

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**34 CFR Part 702**

RIN 1850-AA54

Standards for Conduct and Evaluation of Activities Carried Out by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI); Evaluation of the Performance of Recipients of Grants, Cooperative Agreements, and Contracts

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Assistant Secretary proposes to establish regulations pursuant to OERI's authorizing legislation, the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994. The major purpose of these standards is to ensure that the research, development, and dissemination activities carried out by the recipients of grants from and contracts and cooperative agreements with OERI meet the highest standards of professional excellence.

DATES: Comments must be received by the Department on or before April 27, 1998.

ADDRESSES: All comments concerning these proposed regulations should be addressed to Sharon Bobbitt, U.S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW., room 508c, Washington, DC 20202-5651. Comments may also be sent through the Internet to: comments@ed.gov

You must include the term Phase III in the subject line of your electronic message.

Comments that concern information collection requirements must be sent to the Office of Management and Budget at the address listed in the Paperwork Reduction Act section of this preamble. A copy of those comments may also be sent to the Department representative named in this section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sharon Bobbitt. Telephone: (202) 219-2126. Internet: (Sharon_Bobbitt@ed.gov). Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Invitation to Comment

Interested persons are invited to submit comments and recommendations regarding these proposed regulations. To ensure that public comments have maximum effect in developing the final regulations, the Department urges commenters to identify clearly the specific section or sections of the proposed regulations that each comment addresses and to arrange comments in the same order as the proposed regulations.

The Secretary particularly requests comments on the role of Department of Education staff in the implementation of the Standards. For example, should Department staff serve as reviewers on peer review panels under these regulations? See proposed § 702.10(d) of these regulations in this regard. Should there be a maximum number or maximum percentage of Department staff on peer review panels? Should the participation of Department staff vary by size of the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement? What other issues about the role of Department staff in the peer review process should the Secretary consider?

All comments submitted in response to these proposed regulations will be available for public inspection, during and after the comment period, in Room 600, 555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday of each week except Federal holidays.

On request the Department supplies an appropriate aid, such as a reader or print magnifier, to an individual with a disability who needs assistance to review the comments or other documents in the public rulemaking docket for these proposed regulations. An individual with a disability who wants to schedule an appointment for this type of aid may call (202) 205-8113 or (202) 260-9895. An individual who uses a TDD may call the Federal Information Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339, between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

To assist the Department in complying with the specific requirements of Executive Order 12866 and its overall requirement of reducing regulatory burden, the Secretary invites comments on whether there may be further opportunities to reduce any regulatory burdens found in these proposed regulations.

Background

On March 31, 1994, President Clinton signed Pub. L. 103-227, which includes Title IX, the Educational Research,

Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994 (the Act). The Act restructured OERI and provided it with a broad mandate to conduct an array of research, development, dissemination, and improvement activities aimed at strengthening the education of all students.

Statutory Requirements

The Act directed the Assistant Secretary to develop, in consultation with the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board (the Board), such standards as may be necessary to govern the conduct and evaluation of all research, development, and dissemination activities carried out by OERI to ensure that these activities meet the highest standards of professional excellence. The Board is responsible for reviewing and approving the standards. The legislation requires that the standards be developed in three phases.

In the first phase, standards were created and promulgated to establish the peer review process and evaluation criteria to be used for the review of applications for grants and cooperative agreements and proposals for contracts. The final regulations setting out these standards were published on September 14, 1995 (60 FR 47808). In the second phase, standards were created and promulgated to establish the criteria to be used in reviewing potentially exemplary and promising educational programs. The final regulations setting out these standards were published on November 17, 1997 (62 FR 61427).

In the third phase, which is the subject of this notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM), the Act requires that OERI develop standards for evaluating and assessing the performance of all recipients of grants from and cooperative agreements and contracts with OERI. This evaluation must take place both during and at the conclusion of the performance of the grant, cooperative agreement, or contract, and must include the use of a system of peer review for the final assessment.

In developing the standards, the Assistant Secretary was required to review the procedures utilized by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and other Federal departments or agencies engaged in research and development and to solicit recommendations from research organizations and members of the general public. OERI has reviewed the procedures used to evaluate the performance of recipients of grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements by several offices within NIH and NSF, the Office of Energy Research in the

Department of Energy, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the University Research Initiative of the Department of Defense. Recommendations concerning these standards have been obtained from the American Educational Research Association, the Council for Educational Development and Research, and the Organization of Research Centers. Public comment is invited in response to this NPRM.

