the Bureau, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) The accuracy of the Bureau’s estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methods and the assumptions used; (c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments submitted in response to this notice will be submitted to OMB as part of its review of this request. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Anthony May,
Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

[Billing code 4810–AM–P]

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Applications for New Awards; Postsecondary Success Program

AGENCY: Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Education (Department) is issuing a notice inviting applications (NIA) for fiscal year (FY) 2022 for the Postsecondary Success Program, Assistance Listing Number 84.116M. This notice relates to the approved information collection under OMB control number 1894–0006. This notice relates to the approved information collection under OMB control number 1894–0006.

DATES:
Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: October 11, 2022.
Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: December 12, 2022.

ADDRESSES: For the addresses for obtaining and submitting an application, please refer to our Common Instructions for Applicants to Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the Federal Register on December 27, 2021 (86 FR 73264) and available at www.federalregister.gov/d/2021-27979.

Please note that these Common Instructions supersede the version published on February 13, 2019, and, in part, describe the transition from the requirement to register in SAM.gov a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number to the implementation of the Unique Entity Identifier (UEI).

More information on the phase-out of DUNS numbers is available at https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ofo/docs/unique-entity-identifier-transition-fact-sheet.pdf.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

If you are deaf, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability and wish to access telecommunications relay services, please dial 7–1–1.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: The purpose of this program is to promote postsecondary completion for students close to completion, whether for students currently enrolled in higher education, students who are no longer enrolled because of challenges they faced during the COVID–19 pandemic and close to completion, or both. Institutions may opt to supplement or expand evidence-based and data-driven activities to support retention and completion for both groups. This program aims to improve student outcomes, including retention, transfer, credit accumulation, and completion, by augmenting evidence-based activities that are already underway at eligible institutions of higher education (IHEs).

Background: The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 appropriated $76 million for Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) competitive programs and, within this total, the Joint Explanatory Statement designated $5 million for Postsecondary Student Success Grants “to support evidence-based activities to improve postsecondary retention and completion rates.” The Department intends to focus this grant program on data-driven and evidence-based efforts to support Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, other Minority-Serving Institutions, and institutions serving large shares of low-income students, to improve existing retention and completion efforts and support students on the path to college completion.

Nationally, the U.S. Census Bureau reports that nearly one in five Americans has some college education but no degree. Fewer than two in three students pursuing a bachelor’s degree complete their degree within 6 years, and only about one in three students at 2-year institutions graduate within 150 percent of the expected time to completion. Completion rates are lower for Black, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native students.

The pandemic has further exacerbated some of the college completion challenges that students face. As colleges pivoted to online instruction and students faced unprecedented and simultaneous health, family, and employment challenges, an estimated 1 million students left school. Many still have not returned. Community colleges have seen the largest declines in enrollment. Leaving school before earning a credential may have particularly significant consequences for students who leave school with debt; such borrowers are far more likely to default on their student loans, even when their balances are low.
reenroll students who stopped out of postsecondary education.

We believe the college completion funds available through this grant program will help to amplify the work already happening on campuses to improve retention and completion and reengage students who are close to completion, especially nontraditional students. Specifically, the Department encourages applicants that have already committed to evidence-based practices for reenrollment and retention, completion, and/or closing equity gaps to apply for this grant program. Wherever possible, institutions should note their participation in networks and communities of practice related to college completion efforts as evidence of the institution’s commitment to this work and capacity both to conduct the work and to share it with partner institutions. We also urge applicant institutions to think carefully about opportunities to evaluate their strategies as rigorously as possible to ensure they produce high-quality information about the effectiveness of the intervention as the strength of the institution’s proposed evaluation plan will be a key factor in reviewing the application, as detailed in the selection criteria.” Additionally, subject to the availability of funding, successful applicants may be required to work with a Department technical assistance provider in carrying out project evaluations that will build evidence of effectiveness.

**Priorities:** This notice contains one absolute priority and one invitational priority. We are establishing the absolute priority for the FY 2022 grant competition and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applications from this competition, in accordance with section 437(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), 20 U.S.C. 1232(g)(1).

**Absolute Priority:** This priority is an absolute priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3), we consider only applications that meet this priority.

This priority is:

Projects that are designed to improve postsecondary student outcomes and that are supported by evidence that meets the conditions in the definition of “promising evidence” (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)). In responding to this priority, applicants must identify one or more of the proposed activities (project components) that meet the promising evidence standard and include a logic model that demonstrates the relationship between the proposed activities and the relevant outcomes the project is designed to achieve.

**Invitational Priority:** This priority is an invitational priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(1), we do not give an application that meets this invitational priority a competitive or absolute preference over other applications.

This priority is: **Participation by Community Colleges.** Applications from community colleges (as defined in this notice). Definitions: We are establishing definitions for “Community college,” “Minority-serving institution,” “Prior learning assessment,” and “Stopped-out student.” for the FY 2022 grant competition and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applications from this competition, in accordance with section 437(d)(1) of GEPA. The remaining definitions are from 34 CFR 77.1.

