

separate files in TIFF format. The Federal Register online via *GPO Access* is available via the Internet or as a dial-in service. Historical data is available from January 1994 forward.

Other databases currently available online through *GPO Access* include the *Government Manual*, *Congressional Record*, *Congressional Record Index*, including the *History of Bills*; *Congressional Bills*; *Public Laws*; *U.S. Code*; *GAO Reports*; and a growing list of important Government documents on the same day of publication.

Seating is limited. Individuals interested in attending may reserve a space by contacting John Berger, Product Manager, at the GPO's Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services, by Internet e-mail at jberger@eids21.eids.gpo.gov; by telephone on 202-512-1525; or by fax on 202-512-1262. Seating reservations for Federal agencies will be accepted for the January 10th sessions through Friday, January 5, 1996; and for the January 17th session through Friday, January 12th. From January 8-9 and from January 15-16, reservations will be accepted from the general public on a *space available basis* for the January 10th and January 17th sessions, respectively.

Michael F. DiMario
Public Printer

[FR Doc. 95-31042 Filed 12-20-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 1505-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Findings of Scientific Misconduct

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HHS.
ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) has made final findings of scientific misconduct in the following case:

Ruth Lupu, Ph.D., Georgetown University Medical Center: On December 6, 1995, based on an investigation conducted by Georgetown University Medical Center, ORI found that Ruth Lupu, Ph.D., committed scientific misconduct by submitting a false letter of collaboration in an unfunded application to the Public Health Service (PHS). Letters of collaboration are a significant factor in the evaluation of applications.

Dr. Lupu has entered into a Voluntary Exclusion Agreement with ORI in which she has accepted ORI's finding and has agreed to exclude herself voluntarily, for the period beginning December 6, 1995, and ending January 30, 1997, from serving in any advisory capacity to PHS, including but not limited to service on any PHS advisory committee, board, and/or peer review committee, or as a consultant.

In addition, Dr. Lupu has voluntarily agreed to accept the administrative sanctions imposed by Georgetown University Medical Center, which include requirements that:

- (1) a letter of reprimand be issued and retained in her personnel file for two years; and
- (2) her future grant applications, proposals, and other publications be subject to special monitoring and review for two years.

No scientific publications were required to be corrected as part of this Agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Director, Division of Research Investigations, Office of Research Integrity, 5515 Security Lane, Suite 700, Rockville, MD 20852.

Lyle W. Bivens,
Director, Office of Research Integrity.
[FR Doc. 95-31048 Filed 12-20-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4160-17-P

Findings of Scientific Misconduct

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HHS.
ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) has made final findings of scientific misconduct in the following case:

Ms. Victoria Santa Cruz, University of Arizona: Based on an investigation conducted by the institution, ORI found that Ms. Victoria Santa Cruz, former Program Coordinator, College of Nursing, University of Arizona, engaged in scientific misconduct by fabricating interview data on a questionnaire intended for use in two studies funded by two Public Health Service (PHS) grants.

Ms. Santa Cruz did not contest the ORI findings or administrative actions, which require that, for a period of three years, any institution that proposes her participation in PHS-supported research must submit a supervisory plan designed to ensure the scientific integrity of her contribution. Ms. Santa Cruz is also prohibited from serving in any advisory capacity to PHS, including but not limited to service on any PHS

advisory committee, board, and/or peer review committee, or as a consultant for a period of three (3) years.

Because the studies involved are ongoing, no publications were affected by the fabricated data, and no clinical treatment has been based on the results of the studies.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Director, Division of Research Investigations, Office of Research Integrity, 5515 Security Lane, Suite 700, Rockville, MD 20852.

Lyle W. Bivens,
Director, Office of Research Integrity.
[FR Doc. 95-31049 Filed 12-20-95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4160-17-M

Administration on Children and Families

Local Research Partnerships for Early Head Start Programs: Availability of Funds and Request for Applications

AGENCY: Head Start Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF), Administration for Children and Families (ACF).

ACTION: Availability of funds and request for applications to conduct research in Early Head Start programs.

SUMMARY: The Head Start Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families has recently awarded grants to provide comprehensive services to families with infants and toddlers. A cross-site evaluation of a subsample of the total 68 Early Head Start programs will be performed by Mathematica Policy Research Institute which was designated as the National Early Head Start Evaluation contractor. Additional site-specific research will be conducted by research partners who reside in or near the same subset of Early Head Start programs and will attempt to determine the interrelationships of child, family, program and community variables and program outcomes (local research). This announcement describes the requirements to be met by applicants seeking to conduct the local research.

DATES: The closing time and date for receipt of applications is 5 p.m. (Eastern Time Zone) February 20, 1996. Applications received after 5 p.m. will be classified as late.

ADDRESSES: Mail applications to: Early Head Start Local Research, Department of Health and Human Services, ACF/ Division of Discretionary Grants, 6th floor, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, Washington, DC 20447, Mail Stop 6c-462, Attn: Application for Early Head Start Local Research.

Hand Delivered, Courier or Overnight Delivery applications are accepted during the normal working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, on or prior to the established closing date at: Program Announcement: ACYF/HS, Administration for Children and Families, Division of Discretionary Grants, ACF Mailroom, 2nd Floor Loading Dock, Aerospace Center, 901 D Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The ACYF Operations Center, Technical Assistance Team (1-800-351-2293), is available to answer questions regarding application requirements and to refer you to the appropriate contact person in ACYF for programmatic questions.

In order to determine the number of expert reviewers that will be necessary, if you are going to submit an application, please send a post card with or call in the following information: the name, address, and telephone and fax number of the contact person and the name of the organization four weeks prior to the submission deadline date to: Administration on Children, Youth and Families Operations Center, Ellsworth Associates, Inc., 3030 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 240, Arlington, VA 22201, (1-800-351-2293).

If you decide to submit after the notification date, you may still submit a proposal.

Part I. General Information

A. Table of Contents

This announcement is divided into four parts, plus appendices:

Part I provides information on the purpose of the local research effort and a discussion of issues particularly relevant to the local research under this announcement.

- A. Table of Contents
- B. Definitions
- C. Purpose
- D. Background
- E. Local Research Studies

Part II contains key information such as eligible applicants, project periods, special conditions and other information.

- A. Statutory Authority
- B. Eligible Applicants
- C. Special Conditions
- D. Cooperative Agreements
- E. Project Duration and Federal Share

Part III presents the criteria upon which the proposals will be reviewed and evaluated.

- A. Criteria
- B. Review Process
- Part IV contains information for preparing the fiscal year 1996 application.

- A. Availability of Forms
- B. Proposal limits
- C. Check List for a Complete Application
- D. Due Date
- E. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980
- F. Required Notification of State Single Point of Contact

Appendix A contains a list of the Early Head Start grantees.

Appendix B-1 contains the Request for Proposal for contract to conduct the evaluation of Early Head Start as originally published and now funded.

Appendix B-2 contains the tentative measures proposed for the cross-site evaluation.

Appendix C includes the relevant forms necessary for completing the application.

B. Definitions

Research Partner: The initial university or non-profit organization designated in the Early Head Start grantee's proposal or a university or non-profit organization which formed a partnership with an Early Head Start grantee for the purpose of conducting the research under this announcement after the Early Head Start grant was awarded.

Cooperative Agreement: A cooperative agreement is a funding mechanism which allows substantial Federal involvement in the activities undertaken with Federal financial support. Details of the responsibilities, relationships, and governance of the cooperative agreement will be spelled out in the terms and conditions of the award. The specific responsibilities of the Federal staff and grantee staff are tentatively listed in Part II-D and will be agreed upon prior to the award of each cooperative agreement.

C. Purpose

The purpose of this announcement is to invite universities and non-profit organizations who agree to be the research partners of Early Head Start program grantees to submit proposals for competitive Cooperative Agreements to (1) conduct local research studies on issues related to Early Head Start which will enrich and expand the National Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Study and benefit the field, and (2) establish the foundation for a possible longitudinal study of the mediating and moderating influences on the developmental progress of Early Head Start and Head Start children and families.

D. Background

On March 17, 1995, ACF announced the availability of funds on a

competitive basis for Early Head Start Programs. Sixty-eight applicants were successful and became Early Head Start grantees on the effective date of September 30, 1995. (Applicants should be familiar with this document in order to prepare a responsive proposal. Copies of this announcement are available from the Technical Assistance Team at (1-800-351-2293.) Along with the development of the program specifications for Early Head Start, ACYF designed a set of research and evaluation initiatives to establish the efficacy of the Early Head Start program and to contribute new knowledge to the field on factors which influence the developmental progress of low-income infant and toddlers and their families. The plan for the Early Head Start research and evaluation activities is based on the premise that the first set of Early Head Start programs are prototypes of the Early Head Start concept of state-of-the-art services for families with infants and toddlers. They will operate during a period which will almost assuredly see major social reforms and reconfigurations in services including welfare, health and child care. Therefore, the lessons learned and the models that will be developed will shape the direction of services for families with infants and toddlers well into the 21st century. The plan features (1) a dynamic and iterative formative evaluation process, designed to be used in subsequent Early Head Start programs, that will serve as the instrument for continuous program improvement; (2) an impact evaluation to determine whether and under what conditions program prototypes were effective, and (3) an integrated research base consisting of local research studies as well as the cross-site study for generating further hypotheses around a broad array of potential development and service issues and possibilities; and (4) an intended longitudinal study of both Early Head Start and Head Start.

On May 19, 1995, the first phase of the competitive award process for the conduct of the research and evaluation activities was initiated as a Request for Proposal for a national contractor to perform the cross-site evaluation of Early Head Start (Appendix B-1). The contract resulting from the competition for the national contractor was awarded to Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. This announcement is the second phase, in which cooperative agreements will be awarded on a competitive basis to the research partners of Early Head Start grantees to conduct local research studies.

E. Local Research Studies

1. Local Research Under This Announcement

a. Role of Local Researchers

Under the total Early Head Start Research and Evaluation effort local researchers will have two significant roles:

(1) Under this announcement they will conduct research relevant to the issues addressed in section E.2.b. below; and (2) under a subcontract to the national contractor they will be responsible for the collection of data for the cross-site study. The local researchers will form a consortium with the other local researchers and the national contractor to insure that all the parts of this study form a cohesive whole. A Technical Review Panel will be appointed by ACYF to review all the research and evaluation efforts as a whole and provide additional input. (See Appendix B-1 for a more detailed description.) In order to ensure the minimum of intrusion for the Early Head Start programs and to ensure a cohesive study, no applicants will be considered for an award under this announcement unless they agree to serve as subcontractors to the national contractor.

b. Concepts

Local research studies are intended to supplement, complement and enrich the research that will be conducted in the cross-site study. (See Appendix B-1 The Statement of Work for the Cross-site Evaluation and Appendix B-2 for a list of the tentative measures proposed for the cross-site evaluation.) With full access to the cross-site data collected in their respective sites, local investigators will have an opportunity to explore mediating events or the theoretical pathways that explain the results that are obtained. In addition, local research provides an opportunity to identify outcomes, that because of data constraints, are not explored in the cross-site study or are specific to an individual site. It also expands the possibilities for multiple measures of the same construct. Another advantage of local research is the enhanced opportunity for the use of observational, ethnographic, case study and other qualitative approaches that inform our understanding of how the program functions and explain the particular outcomes that are achieved.

Four outcome domains and specific outcomes under each were preliminarily identified by the Advisory Committee on Services for Families with Infants and Toddlers for Early Head Start.

Although no one program is expected to be equally successful across all outcomes, these outcomes were identified by the Committee as particularly important for continued child, family and program development.

Child: Health and physical development; social competency; secure attachments with parents and other caregivers; language and cognitive development; resiliency factors; benefits to siblings.

Family: Attitudes towards parenting; parent-child interaction; reduction in teenage pregnancy and positive birth outcomes; having a medical home; parenting, employability and progress towards self-sufficiency; training and education; housing; physical and mental health; substance abuse; home environment; safety; involvement in the Early Head Start program; knowledge of child development; child guidance beliefs and practices.

Community: Collaboration among agencies serving children and families; seamlessness in referrals and actual service provision; quality of services for children and families; increase in services for infants and toddlers; safety.

Staff: Staff-parent/child relationships; staff continuity; staff professional development; staff compensation; staff physical and mental health; staff qualifications; and staffing patterns.

The major question for the local studies is "What mediates and moderates positive child and family development within the context of the specific Early Head Start program and the local community?" Each of the local research studies may focus on variables within one of the four outcome domains listed above. Positive child and family development are the ultimate objectives of Early Head Start, and thus, must have a prominent focus. However, well-designed local research studies which focus on particular staff or community outcomes will be considered if their relationship to the well-being of children and families can be theoretically linked through the existing literature and investigated within the time frame of the five-year cooperative agreement. Investigators focusing on the same outcome domain may find additional opportunities for cooperative research. Depending on the questions for the local research, investigators may choose or not choose to incorporate the control group, which will be part of the cross-site evaluation, in the local research study.

Within the framework of the Early Head Start program design, each site represents a unique model based upon the needs, values, resources and cultural climate of its community. Therefore,

within the array of possible outcomes, it is highly likely that each program will place different emphases among them and work toward additional objectives that are unique to the particular local site. It is therefore important for the local research studies to identify site-specific outcomes which are not explored in the cross-site study and to study intra-site differential impacts and the reasons for them. The local studies will enhance the cross-site analysis by the provision of additional explanatory material for inter-site differences and by the identification of additional effects of Early Head Start programs. The first data collection point for the child's developmental status, attachment, mother/child interaction and other child and family measures for the cross-site analysis will be around the time of the child's first birthday. (See Appendix B-2 for a list of tentative measures.) If applicants see a need for earlier data collection for their local research studies, they may propose such data collection using the same or other measures as part of the local research data collection and analyses.

c. Study Parameters

—Design

The program sites whose local research partners receive awards under this announcement will be sites in which both local research and the national cross-site evaluation are conducted. However, if less than 12 proposals receive an acceptable rating, additional sites may be selected to participate only in the national cross-site evaluation to ensure 12 sites for the cross-site effort. The sites with local researchers will become the potential sites to continue on with the follow-up longitudinal studies. For the cross-site evaluation, all 12 sites, whether they are additionally local research sites or not, will be required to participate in random assignment of those families who have applied to the Early Head Start program and in which there is a pregnant woman or a child under one year of age. Such families will be randomly assigned to either the program or control group under a system designed by the national contractor with participation from the local researchers. The Early Head Start program must agree to fully cooperate with the random assignment as a condition for the research partner to receive an award under this announcement.

As noted above, applicants are not required to utilize the control group in their local research designs unless the proposed research questions require such a design. However, since the cost

of the data collection on a number of child and family measures for the program and control group will be covered by the national contractor, the applicant may wish to consider adding an additional sample, such as a random sample of the Early Head Start eligible population, or other types of scientifically sound samples. These samples could contribute valuable information to the Early Head Start research and evaluation effort and would considerably strengthen longitudinal follow-up efforts.

—Sample

In order to be considered for an Early Head Start research cooperative agreement, the applicants must be able to guarantee that their Early Head Start program partners have the ability to recruit a minimum of 150 families meeting the designated criteria for the random assignment pool. Specifically, the families to be recruited must include a child who is born between June 1, 1995 and June 30, 1997 and must not have had a child enrolled in Head Start and PCC (Parent and Child Centers) within the last 12 months, or, in the case of CCDP (Comprehensive Child Development Program), the last five years. Neither may the families to be recruited have been enrolled in any other Federal, State or local program with similar comprehensive services for the last 12 months. Exceptions to these requirements will be considered on a site by site, or family basis after the research sites have been selected. (*Note:* Enrollment in other programs is defined as participating for a minimum of three months.) The families in the random assignment pool, as the term implies, will be randomly assigned to either the program or the control group. (A minimum of 75 in each.) Therefore the Early Head Start program must have the ability to enroll a minimum of 75 families who meet the research requirements during the research recruitment period of March 1, 1996 and June 1, 1998 (27 months). The families must be enrolled some time during the mother's pregnancy or before the child is one year of age. The Early Head Start programs will be continuously enrolling families during the course of their operation. Therefore, the research sample will be an additive sample rather than a cohort sample. However, no family will be recruited into the research sample if the child is born before June 1, 1995 or after June 30, 1997. If a research sample family leaves the program during the 27 month research recruitment period, replacement of families can only be

made within the parameters stated above.

Although there is a 27 month recruitment and enrollment period for the research sample, sites may wish to use all or part of that period to recruit the requisite sample in accordance with what works best for their program. (For example, some programs may not be ready to recruit or enroll families by March and other programs may wish to enroll the majority of their research sample families as early as possible.) However, to ensure that the site will reach the requisite sample size, the earliest possible enrollment of the full research sample is encouraged. In addition, any site which anticipates that it can secure a sample of over 75 program families and 75 control families over the recruitment period that meet the research criteria, may enroll other families, in excess of the 75 families, which do not meet the research criteria. These additional families will not be included in the research sample. Programs are encouraged, however, to achieve the largest research sample possible, up to 125 families each for the program and comparison group. Larger samples would be a major advantage for any future longitudinal research.

2. Considerations for the Longitudinal Studies

Longitudinal studies beyond the five years of the Early Head Start research and evaluation effort are outside the scope of the present announcement. However, it is ACYF's intent to engage in such longitudinal studies, given availability of future funds and the feasibility of such efforts in five years time. It will be necessary to lay the groundwork for such studies from the beginning of the Early Head Start research and evaluation effort in order to ensure that early data necessary for the longer effort is collected.

Although the longitudinal studies are related to and embedded in the Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Study, they have a number of sufficiently unique considerations to warrant a separate discussion.

a. Eligibility—It is anticipated that universities and non-profit organizations which receive Early Head Start research grants under this announcement will be potential candidates for follow-on longitudinal research grants. The exact number of grants that will be awarded for the follow-on longitudinal studies will depend on the availability of funds and other criteria such as the size of the sample left at the site, the quality of the research conducted to date, and the level of program implementation.

b. Studies—The longitudinal follow-ons can be conceptualized as two studies which serve different purposes.

Longitudinal Studies of Early Head Start

Longitudinal studies of Early Head Start will address the contributions of earlier intervention to the child and family's later development.

Longitudinal Studies of Head Start

Since Early Head Start programs are required to establish formal linkages with local Head Start programs in order to provide for the continuity of services for children and families, the Early Head Start research sites provide a unique opportunity for the conduct of longitudinal studies of Head Start. Presently, there are no existing studies of Head Start where the early service patterns and experiences of children and families either enrolling in Head Start or serving as comparisons or controls are known to the extent that they will be known in Early Head Start. That data will be available, at least for part of the Head Start population, in the Early Head Start research sites by the time Longitudinal Studies of Head Start are underway. In addition, the studies can make progress in addressing the question of whom among the Head Start population Head Start serves.

Design and sampling issues for both studies will need careful consideration.

Part II Program Information and Requirements

A. Statutory Authority

The Head Start Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9801 *et seq.*

B. Eligible Applicants

Universities and other non-profit institutions which have been designated by the Early Head Start grantees listed in Appendix A as their research partner for the purposes of the impact evaluation.

A research partner may be the institution identified in the Early Head Start grantee's proposal or a new or additional research partner that the Early Head Start grantee has selected for the purposes of conducting the research under this announcement.

Note: Only one university or non-profit institution per each Early Head Start grantee may apply. An applicant must be certified by the Early Head Start grantee as the designated research partner. In addition, if a university or non-profit institution applies on behalf of one or more investigators as the research partner of an Early Head Start grantee, the university or non-profit institution may only apply as the partner of any other Early Head Start grantee if applying in behalf of different investigators.