Standards

The standards have been developed by the Assistant Secretary in consultation with the Board. The standards in this NPRM would:

- Require interim and final assessments of the performance of recipients of grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts.
- Establish procedures for selecting peer review panels to conduct these assessments.
- Establish procedures and criteria that the peer review panels use in conducting these assessments.
- Establish specific additional criteria that peer review panels use in conducting these assessments for National Research and Development Centers, Regional Educational Laboratories, Field-Initiated Studies, and ERIC Clearinghouses.

In an effort to fulfill the law's intention of ensuring high-quality research, development, and evaluation, OERI has developed standards in which interim and final assessments may be supplemented by a self-assessment by the recipient of a grant, cooperative, agreement, or contract. The Board and the Assistant Secretary believe that the collection and review of evidence on one's own performance is itself a useful tool for improvement.

These standards cover all grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts administered by OERI, ranging from the smallest purchase orders and commissioned papers to the largest research projects and research centers. The Department will require a single interim assessment by a peer review panel for total awards of \$5,000,000 or less. At least one interim review by peer review panel will be required for larger awards. A final assessment by a peer review panel will be required for all awards.

The Government Performance and Results Act requires the establishment of performance indicators for Department activities. Information collected pursuant to those indicators

will be considered, as appropriate, in the evaluation of individual recipients.

Executive Order 12866

1. Potential Costs and Benefits

These proposed regulations have been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866. Under the terms of the order the Secretary has assessed the potential costs and benefits of this regulatory action.

The potential costs associated with the proposed regulations are those resulting from statutory requirements and those determined by the Secretary as necessary for administering this program effectively and efficiently. Burdens specifically associated with information collection requirements are identified and explained elsewhere in this preamble under the heading Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

In assessing the potential costs and benefits—both quantitative and qualitative—of these proposed regulations, the Secretary has determined that the benefits of the proposed regulations justify the costs.

The Secretary has also determined that this regulatory action does not unduly interfere with State, local, and tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions.

To assist the Department in complying with the specific requirements of Executive Order 12866, the Secretary invites comment on whether there may be further opportunities to reduce any potential costs or increase potential benefits resulting from these proposed regulations without impeding the effective and efficient administration of the program.

Summary of Potential Costs and Benefits

The potential costs of the proposed regulations are discussed in this preamble under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The benefit of these standards is to ensure that the research, development, and dissemination activities carried out by the recipients of grants from and contracts and cooperative agreements with OERI meet the highest standards of professional excellence.

2. Clarity of the Regulations

Executive Order 12866 requires each agency to write regulations that are easy to understand.

The Secretary invites comments on how to make these proposed regulations easier to understand, including answers to questions such as the following: (1) Are the requirements in the proposed regulations clearly stated? (2) Do the

proposed regulations contain technical terms or other wording that interferes with their clarity? (3) Does the format of the proposed regulations (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing, etc.) aid or reduce their clarity? Would the proposed regulations be easier to understand if they were divided into more (but shorter) sections? (A "section" is preceded by the symbol "§" and a numbered heading; for example, § 702.2 *What activities must be evaluated by these standards?*) (4) Is the description of the proposed regulations in the "Supplementary Information" section of this preamble helpful in understanding the proposed regulations? How could this description be more helpful in making the proposed regulations easier to understand? (5) What else could the Department do to make the proposed regulations easier to understand?

A copy of any comments that concern how the Department could make these proposed regulations easier to understand should be sent to Stanley M. Cohen, Regulations Quality Officer, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW. (Room 5121, FB-10), Washington, D.C. 20202-2241.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

The Secretary certifies that these proposed regulations would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The small entities that would be affected by these proposed regulations are small local educational agencies (LEAs) and private schools receiving Federal funds under this program. However, the regulations would not have a significant economic impact on the small LEAs and private schools affected because the proposed regulations would not impose excessive regulatory burdens or require unnecessary Federal supervision. The proposed regulations would impose minimal requirements to ensure the proper expenditure of program funds.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

Sections 702.22 and 702.23 contain information collection requirements. As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3504(h)), the Department of Education has submitted a copy of these sections to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for its review.

Collection of Information: Standards for Evaluation of the Performance of Recipients of OERI Grants, Cooperative Agreements, and Contracts.

These regulations affect the following types of entities eligible to enter into

grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts: any public or private agency, organization or institution, or individual.

The public reporting burden is estimated to range from 8 to 120 hours for each interim or final assessment. The actual burden will be determined by how much descriptive information each recipient wishes to provide.

Organizations and individuals desiring to submit comments on the information collection requirements should direct them to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB, room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503; Attention: Desk Officer for U.S. Department of Education.

