I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: The purpose of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities program is to promote academic achievement and to improve results for children with disabilities by providing TA, supporting model demonstration projects, disseminating useful information, and implementing activities that are supported by scientifically based research.

Priority: This competition includes one absolute priority. In accordance with 34 CFR 75.105(b)(2)(v), this priority is from allowable activities specified in sections 663 and 681(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 20 U.S.C. 1463 and 1481(d)).

Absolute Priority: For FY 2021 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applications from this competition, this priority is an absolute priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3), we consider only applications that meet this priority. This priority is:

National Center for Students with Disabilities Who Require Intensive Intervention.

Background: Across all disability categories, there is a group of students who do not make expected progress when standardized evidence-based interventions are implemented with fidelity and who, therefore, require intensive intervention. Intensive interventions are interventions and services provided under IDEA that are individually designed by systematically adjusting intervention components, such as duration, frequency, strength, alignment, and comprehensiveness, to address a student’s unique, severe, and persistent learning or behavior, or both learning and behavior, difficulties. A significant challenge for State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) is supporting schools and educators in implementing interventions for students with disabilities who have severe and persistent learning or behavior difficulties who require intensive specialized instruction (“students who require intensive intervention”) to succeed in school and be prepared for postsecondary opportunities. Incorporating intensive intervention in systems of academic and behavioral instruction and intervention presents challenges due to the complexity of intensive intervention and the needed professional development and organizational resources to effectively support its implementation (e.g., Berkeley et al., 2020; Briesch et al., 2019).

Addressing the complex needs of students who require intensive intervention has presented a significant challenge to SEAs and LEAs in several areas. An ongoing need of SEAs and LEAs has been identifying and implementing evidence-based interventions, especially intensive intervention. Academic data reveals long-standing significant achievement gaps for students with disabilities (e.g., National Assessment of Educational Progress; see Sparks, 2018). In addition to the academic data, it has been well-documented that students with persistent learning or behavior difficulties are at increased risk of being suspended, expelled, or arrested as well as experience other challenges that can severely limit their academic success and postsecondary options (e.g., Brobbey, 2018; Mitchell et al., 2019). Another area of challenge for SEAs and LEAs is that systems of academic and behavioral instruction and intervention are often developed and implemented in a parallel and non-integrated manner. For example, SEAs and LEAs may have adopted over time separate tiered frameworks to address academic or behavioral instruction and intervention which may have resulted in differing implementation approaches as well as varying levels of resources such as funding, professional development opportunities, prioritization by leadership, or hiring of personnel. Moreover, such an approach does not recognize that academic and behavioral needs often co-occur and influence one another and can limit the effectiveness of intensive intervention. Compounding the concern of long-standing significant academic achievement gaps and behavioral challenges for students with disabilities is the impact of the novel coronavirus 2019 (COVID–19) pandemic, the long-term effects of which are unknown. Families, educators, administrators, and other stakeholders have voiced concerns that the disruption in typical instruction due to the COVID–19 pandemic will have a disproportionate negative impact on students who require intensive intervention (e.g., Jodem et al., 2020) as well as English learners (e.g., U.S. Government Accountability Office,
2020), including those requiring intensive intervention. The COVID–19 pandemic has exacerbated, and will continue to exacerbate, the lack of availability and use of existing resources across all State and local jurisdictions for some time to come. The impact of periodic and more localized natural disasters such as hurricanes, fires, and floods will likewise place a strain on resources within and across States. TA and resources for SEAs and LEAs are now even more critical to ensure educators have professional development opportunities to implement intensive interventions, as the need is likely to exponentially increase to address the negative impacts of the disruption in typical instruction. SEAs and LEAs will also need support as they implement interventions aimed at reducing learning loss for students requiring intensive intervention, and as they systematically integrate intensive intervention into existing State initiatives to maximize use of limited resources, such as State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIP).