C. Additional Special Requirements

1. In order to be accepted for review, applications must contain a letter from the Program Director of the Early Head Start program certifying that the applicant is the designated research partner of that program.

2. The proposed local research study must not overlay additional interventions for children, families or staff which are designed by the local research partner for research purposes beyond the existing Early Head Start intervention designed by the program for that site. (For example, the local research may not investigate research hypotheses that would require the assignment of families enrolled in the program to treatment and control groups.)

3. Applicants must agree to enter a subcontractual or other arrangement with the national contractor for the purposes of collecting the data for the cross-site study and for site-specific analysis of the cross-site data. *The subcontract with the national contractor will be in addition to the funds received under this announcement* and will primarily consist of providing input to the cross-site design; supervision of cross-site data collection at the local site; ensuring quality control; and site specific data analyses of the cross-site data.

4. Applicants must agree to work in a consortium with the other local researchers and the national contractor in order to produce an integrated set of studies.

5. Applicants must present their proposal to and receive approval from the Early Head Start program policy councils (or other appropriate policy group) prior to submission.

6. Successful applicants must form a local advisory committee consisting of staff and parents of the Early Head Start program, other community agencies and researchers with expertise in areas relevant to the local research.

7. Applicants' Early Head Start program partner must be able to recruit and enroll the required number and types of families as described in Part I, section E-1-c above.

8. The principal investigator and at least one other key research team member must attend a minimum of one two-day meeting of the local researchers in Washington, DC in addition to the two-day meetings with the national contractor and the Technical Review Panel. A third day will be provided at the national contractor meetings in order for the local researchers to meet on the issues and coordination of the local research projects. Successful

applicants must also plan to attend Head Start's Third National Research Conference in Washington, DC June 20-23, 1996. The applicant will be responsible for all travel expenses related to these meetings. These travel expenses may be included in the applicant's budget.

9. Since the research will be conducted at the Early Head Start program site, applicants must use their off-campus research rates for indirect costs. If the applicant is a non-profit organization, the applicant is limited to an indirect cost rate of no more than 15 percent.

10. In submitting an application, the applicant understands that the data resulting from the local research is the property of the ACYF. Therefore, a copy of the raw data set with accompanying documentation must be submitted to the Government in a manner and frequency that will be specified in consultation with the consortium during the first year of the cooperative agreement. It is not the intention of the Government to inhibit or restrict presentations and publications of the results of the local research by the grantee beyond any publishing restrictions that will be agreed upon by the Consortium and ACYF.

12. The applicant must provide all required assurances and certifications including a Protection of Human Subject Assurance as specified in the policy described on the HHS Form 596 (attached in Appendix A).

D. Cooperative Agreements

ACYF is utilizing a cooperative agreement mechanism to support local research as a means of ensuring close cooperation and coordination between and among local researchers, Early Head Start programs and the National contractor. Together, these three entities form the research team. Although the three entities have equal status on the research team, each has an area of primary responsibility: (1) The Early Head Start program has primary responsibility for the design and implementation of program services and activities; (2) the National contractor has primary responsibility for the cross-site study; and (3) the local researcher has primary responsibility for the local research study. In applying for a cooperative agreement under this announcement, the applicant pledges close cooperation and coordination with the other research partners.

1. Responsibilities of the Grantee

The Grantee

- Conducts a local research study which enhances, enriches or expands

the cross-site data and focuses on one of the four Early Head Start outcome domains.

- Designs and conducts the preliminary research for the Longitudinal Study of Early Head Start and the Longitudinal Study of Head Start.

- Participates as a member of the consortium of local researchers and the national contractor.

- Conducts local analyses and interpretations of the cross-site data.

- Agrees to enter a subcontract or other financial arrangement with the national contractor for purposes of collecting data for the cross-site study.

- Agrees to work as a member of the research team consisting of the Early Head Start program, the national contractor and the local researcher.

2. Responsibilities of the Federal Staff

- Provide guidance in the development of the final study design.

- Participate as members of the national consortium or any policy, steering or other working groups established at the consortium level to facilitate accomplishment of the project goals.

- Facilitate communication among consortium members, Early Head Start grantees and the Federal staff.

- Provide logistical support to facilitate meetings of the local researchers.

E. Project Duration and Federal Share

1. Project Duration

Awards, on a competitive basis, are for a project period of five years. Continuation applications beyond the first 12 month budget period, but within the five-year project period, will be entertained in subsequent years on a non-competitive basis, subject to availability of funds, satisfactory progress and a determination that continued funding is in the best interests of the Government.

2. Federal Share of Project Costs

Federal share of project costs shall not exceed \$150,000 for the first 12-month budget period inclusive of indirect costs and shall not exceed \$150,000 for the second and third 12-month budget period. The Federal share of the fourth and fifth budget period shall be negotiated prior to the fourth and/or fifth year of funding.

3. Matching Requirements

There is no matching requirement; however, applicants must apply their indirect cost rate for off-campus

research or no more than 15 percent for non-profit research institutions.

4. Anticipated Number of Projects to be Funded

It is anticipated that 12 projects will be funded.

Part III Evaluation Criteria

The criteria presented below will be applied by the reviewers to the applicants submission in order to select the successful applicants. ACYF has prepared a document entitled "Helpful Tips for Preparing a Successful Research Grant Application." This document can be obtained from the Technical Assistance Team at (1-800-351-2293).

A. Criteria

1. Objectives and Significance 25 points

- The extent to which the objectives of the local research are important and relevant to the overall Early Head Start Research and Evaluation effort.
- The extent to which the local research study makes a significant contribution to the overall study and to the broader field.
- The extent to which the related literature review supports the study objectives, the questions to be addressed or the hypotheses to be tested.
- The extent to which the questions that will be addressed or the hypotheses that will be tested are sufficient for meeting the stated objectives.

2. Approach 40 points

- The extent to which the planned approach reflects sufficient input from and partnership with the Early Head Start program.
- The extent to which the research design is appropriate and sufficient for addressing the questions of the study.
- The extent to which the planned approach allows for the identification and differentiation of site-specific outcomes.
- The extent to which the planned research includes quantitative and qualitative methods.
- The extent to which the planned measures and analyses both reflect knowledge and use of state-of-the-art measures and analytic techniques and advance the state-of-the-art.
- The adequacy of the anticipated research sample size for the requirements of the cross-site study and for the local research study.
- The extent to which the site in which the research will be conducted has a recruitment and enrollment strategy that meets the requirements set forth in the design section of the announcement.

- The extent to which planned site activities are sufficient preparation for potential longitudinal studies.
- The extent to which the applicant's proposals for resolution of the data collection issues as a result of the two types of data collection are realistic and feasible.
- The applicant has provided all required assurances.
- The reasonableness of the budget for the work proposed.

3. Staffing 35 points

- The extent to which the principal investigator and other key research staff possess the research expertise necessary to conduct the local research including infant/toddler and family development; the application of advanced statistical analysis for quantitative and qualitative data; and the use of quantitative and qualitative methods as demonstrated by the technical portions of the applications and the information contained in their vitae.
- The extent to which the proposed staff reflect an understanding of and sensitivity to the issues of working in a community setting and in partnership with program staff and parents.
- The extent to which the proposed staff reflect a multi-disciplinary team.
- The adequacy of the time devoted to this project by the principal investigator and other key staff in order to ensure a high level of professional input and attention.
- The extent to which the staffing is sufficient for conducting the local research and the data collection and site analysis of the cross-site evaluation.

B. The Review Process

Applications received by the due date will be reviewed and scored competitively. Experts in the field, generally persons from outside the Federal government, will use the evaluation criteria listed in Part III of this announcement to review and score the applications. The results of this review are a primary factor in making funding decisions. ACYF may also solicit comments from ACF Regional Office staff and other Federal agencies. These comments, along with those of the expert reviewers, will be considered in making funding decisions. In selecting successful applicants, consideration may be given to achieving an equitable distribution among geographic regions of the country and other considerations necessary to achieve, to the greatest extent possible, a research and evaluation sample that is representative of all Early Head Start programs.

Part IV Instructions for Submitting Applications

A. Availability of Forms

Eligible applicants interested in applying for funds must submit a complete application including the required forms included at the end of this program announcement in Appendix C. In order to be considered for a grant under this announcement, an application must be submitted on the Standard Form 424 (approved by the Office of Management and Budget under Control Number 0348-0043). A copy has been provided. Each application must be signed by an individual authorized to act for the applicant and to assume responsibility for the obligations imposed by the terms and conditions of the grant award. Applicants requesting financial assistance for non-construction projects must file the Standard Form 424B, "Assurances: Non-Construction Programs" (approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0348-0340). Applicants must sign and return the Standard Form 424B with their application. Applicants must provide a certification concerning lobbying. Prior to receiving an award in excess of \$100,000, applicants shall furnish an executed copy of the lobbying certification (approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0348-0046). Applicants must sign and return the certification with their application.

Applicants must make the appropriate certification of their compliance with the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988. By signing and submitting the application, applicants are providing the certification and need not mail back the certification with the application.

Applicants must make the appropriate certification that they are not presently debarred, suspended or otherwise ineligible for award. By signing and submitting the application, applicants are providing the certification and need not mail back the certification with the application.

Applicants must also understand that they will be held accountable for the smoking prohibition included within Pub.L. 103-227, Part C Environmental Tobacco Smoke (also known as The Pro-Children's Act of 1994). A copy of the Federal Register notice which implements the smoking prohibition is included with the forms. By signing and submitting the application, applicants are providing the certification and need not mail back the certification with the application.

All applicants for research projects must provide a Protection of Human

Subjects Assurance as specified in the policy described on the HHS Form 596 (approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 0925-0137) in Appendix C. If there is a question regarding the applicability of this assurance, contact the Office for Protection from Research Risks of the National Institutes of Health at (301)-496-7041. Those applying for or currently conducting research projects are further advised of the availability of a Certificate of Confidentiality through the National Institute of Mental Health of the Department of Health and Human Services. To obtain more information and to apply for a Certificate of Confidentiality, contact the Division of Extramural Activities of the National Institute of Mental Health at (301) 443-4673.

B. Proposal Limits

The proposal should be double-spaced and single-sided on 8½"×11" plain white paper, with 1" margins on all sides. Use only a standard size font such as 10 or 12 pitch throughout the announcement. All pages of the narrative (including appendices, resumes, charts, references/footnotes, tables, maps and exhibits) must be sequentially numbered, beginning on the first page after the budget justification as page number one. Applicants should not submit reproductions of larger sized paper that is reduced to meet the size requirement. Applicants are requested not to send pamphlets, brochures, or other printed material along with their applications as these pose copying difficulties. These materials, if submitted, will not be included in the review process. In addition, applicants must not submit any additional letters of endorsement beyond any that may be required.

The length of the narrative section, including appendices, should not exceed 60 pages. Anything over 60 pages will be removed and not considered by the reviewers. Applicants are encouraged to submit curriculum vita using "Biographical Sketch" forms used by some government agencies.

Please note that applicants that do not comply with the requirements in the section on "Eligible Applicants" will not be included in the review process.

C. Checklist for a Complete Application

The checklist below is for your use to ensure that the application package has been properly prepared.

- One original, signed and dated application plus two copies.
- Attachments/Appendices, when included, should be used only to provide supporting documentation

such as resumes, and letters of agreement/support.

—A complete application consists of the following items in this order:

- (1) Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424, REV. 4-88);
- (2) Budget information—Non-Construction Programs (SF424A&B REV.4-88);
- (3) Budget Justification, including subcontract agency budgets;
- (4) Letter from the Director of the Early Head Start program certifying that the applicant is the designated research partner of the respective program;
- (5) Application Narrative and Appendices (not to exceed 60 pages);
- (6) Proof of non-profit status. Any non-profit organization submitting an application must submit proof of its non-profit status in its application at the time of submission. The non-profit organization can accomplish this by providing a copy of the applicant's listing in the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) most recent list of tax-exempt organizations described in Section 501(c)(3) of the IRS code or by providing a copy of the currently valid IRS tax exemption certificate, or by providing a copy of the articles of incorporation bearing the seal of incorporation of the State in which the corporation or association is domiciled.
- (7) Assurances Non-Construction Programs;
- (8) Certification Regarding Lobbying;
- (9) Where appropriate, a completed SPOC certification with the date of SPOC contact entered in line 16, page 1 of the SF 424, REV.4-88;
- (10) Certification of Protection of Human Subjects.

D. Due Date for the Receipt of Applications

1. *Deadline:* Mailed applications shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline time and date at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Division of Discretionary Grants, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Mail Stop 6c-462, Washington, DC 20447, Attention: Early Head Start Local Research. Applicants are responsible for mailing applications well in advance, when using all mail services, to ensure that the applications are received on or before the deadline time and date.

Applications handcarried by applicants, applicant couriers, or by overnight/express mail couriers shall be considered as meeting an announced deadline if they are received on or before the deadline date, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., at the U.S. Department of Health and Human

Services, Administration for Children and Families, Division of Discretionary Grants, ACF Mailroom, 2nd Floor Loading Dock, Aerospace Center, 901 D Street, SW., Washington, DC 20024, between Monday and Friday (excluding Federal Holidays). (Applicants are cautioned that express/overnight mail services do not always deliver as agreed.) ACF cannot accommodate transmission of applications by fax. Therefore, applications faxed to ACF will not be accepted regardless of date or time of submission and time of receipt.

2. *Late applications:* Applications which do not meet the criteria above are considered late applications. ACF shall notify each late applicant that its application will not be considered in the current competition.

3. *Extension of deadlines:* ACF may extend the deadline for all applicants because of acts of God such as floods, hurricanes, etc., widespread disruption of the mails or when it is anticipated that many of the applications will come from rural or remote areas. However, if ACF does not extend the deadline for all applicants, it may not waive or extend the deadline for any applicants.

E. Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Public Law 96-511, the Department is required to submit to OMB for review and approval any reporting and record keeping requirements in regulations including program announcements. This program announcement does not contain information collection requirements beyond those approved under OMB Control Numbers 0348-0043, 0348-0044, 0348-0046 and 0925-0137.

F. Required Notification of the State Single Point of Contact

This program is covered under Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs," and 45 CFR part 100, "Intergovernmental Review of Department of Health and Human Services Program and Activities." Under the Order, States may design their own processes for reviewing and commenting on proposed Federal assistance under covered programs.

* All States and Territories except Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, American Samoa and Palau have elected to participate in the Executive Order process and have

established Single Points of Contact (SPOCs). Applicants from these twenty-one jurisdictions need take no action regarding E.O. 12372. Applicants for projects to be administered by Federally-recognized Indian Tribes are also exempt from the requirements of E.O. 12372. Otherwise, applicants should contact their SPOCs as soon as possible to alert them of the prospective applications and receive any necessary instructions. Applicants must submit any required material to the SPOCs as soon as possible so that the program office can obtain and review SPOC comments as part of the award process. It is imperative that the applicant submit all required materials, if any, to the SPOC and indicate the date of this submittal (or the date of contact if no submittal is required) on the Standard Form 424, item 16a.

Under 45 CFR 100.8(a)(2), a SPOC has 60 days from the application deadline to comment on proposed new or competing continuation awards.

SPOCs are encouraged to eliminate the submission of routine endorsements as official recommendations.

Additionally, SPOCs are requested to clearly differentiate between mere advisory comments and those official State process recommendations which may trigger the "accommodate or explain" rule.

When comments are submitted directly to ACF, they should be addressed to: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Division of Discretionary Grants, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447. A list of the Single Points of Contact for each State and Territory is included as an Appendix to this announcement.

Dated: December 14, 1995.

Olivia A. Golden,

Commissioner, Administration on Children, Youth and Families.

Appendix A—List of Early Head Start Grantees

Alaska

Rural CAP Child Development, Karen King, P.O. Box 200908, Anchorage, AK 99520-0908, Telephone: (907) 279-2511, Fax: (907) 279-6343, E-mail: None

Arizona

Southwest Human Development Ginger Ward, 202 E. Earll, Suite 140, Phoenix, AZ 85012, Telephone: (602) 266-5976, Fax: (602) 274-8952, E-mail: SWHD@PRIMENET.COM

Arkansas

Child Development Inc., JoAnn Williams, P.O. Box 2110, Russellville, AR 72811, Telephone: (501) 968-6493, Fax: (501) 968-7825, E-mail: ARHYNE@CSWNET.COM

California

The Children First, Manuel Castellanos Jr., Venice Family Clinic, 604 Rose Avenue, Venice, CA 90291, Telephone: (310) 314-7320 x670, Fax: (310) 314-7641, E-mail: None

Northcoast Children's Services (NCS), Siddiq Kilkenny, P.O. Box 1165, Arcata, CA 95521, Telephone: (707) 822-7206, Fax: (707) 822-7962, E-mail: None

Sacramento Employment Training Agency (SETA), Head Start, Catherine Goins, 3750 Rosin Court, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95834, Telephone: (916) 263-5342, Fax: (916) 263-3779, E-mail: None

Colorado

Clayton Mile High Family Futures Project, Mitzi Kennedy/Adele Phelan, 3801 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Denver, CO 80205, Telephone: (303) 355-2008, Fax: (303) 331-0248, E-mail: None

Community Partnership for Child Development, Terry Schwartz, 2132 E. Bijou, Colorado Springs, CO 80909, Telephone: (719) 635-1536 x217, Fax: (719) 634-8086, E-mail: Later date
Family Star, Lereen Castellano/Alicia Sheridan, 1331 E. 33rd Avenue, Denver, CO 80205, Telephone: (303) 295-7711, Fax: (303) 295-0958, E-mail: None

District of Columbia

Edward C. Mazique Parent Child Center, Cynthia Faust, 1719-13th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009, Telephone: (202) 462-3375, Fax: (202) 939-8696, E-mail: None

United Cerebral Palsy of Washington and Northern VA (UCP), Stanley L. Pryor, 3135 Eighth Street, NE, Washington, DC 20017, Telephone: (202) 269-1500, Fax: (202) 526-0519, E-mail: STAN177640@AOL

Florida

Alachua County School District, Donna Omer, School Board of Alachua County, 620 East University Avenue, Gainesville, FL 32601, Telephone: (904) 955-7605, Fax: (904) 955-6700, E-mail: None

Metro Dade Community Action Agency, Regina M. Grace, 395 NW. 1st Street, Miami, FL 33128, Telephone: (305) 347-4640, Fax: (305) 372-8745, E-mail: None

Georgia

Berry Chattooga Early Development Center, Nancy Daniel, 702 South Congress Street, Summerville, GA 30747, Telephone: (706) 857-1651, Fax: (706) 857-6610, E-mail: None
Clark Atlanta University Head Start, Linda Hassan, 350 Autumn Lane, SW., Atlanta, GA 30314, Telephone: (404) 696-9585 x104, Fax: (404) 696-9524, E-mail: None
Georgia Early Head Start Network, Donna Overcash, Save the Children Child Care Support Ctr., 1447 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 700, Atlanta, GA 30309, Telephone: (404) 885-1578, Fax: (404) 874-7427, E-mail: ATLANTA@SAVECHILDREN.ORG

Illinois

City of Chicago, Dept. of Human Services, Frank McGehee, 510 North Peshtigo Court, 8th Floor, Chicago, IL 60611, Telephone: (312) 744-0251, Fax: (312) 744-7530, E-mail: None
The Ounce of Prevention Fund, Portia Kennel, 188 W. Randolph Street, #2200, Chicago, IL 60601, Telephone: (312) 853-6080, Fax: (312) 853-3337, E-mail: None
Wabash Area Development, Inc., Donna Emmons, 100 N. Latham, Enfield, IL 62835, Telephone: (618) 963-2387, Fax: (618) 963-2525, E-mail: None