The Department considers comments by the public on this proposed collection of information in—

- Evaluating whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical use;
- Evaluating the accuracy of the Department's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhancing the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimizing the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information contained in these proposed regulations between 30 and 60 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, a comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication. This does not affect the deadline for the public to comment to the Department on the proposed regulations.

Assessment of Educational Impact

The Secretary particularly requests comments on whether the proposed regulations in this document would require transmission of information that is being gathered by or is available from any other agency or authority of the United States.

Electronic Access to This Document

Anyone may view this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or portable document format (pdf) on the World Wide Web at either of the following sites:

<http://gcs.ed.gov/fedreg.htm>

<http://www.ed.gov/news.html>

To use the pdf you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with Search, which is available free at either of the previous sites. If you have questions about using the pdf, call the U.S. Government Printing Office toll free at 1-888-293-6498.

Anyone may also view these documents in text copy only on an electronic bulletin board of the Department. Telephone: (202) 219-1511 or, toll free, 1-800-222-4922. The documents are located under Option G—Files/Announcements, Bulletins and Press Releases.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects in 34 CFR Part 702

Education, Educational research, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: December 23, 1997.

Ricky Takai,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number does not apply)

The Secretary proposes to amend Chapter VII of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations by adding a new part 702 to read as follows:

PART 702—STANDARDS FOR CONDUCT AND EVALUATION OF ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)—EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF RECIPIENTS OF GRANTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, AND CONTRACTS

Subpart A—General

Sec.

- 702.1 What is the purpose of these standards?
- 702.2 What activities must be evaluated by these standards?
- 702.3 What additional activities may be evaluated by these standards?
- 702.4 When is performance assessed under these standards?
- 702.5 What definitions apply?

Subpart B—Selection of Peer Review Panels

- 702.10 What are the characteristics of peer reviewers?
- 702.11 What constitutes a conflict of interest for grants and cooperative agreements?
- 702.12 What constitutes a conflict of interest for contracts?
- 702.13 How are peer reviewers selected for panels?

Subpart C—The Evaluation Process

- 702.21 How does a peer review panel evaluate the performance of a recipient?
- 702.22 What information does a peer review panel consider for an interim assessment?
- 702.23 What information does a peer review panel consider for a final assessment?
- 702.24 What evaluation criteria are used for performance assessments?

Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i), unless otherwise noted.

Subpart A—General

§ 702.1 What is the purpose of these standards?

(a) The standards in this part implement section 912(i) of the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994 (the Act).

(b) These standards are intended to ensure that the research, development, and dissemination activities carried out by the recipients of grants from and contracts and cooperative agreements with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) meet the highest standards of professional excellence.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(F))

§ 702.2 What activities must be evaluated by these standards?

These standards apply to activities carried out by OERI using funds appropriated under section 912(m) of the Act including activities carried out by the following entities or programs:

- (a) The National Education Research Institutes.
- (b) The Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination.
- (c) The Educational Resources Information Center.
- (d) The Regional Educational Laboratories.
- (e) The Teacher Research Dissemination Demonstration Program.
- (f) The Goals 2000 Community Partnerships Program.
- (g) The National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(1))

§ 702.3 What additional activities may be evaluated by these standards?

(a) The Secretary may apply these standards to other activities funded by the Department.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(1))

§ 702.4 When is performance assessed under these standards?

(a) The Secretary will assess the performance of recipients of OERI grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements subject to these standards during and at the conclusion of their period of performance.

(b) The Department requires a single interim assessment by a peer review panel for total awards of \$5,000,000 or less. At least one interim review by peer review panel is required for larger awards.

(c) A final assessment by a peer review panel is required for all awards.

(d) As used in this part—

(1) Interim assessment is one conducted during a recipient's period of performance.

(2) Final assessment is one conducted at the conclusion of a recipient's period of performance.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(2)(F))

§ 702.5 What definitions apply?

(a) *Definitions in the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994.*

The following terms used in this part are defined in 20 U.S.C. 6011(1):

Development
Dissemination
Educational research

(b) *Definitions in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations.* The following terms used in this part are defined in 34 CFR 77.1:

Application
Award
Department
Grant
Project
Secretary

(c) *Definitions in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.* The following term used in this part is defined in 48 CFR Chapter 1:

Contract Proposal

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(2)(F))

Subpart B—Selection of Peer Review Panels**§ 702.10 What are the characteristics of peer reviewers?**

(a) The Assistant Secretary selects each peer reviewer. Each peer reviewer must have the necessary knowledge and expertise in the area of the project being reviewed to evaluate the performance of

a recipient. This experience may include—

(1) Expert knowledge of subject matter in the area of the activities to be reviewed;

(2) Expert knowledge of theory or methods or both in the area of the activities to be reviewed;

(3) Practical experience in the area of the activities or type of institution or both to be reviewed;

(4) Knowledge of a broad range of education policies and practices;

(5) Experience in managing complex organizations; or

(6) Expertise and experience in evaluation theory and practice.