Priority:
The purpose of this priority is to fund a cooperative agreement to establish and operate a National Center for Students with Disabilities Who Require Intensive Intervention (Center). This Center will provide TA to increase the capacity of SEAs and LEAs to support schools and educators to address the needs of students who require intensive intervention and disseminate resources and products. The Center must achieve, at a minimum, the following expected outcomes:

(a) Increased capacity of SEAs and LEAs to support schools and educators to identify, implement, and sustain face-to-face and remote intensive intervention;

(b) Increased capacity of SEAs and LEAs to ensure professional development includes training on implementation of face-to-face and remote intensive intervention;

(c) Increased capacity of LEAs and schools to develop or refine and coordinate their system of instruction and intervention to implement and sustain contextually and culturally responsive intensive intervention;

(d) Increased capacity of SEAs to support the efforts of LEAs to incorporate intensive intervention in existing or new initiatives and policies;

(e) Increased capacity of SEAs, LEAs, and educators to use and coordinate existing national, regional, State, and local resources (e.g., parent and family organizations, TA providers, mental health agencies and organizations, and institutions of higher education (IHEs)) to better implement and sustain intensive intervention;

(f) Increased capacity of SEAs and LEAs to address emerging issues related to the implementation and sustainability of intensive intervention, including those issues related to COVID–19 and future instances of learning loss, such as different approaches to mitigating learning loss and efficiently and effectively allocating resources for supporting students who require intensive intervention; and

(g) Increased dissemination of components of intensive intervention and lessons learned from implementing intensive intervention to inform SEA and LEA implementation efforts.

In addition to these programmatic requirements, to be considered for funding under this priority, applicants must meet the application and administrative requirements in this priority, which are:

(a) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Significance,” how the proposed project will—

(1) Address the current and emerging needs of SEAs and LEAs to support schools and educators in implementing and sustaining intensive intervention.

To meet this requirement, the applicant must—

(i) Present applicable national, State, regional, or local research addressing the current capacity of SEAs and LEAs to support schools and educators in the implementation and sustainability of intensive intervention;

(ii) Demonstrate knowledge of current educational issues and policy initiatives relating to addressing the needs of students who require intensive intervention; and

(iii) Address the current and emerging needs of SEAs and LEAs related to the implementation and sustainability of intensive intervention, including those related to COVID–19; and

(2) Improve academic and behavioral outcomes for students who require intensive intervention, and indicate the likely magnitude or importance of the improvements.

(b) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Quality of project services,” how the proposed project will—

(1) Ensure equal access and treatment for members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. To meet this requirement, the applicant must describe how they will—

(i) Identify the needs of the intended recipients for TA and information; and

(ii) Ensure that services and products meet the needs of the intended recipients of the grant;

(2) Achieve its goals, objectives, and intended outcomes. To meet this requirement, the applicant must provide—

(i) Measurable intended project outcomes; and

(ii) In Appendix A, the logic model by which the proposed project will achieve its intended outcomes that depicts, at a minimum, the goals and how they will be measured, activities, outputs, and intended outcomes of the proposed project;

(3) Use a conceptual framework (and provide a copy in Appendix A) to develop project plans and activities, describing any underlying concepts, assumptions, expectations, beliefs, or theories, as well as the presumed relationships or linkages among these variables, and any empirical support for this framework;

Note: The following websites provide more information on logic models and conceptual frameworks: www.osepideasthatwork.org/logicModel and www.osepideasthatwork.org/resources-grantees/program-areas/ta-ta/ta-project-logic-model-and-conceptual-framework.