Indiana

Healthy Beginnings, Hamilton Center, Anita Lascelles, 620 8th Avenue, Terre Haute, IN 47804, Telephone: (812) 231-8335, Fax: (812) 232-8228, E-mail: None

Iowa

Mid-Iowa Community Action, Susan Fessler, 1001 South 18th Street, Marshalltown, IA 50158, Telephone: (515) 752-7162, Fax: (515) 752-9724, E-mail: None
Upper Des Moines Opportunity, Inc., Mary Jo Madvig, P.O. 519, 101 Robbins Avenue, Graettinger, IA 51342-0519, Telephone: (712) 859-3885, Fax: (712) 859-3892, E-mail: None

Kansas

Head Start Parent & Child Center, Glenda Wilcox, 931 South St. Francis, Wichita, KS 67211, Telephone: (316) 267-8314, Fax: (316) 267-7185, E-mail: None
Project EAGLE of the University of Kansas Medical Center, Martha Staker, Gateway Centre Tower II, Suite 1001, 4th & State Avenue, Kansas City, KS 66101, Telephone: (913) 281-2648, Fax: (913) 281-2680, E-mail: None

Salina USD #305, Korey Powell-Hensley, 700 Jupiter, Salina, KS 67401, Telephone: (913) 826-4868, Fax: (913) 826-4867, E-mail: None

Kentucky

Breckinridge-Grayson Programs, Inc., Cleo Lowery, P.O. Box 63, Leitchfield, KY 42755, Telephone: (502) 259-4054, Fax: (502) 259-4055 E-mail: None

Murray Head Start, Judy Whitten, 208 S. 13th Street, Murray, KY 42074, Telephone: (502) 753-6031, Fax: (502) 759-4906, E-mail: None

Maryland

The Family Services Agency, Inc., Mary C. Jackson, 640 E. Diamond Avenue, Suite A, Gaithersburg, MD 20877, Telephone: (301) 840-2000 x205, Fax: (301) 840-9621, E-mail: None

Friends of the Family, Inc., Linda R. Gaither, 1001 Eastern Avenue—2nd Floor, Baltimore, MD 21202-4364, Telephone: (410) 659-7701, Fax: (410) 783-0814, E-mail: None

Michigan

Region II Community Action Agency, Martha York, Center for Family, 817 W. High Street, Jackson, MI 49203, Telephone: (517) 784-2895, Fax: (517) 788-5998; 784-9226, E-mail: None

Mississippi

Friends of Children of Mississippi, Inc., Cathy Gaston/Marvin Hogan, 4880 McWillie Drive, Jackson, MS 39206, Telephone: (601) 362-1541, Fax: (601) 362-1613, E-mail: None

Missouri

Human Development Corporation, Lois A. Harris, 929 North Spring Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63108, Telephone: (314) 652-5100 x285, Fax: (314) 652-0813, E-mail: None

KCMC Child Development Corporation, Shirley Stubbs-Gillette, 2104 East 18th, Kansas City, MO 64127, Telephone: (816) 474-3751 x603, Fax: (816) 474-1818, E-mail: None

Nebraska

Central Nebraska Community Services, Suzan Obermiller, P.O. Box 509, Loup City, NE 68853, Telephone: (308) 745-0780, Fax: (308) 745-0824, E-mail: None

New Hampshire

Community Action Program Belknap-Merrimack Counties, Inc., Rebecca Johnson, P.O. Box 1016, Concord, NH 03302-1016, Telephone: (603) 225-3295, Fax: (603) 228-1898, E-mail: None

New Jersey

Babyland Nursery, Inc., Mary Smith/Martin Schneider, 755 South Orange Avenue Newark, NJ 07106, Telephone: (201) 399-3400, Fax: (201) 399-2076, E-mail: None

NORWESCAP Head Start

Administration, Linda Kane, 481 Memorial Parkway, Phillipsburg, NJ 08865, Telephone: (908) 454-8830, Fax: (908) 859-0729, E-mail: None

New York

The Astor Home for Children, Elizabeth Colkin, 50 Delafield Street, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601, Telephone: (914) 452-4167, Fax: (914) 452-0718, E-mail: None

Chautauqua Opportunities, Inc. Head Start, Grace Knaak, Municipal Bldg—5th Floor, 200 E. Third Street, Jamestown, NY 14701, Telephone: (716) 661-9430 Fax: (716) 661-9436 E-mail: GKNAAK@EPI

Educational Alliance, Marion Lazar, 197 East Broadway, New York, NY 10002, Telephone: (212) 475-6200 x6200, Fax: (212) 982-0932, E-mail: None

Parent & Child Center, Coleen A. Meehan, 175 Hudson Street, Syracuse, NY 13204, Telephone: (315) 470-3324, Fax: (315) 474-6863, E-mail: None

Project Chance Early Head Start, Bart O'Conner, 136 Lawrence Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201, Telephone: (718) 330-0845, Fax: (718) 330-0846, E-mail: None

North Carolina

Asheville City Schools Preschool and Family Literacy Center, Robbie H. Angell 441 Haywood Road, Asheville, NC 28806, Telephone: (704) 255-5423, Fax: (704) 251-4913, E-mail: None

North Dakota

Little Hoop Community College, Beverly Graywater, P.O. Box 89, Fort Totten, ND 58335, Telephone: (701) 766-4070, Fax: (701) 766-1357, E-mail: None

Ohio

Child Focus—Clermont County Head Start, Terrie Hare, 1088 Hospital Drive, Suite A, Batavia, OH 45103, Telephone: (513) 732-5432, Fax: (513) 732-5440, E-mail: None

Cincinnati-Hamilton County Community, Action Agency, Verline Dotson, 2904 Woodburn Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45206, Telephone: (513) 569-1840, Fax: (513) 569-1251, E-mail: None

Oregon

Southern Oregon Child and Family Council, Inc., Blair Johnson, 505 Oak Street, P.O. Box 3819, Central Point, OR 97502, Telephone: (503) 664-4730; 857-9255, Fax: (503) 664-6620, E-mail: Pending

Pennsylvania

Family Foundations, Laurie Mulvey/Heather Fisher, 1811 Boulevard of the Allies, Pittsburgh, PA 15219, Telephone: (412) 281-3511 Fax: (412) 281-3254, E-mail: MULVEY@VMS.CIS.PITT.EDU
Philadelphia Parent Child Center, Inc., Jewel Morrisette-Ndulula, 2515 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19133, Telephone: (215) 229-1800, Fax: (215) 229-5860, E-mail: None

Puerto Rico

Aspira Inc. of Puerto Rico, Edme Ruiz Torres, Box 29132, 65th Infantry Station, Rio Piedras, PR 00929, Telephone: (809) 768-1968, Fax: (809) 257-2725, E-mail: None
New York Foundling Hospital, Zaida Fernandez, P.O. Box 191274, San Juan, PR 00919-1274, Telephone: (809) 753-9082; 753-1321; 753-9080, Fax: (809) 763-9209, E-mail: None

South Carolina

District #17 Schools, Anita E. Kieslich, P.O. Box 1180, Sumter, SC 29150, Telephone: (803) 778-6433, Fax: (803) 469-6006, E-mail: None
SHARE Greenville-Pickens Head Start, Rubye H. Jones, 652 Rutherford Road, Greenville, SC 29609, Telephone: (803) 233-4128, Fax: (803) 233-4019, E-mail: None

Tennessee

Chattanooga Human Services, Head Start/PCC, Donna Ginn, 2302 Ocoee Street, Chattanooga, TN 37406, Telephone: (423) 493-9750, Fax: (423) 493-9754, E-mail: None
Tennessee CAREs, Barbara Nye, Tennessee State University, 330 Tenth Avenue N., Box 141, Nashville, TN 37203, Telephone: (615) 963-7231, Fax: (615) 963-7214 E-mail: None

Texas

Avance San Antonio Inc., Rebecca C. Cervantez, 2300 W. Commerce, Suite 304, San Antonio, TX 78207, Telephone: (210) 220-1788, Fax: (210) 220-3795, E-mail: None
Head Start of Greater Dallas, Inc., Rob Massonneau, 1349 Empire Central, Suite 900, Dallas, TX 75247, Telephone: (214) 634-8704 x484, Fax: (214) 631-5417, E-mail: None

Parent/Child Incorporated, Blanche A. Russ-Glover, 1000 West Harriman Place, San Antonio, TX 78207-7900, Telephone: (210) 226-6232, Fax: (210) 228-0071, E-mail: None

Texas Migrant Council, Inc., John E. Gonzales, 5102 N. Bartlett Avenue, P.O. Box 2579, Laredo, TX 78041, Telephone: (210) 722-5174, Fax: (210) 726-1301, E-mail: None

Utah

Bear River Head Start, Glenna Markey, 75 South 400 West, Logan, UT 84321, Telephone: (801) 753-0951, Fax: (801) 753-1101, E-mail: None

Vermont

CVCAC Head Start, Marianne Miller, PO. Box 747, 36 Barre-Montpelier Road, Barre, VT 05641, Telephone: (802) 479-1053, Fax: (802) 479-5353, E-mail: None

Early Education Services, Judith Jerald, 218 Canal Street, Brattleboro, VT 05301, Telephone: (802) 254-3742, Fax: (802) 254-3750, E-mail: None

Washington

Families First, Peg Mazen, P.O. Box 1997, Auburn, WA 98071, Telephone: (206) 850-2582, Fax: (206) 850-0220, E-mail: None

Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe, Jaclyn Haight, 31912 Little Boston Road, NE, Kingston, WA 98346, Telephone: (360) 297-6258, Fax: (360) 297-7097, E-mail: None

Spokane County Head Start/ECEAP, Washington State Community College #17, Patt Earley, 4410 North Market, Spokane, WA 99202, Telephone: (509) 533-8500, Fax: (509) 533-8599, E-mail: None

Washington State Migrant Council, Carlos Trevino, 312 Division, Grandview, WA 98930, Telephone: (509) 882-5800, Fax: (509) 882-1605, E-mail: None

West Virginia

Monongalia County Head Start, Marie Alsop/Cheryl Wienke, 1433 Dorsey Avenue, Morgantown, WV 26505, Telephone: (304) 291-9330, Fax: (304) 291-9324, E-mail: CWIENKE@ACCESS.K12.WV.US

Wisconsin

Renewal Unlimited, Inc. - Head Start of Central Wisconsin, Suzanne Hoppe, N6510 Hwy. 51 South, Portage, WI 53901-9603, Telephone: (608) 742-5329, Fax: (608) 742-5481, E-mail: None

Appendix B-1—Statement of Work for the Early Head Start Evaluation Contract

Request for Contract—The Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project

I. Background

The Head Start Act, as amended May, 1994 (42 usc 9801 et seq.) established a new program for families with infants and toddlers within the framework of Head Start. Section 645A of the Head Start Act, Programs for Families with Infants and Toddlers states that (a) "The Secretary shall make grants in accordance with the provisions of this section for—(1) programs providing family-centered services for low-income families with very young children designed to promote the development of the children and to enable their parents to fulfill their roles as parents and to move toward self-sufficiency."

The Department of Health and Human Services calls this new program Early Head Start. In developing Early Head Start, the Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF)/ Administration for Children and Families (ACF) engaged in an intensive consultation process to learn from parents, practitioners, researchers and academics about the state of the art of quality programming for pregnant women and families with infants and toddlers. As part of the consultation process, the Secretary of Health and Human Services formed the Advisory Committee on Services for Families with Infants and Toddlers. That committee issued a report in September, 1994, that provides the blueprint for the design of the Early Head Start program. The ACF issued a Program Announcement of in March, 1995, and is expected to begin funding programs by September 30, 1995.

The award of this contract will be followed by a competition among Early Head Start program research partners to establish a limited number of local research sites. The first part of this section describes the overall Early Head Start research and evaluation design, including activities to be completed both by the national Contractor and local researchers; the second part details the scope of work for the national evaluation contract.

The Need for Early Head Start Research and Evaluation

It will be important for the proposed evaluation, mandated by the Head Start legislation, to build upon the substantial body of knowledge that exists and to expand upon findings from related studies. The CCDP evaluation will

present results of a rigorous evaluation of an intensive, comprehensive, multi-service intervention program for families of infants and toddlers, implemented across a number of communities nationwide. Additional studies currently underway, such as the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Child Care study and the Healthy Start evaluation will provide findings and methods that will contribute to the Early Head Start research and evaluation. However, Early Head Start, while related programmatically to many predecessors, combines and/or extends elements in previous programs to present a unique program for evaluation. The Early Head Start program is individualized; intense; comprehensive; child-service oriented; two-generational; locally-adapted, utilizing parents in decision making, and designed to have four levels of effect, on infants and toddlers, families, communities and staff.

II. The Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Plan

The research and evaluation plan highlights the first Early Head Start programs as prototypes of the Early Head Start concept. The plan features (1) a dynamic formative evaluation process, designed to be used in subsequent Early Head Start programs, that will serve continuous program improvement; (2) an impact evaluation that will enable determination of whether and under what conditions program prototypes were effective, and (3) an integrated research base for generating further hypotheses around the broad array of potential program issues and possibilities.

This research and evaluation plan features an integrated local and national evaluation design with nested levels of program involvement. Level I, continuous program improvement, is for all sites; Level II, cross-site impact evaluation and site-specific, related research will occur at selected sites. The impact evaluation is designed to determine the attribution of outcomes to the intervention. The research portion of the study will examine the causally modeled and directional relationships among specific child, family, program and community variables and outcomes.

A. Purposes

Elaboration of the purposes and the proposed approach proposed for each follow:

1. *Continuous Program Improvement.* The Advisory Committee on Services for Families with Infants and Toddlers proposed a new role for program

evaluation that would be useful to programs seeking to develop to a standard of high quality. A systematic feedback procedure utilizing formative evaluation techniques will be developed as a tool for dynamic program improvement, and as a prototype formative evaluation tool in the event of Early Head Start program expansion. Thus, the first purpose of this effort is to support a process for generating and utilizing program qualitative and quantitative data, including management information system data, in continuous program improvement. This feature will be addressed programmatically at all Early Head Start sites, in most cases with the aid of local research partners. The national Contractor will provide support for this evaluation function through development of formative evaluation formats for continuous improvement.

2. *Impact.* The Head Start Act and the Advisory Committee on Services for Families with Infants and Toddlers called for a study of program effectiveness. A cross-site impact study will be conducted by a national Contractor in a sample of selected sites. Site-specific analyses, conducted by local research partners, will identify local program impacts and elucidate the processes, pathways, and conditions under which the program had an effect. Cross-site and local studies will complement each other.

3. *Additional Research.* The Advisory Committee on Services for Families with Infants and Toddlers sought to stimulate the research community to address the many questions we have about how best to enhance the development of low-income infants and toddlers and their families under conditions of changing policies and programmatic variations. The potential for research under the broad umbrella of the Early Head Start purposes and in connection with impact and continuous programmatic improvement is great. The Early Head Start research and evaluation plan thus seeks to bring forth a new generation of solid research to enhance current understandings of optimal developmental circumstances for low-income infants/toddlers, their families and communities. Further, questions related to the program are expected to be fitted to theoretical frameworks to encompass and extend beyond the realm of impact evaluation. This research will be conducted primarily at selected research sites by local research partners

4. *Longitudinal Study.* Early Head Start presents a unique opportunity to conduct longitudinal research on Early Head Start, Head Start and beyond.

Thus, the research and evaluation plan emphasizes the underlying longitudinal nature of the study of Early Head Start, and is the beginning of a longitudinal study of Early Head Start children and families.

B. Studies

The specific studies this project is expected to generate and the approximate sequence are as follows:

- Studies to Describe Early Head Start Programs
- Studies of Program Quality and Program Implementation
- Studies of Program Impact
- Studies of Program Variation
- Studies Directed Towards Specific Policy Concerns
- Studies of Program Impact in a Longitudinal Context
- Studies by Local Researchers on Multiple Topics Pertaining to Early Head Start

C. Questions

A series of preliminary research questions have been developed to guide the formation of the research and evaluation design.

What are the *characteristics* of Early Head Start children and families, communities and staff and programs? What are the origins of Early Head Start programs? Who attends Early Head Start? How representative are the children and families who attend Early Head Start of the Early Head Start-eligible population within their communities? What types of communities are Early Head Start programs in? What types of services are delivered? What are the characteristics and emphases of local programs?

What are the pathways to *quality* in Early Head Start Programs? How do programs achieve full implementation? How is quality in Early Head Start program components defined? What is the quality of Early Head Start programs and program components? How long does it take to attain quality in Early Head Start programs? What outcomes are associated with various aspects of program quality?

Is Early Head Start effective in supporting the development of children, family, communities and staff? Which Early Head Start practices maximize benefits for children, families, communities and staff under what kinds of circumstances? What are the collective and differentiated impacts of Early Head Start? How does Early Head Start support development under varying conditions of risk? Are there diffuse effects of the program? Are there effects that can be attributed to targeted programs or services in Early Head

Start? Are there mediators between services and outcomes that can be identified? What are the benefits of Early Head Start that translate into dollars saved?

What child, family, program and community variables contribute to the optimal development of low-income *children* in Early Head Start programs? Which Early Head Start practices maximize benefits for which *children* under what conditions? What factors contribute to resiliency of children in Early Head Start? What factors associated with Early Head Start contribute to optimizing health, social or cognitive development? Is targeting specific services for children effective? Are there strategies that are particularly effective with high-risk infants? What are the programs that are achieving positive outcomes for children doing? What are the barriers to attaining positive outcomes for children in Early Head Start programs?

What Early Head Start factors, community, family and personal factors contribute to *parent and family-level outcomes*? What factors, under what conditions, enhance parenting skills including parent/child interactions for which parents? What factors contribute to the parents' ability to make progress toward self-sufficiency? What factors contribute to the health and well-being of Early Head Start parents? What factors contribute to male involvement in the lives of Early Head Start children? What factors contribute to parental involvement for which parents in the Early Head Start program? What family outcomes are associated with positive child outcomes, and what are the pathways from parent to child development in the context of Early Head Start? Are there targeted strategies that specifically benefit some parents?

What changes in *communities* occur as a result of the Early Head Start program? What were the baseline characteristics of Early Head Start communities at the time programs began? What Early Head Start practices maximize benefits for which communities under what types of circumstances? What new collaborations were established? What community factors supplemented or supplanted the Early Head Start success with families and children? How strong was the community effect on Early Head Start programs? Did Early Head Start have a positive effect on child care services, or on any other services, throughout the community?

What is the role of *staffing* in Early Head Start programs? What is the role of staffing and staff development in creating effective program processes and

bringing about positive outcomes for children, families and communities? What enables staff to create the environments and relationships that promote infant/toddler and family development? What factors contribute to staff continuity with children and families? What role does Early Head Start professional development play in staff effectiveness?

What are the effects of *program variations*? What are the identifiable program variations in Early Head Start? What can be said about the types of variations and their effects?

What can we learn through Early Head Start to maximize collective effectiveness of *policies* and programs that promote the development of low-income children and their families? What is the role of Early Head Start for promoting parents' pathways to work? How do comprehensive Early Head Start services add to the effects of child care on children and families? What are the barriers and pathways to the successful integration of children with special needs into Early Head Start? These questions will be addressed in a report directed towards specific policy concerns by the national Contractor and the Contractor may be asked to provide additional special reports around related issues.

