or concurrent legislative jurisdiction are delegated the authority to establish additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic rules and regulations for their installations. All persons on a military installation shall comply with locally established vehicular and pedestrian traffic rules and regulations.
(d) A person found guilty of violating, on a military installation, any state vehicular or pedestrian traffic law or local installation vehicular or pedestrian traffic rule or regulation made applicable to the installation under the provisions of this part is subject to a fine of not more than $50 or imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both, for each violation (40 U.S.C. 318c).
(e) A copy of this part shall be posted in an appropriate place on the DoD installation concerned.


§ 210.4 Responsibilities.
(a) The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics) shall modify this part as appropriate.
(b) Secretaries of the Military Departments shall comply with this part.

1Copies may be obtained, at cost, from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

2See footnote 1 to §210.1.