(4) Be based on current research and make use of evidence-based practices (EBPs). To meet this requirement, the applicant must describe—

(i) The current research on the assessment of a coordinated system of instruction and intervention that builds capacity in SEAs and LEAs to implement and sustain intensive intervention and related EBPs;

(ii) The current research about adult learning principles and implementation science that will inform the proposed TA; and

(iii) How the proposed project will incorporate current research and EBPs in the development and delivery of its products and services;

(5) Develop products and provide services that are of high quality and sufficient intensity and duration to achieve the intended outcomes of the proposed project. To address this...
requirement, the applicant must describe—

(i) How it proposes to identify and develop and expand the knowledge base on intensive intervention and how it can be integrated in systems of instruction and intervention;

(ii) Its proposed approach to universal, general TA, which must identify the intended recipients, including the type and number of recipients, that will receive the products and services, a description of the products and services that the Center proposes to make available, and the expected impact of those products and services under this approach; and

(iii) Its proposed approach to intensive, sustained TA, which must identify—

(A) The intended recipients, including the type and number of recipients, that will receive the products and services; a description of the products and services that the Center proposes to make available, and the expected impact of those products and services under this approach; and

(B) Its proposed approach to measure the readiness of potential TA recipients to work with the project, assessing, at a minimum, their current infrastructure, available resources, and ability to build capacity at the local level; and

(iv) Its proposed approach to targeted, specialized TA, which must identify—

(A) The intended recipients, including the type and number of recipients, that will receive the products and services under this approach; and

(B) Its proposed approach to measure the readiness of SEAs and LEAs to work with the project, including their commitment to the initiative, alignment of the initiative to their needs, current infrastructure, available resources, and ability of the SEAs and LEAs to build capacity at the local level;

(C) Its proposed plan for assisting SEAs and LEAs to build or enhance training systems that include professional development based on adult learning principles and coaching; and

(D) Its proposed plan for working with appropriate levels of the education system (e.g., SEAs, LEAs, other TA providers, parents and families) to ensure that there is communication between each level and that there are systems in place to support implementation of intensive intervention;

(6) Develop products and implement services that maximize efficiency. To address this requirement, the applicant must describe—

(i) How the proposed project will use technology to achieve the intended project outcomes;

(ii) With whom the proposed project will collaborate and the intended outcomes of this collaboration; and

(iii) How the proposed project will use non-project resources to achieve the intended project outcomes; and

(7) Develop a dissemination plan that describes how the applicant will systematically distribute information, products, and services to varied intended audiences, using a variety of dissemination strategies, to promote awareness and use of the Center’s products and services.

c. In the narrative section of the application under “Quality of the project evaluation,” include an evaluation plan for the project as described in the following paragraphs. The evaluation plan must describe: Measures of progress in implementation, including the criteria for determining the extent to which the project’s products and services have met the goals for reaching its target population; measures of intended outcomes or results of the project’s activities in order to evaluate those activities; and how well the goals or objectives of the proposed project, as described in its logic model, have been met.

The applicant must provide an assurance that, in designing the evaluation plan, it will—

(1) Designate, with the approval of the OSEP project officer, a project liaison with sufficient dedicated time, experience in evaluation, and knowledge of the project to work in collaboration with the Center to Improve Program and Project Performance (CIPP), the project director, and the OSEP project officer on the following tasks:

(i) Revise the logic model submitted in the application to provide for a more comprehensive measurement of implementation and outcomes and to reflect any changes or clarifications to the model discussed at the kick-off meeting;

(ii) Refine the evaluation design and instrumentation proposed in the application consistent with the revised logic model and using the most rigorous design suitable (e.g., prepare evaluation questions about significant program processes and outcomes; develop quantitative or qualitative data collections that permit both the collection of progress data, including fidelity of implementation, as appropriate, and the assessment of project outcomes; and identify analytic strategies); and

(iii) Revise the evaluation plan submitted in the application such that it clearly—

(A) Specifies the evaluation questions, measures, and associated instruments or sources for data appropriate to answer these questions, suggests analytic strategies for those data, provides a timeline for conducting the evaluation, and includes staff assignments for completing the evaluation activities;

(B) Delineates the data expected to be available by the end of the second project year for use during the project’s evaluation (3+2 review) for continued funding described under the heading Fourth and Fifth Years of the Project; and