How do Early Head Start and Head Start families and comparable groups who do not participate in Early Head Start develop over *time*? What are the developmental trajectories of Early Head Start and comparison group children and families under varying experiences and varying degrees of risk?

D. Design

The Early Head Start program is designed as a prototype of an on-going service program as opposed to an intervention designed by an investigator for theory building or hypothesis testing. Thus, while Early Head Start was planned to accommodate evaluation, the evaluation design primarily has been fitted to the program. This programmatic emphasis has shaped numerous research and evaluation design elements as well as the overall two-tier nature of the research and evaluation plan. All Early Head Start programs will participate in either one or both levels of the research and evaluation.

Level I: All program sites will participate in formative evaluation activities which are designed to assist programs in continuous improvement towards program quality. The Level I evaluation activities also will be instituted for all subsequent Early Head Start programs under conditions of

program expansion. The following are features of Level I.

- Sites will use data from a uniform management information system, together with local qualitative and quantitative data in a formative evaluation process.
- In most cases, sites will utilize a local research partner for this aspect of the evaluation.
- The national Contractor will provide standard formats for the use of these data during the first year of the project, and will make the characteristics of this format available to sites added in subsequent years through collaboration with the Training and Technical Assistance Contractor.

Level II: A sample of sites (12) will participate in Level II activities focusing on evaluating the effectiveness of the Early Head Start utilizing approaches to generate both breadth and depth in impact evaluation. The following are characteristics of Level II activities.

- There will be a *cross-site* impact study, conducted by a national Contractor, that will be complemented by *local* studies of program impact.
- The local research partners may apply through a competitive process for grants to carry out research studies at their local sites. The sites whose local research partners receive these grants will become sites for the cross-site impact evaluation. In the event that there are not sufficient numbers of sites whose local research partners have submitted an acceptable proposal or if a better distribution of Early Head Start programs is required than the research site pool represents, as programs were alerted in the Early Head Start program announcement, ACYF may select further sites for evaluation. Data collection at these sites would be conducted directly by the national Contractor.

• The impact evaluation will follow an experimental model. The program will recruit double the number of families needed to fill program openings. Families then will be assigned into program and comparison groups by random assignment, most likely midway through the first fiscal year. The recruitment and random assignment process will continue until October 1, 1996, when programs are expected to attain full enrollment, and, thereafter, as openings occur.

- Only those programs that are fully implemented and operating as the program was designed, with criteria to be determined as an evaluation task, will be included in the final impact evaluation. Additional criteria for impact evaluation may be proposed by ACYF as well. It is anticipated that 12

sites will participate in the final impact evaluation, however, 15 sites will be selected as preliminary impact sites to provide an ample pool of sites for impact evaluation.

- To fit the service emphasis of the program, subjects will be continuously recruited into the program to fill program openings as they occur. That is, this is not a cohort study. Sample sizes will build over time.

• While programs are encouraged to give preference to subjects who are pregnant and have infants under a year of age, they may serve children up to three years of age. However, to focus the sample and to have a potential longitudinal sample of children who began the program early, the *research sample will be comprised only of pregnant women and families with infants up to one year of age*. This requirement will apply to families recruited at the time the program begins as well as to replacement families.

- Programs will range in size from 75 to 150 families. The impact evaluation sample, due to continuous recruitment, may exceed 150 program (and an equal number of comparison group) families but shall be capped at 175 program (and an equal number of comparison group) families for any one site. Site samples need to include at least 50 program families (with an equal number of comparison families).

• In addition to documenting the services received by program families in the Early Head Start program, it will be necessary to document the needs and service use by comparison families to determine if the individualized services provided by the Early Head Start program had an impact beyond what comparison families received in their communities. Therefore, the same needs assessment will need to be conducted on control families and their service usage will need to be tracked in a manner as similar to the experimental group as possible.

- Comparison group families will be given an annotated list of community services. Pregnant women will receive an initial referral to prenatal care. All families, program and comparison, participating in the evaluation study will receive approximately \$20/ interview period for their participation in the study. Both the national Contractor and local researchers are encouraged to solicit material goods to give to families for completing interviews. These goods may be donated locally or nationally and could include diapers, infant clothing, or educational toys.

• Program families who drop out will be followed, to the extent possible. An

evaluation task will be to develop a plan for tracking comparison and program group dropout research sample families and for defining the minimum amount of time that constitutes program involvement.

E. Desired Outcomes

The Early Head Start program targets specific outcome variables in the four program areas. It will be important for this evaluation to focus on those outcomes likely to be associated with involvement in Early Head Start, outcomes that realistically could be expected in a program of this nature. It will also be important to target potential interim outcomes, outcomes most likely to be apparent after the first 2–3 years of the study. Preliminary outcomes as proposed by the Advisory Committee on Services for Families with Infants and Toddlers include:

Child: Health and physical development; social competency; secure attachments with parents and other caregivers; language and cognitive development; resiliency factors; benefits to siblings.

Family: Attitudes towards parenting; parent-child interaction; reproductive sequelae; having a medical home; parenting employability and progress towards self-sufficiency; training and education; housing; physical and mental health; substance abuse; home environment; safety; involvement in the Early Head Start program; knowledge of child development; child guidance beliefs and practices.

Community: Collaboration among agencies serving children and families; seamlessness in referrals and actual service provision; quality of services for children and families; increase in services for infants and toddlers; safety.

Staff: Staff-parent/child relationships; staff continuity; staff professional development; staff compensation; staff physical and mental health.

F. Data Sources

For purposes of definition and discussion, data are referred to as either (1) process or (2) outcome data. Process data refer to those data that document program use and other experiences of families; outcome data refer to those qualities the program seeks to bring about. These data may be thought of, respectively, as independent and dependent variables. It is recognized that some data fit both definitions and that under different circumstances the same data element could be either process or product, independent or dependent, or, mediating, variables.

A family-level management information system will be introduced,

with technical assistance, at the outset of Early Head Start. This information system, known as the Head Start Family Information System (HSFIS) will include data elements focused on intake; needs assessment; use of direct and referred services; family and child health information and other information related to parent employment, housing, education and services. Primarily, HSFIS data will be referred to as process data, however, some of the HSFIS data also can be viewed as interim outcome and outcome data. Program staff will enter and utilize HSFIS data. Program staff will enter initial family background data for all Early Head Start families prior to the random assignment process. HSFIS data will be available for the evaluation of the Early Head Start program.

Comparison family services use and health data will be recorded frequently in a special HSFIS module that will be identical to or parallel to HSFIS-entered program data. It is proposed that these data will be entered by a Community Family Coordinator/s, who will form a relationship with the comparison group families, paralleling to some extent the context in which HSFIS data for program families will be entered by program staff. The Community Family Coordinator services will be subcontracted by the national Contractor, as feasible, through the local researchers.

Additional process data (qualitative and quantitative) may be collected locally or nationally as determined by researchers at either level. This may include process data that cannot be collected through the HSFIS in comparable ways for the comparison and program families and will therefore have to be collected using the same, vs. parallel data collection procedures.

Outcome variables and the measurement for those variables will be identified and developed for the cross-site evaluation, for both project and comparison families, by the national Contractor with input from the local research team. Collection will be contracted through the national Contractor to the local researchers.

Local research data will be collected by local researchers through grants made directly from ACYF to the local researcher.

G. The Structure

In this research and evaluation design the primary responsibility of the national Contractor will be to coordinate and administer the cross-site evaluation in the 12 impact evaluation sites. This includes financial and administrative responsibility for all data collected for

the cross-site-evaluation, including both process and outcome data for both comparison and project families. The national Contractor may use as much program-collected data (HSFIS) as the Contractor and ACYF deem appropriate and, as feasible, is encouraged to subcontract other local data collection to local researchers. The national Contractor has an additional responsibility to provide a standard format for continuous programmatic improvement.

The local program research partners will be responsible for designing and conducting local research in areas relating to the overall research and evaluation questions. Local researchers will be funded through individual grants with ACYF to carry out locally-relevant research. Local researchers will be expected to be reliable subcontractors for the cross-site project. These same local researchers will be expected to serve the continuous improvement needs of their sites and to provide local impact evaluation reports to accompany the cross-site reports required by this research and evaluation design.

A consortium will provide the mechanism for the coordination required by the project. A Technical Work Group, meeting with the consortium, will advise both the cross-site studies and the local research projects.

H. Challenges to the Evaluation

The unique design for the Early Head Start program and the requirements for research and evaluation present specific interesting challenges that both local researchers and the national Contractor will need to address. These include:

- Program variation within and between sites. The evaluation is expected to stimulate unique approaches for process data measurement to meet the challenge of documenting the variety of programs that will be offered across sites and the individualized nature of services within sites.
- Changing conditions over time. The evaluation is expected to take into account a shifting range of ages. The age range will shift from a less-than-two year range at the outset to nearly five years towards program completion, due to continuous enrollment. Further, the evaluation will need to accommodate the transition of children out of the program at age 3 into Head Start or other programs and to plan for extending this study longitudinally.
- Decoupling of parent and child data collection. Because Early Head Start is not a cohort study, the periodicity of child assessments by child age may

- need to be decoupled from periodicity in assessing parent variables.
- Measuring the true nature of services delivered by Early Head Start at both the child and family levels. This challenge requires assessing a number of features associated with services, such as professional standards of quality, duration, intensity, quality of relationships and goodness of fit between the program services and individual needs.
 - Delineating whether the services received are a function of the program or of the families' own initiative from other sources in the community. Since this study is not conducted in the isolation of a laboratory, families may seek and receive services from other community service providers. Therefore, it is important to determine what services families receive outside the program.
 - Documenting services received by the comparison group. We cannot assume a no-treatment comparison group. While some comparison group data has been collected through parent interview, in other studies these data are usually collected at fairly long intervals with limited checking of reliability. The current study requires a careful documentation of comparison group services for interpretation of study findings.
 - Framing the role of relationships. For very young children the relationships with parents and caregivers are central to development and these relationships are often influenced by the relationships between parents and program staff and the relationships of both to the community at large. The evaluation is challenged to assess the central role of relationships in this program.
 - Measuring the effect of Early Head Start on communities and the effect of communities on Early Head Start. Early Head Start is designed to impact not only children and families but also communities. It is designed to have a ripple effect on all the programs for young children in a community. It is an important challenge for the evaluation to determine how to measure the community at baseline and how to measure change. Reciprocally, Early Head Start programs are nested in communities. The evaluation is challenged to reflect the variance of communities and to document the effect these communities have on Early Head Start's ability to carry out its purposes.
 - Conducting impact evaluation exclusively at fully-implemented programs. The evaluation is challenged to determine criteria and timing for assessing full implementation in order to focus the evaluation on programs that are fulfilling the intent of the Early Head Start program.
 - Determining meaningful effects. It will be important for the national Contractor and local researchers to go beyond the question of whether Early Head Start had a simple effect. Researchers are challenged to conceptualize the Early Head Start data set for use with complex analytical approaches involving meaningful aggregations and pattern analyses to account for varying degrees of risk, program variation and time.
 - Fitting national and local evaluations together. The evaluation is challenged to bring two kinds of knowledge about Early Head Start together—that gathered across sites and that gathered from in-depth analyses within sites. A number of premises have been already made about this feature of the evaluation. For example, it is central to this project that local researchers and the national Contractor be equals in evaluating this project. It is presumed that there are questions that each can answer best from their unique perspectives. Local researchers are in a position to truly delve into the causes and effects and pathways to outcomes. They can use in depth and observational as well as qualitative measures to determine a program's effect. The local researchers are expected to address "what's in the box" at their site using multiple measures and methods in site-specific studies. The local researchers will also need to work together to lay the groundwork for continuation of the study beyond the five-year funding period. The national evaluation Contractor, on the other hand, will need to address those questions that cross-site data will enable answering, including those focused on program variation, and those requiring large samples for ample cells sizes required for examination of how the program worked for which children and families under which conditions. The research and evaluation was designed to bring forth both types of studies, and both types of studies are important to the story this evaluation is expected to tell. It will be necessary for every report to reflect this dual and complementary input and for the researchers at both levels to affirm the role of the other. Their task as partners in this evaluation will be to determine at each step of the project how their two efforts fit together.
- Attrition. Given the five year nature of this program and the intention to continue to follow the original Early Head Start families, it will be important for the partners in this project to coordinate to keep families in the sample. The evaluation is challenged to develop an array of sample-retention ideas that may range from local solicitation of gifts, newsletters and birthday cards to relationship-building to maintain subjects' interest. It will also be necessary to develop a clear plan for determination of which families who leave the project will be followed for research purposes under what conditions.
- C-2 Scope of Work for the National Contractor
- Specifically, the national Contractor will:
1. Provide a description of Early Head Start, from its inception through Year 1 for the Early Head Start programs, in all sites, with special emphasis on the 12 research sites, relying primarily on HSFIS data, but complemented by site profiles from research sites.
 2. Conduct a study of program quality and implementation in Early Head Start (preliminary) impact study sites programs (estimate 12). This study will be used in the selection of fully-implemented sites for inclusion in the final impact evaluation, and to present a story of the development of quality for future Early Head Start programs;
 3. Design and carry out an effective cross-site impact evaluation (estimate 12 sites) that addresses evaluation challenges and determines whether Early Head Start had an impact on children, families, communities or staff, and that addresses differential effectiveness by age of entry, need, sub-population, and by program features, duration and intensity;
 4. Conduct a study of program variation in the impact evaluation sites (estimate 12 sites) and its effects;
 5. Establish an infant sample for future longitudinal study in impact evaluation sites (estimate 12 sites), to carefully track all subjects to minimize attrition for the longitudinal study and to include cross-site analyses of data in a longitudinal context in the Final Report of this project;
 6. Conduct timely analyses and reports (in all years) with Early Head Start data in the context of critical policy issues, e.g., examining the value added of Early Head Start comprehensive services for children in full-time child care and in the transition from welfare to work, as requested by

the ACYF and/or the Technical Work Group; and

7. Prepare an Interim Report in September, 1997, and a Final Report for this project which fully integrate the cross-site and local studies, drawing upon the strengths of each.

C-3 Tasks

As part of this Early Head Start evaluation effort, the Contractor shall access, collect, utilize, analyze and synthesize information regarding the implementation, operation and effectiveness of Early Head Start programs.

The work for this contract will be conducted in five sequential 12 month phases and the activities that will be accomplished include the following:

In Phase I, the Contractor shall:

- (1) Participate in an orientation meeting;
- (2) Develop a coordination strategy for working with other Contractors involved with Early Head Start;
- (3) Conduct a literature review;
- (4) Select a cadre of consultants;
- (5) Select a Technical Work Group;
- (6) Prepare a revised study design;
- (7) Prepare a process data collection plan;
- (8) Conduct a feasibility study;
- (9) Prepare a logistical proposal for the consortium;
- (10) Prepare a site visit protocol;
- (11) Convene the consortium;
- (12) Prepare a final study design;
- (13) Conduct site visits to all impact evaluation sites;
- (14) Prepare a protocol for the data collection instruments;
- (15) Prepare a data collection and analysis plan;
- (16) Prepare an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance package;
- (17) Prepare a revised work plan;
- (18) Develop criteria for selection of impact sites.

In Phases II-V, the Contractor shall:

- (19) Conduct annual site visits to impact evaluation sites.
- In ALL Phases, the Contractor shall:
- (20) Conduct cross-site data collection;
- (21) Conduct a minimum of two consortium meetings a year in Washington, DC;
- (22) Establish a protocol of all new or additional data collection instruments and prepare OMB clearance packages for all new or additional data collection instruments;
- (23) Provide timely data entry and return of data disks to sites;
- (24) Process and analyze the data collected;
- (25) Provide a format for continuous program improvement and support its use.

In addition, in all phases the Contractor shall prepare deliverables as necessary for the work completed in each Phase, including monthly progress reports and in-depth annual progress reports, and the following reports within an agreed-upon time: "Report of Characteristics of Early Head Start Programs," "Pathways to Quality Study," "Impact Study," "Study of Program Variations," "Studies Directed Toward Specific Policy Concerns," an Interim Report, and a Final Report which shall include a synthesis of the results of the final data analyses, reports of site researchers and a summary of the five-year project. In all Phase reports, the national impact study will be supplemented and integrated with the studies from the local research sites.

A. PHASE I

Task 1—Orientation Meeting With the Federal Project Officer (FPO)

Within *one week of the effective date of the contract*, the Contractor shall meet with the Federal Project Officer (FPO), and other relevant Federal staff to review the background of the project, and the work to be conducted. The FPO will provide the Contractor with available copies of the relevant grant proposals for ACYF-funded Early Head Start grantees. The Contractor shall propose an agenda for the meeting, indicate who would attend on behalf of the Contractor, list the types of study design modifications or other problems that would require FPO decisions at that meeting, and shall provide a project summary for distribution to ACYF staff. Specific topics to be discussed at the meeting include: Revisions to the proposed work plan in the Contractor's proposal; arrangements for maintaining regular contact with the FPO and relevant Federal staff via the INTERNET network and other means of communication; arrangements for initial contacts and ongoing cooperation with program sites; arrangements for information to be supplied upon selection of research sites and plans for carrying out the Phase I tasks. The meeting shall provide an opportunity to discuss any clarifications of the Contractor's proposed approach, the nature of the project, the schedule of work, and the progress report requirements and other deliverables. There shall be an additional meeting with the consortium in the second half of Phase I.

TASK 2—DEVELOP A COORDINATION STRATEGY FOR WORKING WITH OTHER CONTRACTORS—HSFIS and TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONTRACTORS

During all phases of the project, effective coordination with the Federal staff, Federal Contractors working on related projects and evaluations and outside stakeholders will be important to the success of the project. The Contractor shall work with the FPO and other Federal staff to establish and maintain cooperative working arrangements and in weeks *two through six* of Phase I shall establish a list of tasks and a communication plan for approval by ACYF. It is particularly important that procedures be coordinated with the HSFIS Contractor, including procedures for communication and bi-annual meetings in Washington, DC; procedures for ensuring readiness of grantees to utilize the HSFIS at the outset of Early Head Start; feasibility of HSFIS process data collection for project and comparison groups; procedures for transferring HSFIS reports to the national evaluation Contractor and for reports to the HSFIS Contractor. It will also be necessary to coordinate with Training and Technical Assistance personnel at ACYF and with the Contractor for Early Head Start Training and Technical Assistance, planning for two yearly meetings with that Contractor and ACYF staff in Washington, DC. Reports shall be given to ACYF from each of the meetings.

TASK 3—PREPARE A LITERATURE REVIEW

The Contractor shall conduct a thorough review of the existing literature on programs and evaluations of services to families with infants and toddlers, including documents produced by ACYF, foundations and reports of evaluations, published and not published. To place this evaluation in a national context, the Contractor shall review and synthesize relevant research and evaluation findings based on reliable research methodologies about the effects of services to families with infants and toddlers. This report shall synthesize findings from services to families for infants and toddlers and those from services related to any portion of Early Head Start, present methodological issues and creative solutions to those issues, identify gaps in the findings and methodologies and outline how this study will fill those gaps. This report shall also include the Contractor's recommendations for adding to or refining the evaluation research questions. The draft report

shall be submitted by the beginning of the *second month* of Phase I and the final report shall be submitted at the beginning of the *third month* of Phase I. The Contractor shall provide ACYF with copies of each document referenced in the literature review and shall deliver a an IBM PC-compatible 3-1/2 inch diskette. ACYF shall reserve the right to make the literature review, or parts of the document, available to the public.

