

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**Drug Enforcement Administration****Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application**

Pursuant to § 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on December 6, 1999, Mallinckrodt, Inc., Mallinckrodt & Second Streets, St. Louis, Missouri 63147, made application by letter to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of dihydromorphine (9145), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule I.

Mallinckrodt, Inc. plans to isolate dihydromorphine as a step in a multistep synthesis of hydromorphone.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substance may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (CCR), and must be filed no later than (April 10, 2000).

Dated: January 28, 2000.

John H. King,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-2872 Filed 2-8-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**National Institute of Corrections****Solicitation for a Cooperative Agreement—Community Restorative Justice Outcomes/Measurements and Evaluation**

AGENCY: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

ACTION: Solicitation for a Cooperative Agreement—Community Restorative Justice Outcomes/Measurements and Evaluation.

SUMMARY: The Department of Justice (DOJ), National Institute of Corrections (NIC) announces the availability of funds in FY 2000 for a cooperative agreement to establish and develop "community restorative justice" performance outcome, measurement and evaluation protocols. This

solicitation is for phase I and II of a "three-phase" project.

Background/Purpose: Restorative Justice has emerged as a critical issue for the future of Criminal Justice Systems. Because it is new it requires a unique set of skills, competencies and perspectives from corrections agencies and other justice professionals. Victims and citizens have become increasingly frustrated with the justice system with a belief that the justice system does not represent their interest and does not provide them any value in terms of enhanced public safety, quality of life in communities, and a legitimate voice and role in the justice process. Restorative and community oriented practices show promise for being more responsive to victims and communities, and holding offenders accountable for understanding the harmful impact of their behavior, and for repairing the harm that they have caused. Many activities and efforts have taken place over the past four years to assist agencies in developing and implementing systems, protocols and practices related to Restorative Justice. Likewise, the effectiveness and evaluation of these new systems and programs has come into question and has become a central issue among professionals and criminal justice agencies. In some instances, restorative justice programs have been evaluated against traditional measures that focus exclusively on offender recidivism. Proponents argue that restorative justice is a radically different paradigm and so too needs to be our measures and methods of evaluating restorative justice. It is also argued that restorative justice is more than just a certain program (mediation, conferencing, boards, restitution, etc.), rather it is an operating framework driven and grounded by different values and principles. It requires us to look beyond offender focused measures and adopt measures that account not only for impact on offenders, but also on victim health and satisfaction, community safety and vitality, community problem-solving capacity and other variables grounded in these new set of principles and values. By identifying a host of new, or non-traditional evaluation measures to evaluate restorative justice initiatives, agencies will be able to evaluate the relative effectiveness of restorative justice initiatives, and defend and make informed decisions on the purpose and use of such initiatives and programs. Additionally, the project will assist criminal justice agencies in evaluating the effective design and implementation of restorative justice programs.

Project Goal and Objectives: The goal of this project is to provide criminal justice agencies the capability to evaluate the design, implementation, and impact of programs and initiatives being conducted under auspices of community and restorative justice.

The objective of this project are to:

1. Identify outcome and impact measures to evaluate the effectiveness of restorative justice programs and initiatives.
2. Identify process measures to guide and evaluate the implementation of restorative justice programs.
3. Develop an evaluation methodology for the collection and analysis of restorative justice data.
4. Design and create a tool(s) and protocols incorporating restorative measures that agencies can use to evaluate the both the process (implementation) and the outcome/ impact of restorative justice programs.
5. Produce a document for wide dissemination in the criminal justice field on restorative justice measures and evaluation using the results from the first four objectives.
6. Develop and deliver a pilot training curriculum for correctional practitioners on the use restorative justice evaluation measures, tools and protocols.

Scope of Work Deliverables

Phase I: The desired outcome and product for Phase I is "the identification of specific process, outcome and impact measures for evaluating restorative justice programs and initiatives." Intended work activities include assembly of a focus/work group to participate in the identification of restorative measures.

Phase II: The desired outcome and deliverables for Phase II is the "actual design and development of an evaluation tool/instrument and protocol, the pilot application and revision of the tool at two jurisdictional sites, and the development of a document for broad public dissemination containing the results from phase I and II activities." The process tool should take the form of an inventory (or checklist) consisting of measurable items that can provide direction and feedback on the extent to which programs and initiatives are more or less restorative in their design and implementation. The site used in a pilot application of the evaluation design must be inclusive of a publicly funded correctional agency as a primary administrator of the program or initiative being evaluated, and shall be subject to consideration and approved by the NIC project coordinator. The document should provide correctional