(C) Can be used to assist the project director and the OSEP project officer, with the assistance of CIPP, as needed, to specify the project performance

The major tasks of CIPP are to guide, coordinate, and oversee the design of formative evaluations for every large discretionary investment (i.e., those awarded $500,000 or more per year and required to participate in the 3+2 process) in OSEP’s Technical Assistance and Dissemination; Personnel Development; Parent Training and Information Centers; and Educational Technology, Media, and Materials programs. The efforts of CIPP are expected to enhance the individual project evaluation plans by providing expert and unbiased TA in designing the evaluations with due consideration of the project’s budget. CIPP does not function as a third-party evaluator.
measures to be addressed in the project’s annual performance report;
(2) Dedicate sufficient staff time and other resources during the first six months of the project to collaborate with CIPP staff, including regular meetings (e.g., weekly, biweekly, or monthly) with CIPP and the OSEP project officer, in order to accomplish the tasks described in paragraph (c)(1) of this section; and
(3) Dedicate sufficient funds in each budget year to cover the costs of carrying out the tasks described in paragraphs (c)(1) and (2) of this section and revising and implementing the evaluation plan. Please note in your budget narrative the funds dedicated for this activity.
(d) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Adequacy of resources and quality of project personnel,” how—
(1) The proposed project will encourage applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability, as appropriate;
(2) The proposed key project personnel, consultants, and subcontractors have the qualifications and experience to carry out the proposed activities and achieve the project’s intended outcomes;
(3) The applicant and any key partners have adequate resources to carry out the proposed activities; and
(4) The proposed costs are reasonable in relation to the anticipated results and benefits.
(e) Demonstrate, in the narrative section of the application under “Quality of the management plan,” how—
(1) The proposed management plan will ensure that the project’s intended outcomes will be achieved on time and within budget. To address this requirement, the applicant must describe—
(i) Clearly defined responsibilities for key project personnel, consultants, and subcontractors, as applicable; and
(ii) Timelines and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks;
(2) Key project personnel and any consultants and subcontractors will be allocated and how these allocations are appropriate and adequate to achieve the project’s intended outcomes;
(3) The proposed management plan will ensure that the products and services provided are of high quality, relevant, and useful to recipients; and
(4) The project will benefit from a diversity of perspectives, including those of families, educators, TA providers, researchers, and policy makers, among others, in its development and operation.
(f) Address the following application requirements. The applicant must—
(1) Include, in Appendix A, personnel-loading charts and timelines, as applicable, to illustrate the management plan described in the narrative;
(2) Include, in the budget, attendance at the following:
(i) A one and one-half day kick-off meeting, either virtually or in Washington, DC, after receipt of the award, and an annual planning meeting either virtually or in Washington, DC, with the OSEP project officer and other relevant staff during each subsequent year of the project period.
Note: Within 30 days of receipt of the award, a post-award teleconference must be held between the OSEP project officer and the grantee’s project director or other authorized representative;
(ii) A two and one-half day project directors’ conference either virtually or in Washington, DC, during each year of the project period;
(iii) Two annual two-day trips, either virtually or in Washington, DC, to attend Department briefings, Department-sponsored conferences, and other meetings, as requested by OSEP; and
(iv) A one-day intensive face-to-face review meeting either virtually or in Washington, DC, during the last half of the second year of the project period.
(3) Include, in the budget, a line item for an annual set-aside of 5 percent of the grant amount to support emerging needs that are consistent with the proposed project’s intended outcomes, as those needs are identified in consultation with, and approved by, the OSEP project officer. With approval from the OSEP project officer, the project must reallocate any remaining funds from this annual set-aside no later than the end of the third quarter of each budget period;
(4) Maintain a high-quality website, with an easy-to-navigate design, that meets government or industry-recognized standards for accessibility;
(5) Ensure that annual project progress toward meeting project goals is posted on the project website; and
(6) Include, in Appendix A, an assurance to assist OSEP with the transfer of pertinent resources and products and to maintain the continuity of services to States during the transition to this new award period and at the end of this award period, as appropriate.
Fourth and Fifth Years of the Project:
In deciding whether to continue funding the project for the fourth and fifth years, the Secretary will consider the requirements of 34 CFR 75.253(a), including—
(a) The recommendations of a 3+2 review team consisting of experts who have experience and knowledge in providing TA to address the needs of students who require intensive intervention. This review will be conducted during a one-day intensive meeting that will be held during the last half of the second year of the project period;
(b) The timeliness with which, and how well, the requirements of the negotiated cooperative agreement have been or are being met by the project; and
(c) The quality, relevance, and usefulness of the project’s products and services and the extent to which the project’s products and services are aligned with the project’s objectives and likely to result in the project achieving its intended outcomes.
Under 34 CFR 75.253, the Secretary may reduce continuation awards or discontinue awards in any year of the project period for excessive carryover balances or a failure to make substantial progress. The Department intends to closely monitor unbudgeted balances and substantial progress under this program and may reduce or discontinue funding accordingly.
References:
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IV. Application and Submission Information