TASK 4—SELECT A CADRE OF CONSULTANTS

The Contractor shall establish a cadre of consultants from relevant academic, professional, consulting and service-provider communities and recommend names *within two weeks* of the contract effective date. The intent is to have a cadre of professionals available for more intensive involvement on the design and implementation than is feasible with the Technical Work Group (TASK 5). Contractor shall provide the names and vitae of potential consultants.

The Contractor shall not secure their formal commitment prior to the award of the contract, and without prior approval of ACYF. The Contractor shall provide the names and vitae of potential consultants, including their specific qualifications relevant to this study. Prior to final approval, the Contractor shall provide a sufficiently detailed description of the specific work (including total projected hours per task or subtask to be done by this cadre, and a timeline for its completion). The Contractor will be responsible for all expenses of these consultants, including air fare, per diem and honorarium. The number of persons in the cadre and the quantity of consultation shall be the decision of the Contractor in cooperation with ACYF. The Contractor shall propose an estimate of consultant use.

The Contractor shall report on expenditures for professional consultants as a separate line item in monthly expense vouchers and shall provide a separate monthly report on activities of consultants.

TASK 5: SELECT AND CONVENE A TECHNICAL WORK GROUP

The Technical Work Group will advise the entire Early Head Start research and evaluation project, including national impact and local research activities. Within *two weeks* following the contract effective date, the evaluation Contractor shall recommend eighteen experts in relevant fields, such as: Infant and toddler development; home visitation; child care; Head Start; parent-child relationships; family systems; teen parenting; services

research; prevention and intervention research; ethnic diversity and minority issues; health delivery systems; parent education; mental health; adult education; family ecology; community development; staff development; assessment of child development; research methodology; statistics, instrument development, tests and measurement. The Contractor shall be prepared to make modifications in the list, as suggested by ACYF, based on additional and/or alternative candidates who might bring additional strengths to the Technical Work Group and to complete a group of twelve. All Technical Work Group members will require the approval of the ACYF Commissioner. In addition, the Technical Work Group must include rotating representation from research and program sites. Technical Work Group meetings will be held in conjunction with national-local research consortium meetings but there may be additional meetings called by the Contractor as needed. The Technical Work Group will provide guidance for this entire project, advising the cross-site evaluation study and local research, to produce a comprehensive picture of the complex story of the impact of Early Head Start. Therefore, available time of the Technical Work Group will need to be appropriated accordingly. A portion of each Technical Work Group meeting shall be allotted to local researchers issues.

Phase I meeting schedule: During Phase I of the project the Contractor shall convene the meetings of the Technical Work Group. With the exception of the first meeting, these meetings shall be held during the consortium meetings. Within *two months, or earlier if determined advisable in the orientation session*, of Phase I a meeting will be convened to solicit initial comments and suggestions regarding the overall scope of the evaluation and issues related to implementing the set of proposed evaluation activities; to review the draft of the literature and resource review plan; to review the draft design and sampling plan and process data collection plans and for consultation in selection of local research partners. Within *six months* (with final determination to be set by the Early Head Start program timetable) but *as early as within four months* of Phase I the Technical Work Group will convene in the consortium to be introduced to local researchers and their projects; advise local projects; establish representation from the consortium for the Technical Work Group; establish

sampling plans; plan site visits; and to establish the preliminary data collection instruments protocol. *Nine months* following the beginning of Phase I, members will participate in and report on site visits, including creating site profiles; consult for process evaluation; recommend a final design; recommend a data collection instruments protocol for the cross-site studies; meet with local researchers to plan specifications for their studies; and review the overall research and evaluation plan for Early Head Start. All expenses of the Technical Work Group including honorarium, per diem, travel and lodging to Technical Work Group or consortium meetings shall be covered by the national Contractor. Any site-specific consulting done by the Technical Work Group at site locations, with the exception of that done during site visits, shall not be the responsibility of the national Contractor.

TASK 6—PREPARE A REVISED STUDY DESIGN

Within *four and one half months* after the beginning of Phase I, the Contractor shall prepare a revised design and sampling plan.

Design and Sampling Plan: The Contractor shall develop a design and sampling plan based on random assignment methodology. The design and sampling plan also shall specifically include:

- A discussion of the issues and approach the Contractor will use to manage and coordinate with program and research staff, the recruitment and random assignment of families into project and comparison groups in 12 (preliminary) evaluation sites, including discussion of issues pertaining to the implementation of experimental design in low-income communities, steps that will be taken to ensure comparability of program and comparison families and how to ensure minimization of differential response rates and bias, over time;
- A discussion of how the Contractor will meet ethical challenges for comparison families presented by an experimental design, to be addressed, to some extent by presenting an annotated list of community services to comparison families, by a referral process for families that have identified crises, and for pregnant women to receive a focused initial referral for prenatal services;
- A discussion of how the Contractor will resolve challenges related to the burden on families, compensation, and attrition, and a discussion of procedures to be put into place to maintain families' interest, including predetermined plans

for Contractor to provide a payment of approximately \$20/interview period for project and comparison families; efforts of the national Contractor or efforts to encourage local sites to leverage additional material resources (such as diapers, infants clothing or toys); efforts of a part-time Community Family Coordinator at each site, who will be subcontracted by the national Contractor, to form relationships with and collect data from the comparison group families (and to some extent, program families). (See TASK 7, for elaboration);

- A discussion of how the Contractor will address the challenge of documenting the nature of services received by the program families, given program variation between and within sites in type of program delivered, quality, duration, intensity, and goodness of fit between program and need; and a discussion of how the Contractor will address the challenge of documenting the types of services comparison group families received.

- A discussion of how the Contractor will meet other challenges to the design as presented in Section C-1-II-H Challenges to the Evaluation, on page 19 of this document, and not directly addressed in any other segment of the Contractor's proposal, including measuring changing conditions over time; framing the role of relationships; measuring and determining full program implementation (See also TASK 18);

- A discussion of the importance of the Contractor's plan for determining the representativeness of the Early Head Start sample in impact evaluation communities, utilizing existing data sources;

- A discussion of the implications of the design and how the Contractor will collect data to place impact evaluation programs in a community context, including a baseline measure of community infrastructure; and

- A discussion of any other challenges the Contractor identifies for this evaluation and the Contractor's proposal for resolving those challenges.

TASK 7—PREPARE A PROCESS EVALUATION PLAN

There are multiple challenges to the process evaluation of the Early Head Start program that shall be addressed in a process evaluation plan to accompany the study design (TASK 6) *four months* after the beginning of Phase I. (1) In Level I sites the Contractor shall develop a process report, "Characteristics of Early Head Start Programs Report," which will be a description of FY '95 and FY '96 programs, using HSFIS data. (2) In Level

II sites it will be necessary to begin documenting the characteristics, needs and the nature of services for both program and comparison group families, including the characteristics of programs and communities from the outset of Early Head Start.

The Contractor shall have overall responsibility for collecting the process data required for this study, but shall coordinate with local researchers and program personnel. It is recommended that a part-time Community Family Coordinator be employed or subcontracted at each site who will coordinate local process data collection; maintain a relationship with comparison families; document the service use and provide emergency services for comparison families; and track families who have moved or have left the program. The Contractor shall also be responsible for the collection of:

- A baseline intake interview for comparison and program families in Level II sites. The baseline intake interview may be completed by program staff using the HSFIS, before random assignment of recruited families.

- A needs assessment for comparison and project groups, which may be gathered by the program personnel (program) and a Community Family Coordinator (comparison) families using identical formats, or utilizing an alternative format proposed by the Contractor.

- Establishing comparability of process data between program and comparison groups, utilizing a program-entered HSFIS data and parallel comparison group HSFIS data entry. It is anticipated that collection of service-use and health data will be conducted by the program personnel (for program families) and that a Community Family Coordinator will form a relationship with and enter such data for comparison group families, using a special module of HSFIS. However, the Community Family Coordinator will interview both project and comparison families for data for which comparability of parallel entry cannot be established or the Contractor shall propose an alternative format.

- Additional data collection procedures and a timetable for process data collection from comparison and project families.

- A plan for developing site-specific profiles that will characterize each of the FY '95 impact evaluation sites. This task may cross reference with TASK 10, PREPARE A SITE VISIT PROTOCOL. Year 1 site profiles for impact evaluation sites will be jointly authored by national and local researchers and local program personnel.

- An approach that would be used in drawing up a cross-site descriptive study of the FY '95 and FY '96 Early Head Start programs utilizing HSFIS data, supplemented by site profiles from research sites.

- Within *two months* after the beginning of Phase I, the Contractor shall be prepared to submit an OMB package. See TASK 16, PREPARE AN OMB CLEARANCE PACKAGE) of process data collection instruments in the eventuality all or part of a HSFIS evaluation module is not deemed comprehensive or desirable for process data collection.

- An approach that would be used in drawing up a cross-site descriptive study of FY 95 programs with special emphasis on describing the 12 research sites, using HSFIS data supplement by site profiles from research sites.

TASK 8—CONDUCT A FEASIBILITY STUDY IN 3 SITES

Within *two months* of the beginning of Phase I, the Contractor shall discuss rationale for and submit a protocol for an evaluation feasibility study protocol and within *three months* of Phase I shall conduct a feasibility study in 3 sites in order to determine if assumptions about the evaluation design are valid. This study shall involve site visits which shall have tasks to: determine the status of the HSFIS in the site; determine program-use needs assessment; determine viability of entering comparison and project group data with HSFIS software; determine feasibility of establishing adequate sample size for experimental design; and estimate the feasibility of measuring the level and quality of services available in the community for referral services. A report from this study shall be submitted within *four months* of Phase I.

TASK 9—PREPARE A LOGISTICAL PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL-LOCAL RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

Within *three months* of Phase I, the Contractor shall be responsible for proposing a consortium logistics plan which shall be submitted to ACYF for approval the *seventh month* after the beginning of Phase I, following review by the consortium members. This plan shall include the logistical approach to bi-annual consortium meetings in Washington, DC, to be attended by the Contractor, the Technical Work Group and local researchers from impact evaluation sites; a discussion of time-use divided into equal day-long segments in order to meet the three needs of the consortium (impact study planning; local research, and Technical

Work Group consultation); a discussion of areas of the impact study for which the Contractor will seek input from the local researchers, i.e., site visit protocols; data collection instruments; data collection procedures; workplan; a discussion of the areas for which the national Contractor, the Technical Work Group and the local researchers will need to work closely together as partners, i.e., preventing attrition, integrating the national and local research efforts, publication issues, and data use. The Contractor is encouraged in preparing these discussions to review other consortium arrangements such as that utilized by LONGSCAN. The Contractor will be responsible for logistical expenses associated with the consortium, as well as for all of the expenses of the Technical Work Group. Local researchers will cover their own travel, lodging, registration and other expenses. The national Contractor shall also provide for honoraria and expenses of any speakers, if necessary, and subject to prior approval from the FPO.

TASK 10—PREPARE A SITE VISIT PROTOCOL

The *third month* of Phase I, the Contractor shall develop a draft site visit protocol which details procedures for site visits. The purposes of the site visits will be to review continuous program improvement evaluation procedures at all FY '95 (and FY '96 research sites). In impact evaluation sites, additional purposes will be to establish site profiles, to review staffing for Community Family Coordinators; to establish relationships with the local researchers and to understand the local research projects; to establish the procedures for random assignment, and to establish local procedures for data collection. The FPO and other ACYF representatives will review the draft protocol and return it within one week to the Contractor who shall present a final protocol to ACYF by the *fourth month* of Phase I. As part of the protocol development process by the *third month* of Phase I the Contractor shall provide the FPO with a draft letter of introduction for the ACYF Commissioner to send to Early Head Start sites that will participate in site visits. The letter shall identify the Contractor, describe the purpose of the project, and inform the Early Head Start programs about plans for the site visits and specify other contacts, including community and research representatives. A letter shall also be provided to the FPO for the researchers at the sites, identifying their roles in the site visit and describing the purpose of the visit. *Prior to conducting the site*

visits, the Contractor shall submit a memorandum to the FPO outlining a schedule for the visits and an outline of a standardized format for site visit reports that shall be submitted to the FPO within two weeks after each visit. Each proposed three-person site visit team shall be comprised of, but not limited to, representatives of the national Contractor; the Technical Work Group, and program or research staff from other sites. ACYF staff may be represented as well.

TASK 11—CONVENE THE CONSORTIUM

Upon selection of research sites, *within four months* of Phase I and/or *within one month* of the selection of research sites, the Contractor shall convene a meeting of the consortium in Washington, DC, including ACYF, the national Contractor, local researchers and the Technical Work Group. The Contractor shall carry out the logistical plan as proposed previously, dividing the consortium time into thirds for addressing needs of the cross-site impact evaluation, local research development and advise for both from the Technical Work Group. At the initial consortium meeting, the Contractor shall provide opportunities for identification of each of the local research sites' research purposes; discuss the logistical plan with the consortium; establish committees as identified by the logistical plan; establish a work plan; establish any subcommittees; discuss issues for immediate and future data collection; review process data to be collected by HSFIS and otherwise; review sample selection procedures; review the preliminary site visit protocol; and name site visit teams. The national Contractor shall communicate about this meeting with ACYF for a potential joint meeting with program staff. The national Contractor is responsible for all costs associated with consortium meetings, including hotel, break out rooms, expenses of Technical Work Group, except for the direct expenses of the local researchers and federal staff.

TASK 12—CONDUCT SITE VISITS TO ALL FY '95 EARLY HEAD START IMPACT EVALUATION SITES

From the *fifth through seventh month* of Phase I and/or *within two months* of the selection of research sites, the Contractor shall begin site visits as specified in the Site Visit Protocol. A draft report and sample site profiles shall be submitted to the FPO by the *sixth month* of Phase I. Site visit reports and profiles on every Early Head Start site evaluation site shall be submitted to

ACYF by the *seventh month* of Phase I. For planning purposes, the Contractor shall allow for site visits of 2 days in length for each site (with the actual length of the visits varying somewhat as a function of the size and complexity of the program, as well as the intended tasks to be accomplished.) All expenses from the site visits shall be handled through the national contract.

TASK 13—PREPARE A FINAL DESIGN

It is anticipated that information provided by the Early Head Start site visits, by the interactions with the local researchers and by the meetings with the consortium, Technical Work Group and the FPO will call for changes and clarifications in the evaluation design and implementation plan. Based on this information the Contractor shall prepare a draft revised technical evaluation design and analysis report by the *seventh month* of Phase I and final plan by the *eighth month* of Phase I which consists of the following components:

A. Statement of Evaluation Outcomes

A list of research and policy questions, both general and specific, that the study shall address. Each specific question shall be logically connected with the general question to which it relates, as well as being organized according to the overall conceptual model of the study.

For each specific question the theoretical hypothesis, required data elements and data source(s) shall be identified.

For each specific question, a discussion of any measurement issues for obtaining realistic and valid outcomes and the approach to resolving those measurement issues shall be included.

B. Revised Study Design (See TASK 6)

C. Revised Process Data Collection Plan (See TASK 7)

TASK 14—ESTABLISH A PROTOCOL FOR ALL DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

By the *ninth month* following the award of this contract, the Contractor shall submit to the FPO a complete draft protocol for data collection instruments for studies for Phase II of the evaluation and a proposed protocol for data collection instruments for Phases III–V of this study. It is expected that the Contractor will seek input from local researchers through the consortium but that final responsibility for this protocol rests with the Contractor. This protocol will have multiple sets of data collection instruments (or interview guides). The first set includes

instruments to assess quality in site program activities and the second set will include instruments to measure the programs' impact on children, families, communities and staff. A third set will include instruments to determine the variations in programs and may overlap with other sets. It is anticipated that information shall be gathered through interviews with parents and staff as well as through observation of children, parents, home environments, and staff.

The Contractor's approach to measurement, including discussion of measurement issues, for the several studies of this evaluation shall be presented. The Contractor shall identify strategies for searching for measurement instruments, for including measurement instruments utilized in related studies of infant/toddler development or family services; and for pilot testing the data collection instruments. It is anticipated that community-level outcomes may involve the development of new data collection instruments. It is possible that some of the quality, variations or policy-related data may be collected by the national Contractor using cross-site survey methods or qualitative assessments.

The instruments selected or developed shall be clearly linked to the conceptual design of the study, services delivered and expected outcomes. The set of instruments for the quality study shall generate information in critical areas such as:

- Child relationships with caregivers.
- Child and parent continuity in relationship with program providers.
- Parent perceptions of, expectations of, and satisfaction with the program.
- Staff perceptions of the quality of their program.
- Parent relationships with case managers and other key Staff.
- Goodness of fit between parent/child needs and services delivered.
- Availability, access and quality of services in the community.
- Availability, access and quality of parent education activities.
- Quality of home visitation.
- Perceptions of the program by community members.
- Child care environment.

The studies of impact shall generate information in critical areas not contained in the HSFIS or gathered as process data and including:

- Child development.
- Child security of attachment.
- Child risk and resiliency factors.
- Home environment.
- Child care environments.
- Parent-child relationships.
- Other caregiver-child relationships.
- Parenting attitudes.

- Parent knowledge of child development.
- Parent attitudes about guidance.
- Support for parenting.
- Perceptions of conflict and/or violence in the neighborhood.
- Perception of parent involvement activities.
- Community collaboration.
- Community development of services.
- Staff professional development.
- Staff-children/family relationships.
- Sibling health and development.

For each of the proposed data collection instruments, the Contractor shall attach an analysis of the instruments with regard to any prior use in other studies of a similar nature, their psychometric properties and their acceptance by experts in the field as appropriate measures. The Contractor shall attach the results from pilot studies of each of the instruments in the final protocol. The Contractor shall prepare complete protocols of all instruments, and a training plan for all data collectors. The Contractor shall revise the instruments plan based on input from the FPO and the consortium, including the Technical Work Group, and shall submit final data collection instruments to the FPO for approval by the end of the *tenth month* of Phase I.

TASK 15—SUBMIT A DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PLAN

The Contractor shall prepare a data collection and analysis plan that links each study question to the data collection instruments, proposed respondents/data sources and study methods and the final design and sampling plan (TASK 11). The Contractor shall provide a graphic that displays this information.

The national Contractor shall be responsible for all the costs of data collection for all of the national studies as described in this document, including the cost of compensating families for interviews. Local researchers will also be encouraged to generate additional material resources for families. Impact data collection may be, and it is anticipated in most cases, will be, subcontracted to the local researcher, in response to the Contractor's call for an application containing data collection plan and qualifications of staff. The local researcher shall have first subcontracting opportunity at the first collection period. However, if, after that, due to a lack of quality or timeliness in previous data collection; or the local researcher does not want to subcontract; or there is no local researcher at the site, the national Contractor may subcontract

with other qualified researchers for local data collection. Subcontracts shall be renewed on an annual basis.

The Contractor shall develop an overall data collection plan which clearly outlines timelines for all proposed data collection activities, including a theoretically-based justification for each proposed data collection activity. The data collection plan shall include:

- A discussion of issues around the timing of data collection and a proposed timetable for data collection. It is also anticipated that the impact data shall be collected at multiple points in time, to correspond with predetermined targets around children's age and parent and staff length of time in the program.