(b) Each peer reviewer must be free of conflict of interest, as determined in accordance with § 702.11 or 702.12.

(c) The Assistant Secretary may solicit nominations for peer reviewers from professional associations, nationally recognized experts, and other sources.

(d) OERI and other Department staff who possess the qualifications in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section may serve as peer reviewers.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(2)(B))

§ 702.11 What constitutes a conflict of interest for grants and cooperative agreements?

A peer reviewer assessing the performance of the recipient of a grant from or cooperative agreement with OERI is considered an employee of the Department for the purposes of conflict of interest analysis. As an employee of the Department, the peer reviewer is subject to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 208, 5 CFR 2635.502, and the Department's policies used to implement those provisions.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(2)(B))

§ 702.12 What constitutes a conflict of interest for contracts?

A peer reviewer assessing the performance of the recipient of a contract with OERI is considered an employee of the Department in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), 48 CFR 3.104-4(h)(2). As an employee of the Department, the peer reviewer is subject to the provisions of the FAR, 48 CFR Part 3, Improper Business Practices and Personal Conflict of Interest.

(Authority: 41 U.S.C. 423)

§ 702.13 How are peer reviewers selected for panels?

(a) The Assistant Secretary assigns peer reviewers to panels that conduct the performance assessments.

(b) The Assistant Secretary may establish panels by category of recipient, such as a panel to review the

performance of all Regional Educational Laboratories. Each recipient is evaluated individually by reviewers who have been assigned to this type of panel.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(2)(B))

Subpart C—The Evaluation Process**§ 702.21 How does a peer review panel evaluate the performance of a recipient?**

(a) In each evaluation, a peer review panel—

(1) Considers relevant information about the recipient's performance, as described in §§ 702.22 and 702.23; and

(2) Makes judgments about the recipient's performance, using the criteria in § 702.24.

(b) Each peer reviewer prepares a report based on the reviewer's assessment of the quality of the project according to the evaluation criteria.

(c) After each peer reviewer has evaluated each project independently, the panel may be convened to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the project. Each reviewer may then independently re-evaluate each project with appropriate changes made to the written report.

(d) The report of the interim assessment must include any recommendations the peer reviewer may have for improving the recipient's performance.

(e) The report of the final assessment must contain each peer reviewer's evaluative summary of the recipient's performance, from the beginning of the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement to its conclusion.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(2)(F))

§ 702.22 What information does a peer review panel consider for an interim assessment?

(a) Sources of information for the interim assessment must include—

(1) The original request for proposals or grant announcement and the contract proposal or grant application;

(2) Documentation of any changes in the work described in the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, including reasons for the changes;

(3) Any progress reports delivered to the Department or made available to the public by the recipient;

(4) Examples of products delivered to the Department or made available to the public by the recipient;

(5) Any relevant reports written by OERI staff, including reports of site visits by OERI staff;

(6) Any performance evaluations conducted under the FAR or the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (34 CFR part 75).

(7) Any relevant information provided by the recipient in response to Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) (Pub. L. 103-62) requirements; and

(8) Any reports from program evaluations commissioned by the Department.

(b) Sources of information for the interim assessment may also include—

(1) A self-assessment, prepared by the recipient, addressing the criteria in § 702.24;

(2) One or more site visits by the peer review panel;

(3) One or more oral or written presentations to the panel by the recipient describing its performance; or

(4) Other information about the recipient's performance.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(l)(2)(F))

§ 702.23 What information does a peer review panel consider for a final assessment?

(a) Sources of information for the final assessment must include—

(1) The original request for proposals or application notice and the contract proposal or grant application, together with documentation of any changes in the work described in the proposal or application, including reasons for the changes;

(2) If consistent with the recipient's contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with OERI, a written report or oral presentation or both by the recipient summarizing its activities and accomplishments;

(3) Any relevant information provided by the recipient in response to Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) (Pub. L. 103-62) requirements; and

(4) Any reports from program evaluations commissioned by the Department.

(b) The final assessment may also include other sources of information, such as one or more of those listed in § 702.22.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(l)(2)(F))

§ 702.24 What evaluation criteria must be used for performance assessments?