1. Application Submission Instructions: Applicants are required to follow the Common Instructions for Applicants to Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the Federal Register on February 13, 2019 (84 FR 3768), and available at www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2019-02-13/pdf/2019-02206.pdf, which contain requirements and information on how to submit an application.

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

3. Funding Restrictions: We reference regulations outlining funding restrictions in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice.

4. Recommended Page Limit: The application narrative is where you, the applicant, address the selection criteria that reviewers use to evaluate your application. We recommend that you (1) limit the application narrative to no more than 70 pages and (2) use the following standards:
   - A “page” is 8.5” x 11”, on one side only, with 1” margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.
   - Double-space (no more than three lines per vertical inch) all text in the application narrative, including titles, headings, footnotes, quotations, reference citations, and captions, as well as all text in charts, tables, figures, graphs, and screen shots.
   - Use a font that is 12 point or larger.
   - Use one of the following fonts: Times New Roman, Courier, Courier New, or Arial.

The recommended page limit does not apply to the cover sheet; the budget section, including the narrative budget justification; the assurances and certifications; or the abstract (follow the guidance provided in the application package for completing the abstract), the table of contents, the list of priority requirements, the resumes, the reference list, the letters of support, or the appendices. However, the recommended page limit does apply to all of the application narrative, including all text in charts, tables, figures, graphs, and screen shots.

V. Application Review Information

1. Selection Criteria: The selection criteria for this competition are from 34 CFR 75.210 and are listed below:
(a) Significance (10 points).
(1) The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project.
(2) In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(i) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.
(ii) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project.
(b) Quality of project services (35 points).
(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project.
(2) In determining the quality of the services to be provided by the proposed project, the Secretary considers the quality and sufficiency of strategies for ensuring equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.
(3) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(i) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
(ii) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.
(iii) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project reflect up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice.
(iv) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
(v) The extent to which the TA services to be provided by the proposed project involve the use of efficient strategies, including the use of technology, as appropriate, and the leveraging of non-project resources.
(c) Quality of the project evaluation (20 points).
(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project.
(2) In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of project implementation strategies.
(iii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
(iv) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.
(d) Adequacy of resources and quality of project personnel (15 points).
(1) The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project and the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.
(2) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability.
(3) In addition, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(i) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.
(ii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel.
(iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of project consultants or subcontractors.
(iv) The qualifications, including relevant training, experience, and independence, of the evaluator.
(v) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.
(vi) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.
(vii) The extent to which the budget is adequate to support the proposed project.
(viii) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.
(e) Quality of the management plan (20 points).
(1) The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project.
(2) In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:
(i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.
(ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project.
(iii) The adequacy of mechanisms for ensuring high-quality products and services from the proposed project.
(iv) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate.
2. Review and Selection Process: We remind potential applicants that in reviewing applications in any discretionary grant competition, the Secretary may consider, under 34 CFR 75.217(d)(3), the past performance of the applicant in carrying out a previous award, such as the applicant’s use of funds, achievement of project objectives, and compliance with grant conditions. The Secretary may also consider whether the applicant failed to submit a timely performance report or submitted a report of unacceptable quality.
In addition, in making a competitive grant award, the Secretary requires various assurances, including those applicable to Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department (34 CFR 100.4, 104.5, 106.4, 108.8, and 110.23).
3. Additional Review and Selection Process Factors: In the past, the Department has had difficulty finding peer reviewers for certain competitions because so many individuals who are eligible to serve as peer reviewers have conflicts of interest. The standing panel requirements under section 682(b) of IDEA also have placed additional constraints on the availability of reviewers. Therefore, the Department has determined that for some discretionary grant competitions, applications may be separated into two or more groups and ranked and selected for funding within specific groups. This procedure will make it easier for the
Department to find peer reviewers by ensuring that greater numbers of individuals who are eligible to serve as reviewers for any particular group of applicants will not have conflicts of interest. It also will increase the quality, independence, and fairness of the review process, while permitting panel members to review applications under discretionary grant competitions for which they also have submitted applications.