Thus, data collection activities involving parents and children may need to be decoupled, leading to the likelihood that data collection in any one site may be relatively continuous. The Contractor shall discuss a preferred approach to this issue;

- Procedures for contacting and tracking families over time;
- A discussion of recommended procedures for the follow-up of incomplete data;
- Theoretical justification, procedures and timelines for assessment strategies proposed by the Contractor in additional areas not already mentioned in the presentation related to data collection of the program process;
- Theoretical justification, procedures and timelines for assessment strategies proposed by the Contractor related to data collection of child, family, community or staff outcomes;
- Theoretical justification, procedures and timelines for conducting observations and other data collection focused on program quality or variations;

• A discussion of a quality control component which addresses the training of data collection staff at the local Early Head Start program sites, continuity of data collection staff and methods for ascertaining reliability and effectiveness of data collectors;

- Procedures for identifying and assessing the quality of existing data, as well as procedures for negotiating with sites to access and utilize existing sources of data, particularly as they pertain to community data for determining the representativeness of the Early Head Start recruited families; and

• Procedures for establishing, maintaining and overseeing the subcontractors cooperative relationships with the Early Head Start programs that shall maintain the independence and objectivity required for a third party

evaluation, but will allow for the effective management of data collection activities.

The Contractor shall discuss the data analysis challenge (Section I-I), including a discussion focused on determining the magnitude of effect across diffuse program services, and propose solutions to these challenges. The Contractor shall identify the specific types of data analyses that will be employed for each phase of data collection and for each data element, within the context of the revised study design, including the unit of analysis, possible aggregations and method of display in the final report.

The draft data collection and analysis plan shall be submitted to the FPO by the end of the *eleventh month* after contract effective date. The FPO will review this plan with other ACYF staff and submit comments to the Contractor within one week. The Contractor shall make the required corrections and resubmit the plan in final form to the FPO by the end of *twelfth month* after contract effective date.

TASK 16—PREPARE AN OMB CLEARANCE PACKAGE

The Contractor shall develop an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance package for the study, including all data collection instruments and transmittal memorandum in accordance with OMB and the ACF guidelines. The package shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- A justification and introduction to the study. This includes a justification of why the study is needed; how, by whom and for what purpose the information will be used; why existing information cannot be used and a summary of study components;
- Data collection plan. This includes both a description of and a justification for the study design, including the sample plan; design of data collection instruments with a question by question justification; results of pretesting data collection instruments; and a data analysis plan;
- Tabulation and publication plans;
- Consultation with outside agencies;
- Respondent burden estimate;
- Confidentiality statement.

The OMB package shall be submitted to the FPO by the end of the *eleventh month* of Phase I. The FPO will provide up to four sets of comments to the Contractor over a period of three weeks. The Contractor shall then submit the final OMB package to the FPO by the end of the *twelfth month of Phase II*. The Contractor shall allow at least 120 days for OMB approval.

TASK 17—REVISE THE INITIAL WORK PLAN INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSAL

Based on the progress of work covered by Tasks 1-16, the Contractor shall produce a revised work plan for each of the remaining Phases of the contract (Phases II-V), by the *twelfth month* after the contract effective date. Key issues to be addressed in both the initial and revised work plan shall include:

- Effective coordination of this project with Federal staff and designated Contractors, including HSFIS Contractor; Training and Technical Assistance Coordinator; Early Head Start sites, the consortium and the Technical Work Group;
- Identification of issues to be resolved for data collection with plans and timelines for how those issues will be addressed;
- Identification of logistical issues in the workings of the consortium and plans for addressing these issues. A schedule of consortium meetings;
- A proposed protocol of measures with timelines and identification of data collectors for each data collection point;
- Data collection, analyses and reporting plans for later phases of this project;
- A schedule for subsequent site visits;
- Any other remaining tasks.

TASK 18—SELECT FINAL CRITERIA FOR INCLUSION IN IMPACT EVALUATION

The Advisory Committee on Services to Families with Infants and Toddlers recommended establishing criteria for Early Head Start program evaluation, including the recommendation that no Early Head Start program shall be evaluated that is not fully implemented. *Twelve months after the beginning of Phase I*, the Contractor, with input from the Technical Work Group, shall submit a draft plan for determining whether sites demonstrate viability for impact evaluation. This plan shall include criteria for defining the minimum threshold for program implementation; standards for demonstrating whether comparability between comparison and project families was maintained; adequate power, and any other criterion deemed important to a valid evaluation of impact, i.e., absence of saturation of Head Start-like services in the community. As criteria for full implementation, the review shall include consideration of measures of implementation associated with the Early Head Performance Standards; Head Start Performance Measures; and program quality in general. This review and the plan shall be submitted to

ACYF. On approval of the criteria, site visit teams will rate sites, beginning with research sites, on each criterion; this rating shall involve a site visit which may be combined with a previously scheduled site visit or with other planned data collection. Ratings will be forwarded to ACYF, who will make the final determination of which sites shall be included in the evaluation. *Three months* after the beginning of Phase II or on a modified timetable as proposed by ACYF or the national Contractor and approved by ACYF, final determination shall be made by ACYF regarding which and how many sites to include in the final impact evaluation. As a conservative estimate, the Contractor shall plan to conduct an impact evaluation at 12 sites.

B. PHASES II-V

TASK 19—CONDUCT ANNUAL SITE VISITS

Within *one month* of each new Phase, the Contractor shall develop a revised protocol for annual site visits to, at a minimum, all sites included in the evaluation. Protocols for the site visits shall be developed with input from the consortium, including the Technical Work Group, and be submitted to ACYF for final approval within *three months* of each new Phase. Site visits shall follow the approved protocol and shall include verification of data collection procedures; availability and use of program data, including HSFIS data, for continuous program improvement; follow through on research plans, and continued documentation of the nature of the program. Written reports shall be submitted to ACYF and the site within *three weeks* of each visit. The written report shall include an updated site profile, authored jointly by the Contractor and the local researcher, where applicable. The Contractor may be asked to conduct site visits to new Early Head Start sites for purposes the same as for FY '95 program sites. The proposal shall include a per-site cost to cover the possibility of additional Early Head Start program site visits in subsequent years.

C. ALL PHASES

TASK 20—CONDUCT CROSS-SITE DATA COLLECTION

The Contractor shall conduct cross-site data collection for the national impact studies (for both the project and comparison groups) in an estimated 12 selected Early Head Start sites, either directly providing for data collection or by subcontracting with local evaluators, as determined on an annual basis.

Upon approval of the OMB Clearance Package, the Contractor shall conduct the appropriate data collection activities (outlined in the OMB clearance package) at the selected Early Head Start programs. The Contractor shall develop a plan to have senior evaluation staff conduct periodic site visits during data collection periods for the purpose of monitoring on-site evaluation staff, ensuring quality control and maintaining good working relationships with local research and program staff. The Contractor shall develop procedures for monitoring local staff to make sure they carry out their evaluation responsibilities.

Where appropriate, the Contractor also shall consider the potential need for the use of security guards to accompany researchers in cases where their safety is at risk.

As the data collection in this project has a longitudinal nature, whenever possible, data collectors with demonstrated effectiveness shall maintain continuity with families; the Contractor shall have developed compensatory procedures for maintaining reliability of measurement.

In each site, the Contractor shall continue to design and implement methods for understanding the services provided to both the treatment and comparison groups and at the community level. The Contractor shall continue to build the profile begun at each site to describe the general character of each program and shall continue to examine methods for documenting the program. Finally, the Contractor shall continue to explore methods for understanding the communities' impacts on and from Early Head Start programs. The Contractor shall work closely with researchers at local sites in these tasks.

TASK 21—CONDUCT A MINIMUM OF TWO MEETINGS A YEAR WITH THE CONSORTIUM

Within the *first three months* following the beginning of each new phase, the Contractor shall convene the consortium, including the local researchers and the Technical Work Group, in Washington, DC., to conduct the business of the consortium according to the consortium workplan. A minimum of two consortium meetings shall be convened each year, and no six month period shall pass without a consortium meeting. The possibility of meeting in connection with Early Head Start program personnel shall be considered for at least one of the two meetings and ACYF shall guide the decision on whether a program-research meeting is advised. There shall be

support for at least two meetings of each of the consortium subcommittees per year, as necessary. The Contractor shall deliver ACYF consortium reports with embedded Technical Work Group reports *within one month* following each consortium meeting. The Contractor shall be responsible for all costs associated with consortium meetings (See TASK 11), except for the direct costs of local researchers and the federal staff. If the Contractor coordinates with program personnel, only the research and evaluation portion of the costs of the consortium shall be the responsibility of the national Contractor.

TASK 22—ESTABLISH A PROTOCOL OF ALL MEASURES FOR EACH NEW PHASE OF THE PROJECT AND PREPARE AND SUBMIT NEW CLEARANCE PACKAGES FOR SUBMISSION TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET (OMB), AS NECESSARY

Within the *first three months* of each new phase, and as needed, the Contractor shall review the work plan to determine acceptability of the protocol for each new phase of measurement and the need to obtain OMB clearance. Measures added shall be submitted with input from the local researchers and the Technical Work Group, to ACYF, pilot tested and approved by the consortium according to procedures developed in the original protocol before being submitted to OMB. Procedures under TASK 14, TASK 15 and TASK 16 shall be adopted for subsequent measures.

TASK 23—PROVIDE SITES WITH DATA FILES AND SUMMARY REPORTS

The objective of continuous program improvement necessitates the timely turnaround of all data. Therefore, it will be necessary for impact data submitted from local sites to the national Contractor to be cleaned, entered and returned on disk to the local site within *three months* of its submission to the national Contractor. The national Contractor will need to develop procedures for working with sites that do not maintain quality and timeliness standards within the subcontracting structure.

Within *six months* of each Phase, a site-level printout for all impact evaluation sites shall be generated with sites identified only by number to maintain confidentiality, presenting the data, as predetermined in the data analysis plan, in summary form for each site and summed or averaged, as appropriate, across sites. From these printouts, sites shall be able to compare

their own results with those of other sites. This report shall include HSFIS data. The national Contractor shall be required to submit, receive and report to ACYF a brief assessment of their own activities in the task of timely data turn around. To this end, initiated by the national Contractor, local programs will briefly evaluate the Contractor's timeliness and formatting of returned data. This brief report shall be due to ACYF by the *eleventh* month of each Phase, and will be submitted to the ACYF together with printouts of data returned to sites.

TASK 24—PROVIDE FORMATS FOR CONTINUOUS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

All Level I sites are expected to utilize formative evaluation procedures for continuous program improvement as a component of program management. Many Level I sites will identify a local university or research institution partner to assist them in completing this task; Level II sites will be expected to participate in continuous program improvement activities in addition to conducting research. The national Contractor shall be a partner in formative evaluation tasks for continuous program improvement by: Conducting site visits to all 12 evaluation sites in order to informally assess site preparedness for continuous program improvement and to provide on-site guidance for initiating this function at the local level; developing a standard format for orienting subsequent Early Head Start sites (FY '96 and beyond) to continuous program improvement activities; providing annual formative evaluation training, either directly or through the Training and Technical Assistance Contractor, to all program sites, during annual program consortium meetings in Washington, DC. or utilizing an alternative format; participating in bi-annual coordination meetings with the Training and Technical Assistance Contractor to ascertain that capacity for this new management function develops in all sites, and coordinating with the HSFIS Contractor through bi-annual meetings to assure that HSFIS data are being utilized for continuous program improvement. The Contractor shall provide a continuous program improvement report in the *twelfth month* of each Phase.

TASK 25—ANALYZE THE DATA

The Contractor shall conduct and complete analyses of national evaluation data on a timetable jointly agreed upon by ACYF and the Contractor, and based on the

methodology approved under TASK 15. After preliminary analyses during each Phase, the Contractor may revise the analytical plan based on the quality and completeness of the database or on refinements of the conceptual hypotheses. Procedures for data analysis shall be reviewed by the Technical Work Group after each Phase of data collection and analysis. Recommendations for any revisions in the data analysis plan shall be submitted to the FPO for review and approval. In addition, the Contractor shall reserve 5% of the budget for analyses requested by ACYF or the Technical Work Group for analyses focused on policy or not specified in the contract.

C-4 Deliverables

a. *Literature and Research Review, Draft and Final:* The Contractor shall produce a draft and final literature review. The draft report shall be submitted to the FPO by November 1, 1995. The FPO shall provide comments within two weeks. The final version of the revised literature review shall be submitted to the FPO by December 1, 1995.

b. *Revised Draft Study Design and Process Data Plan:* The Contractor shall submit a revised study design and sampling plan and process data plan by January 31, 1996. This shall be an updated version of the design and sampling plan submitted in the Contractor's Best and Final proposal and shall reflect input from the Technical Work Group and ACYF. It shall be in draft form. The process data plan shall reflect the progress of HSFIS implementation as well.

c. *Feasibility Study to Test Assumptions of the Design—Protocol and Report:* By November 31, 1995, the Contractor shall submit a feasibility protocol, updated from the proposal to reflect knowledge of sites available for the feasibility study. This shall be a pilot study of the sampling, design and process evaluation procedures proposed. Working with ACYF, program sites for this study will be selected and the Contractor shall report findings by January 31, 1996.

d. *Consortium Logistics Plan, Draft and Final:* The draft and final Logistics Plan shall be submitted, respectively, by December 31, 1995 and April 30, 1996. This document shall be an update from procedures submitted with this contract and shall propose operations procedures that will guide the coordination of consortium logistics for the cooperative aspects of this project.

e. *Site Visit Draft and Final Protocols, Draft and Reports:* After review by the

Technical Work Group, the draft of the site visit protocol shall be submitted to the FPO by the end of December 1995. ACYF will make recommendations, and the final site visit protocol shall be submitted to the FPO for approval by January 31, 1996. By the beginning of the March 1996, (the week after the first site visit), the Contractor shall submit a draft site visit report for approval by the FPO. The draft report shall include a schedule of events, an analysis of data from interviews and assessments, a summary of any additional issues raised, and an updated and expanded profile of the program and its evaluation. The FPO shall provide feedback to clarify expectations about content and format within two weeks. The final version of the first site visit report shall be submitted to the FPO for approval by the end of the March 1996. For each remaining site visit, a draft of the site visit report shall be submitted to the FPO one week after the site visit. The final version of each report shall be submitted to the FPO for approval *three weeks* after the site visit. The report for the last of the site visits shall be submitted no later than the end of April 1996.

f. *Study Design, Draft and Final:* The study design report shall be due April 30, 1996, reflecting input from the Technical Work Group, the consortium, and from site visits. The FPO shall review the design, obtain comments from other ACYF staff, and provide comments to the Contractor within two weeks. The Contractor shall then make corrections to the design and submit a final study design for review and approval by the FPO. The final study design shall be submitted by May 31, 1996.

g. *Data Collection Instruments Protocol, Draft and Final:* With input from the consortium including the Technical Work Group, the Contractor shall develop, or select existing data collection instruments to be submitted to the FPO by the end of the June 1996. The Contractor shall attach an analysis of the instruments with regard to any prior use in other studies of a similar nature, their psychometric properties, their acceptance by experts in the field as appropriate measures, and their performance in pre-tests and field testing. The FPO shall provide comments to the Contractor within two weeks. The Contractor shall revise the instruments based on the comments by the FPO and shall submit final data collection instruments to the FPO for approval by July 31, 1996.

i. *Data Collection and Analysis Plan, Draft and Final:* With input from the consortium including the Technical

Work Group, the Contractor shall present a draft data collection and analysis plan to the FPO by August 31, 1996 that shall be a complete plan for the data collection for this project and shall present a plan for analysis to answer the original study questions. The FPO shall review this plan, returning it to the Contractor for revisions and request its return by the September 30, 1996.

j. *Revised Work Plan, Draft and Final:* A draft of the Phase I Revised Work Plan shall be submitted to the FPO for approval by July 31, 1996. The FPO shall provide feedback within one week. The final version shall be submitted by September 30, 1996. The work plan may be revised once the data collection is underway to make use of new information or strategies which emerge over time. Proposed changes shall be indicated in the monthly technical progress reports and shall require the prior written approval of the FPO before changes are implemented.

k. *OMB Clearance Package:* The draft OMB package shall be submitted to the FPO by August 31, 1996. The FPO shall provide up to four separate sets of comments to the Contractor over a period of two weeks. The Contractor shall then submit the final OMB package to the FPO for approval by the end of the September 1996. The Contractor shall allow at least 120 days for OMB approval. An early OMB package shall be developed within the first several months on a schedule to be determined by the Contractor and FPO.

l. *Report of Site Qualifications for Evaluation:* The draft criteria, finalized criteria and report of sites' qualification for criteria shall be submitted to ACYF respectively, September 30, 1996, November 30 and December 31, 1996.

m. *Phase II—V Site Visit Protocols, Reports:* Following the schedule established for the Phase I site visit reports, a draft of the site visit protocol shall be submitted to the FPO by the *third month* of each Phase and a draft report shall be submitted *one week* after the first site visit. The final version of each report shall be submitted to the FPO *three weeks* after the site visit.

n. *Monthly and Annual Progress Reports:* The Contractor shall provide brief monthly technical progress reports to the FPO which clearly indicate the contract tasks which were to be performed in the prior month, a description of the progress made in completing these tasks, problems encountered or remaining from the prior month, expected approach to resolve problems from the prior month, tasks for the current month, and any budgeting implications or significant concerns to

be addressed by the FPO. In addition, the monthly progress reports shall provide a brief review of the status of the contract budget for the respective Phase, with separate presentations (by tasks and subtasks) of the original amount budgeted, funds expended to date, funds expended in the prior month, and the remaining balance of funds in the contract. The *first two monthly* progress reports shall contain a communication plan which details how all relevant parties shall be updated regarding project activities. This communication plan shall be updated as necessary in the monthly progress report.

At the end of each project year, the Contractor shall prepare an in-depth annual progress report, summarizing the status of the evaluation cross sites and in each site as well as activities of the evaluation and the consortium, accomplishments, and problems encountered during the year. This report shall also include a detailed plan for activities in each site during the coming year. *Within one month* of submitting the annual report for approval, the Contractor shall provide an in-depth briefing on the progress of the study and initial findings in Washington, DC, for ACYF staff. Following those briefings, after receiving input from ACYF staff, the Contractor may be required to present a similar briefing for a Congressional audience. In all briefings, the Contractor may be required to collaborate with local researchers involved with Early Head Start evaluation.

o. New Data Collection Instruments Protocols and OMB Clearance: Within *three months* of the beginning of each new phase or as is necessary, the Contractor shall submit a protocol and OMB clearance for any new measures to be added to or changed from the originally approved protocols. The form of these deliverables shall be similar to form specified above for Data Collection Instruments Protocol, Draft and Final, and OMB Clearance Package.

p. Consortium and Technical Work Group Reports: Within *one month* after each consortium meeting and subcommittee meetings and within one month of each Technical Work Group meeting a written report shall be submitted to ACYF. All meetings of these bodies shall be reported in separate reports, even though Technical Work Group meetings may be embedded in the consortium meetings.

q. Collaborative Contractor Coordination Reports: *One week* following each meeting with the HSFIS or Training and Technical Assistance

Contractor, a report shall be submitted to ACYF and to the relevant Contractor.

r. Reports of Data Returned to Sites: Timeliness and Usefulness of Data Turnaround: Reports of data disks returned to sites, site printouts, and reports of assessments of the Contractor's activities at local sites shall be submitted to ACYF by August 31st of each Phase.

s. Reports of Activities to Support Continuous Program Improvement: By September 30th of each Phase, a report shall be submitted summarizing the Contractor's role in Continuous Program Improvement activities and progress.

t. Phase Reports: For each Phase, the Contractor shall produce Draft and Final Report/s that shall incorporate data collected and analyzed around the intended purposes and plan of the project. These reports shall be due in draft form August 31 *and in final form September 30* of each Phase, *or as determined between ACYF and the Contractor.* Each report shall have attached relevant local researchers' reports, and provide an overview that integrates national and local findings. The reports shall be presented in the following approximate sequence:

"Report of Characteristics of Early Head Start Programs" which shall be an analysis of first year HSFIS data together with site profiles from impact evaluation sites, co-authored by local researchers and program staff.