(a) Peer reviewers (and those recipients who conduct self-evaluations) shall use the criteria in paragraph (b) of this section to assess performance and, in case of interim assessments, to identify areas in which the performance of recipients may need improvement.

(b) The following evaluation criteria are to guide the assessment process undertaken by peer reviewers. The peer reviewers determine the extent to which recipients meet these criteria:

(1) *Implementation and management.*

(i) Peer reviewers shall consider the

degree to which the recipient has fully executed its program of work. In doing so, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which the recipient completes the work described in the approved application or contract, including any approved modifications, in the time period proposed and in an efficient manner.

(ii) In examining the degree of implementation, peer reviewers may also consider evidence on the extent to which—

(A) The recipient implements and utilizes a quality assurance system for its products or services or both; and

(B) The recipient conducts self-assessment or self-evaluation activities, including periodically seeking out independent critiques and evaluations of its work, and uses the results to improve performance.

(2) *Quality.* (i) Peer reviewers shall consider the degree to which the recipient's work approaches or attains professional excellence. In determining quality, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which—

(A) The recipient utilizes processes, methods, and techniques appropriate to achieve the goals and objectives for the program of work in the approved application; and

(B) The recipient applies appropriate processes, methods, and techniques in a manner consistent with the highest standards of the profession.

(ii) In determining quality, peer reviewers may also consider the extent to which the recipient conducts a coherent, sustained program of work informed by relevant research.

(3) *Utility.* (i) In determining the utility of the recipient's products or services or both, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which the recipient's work (including information, materials, processes, techniques, or activities) is effectively used by and is useful to its customers in appropriate settings.

(ii) In determining utility, peer reviewers may also consider the extent to which the recipient has received national recognition; e.g., articles in refereed journals and presentations at professional conferences.

(4) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) Peer reviewers shall consider the results of the recipient's work. In examining outcomes and impact, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which—

(A) The recipient meets the needs of its customers; and

(B) The recipient's work contributes to the increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

(ii) In examining outcomes and impact, peer reviewers may also consider the extent to which recipients address issues of national significance through its products or services or both.

(c) For National Research and Development Centers, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Quality.* (i) The recipient uses a well-conceptualized framework and sound theoretical and methodological tools in conducting professionally rigorous studies; and

(ii) The recipient conducts work of sufficient size, scope, and duration to produce sound guidance for improvement efforts and future research.

(2) *Utility.* The recipient documents, reports, and disseminates its work in ways to facilitate the effective use of its work in appropriately targeted settings.

(3) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient's work contributes to the development and advancement of theory in the field of study, including its priority area; and

(ii) The recipient addresses issues of national significance through its products or services or both.

(d) For the Regional Educational Laboratories, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Quality.* (i) The recipient utilizes a well-conceptualized framework and sound theoretical and methodological tools in conducting professionally rigorous studies;

(ii) The recipient conducts work of sufficient size, scope, and duration to produce sound guidance for improvement efforts; and

(iii) The recipient's products are well-tested and based on sound research.

(2) *Utility.* The recipient documents, reports, and disseminates its work in ways to facilitate its effective use in appropriately targeted settings, particularly in school improvement efforts of States and localities.

(3) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient assists States and localities to implement comprehensive school improvement strategies through the provision of research-based information (including well-tested models and strategies), materials and assistance; and

(ii) The recipient's work results in widespread access to information regarding research and best practices, particularly within its region.

(e) For Field-Initiated Studies, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Implementation and management.* The recipient's work responds to the goals, objectives and mission of the National Institute from which it is funded.

(2) *Quality.* The recipient utilizes a well-conceptualized framework and sound theoretical and methodological tools in conducting professionally rigorous studies.

(3) *Utility.* The recipient documents, reports, and disseminates its work in ways to facilitate its effective use in appropriately targeted settings.

(4) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient's work contributes to the development and advancement of

theory and knowledge in the field of study; and

(ii) The recipient addresses issues of national significance through its products or services or both.

(f) For the ERIC Clearinghouses, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Quality.* The recipient applies an integrated approach to acquiring and disseminating significant and high-quality educational literature and materials to maintain and enhance the ERIC database.

(2) *Utility.* The recipient contributes to the development of the ERIC database as a source of literature and materials

that reflects trends and issues within its scope.

(3) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient meets the informational and educational needs of its customers through dissemination and outreach approaches and the development of an array of print and non-print materials; and

(ii) The recipient provides national leadership on the use of current computer, networking, and information technology.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(I)(2)(F))

[FR Doc. 98-4690 Filed 2-23-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P