4. Risk Assessment and Specific Conditions: Consistent with 2 CFR 200.206, before awarding grants under this competition the Department conducts a review of the risks posed by applicants. Under 2 CFR 200.208, the Secretary may impose specific conditions, and under 2 CFR 3474.10, in appropriate circumstances, high-risk conditions on a grant if the applicant or grantee is not financially stable; has a history of unsatisfactory performance; has a financial or other management system that does not meet the standards in 2 CFR part 200, subsection D; has not fulfilled the commitments of a prior grant; or is otherwise not responsible.

5. Integrity and Performance System: If you are selected under this competition to receive an award that over the course of the project period may exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (currently $250,000), under 2 CFR 200.206(a)(2) we must make a judgment about your integrity, business ethics, and record of performance under Federal awards—that is, the risk posed by you as an applicant—before we make an award. In doing so, we must consider any information about you that is in the integrity and performance system (currently referred to as the Federal Awarded Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS)), accessible through the System for Award Management. You may review and comment on any information about yourself that a Federal agency previously entered and that is currently in FAPIIS.

Please note that, if the total value of your currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from the Federal Government exceeds $10,000,000, the reporting requirements in 2 CFR part 200, Appendix XII, require you to report certain integrity information to FAPIIS semiannually. Please review the requirements in 2 CFR part 200, Appendix XII, if this grant plus all the other Federal funds you receive exceed $10,000,000.

6. In General: In accordance with the Office of Management and Budget’s guidance located at 2 CFR part 200, all applicable Federal laws, and relevant Executive guidance, the Department will review and consider applications for funding pursuant to this notice inviting applications in accordance with—

(a) Selecting recipients most likely to be successful in delivering results based on the program objectives through an objective process of evaluating Federal award applications (2 CFR 200.205);

(b) Prohibiting the purchase of certain telecommunication and video surveillance services or equipment in alignment with section 889 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2019 (Pub. L. 115–232) (2 CFR 200.216); and

(c) Providing a preference, to the extent permitted by law, to maximize use of goods, products, and materials produced in the United States (2 CFR 200.322); and

(d) Terminating agreements in whole or in part to the greatest extent authorized by law if an award no longer effectuates the program goals or agency priorities (2 CFR 200.340).

VI. Award Administration Information

1. Award Notices: If your application is successful, we notify your U.S. Representative and U.S. Senators and send you a Grant Award Notification (GAN); or we may send you an email containing a link to access an electronic version of your GAN. We may notify you informally, also.

If your application is not evaluated or not selected for funding, we notify you.