"Pathways to Quality Study" which shall be an analysis of quality data from sites in describing the various procedures and successes of programs in attaining program quality. There shall be attached local studies focused on improving program quality. The national Contractor shall provide an overview that integrates findings from the national and local studies.

"Impact Studies" of this project shall compare program to comparison groups and also address the question: for which children and families were there impacts under which conditions? Local research studies focused on this question shall be attached and the national Contractor shall provide an overview that integrates findings from the national and local studies.

The "Study of Program Variations" shall first describe, then examine in depth the site profiles in relation to impact data collected to examine the questions pertaining to which children and families benefitted under what conditions of Early Head Start program variations. Local research reports that address the question shall be included and integrated.

"Studies Directed Towards Specific Policy Concerns," shall examine

potential studies nested in the data set, i.e., analyzing across sites the added effect of Early Head Start to child care and in transition from welfare to work. "Studies of Impact in a Longitudinal Context" shall be an analysis of findings in a longitudinal context. Local research reports that address the question of change over.

u. Interim Report: The Contractor shall produce an Interim Report, due September 1, 1997, which will summarize findings to date for the study. This report may require integration with other studies and evaluations of services for infants and toddlers, such as the CCDP evaluation.

v. Final National Report: The Contractor shall produce a Final Report which provides a national assessment of Early Head Start program implementation and program impacts across the programs examined. This report shall be comprehensive of the entire 5-year duration of the project and shall include and integrate findings from local studies, but maintaining the integrity of the separate studies.

The Report shall draw conclusions about the following issues (as well as other relevant issues raised during the course of the evaluation):

- (1) Were nationally-defined Early Head Start objectives met?
- (2) Were program implementation objectives realized?
- (3) To what extent were continuous improvement objectives realized?
- (4) To what extent and under what conditions were programs able to implement quality services?
- (5) What short- and long-term impacts did Early Head Start programs have on children, families, communities and staff?
- (6) For which children, families, communities and staff under which conditions was Early Head Start able to realize its objectives? What else was learned about child, family, community, staff effects through Early Head Start?
- (7) To what extent did different prototypes of Early Head Start variation emerge and what kinds of outcomes were associated with various prototypes?
- (8) What was learned through analyses of subgroups in Early Head Start with additional implications for public policy?
- (9) What were the longitudinal effects of Early Head Start under a variety of conditions, including risk and program variation?
- (10) How did the study of Early Head Start programs advance the methods of program evaluation?

In the Report, the Contractor shall discuss how the contents of this Report

relate to any findings and recommendations presented in previous work produced under this contract. The Contractor also shall provide a discussion of the findings in relation to the literature in the field. The discussion of the literature shall be based on a revised version of the preliminary literature review. These revisions shall take into account new work in the field as well as information produced by Contractors under related studies.

The Contractor shall submit a draft outline of the final report to the FPO by the end of the *ninth month* before the end of Phase V. The FPO will have four weeks to review and approve the outline. The outline shall include a framework for a stand-alone Executive Summary. The draft final report based on the approved outline shall be submitted by the end of the *tenth month* before the end of Phase V. The FPO shall have four weeks to comment on the report and to obtain comments from other HHS staff and the Technical Work Group and the consortium. The Contractor shall plan to revise the draft at least twice based on comments from the FPO and other ACYF staff prior to

submitting the final report to the FPO for approval. The Contractor shall make a presentation to Federal staff *four weeks* after submission of the draft final report. Issues raised in response to the presentation shall be considered in preparing the final version of the report. The final report and a camera ready copy of the final report shall be submitted to the FPO for approval by the end of the 60th month after contract effective date. The final report shall include a stand-alone Executive Summary which must not exceed fifteen pages in length. A copy of the Report of Evaluation Outcomes and of the Executive Summary shall be submitted on IBM PC compatible 3.5 inch 1.4 megabyte DS/HD diskettes in Wordperfect 5.1. In order to accommodate a publishing plan, the Contractor shall submit line item quotes reflecting the exact costs of research, writing, editing and copy preparation associated with the copies of the Final National Report and the Executive Summary (including one unbound camera-ready copy of each report).

w. *Data Files:* The Contractor shall produce a public use data diskette for an IBM PC Compatible 3.5 inch 1.4 MB DS/

HD diskette at the conclusion of each Phase and at the end of the project for purposes of data archiving. Documentation shall include file and record layout, data dictionary including coding keys, a dump of the first and last 20 records of the data set and a summary of the processing including edit conditions and software used for analysis. The file shall contain no personal identifiers or confidential information.

It is the intent of ACYF that data should be publicly available for secondary analysis and publication of results as soon as possible following the completion of the contract. Prior to the end of the five year project, however, approval of the FPO and consideration by the consortium shall be required for publications, presentations or other uses of the data that are based on that national evaluation, at either a national or local level. Data tapes may be released for analyses by phases with first priority for a six-month period of time going to the Technical Work Group and researchers involved with the project.

Appendix B-2

TABLE 1.—COMPONENTS OF PROPOSED CHILD AND FAMILY ASSESSMENTS

	Assessment point (child's age)		
	14 months	24 months	36 months
Direct Child Assessments:			
Cognitive and Language Development:			
Bayley Scales of Infant Development	X	X	X
Expressive Language			X
Receptive Language			X
Social Competence:			
Bayley Behavioral Rating Scale	X	X	X
Emotional and Self Regulation:			
Bayley Behavioral Rating Scale	X	X	X
Maternal Interview:			
Parenting and the Home Environment ^a	X	X	X
Social Support Networks for Families ^b	X	X	X
Child's Social and Emotional Outcomes ^c	X	X	X
Child's Language Development (MacArthur Communicative Development)	X	X	
Quality of Parent-Caregiver Relationship	X	X	X
Home and Family Observations:			
Home Observation for Measurement of the	X	X	X
Attachment Q-Sort (Mother-Child)	X	X	X
Videotaping—Mother-Child Tasks		X	

^a Proposed measures include Concepts of Development Questionnaire, Knowledge of Infant Development Inventory, Aggravation Related to Parenting Scale, Parent Attitude toward Child Expressiveness Scale, Parent Attributions Test, Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment, Family Functioning Style, and Family Environment Rating Scale.

^b Proposed measures include Social Support Scale and Family Social Network Scale.

^c Proposed measures include Infant Characteristics Questionnaire, Adaptive Social Behavior Inventory, and a behavioral problem checklist.

TABLE 2.—COMPONENTS OF PROPOSED PARENT SERVICES INTERVIEWS

Parent interviews	Timing (months since enrollment)					
	Baseline	6	12	18	24	36
Service Needs and Use	X	X	X	X	X	X
Family Health Outcomes		X	X	X	X	X
Parent Involvement			X		X	X
Progress Toward Economic Self-Sufficiency			X		X	X

TABLE 2.—COMPONENTS OF PROPOSED PARENT SERVICES INTERVIEWS—Continued

Parent interviews	Timing (months since enrollment)					
	Baseline	6	12	18	24	36
Perceptions of Community	X	X	X
Child Health and Physical Development Outcomes	X	X	X	X	X	X
Benefits to Siblings—Health	X	X	X	X	X	X

TABLE 3.—COMPONENTS OF PROPOSED CHILD CARE QUALITY ASSESSMENTS

	Assessment point (child's age)		
	14 months	24 months	36 months
Observation of Child Care Setting and Provider-Child Interactions ^a	X	X	X
Provider Survey	X	X	X
Attachment Q-Sort (Caregiver-Child)	X	X	X

^aProposed measures include Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale, Family Day Care Rating Scale, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, Adult Involvement Scale, and Arnett Scale of Provider Sensitivity.

Appendix C

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS ASSURANCE/CERTIFICATION/DECLARATION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input type="checkbox"/> FOLLOWUP <input type="checkbox"/> REVISION	<input type="checkbox"/> GRANT <input type="checkbox"/> CONTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> FELLOW <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/> NEW <input type="checkbox"/> RENEWAL <input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUATION APPLICATION IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (if known)
--	--

STATEMENT OF POLICY: Safeguarding the rights and welfare of subjects at risk in activities supported under grants and contracts from DHHS is primarily the responsibility of the institution which receives or is accountable to DHHS for the funds awarded for the support of the activity. In order to provide for the adequate discharge of this institutional responsibility, it is the policy of DHHS that no activity involving human subjects to be supported by DHHS grants or contracts shall be undertaken unless the Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved such activity, and the institution has submitted to DHHS a certification of such review and approval, in accordance with the requirements of Public Law 93-348, as implemented by Part 46 of Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as amended, (45 CFR 46). Administration of the DHHS policy and regulation is the responsibility of the Office for Protection from Research Risks, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20205.

1. TITLE OF PROPOSAL OR ACTIVITY

2. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/ACTIVITY DIRECTOR/FELLOW

3. DECLARATION THAT HUMAN SUBJECTS EITHER WOULD OR WOULD NOT BE INVOLVED

- A. NO INDIVIDUALS WHO MIGHT BE CONSIDERED HUMAN SUBJECTS, INCLUDING THOSE FROM WHOM ORGANS, TISSUES, FLUIDS, OR OTHER MATERIALS WOULD BE DERIVED, OR WHO COULD BE IDENTIFIED BY PERSONAL DATA, WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY. (IF NO HUMAN SUBJECTS WOULD BE INVOLVED, CHECK THIS BOX AND PROCEED TO ITEM 7. PROPOSALS DETERMINED BY THE AGENCY TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS WILL BE RETURNED.)
- B. HUMAN SUBJECTS WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY AS EITHER: NONE OF THE FOLLOWING, OR INCLUDING: MINORS, FETUSES, ABORTUSES, PREGNANT WOMEN, PRISONERS, MENTALLY RETARDED, MENTALLY DISABLED. UNDER SECTION 5. COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS, ON REVERSE OF THIS FORM, GIVE NAME OF INSTITUTION AND NAME AND ADDRESS OF OFFICIAL(S) AUTHORIZING ACCESS TO ANY SUBJECTS IN FACILITIES NOT UNDER DIRECT CONTROL OF THE APPLICANT OR OFFERING INSTITUTION.

4. DECLARATION OF ASSURANCE STATUS/CERTIFICATION OF REVIEW

- A. THIS INSTITUTION HAS NOT PREVIOUSLY FILED AN ASSURANCE AND ASSURANCE IMPLEMENTING PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS WITH THE DHHS THAT APPLIES TO THIS APPLICATION OR ACTIVITY. ASSURANCE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THIS INSTITUTION WILL COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS OF *DHHS Regulation 45 CFR 46*, THAT IT HAS ESTABLISHED AN INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS AND, WHEN REQUESTED, WILL SUBMIT TO DHHS DOCUMENTATION AND CERTIFICATION OF SUCH REVIEWS AND PROCEDURES AS MAY BE REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ASSURANCE FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT OR ACTIVITY.
- B. THIS INSTITUTION HAS AN APPROVED GENERAL ASSURANCE (DHHS ASSURANCE NUMBER _____) OR AN ACTIVE SPECIAL ASSURANCE FOR THIS ONGOING ACTIVITY, ON FILE WITH DHHS. THE SIGNER CERTIFIES THAT ALL ACTIVITIES IN THIS APPLICATION PROPOSING TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THIS INSTITUTION'S INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD IN A CONVENED MEETING ON THE DATE OF _____ IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE *Code of Federal Regulations on Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46)*. THIS CERTIFICATION INCLUDES, WHEN APPLICABLE, REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFYING FDA STATUS FOR EACH INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG TO BE USED (SEE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM).

THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD HAS DETERMINED, AND THE INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL SIGNING BELOW CONCURS THAT:

EITHER HUMAN SUBJECTS WILL NOT BE AT RISK; OR HUMAN SUBJECTS WILL BE AT RISK.

5. AND 6. SEE REVERSE SIDE

7. NAME AND ADDRESS OF INSTITUTION

8. TITLE OF INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL

TELEPHONE NUMBER

SIGNATURE OF INSTITUTIONAL OFFICIAL

DATE

HHS-596 (Rev. 5-80)

ENCLOSE THIS FORM WITH THE PROPOSAL OR RETURN IT TO REQUESTING AGENCY.

5. INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUGS - ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT

SECTION 46.17 OF TITLE 45 OF THE Code of Federal Regulations states, "Where an organization is required to prepare or to submit a certification . . . and the proposal involves an investigational new drug within the meaning of The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the drug shall be identified in the certification together with a statement that the 30-day delay required by 21 CFR 130.3(a)(2) has elapsed and the Food and Drug Administration has not, prior to expiration of such 30-day interval, requested that the sponsor continue to withhold or to restrict use of the drug in human subjects; or that the Food and Drug Administration has waived the 30-day delay requirement; provided, however, that in those cases in which the 30-day delay interval has neither expired nor been waived, a statement shall be forwarded to DHHS upon such expiration or upon receipt of a waiver. No certification shall be considered acceptable until such statement has been received."

INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG CERTIFICATION

TO CERTIFY COMPLIANCE WITH FDA REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSED USE OF INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUGS IN ADDITION TO CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL, THE FOLLOWING REPORT FORMAT SHOULD BE USED FOR EACH IND: (ATTACH ADDITIONAL IND CERTIFICATIONS AS NECESSARY).

- IND FORMS FILED: FDA 1571, FDA 1572, FDA 1573
- NAME OF IND AND SPONSOR _____
- DATE OF 30-DAY EXPIRATION OR FDA WAIVER
(FUTURE DATE REQUIRES FOLLOWUP REPORT TO AGENCY) _____
- FDA RESTRICTION _____
- SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR _____ DATE _____

6. COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS - ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT

SECTION 46.16 OF TITLE 45 OF THE Code of Federal Regulations IMPOSES SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS ON THE CONDUCT OF STUDIES OR ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THE GRANTEE OR PRIME CONTRACTOR OBTAINS ACCESS TO ALL OR SOME OF THE SUBJECTS THROUGH COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS NOT UNDER ITS CONTROL. IN ORDER THAT THE DHHS BE FULLY INFORMED, THE FOLLOWING REPORT IS REQUESTED WHEN APPLICABLE.

USE FOLLOWING REPORT FORMAT FOR EACH INSTITUTION OTHER THAN GRANTEE OR CONTRACTING INSTITUTION WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS PARTICIPATING IN THIS ACTIVITY: (ATTACH ADDITIONAL REPORT SHEETS AS NECESSARY).

INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCESS TO SUBJECTS

- SUBJECTS: STATUS (WARDS, RESIDENTS, EMPLOYEES, PATIENTS, ETC.) _____
- NUMBER _____ AGE RANGE _____
- NAME OF OFFICIAL (PLEASE PRINT) _____
- TITLE _____ TELEPHONE _____
- NAME AND ADDRESS OF COOPERATING INSTITUTION _____

- OFFICIAL SIGNATURE _____

NOTES: (e.g., report of modification in proposal as submitted to agency affecting human subjects involvement)

Instructions for the SF 424

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted for Federal assistance. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that States which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process, have been given an opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

Item and Entry

1. Self-explanatory.
2. Date application submitted to Federal agency (or State if applicable) and applicant's control number (if applicable).
3. State use only (if applicable).
4. If this application is to continue or revise an existing award, enter present Federal identifier number. If for a new project, leave blank.
5. Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of the applicant, and name and telephone number of the person to contact on matters related to this application.
6. Enter Employer Identification Number (EIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.

7. Enter the appropriate letter in the space provided.

8. Check appropriate box and enter appropriate letter(s) in the space(s) provided:

- “New” means a new assistance award.
- “Continuation” means an extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date.
- “Revision” means any change in the Federal Government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation.

9. Name of Federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application.

10. Use the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested.

11. Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project.

12. List only the largest political entities affected (e.g., State, counties, cities).

13. Self-explanatory.

14. List the applicant's Congressional District and any District(s) affected by the program or project.

15. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate *only* the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 15.

16. Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process.

17. This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.

18. To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain Federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.)

BILLING CODE 4184-01-P

OMB Approval No. 0348-0044

BUDGET INFORMATION -- Non-Construction Programs

SECTION A -- BUDGET SUMMARY						
Grant Program Function or Activity (a)	Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)	Estimated Unobligated Funds		New or Revised Budget		Total (g)
		Federal (c)	Non-Federal (d)	Federal (e)	Non-Federal (f)	
1.		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
2.						
3.						
4.						
5. TOTALS		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
SECTION B -- BUDGET CATEGORIES						
Object Class Categories	GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Total (5)	
a. Personnel	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
b. Fringe Benefits						
c. Travel						
d. Equipment						
e. Supplies						
f. Contractual						
g. Construction						
h. Other						
i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a - 6h)						
j. Indirect Charges						
k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
7. Program Income						

Standard Form 424A (4-88)

Authorized for Local Reimbursement

SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES					
(a) Grant Program	(b) Applicant	(c) State	(d) Other Sources	(e) TOTALS	
8.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
9.					
10.					
11.					
12. TOTALS (sum of lines 8 and 11)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS					
	Total for 1st Year				4th Quarter
	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	
13. Federal	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
14. NonFederal					
15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT					
(a) Grant Program	FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (Years)				
	(b) First	(c) Second	(d) Third	(e) Fourth	
16.	\$	\$	\$	\$	
17.					
18.					
19.					
20. TOTALS (sum of lines 16-19)	\$	\$	\$	\$	
SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION (Attach additional Sheets if Necessary)					
21. Direct Charges:					22. Indirect Charges:
23. Remarks					

SF 424A (4-88) Page 2
 Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102

Authorized for Local Reproduction

Instructions for the SF-424A

General Instructions

This form is designed so that application can be made for funds from one or more grant programs. In preparing the budget, adhere to any existing Federal grantor agency guidelines which prescribe how and whether budgeted amounts should be separately shown for different functions or activities within the program. For some programs, grantor agencies may require budgets to be separately shown by function or activity. For other programs, grantor agencies may require a breakdown by function or activity. Sections A,B,C, and D should include budget estimates for the whole project except when applying for assistance which requires Federal authorization in annual or other funding period increments. In the latter case, Sections A,B,C, and D should provide the budget for the first budget period (usually a year) and Section E should present the need for Federal assistance in the subsequent budget periods. All applications should contain a breakdown by the object class categories shown in Lines a-k of Section B.

Section A. Budget Summary

Lines 1-4, Columns (a) and (b)

For applications pertaining to a single Federal grant program (Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog number) and not requiring a functional or activity breakdown, enter on Line 1 under Column (a) the catalog program title and the catalog number in Column (b).

For applications pertaining to a single program requiring budget amounts by multiple functions or activities, enter the name of each activity or function on each line in Column (a), and enter the catalog number in Column (b). For applications pertaining to multiple programs where none of the programs require a breakdown by function or activity, enter the catalog program title on each line in Column (a) and the respective catalog number on each line in Column (b).

For applications pertaining to multiple programs where one or more programs require a breakdown by function or activity, prepare a separate sheet for each program requiring the breakdown. Additional sheets should be used when one form does not provide adequate space for all breakdown of data required. However, when more than one sheet is used, the first page should provide the summary totals by programs.

Lines 1-4, Columns (c) Through (g.)

For new applications, leave Column (c) and (d) blank. For each line entry in Columns (a) and (b), enter in Columns (e), (f), and (g) the appropriate amounts of funds needed to support the project for the first funding period (usually a year).

For continuing grant program applications, submit these forms before the end of each funding period as required by the grantor agency. Enter in Columns (c) and (d) the estimated amounts of funds which will remain unobligated at the end of the grant funding period only if the Federal grantor agency instructions provide for this. Otherwise, leave these columns blank. Enter in columns (e) and (f) the amounts of funds

needed for the upcoming period. The amount(s) in Column (g) should be the sum of amounts in Column (e) and (f).

For supplemental grants and changes to existing grants, do not use Column (c) and (d). Enter in Column (e) the amount of the increase or decrease of Federal funds and enter in Column (f) the amount of the increase or decrease of non-Federal funds. In Column (g) enter the new total budgeted amount (Federal and non-Federal) which includes the total previous authorized budgeted amounts plus or minus, as appropriate, the amounts shown in Columns (e) and (f). The amount(s) in Column (g) should not equal the sum of amounts in Column (e) and (f).

Line 5—Show the totals for all columns used.

Section B. Budget Categories

In the column headings (1) through (4), enter the titles of the same programs, functions, and activities shown on Lines 1-4, Column (a), Section A. When additional sheets are prepared for Section A, provide similar column headings on each sheet. For each program, function or activity, fill in the total requirements for funds (both Federal and non-Federal) by object class categories.

Lines 6a-i—Show the totals of Lines 6a to 6h in each column.

Line 6j—Show the amount of indirect cost.

Line 6k—Enter the total of amounts on Lines 6i and 6j. For all applications for new grants and continuation grants the total amount in column (5), Line 6k, should be the same as the total amount shown in Section A, Column (g), Line 5. For supplemental grants and changes to grants, the total amount of the increase or decrease as shown in Columns (1)-(4), Line 6k should be the same as the sum of the amounts in Section A, Columns (e) and (f) on Line 5.

Line 7—Enter the estimated amount of income, if any, expected to be generated from this project. Do not add or subtract this amount from the total project amount. Show under the program narrative statement the nature and source of income. The estimated amount of program income may be considered by the federal grantor agency in determining the total amount of the grant.

Section C. Non-Federal-Resources

Lines 8-11—Enter amounts of non-Federal resources that will be used on the grant. If in-kind contributions are included, provide a brief explanation on a separate sheet.

Column (a)—Enter the program titles identical to Column (a), Section A. A breakdown by function or activity is not necessary.

Column (b)—Enter the contribution to be made by the applicant.

Column (c)—Enter the amount of the State's cash and in-kind contribution if the applicant is not a State or State agency. Applicants which are a State or State agencies should leave this column blank.

Column (d)—Enter the amount of cash and in-kind contributions to be made from all other sources.

Column (e)—Enter totals of Columns (b), (c), and (d).

Line 12—Enter the total for each of Columns (b)-(e). The amount in Column (e)

should be equal to the amount on Line 5, Column (f), Section A.

Section D. Forecasted Cash Needs

Line 13—Enter the amount of cash needed by quarter from the grantor agency during the first year.

Line 14—Enter the amount of cash from all other sources needed by quarter during the first year.

Line 15—Enter the totals of amounts on Lines 13 and 14.

Section E. Budget Estimates of Federal Funds Needed for Balance of the Project

Line 16-19—Enter in Column (a) the same grant program titles shown in Column (a), Section A. A breakdown by function or activity is not necessary. For new applications and continuation grant applications, enter in the proper columns amounts of Federal funds which will be needed to complete the program or project over the succeeding funding periods (usually in years). This section need to be completed for revisions (amendments, changes, or supplements) to funds for the current year of existing grants.

If more than four lines are needed to list the program titles, submit additional schedules as necessary.

Line 20—Enter the total for each of the Columns (b)-(e). When additional schedules are prepared for this Section, annotate accordingly and show the overall totals on this line.

Section F. Other Budget Information

Line 21—Use this space to explain amounts for individual direct object-class cost categories that may appear to be out of the ordinary or to explain the details as required by the Federal grantor agency.

Line 22—Enter the type of indirect rate (provisional, predetermined, final or fixed) that will be in effect during the funding period, the estimated amount of the base to which the rate is applied, and the total indirect expense.

Line 23—Provides any other explanations or comments deemed necessary.

Assurances—Non-Construction Programs

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance, and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will

establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4728–4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the nineteen statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88–352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681–1683, and 1685–1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101–6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92–255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91–616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§ 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. 290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination

statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91–646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§ 1501–1508 and 7324–7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

9. Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. §§ 276a to 276a-7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. § 276c and 18 U.S.C. §§ 874), and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. §§ 327–333), regarding labor standards for federally assisted construction subagreements.

10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93–234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is \$10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91–190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clear Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clear Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7401 et

seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93–523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93–205).

12. Will comply with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

13. Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 469a–1 et seq.).

14. Will comply with P.L. 93–348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89–544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984.

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.

Signature of Authorized Certifying Official

Title

Applicant Organization

Date Submitted

BILLING CODE 4184-01P

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
Grantees Other Than Individuals

By signing and/or submitting this application or grant agreement, the grantee is providing the certification set out below.

This certification is required by regulations implementing the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, 45 CFR Part 76, Subpart F. The regulations, published in the May 25, 1990 Federal Register, require certification by grantees that they will maintain a drug-free workplace. The certification set out below is a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) determines to award the grant. If it is later determined that the grantee knowingly rendered a false certification, or otherwise violates the requirements of the Drug-Free Workplace Act, HHS, in addition to any other remedies available to the Federal Government, may taken action authorized under the Drug-Free Workplace Act. False certification or violation of the certification shall be grounds for suspension of payments, suspension or termination of grants, or governmentwide suspension or debarment.

Workplaces under grants, for grantees other than individuals, need not be identified on the certification. If known, they may be identified in the grant application. If the grantee does not identify the workplaces at the time of application, or upon award, if there is no application, the grantee must keep the identity of the workplace(s) on file in its office and make the information available for Federal inspection. Failure to identify all known workplaces constitutes a violation of the grantee's drug-free workplace requirements.

Workplace identifications must include the actual address of buildings (or parts of buildings) or other sites where work under the grant takes place. Categorical descriptions may be used (e.g., all vehicles of a mass transit authority or State highway department while in operation, State employees in each local unemployment office, performers in concert halls or radio studios.)

If the workplace identified to HHS changes during the performance of the grant, the grantee shall inform the agency of the change(s), if it previously identified the workplaces in question (see above).

Definitions of terms in the Nonprocurement Suspension and Debarment common rule and Drug-Free Workplace common rule apply to this certification. Grantees' attention is called, in particular, to the following definitions from these rules:

"Controlled substance" means a controlled substance in Schedules I through V of the Controlled Substances Act (21 USC 812) and as further defined by regulation (21 CFR 1308.11 through 1308.15).

"Conviction" means a finding of guilt (including a plea of nois contendere) or imposition of sentence, or both, by any judicial body charged with the responsibility to determine violations of the Federal or State criminal drug statutes;

"Criminal drug statute" means a Federal or non-Federal criminal statute involving the manufacture, distribution, dispensing, use, or possession of any controlled substance;

"Employee" means the employee of a grantee directly engaged in the performance of work under a grant, including: (i) All "direct charge" employees; (ii) all "indirect charge" employees unless their impact or involvement is insignificant to the performance of the grant; and, (iii) temporary personnel and consultants who are directly engaged in the performance of work under the grant and who are on the grantee's payroll. This definition does not include workers not on the payroll of the grantee (e.g., volunteers, even if used to meet a matching requirement; consultants or independent contractors not on the grantee's payroll; or employees of subrecipients or subcontractors in covered workplaces).

The grantee certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an ongoing drug-free awareness program to inform employees about:

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace; (2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace; (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and, (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will:

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and, (2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency in writing, within ten calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to every grant officer or other designee on whose grant activity the convicted employee was working, unless the Federal agency has designated a central point for the receipt of such notices. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted:

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or, (2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant (use attachments, if needed):

Place of Performance (Street address, City, County, State, ZIP Code) _____

Check if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

Sections 76.630(c) and (d)(2) and 76.635(a)(1) and (b) provide that a Federal agency may designate a central receipt point for STATE-WIDE AND STATE AGENCY-WIDE certifications, and for notification of criminal drug convictions. For the Department of Health and Human Services, the central receipt point is: Division of Grants Management and Oversight, Office of Management and Acquisition, Department of Health and Human Services, Room 517-D, 200 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201.

DGMO Form#2 Revised May 1990

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters—Primary Covered Transactions

By signing and submitting this proposal, the applicant, defined as the primary participant in accordance with 45 CFR Part 76, certifies to the best of its knowledge and believe that it and its principals:

(a) are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal Department or agency;

(b) have not within a 3-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) are not presently indicted or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1) (b) of this certification; and

(d) have not within a 3-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default.

The inability of a person to provide the certification required above will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. If necessary, the prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.

The prospective primary participant agrees that by submitting this proposal, it will include the clause entitled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion—Lower Tier Covered Transaction." provided below without modification in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion—Lower Tier Covered Transactions

(To Be Supplied to Lower Tier Participants)

By signing and submitting this lower tier proposal, the prospective lower tier participant, as defined in 45 CFR Part 76, certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief that it and its principals:

(a) are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any federal department or agency.

(b) where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the above, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include this clause entitled "certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion—Lower Tier Covered Transactions." Without modification in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.

Certification Regarding Lobbying

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant,

loan or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

State for Loan Guarantee and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Signature

Title

Organization

Date

BILLING CODE 4184-01-P

Certification Regarding Environmental Tobacco Smoke

Public Law 103-227, Part C—Environmental Tobacco Smoke, also known as the Pro-Children Act of 1994 (Act), requires that smoking not be permitted in any portion of any indoor facility owned or leased or contracted for by an entity and used routinely or regularly for the provision of health, day care, education, or library services to children under the age of 18, if the services are funded by Federal programs either directly or through State or local governments, by Federal grant, contract, loan, or loan guarantee. The law does not apply to children's services provided in private residences, facilities funded solely by Medicare or Medicaid funds, and portions of facilities used for inpatient drug or alcohol treatment. Failure to comply with the provisions of the law may result in the imposition of a civil monetary penalty of up to \$1,000 per day and/or the imposition of an administrative compliance order on the responsible entity.

By signing and submitting this application the applicant/grantee certifies that it will comply with the requirements of the Act. The applicant/grantee further agrees that it will require the language of this certification be included in any subawards which contain provisions for children's services and that all subgrantees shall certify accordingly.

OMB STATE SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT LISTING*

ARIZONA

Janice Dunn, Arizona State Clearinghouse, 3800 N. Central Avenue, Fourteenth Floor, Phoenix, Arizona 85012, Telephone: (602) 280-1315, FAX: (602) 280-1305

ARKANSAS

Mr. Tracy L. Copeland, Manager, State Clearinghouse, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Department of Finance and Administration, 1515 W. 7th St., Room 412, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203, Telephone: (501) 682-1074, FAX: (501) 682-5206

ALABAMA

Jon C. Strickland, Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs, Planning and Economic Development Division, 401 Adams Avenue, Montgomery, AL 36103-5690, Telephone: (205) 242-5483, FAX: (205) 242-5515

CALIFORNIA

Grants Coordinator, Office of Planning and Research, 1400 Tenth Street, Room 121, Sacramento, California 95814, Telephone: (916) 323-7480, FAX: (916) 323-3018

DELAWARE

Francine Booth, State Single Point of Contact, Executive Department, Thomas Collins Building, P.O. Box 1401, Dover, Delaware 19903, Telephone: (302) 739-3326, FAX: (302) 739-5661

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Charles Nichols, State Single Point of Contact, Office of Grants Mgmt. and Dev., 717 14th Street, N.W.—Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005, Telephone: (202) 727-6554, FAX: (202) 727-1617

FLORIDA

Suzanne Traub-Metlay, Florida State Clearinghouse, Intergovernmental Affairs Policy Unit, Executive Office of the Governor, The Capitol (Room 1603), Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0001, Telephone: (904) 488-8114, FAX: (904) 488-9005

GEORGIA

Tom L. Reid, III, Administrator, Georgia State Clearinghouse, 254 Washington Street, S.W.—Room 401J, Atlanta, Georgia 30334, Telephone: (404) 656-3855 or (404) 656-3829, FAX: (404) 656-7938

ILLINOIS

Tim Golemo, State Single Point of Contact, Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, 620 East Adams, Springfield, Illinois 62701, Telephone: (217) 782-1671, FAX: (217) 782-6620

INDIANA

Frances E. Williams, State Budget Agency, 212 State House, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, Telephone: (317) 232-2972, FAX: (317) 233-3323

IOWA

Steven R. McCann, Division for Community Assistance, Iowa Department of Economic Development, 200 East Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50309, Telephone: (515) 242-4719, FAX: (515) 242-4859

KENTUCKY

Ronald W. Cook, Office of the Governor, Department of Local Government, 1024 Capitol Center Drive, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-8204, Telephone: (502) 573-2382, FAX: (502) 573-2512

MAINE

Joyce Benson, State Planning Office, State House Station #38, Augusta, Maine 04333, Telephone: (207) 287-3261, FAX: (207) 287-6489

MARYLAND

William G. Carroll, Manager, State Clearinghouse for Intergovernmental Assistance, Maryland Office of Planning, 301 W. Preston Street—Room 1104, Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2365, Staff Contact: Linda Janey, Telephone: (410) 225-4490, FAX: (410) 225-4480

MISSISSIPPI

Cathy Mallette, Clearinghouse Officer, Department of Finance and Administration, 455 North Lamar

Street, Jackson, Mississippi 39202-3087, Telephone: (601) 359-6762, FAX: (601) 359-6764

MISSOURI

Lois Pohl, Federal Assistance Clearinghouse, Office of Administration, P.O. Box 809, Room 760, Truman Building, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102, Telephone: (314) 751-4834, FAX: (314) 751-7819

NEVADA

Department of Administration, State Clearinghouse, Capitol Complex, Carson City, Nevada 89710, Telephone: (701) 687-4065, FAX: (702) 687-3983

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Jeffrey H. Taylor, Director, New Hampshire Office of State Planning, Attn: Intergovernmental Review Process

Mike Blake, 2½ Beacon Street, Concord, New Hampshire 03301, Telephone: (603) 271-2155, FAX: (603) 271-1728

NEW JERSEY

Gregory W. Adkins, Assistant Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Community Affairs

Please direct all correspondence and questions about intergovernmental review to:

Andrew J. Jaskolka, State Review Process, Intergovernmental Review Unit, CN 800, Room 813A, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0800, Telephone: (609) 292-9025, FAX: (609) 633-2132

NEW MEXICO

Robert Peters, State Budget Division, Room 190 Bataan Memorial Building, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503, Telephone: (505) 827-3640

NEW YORK

New York State Clearinghouse, Division of the Budget, State Capitol, Albany, New York 12224, Telephone: (518) 474-1605

NORTH CAROLINA

Chrys Baggett, Director, N.C. State Clearinghouse, Office of the Secretary of Admin., 116 West Jones Street, Raleigh North Carolina 27603-8003, Telephone: (919) 733-7232, FAX: (919) 733-9571

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Single Point of Contact, Office of Intergovernmental Assistance, 600 East Boulevard Avenue, Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0170, Telephone: (701) 224-2094, FAX: (701) 224-2308

OHIO

Larry Weaver, State Single Point of Contact, State Clearinghouse, Office of Budget and Management, 30 East Broad Street, 34th Floor, Columbus,

Ohio 43266-0411
Please direct correspondence and questions about intergovernmental review to:
Linda Wise, Telephone: (614) 466-0698, FAX: (614) 466-5400

RHODE ISLAND
Daniel W. Varin, Associate Director, Department of Administration, Division of Planning, One Capitol Hill, 4th Floor, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5870, Telephone: (401) 277-2656, FAX: (401) 277-2083
Please direct correspondence and questions to:
Review Coordinator, Office of Strategic Planning

SOUTH CAROLINA
Omeagia Burgess, State Single Point of Contact, Grant Services, Office of the Governor, 1205 Pendleton Street—Room 477, Columbia, South Carolina 29201, Telephone: (803) 734-0494, FAX: (803) 734-0385

TEXAS
Tom Adams, Governors, Officer, Director, Intergovernmental Coordination, P.O. Box 12428, Austin, Texas 78711, Telephone: (512) 463-1771, FAX: (512) 463-1888

UTAH
Carolyn Wright, Utah State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Budget, Room 116 State Capitol, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 Telephone: (801) 538-1535, FAX: (801) 538-1547

VERMONT
Nancy McAvoy, State Single Point of Contact, Pavilion Office Building, 109 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont 05609 Telephone: (802) 828-3326, FAX: (802) 828-3339

WEST VIRGINIA
Fred Cutlip, Director, Community Development Division, W. Virginia Development Office, Building #6, Room 553, Charleston, West Virginia 25305, Telephone: (304) 558-4010, FAX: (304) 558-3248

WISCONSIN
Martha Kerner, Section Chief, State/Federal Relations, Wisconsin Department of Administration, 101 East Wilson Street—6th Floor, P.O. Box 7868, Madison, Wisconsin 53707, Telephone: (608) 266-2125, FAX: (608) 267-6931

WYOMING
Sheryl Jeffries, State Single Point of Contract, Herschler Building, 4th Floor, East Wing, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002, Telephone: (307) 777-7574, FAX: (307) 638-8967

TERRITORIES

GUAM

Mr. Giovanni T. Sgambelluri, Director, Bureau of Budget and Management Research, Office of the Governor, P.O. Box 2950, Agana, Guam 96910, Telephone: 011-671-472-2285, FAX: 011-671-472-2825

PUERTO RICO

Norma Burgos/Jose E. Caro, Chairwoman/Director, Puerto Rico Planning Board, Federal Proposals Review Office, Minillas Government Center, P.O. Box 41119, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00940-1119, Telephone (809) 727-4444, (809) 723-6190, FAX: (809) 724-3270, (809) 724-3103

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

State Single Point of Contact, Planning and Budget Office, Office of the Governor, Saipan, CM, Northern Mariana Islands 96590

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Jose George, Director, Office of Management and Budget, #41 Norregade Emancipation Garden Station, Second Floor, Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands 00802

Please direct all questions and correspondence about intergovernmental review to:

Linda Clarke, Telephone: (809) 774-0750, FAX: (809) 776-0069

[FR Doc. 95-31009 Filed 12-20-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner

[Docket No. FR—3917-N-36]

Notice of Proposed Information Collection for Public Comment

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

DATES: Comments due: February 20, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or QMB Control Number and should be sent to:

Oliver Walker, Housing, Department of Housing & Urban Development, 451—7th Street, SW, Room 9116, Washington, DC 20410.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Oliver Walker, Telephone number (202) 708-1694 (this is not a toll-free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department will submit the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended).

The Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affecting agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also list the following information:

Title of Proposal: Request for Credit Approval of Substitute Mortgagor.

OMB Control Number: 2502-0036.

Description of the need for the information and the proposed use: Section 204(b) of the National Housing Act (P.L. 479, 48 Stat. 1246, 12 U.S.C. 1701 et. seq.) provides that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the mortgagor from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instrument secured thereby, or consent to the release of parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage.

Agency form numbers: HUD-92210.

Members of affected public: Individuals or households.

An estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection is 10,000, number of respondents is 10,000, frequency response is monthly and the response is one hour.

Status of the proposed information collection: Extension of a currently approved collection.