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

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

3. Open Licensing Requirements: Unless an exception applies, if you are awarded a grant under this competition, you will be required to openly license to the public grant deliverables created in whole, or in part, with Department grant funds. When the deliverable consists of modifications to pre-existing works, the license extends only to those modifications that can be separately identified and only to the extent that open licensing is permitted under the terms of any licenses or other legal restrictions on the use of pre-existing works. Additionally, a grantee that awarded competitive grant funds must have a plan to disseminate these public grant deliverables. This dissemination plan can be developed and submitted after your application has been reviewed and selected for funding. For additional information on the open licensing requirements please refer to 2 CFR 3474.20.

4. Reporting: (a) If you apply for a grant under this competition, you must ensure that you have in place the necessary processes and systems to comply with the reporting requirements in 2 CFR part 170 should you receive funding under the competition. This does not apply if you have an exception under 2 CFR 170.110(b).

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

5. Performance Measures: For the purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) and reporting under 34 CFR 75.110, we have established a set of performance measures, including long-term measures, that are designed to yield information on various aspects of the effectiveness and quality of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children With Disabilities program. These measures are:

• Program Performance Measure 1: The percentage of technical assistance and dissemination products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of the products and services.

• Program Performance Measure 2: The percentage of special education technical assistance and dissemination products and services deemed by an independent review panel of qualified experts to be of high relevance to educational or early intervention policy or practice.

• Program Performance Measure 3: The percentage of all special education technical assistance and dissemination products and services deemed by an independent review panel of qualified experts to be useful in improving educational or early intervention policy or practice.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Privacy Act of 1974; Matching Program

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of a New Matching Program.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended by the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988 and the Computer Matching and Privacy Protections Amendments of 1990 (Privacy Act), and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance on the conduct of matching programs, notice is hereby given of the re-establishment of the matching program between the Department of Education (ED or Department) (recipient agency) and the Social Security Administration (SSA) (source agency) to assist the Department in its obligation to ensure that applicants for student financial assistance under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA), satisfy eligibility requirements.

DATES: The period of this matching program is estimated to cover the 18-month period from April 11, 2021 through October 10, 2022. However, the computer matching agreement (CMA) will become applicable at the later of the following two dates: April 11, 2021, or 30 days after the publication of this notice, on March 8, 2021, unless comments have been received from interested members of the public requiring modification and republication of the notice. The matching program will continue for 18 months after the applicable date and may be extended for up to an additional 12 months, if the respective agency Data Integrity Boards (DIBs) determine that the conditions specified in 5 U.S.C. 552a(o)(2)(D) have been met.

ADDRESSES: Submit your comments through the Federal eRulemaking Portal or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. We will not accept comments submitted by fax or by email or those submitted after the comment period. To ensure that we do not receive duplicate copies, please submit your comments only once. In addition, please include the Docket ID at the top of your comments.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. You may view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the Federal Register in text or Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site. You may also access documents of the Department published in the Federal Register by using the article search feature at www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. You may view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the Federal Register in text or Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at the site. You may also access documents of the Department published in the Federal Register by using the article search feature at www.federalregister.gov. Specifically, through the advanced search feature at this site, you can limit your search to documents published by the Department.

Submit your comments electronically. Information on using Regulations.gov, including instructions for accessing agency documents, submitting comments, and viewing the docket, is available on the site under the “help” tab.

Postal Mail, Commercial Delivery, or Hand Delivery: If you mail or deliver your comments about this new matching program, address them to: Gerard Duffey, Management and Program Analyst, Wanamaker Building, U.S. Department of Education, Federal Student Aid, 100 Penn Square East, Suite 509B10, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Telephone: (215) 656–3249.

Privacy Note: The Department’s policy is to make all comments received from members of the public available for public viewing in their entirety on the Federal eRulemaking Portal at www.regulations.gov. Therefore, commenters should be careful to include in their comments only information that they wish to make publicly available.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with the Privacy Act; OMB