**Community college means an institution that meets the definition in section 312(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) (20 U.S.C. 1058(f)) or an IHE (as defined in section 101 of the HEA) that awards degrees and certificates, more than 50 percent of which are not bachelor’s degrees (or an equivalent) or master’s, professional, or other advanced degrees.**

**Experimental study** means a study that is designed to compare outcomes between two groups of individuals (such as students) that are otherwise equivalent except for their assignment to either a treatment group receiving a project component or a control group that does not. Randomized controlled trials, regression discontinuity design studies, and single-case design studies are the specific types of experimental studies that, depending on their design and implementation (e.g., sample attrition in randomized controlled trials and regression discontinuity design studies), can meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations as described in the WWC Handbooks:

(i) A randomized controlled trial employs random assignment of, for example, students, teachers, classrooms, or schools to receive the project component being evaluated (the treatment group) or not to receive the project component (the control group).

(ii) A regression discontinuity design study assigns the project component being evaluated using a measured variable (e.g., assigning students reading below a cutoff score to tutoring or developmental education classes) and controls for that variable in the analysis of outcomes. (iii) A single-case design study uses observations of a single case (e.g., a student eligible for a behavioral intervention) over time in the absence and presence of a controlled treatment manipulation to determine whether the outcome is systematically related to the treatment.

**Logic model** (also referred to as a theory of action) means a framework that identifies key project components of the proposed project (i.e., the active “ingredients” that are hypothesized to be critical to achieving the relevant outcomes) and describes the theoretical and operational relationships among the key project components and relevant outcomes. Note: In developing logic models, applicants may want to use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory’s Logic Model Application (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/products/resource/100677). **Minority-serving institution** means an institution that is eligible to receive assistance under sections 316 through 320 of part A of title III, under part B of title III, or under title V of the HEA. **Performance measure** means any quantitative indicator, statistic, or metric used to gauge program or project performance.

**Prior learning assessment** means the process by which an individual’s learning (that may have been acquired through on-the-job experiences, corporate training, military training or experience, volunteer work, or self-guided study) is assessed and evaluated for purposes of granting college credit, certification, or advanced standing toward further education or training. **Project component** means an activity, strategy, intervention, process, product, practice, or policy included in a project. Evidence may pertain to an individual project component or to a combination of project components (e.g., training teachers on instructional practices for English learners and follow-on coaching for these teachers).

**Promising evidence** means that there is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project component in improving a relevant outcome, based on a relevant finding from one of the following:

(i) A practice guide prepared by What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) reporting a “strong evidence base” or “moderate evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation; (ii) An intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “positive effect” or “potentially positive effect” on a relevant outcome with no reporting of a “negative effect” or “potentially negative effect” on a relevant outcome; or (iii) A single study assessed by the WWC reporting a “strong evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation.

Note: In developing logic models, applicants may want to use resources such as the Pacific Education Laboratory’s Logic Model Application (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/products/resource/100677). **Minority-serving institution** means an institution that is eligible to receive assistance under sections 316 through 320 of part A of title III, under part B of title III, or under title V of the HEA. **Performance measure** means any quantitative indicator, statistic, or metric used to gauge program or project performance.

**Prior learning assessment** means the process by which an individual’s learning (that may have been acquired through on-the-job experiences, corporate training, military training or experience, volunteer work, or self-guided study) is assessed and evaluated for purposes of granting college credit, certification, or advanced standing toward further education or training. **Project component** means an activity, strategy, intervention, process, product, practice, or policy included in a project. Evidence may pertain to an individual project component or to a combination of project components (e.g., training teachers on instructional practices for English learners and follow-on coaching for these teachers). **Promising evidence** means that there is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project component in improving a relevant outcome, based on a relevant finding from one of the following:

(i) A practice guide prepared by What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) reporting a “strong evidence base” or “moderate evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation; (ii) An intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “positive effect” or “potentially positive effect” on a relevant outcome with no reporting of a “negative effect” or “potentially negative effect” on a relevant outcome; or (iii) A single study assessed by the WWC reporting a “strong evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation. **Promising evidence** means that there is evidence of the effectiveness of a key project component in improving a relevant outcome, based on a relevant finding from one of the following:

(i) A practice guide prepared by What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) reporting a “strong evidence base” or “moderate evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation; (ii) An intervention report prepared by the WWC reporting a “positive effect” or “potentially positive effect” on a relevant outcome with no reporting of a “negative effect” or “potentially negative effect” on a relevant outcome; or (iii) A single study assessed by the WWC reporting a “strong evidence base” for the corresponding practice guide recommendation.
designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias (e.g., a study using regression methods to account for differences between a treatment group and a comparison group); and
(B) Includes at least one statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect on a relevant outcome.

Quasi-experimental design study means a study using a design that attempts to approximate an experimental study by identifying a comparison group that is similar to the treatment group in important respects. This type of study, depending on design and implementation (e.g., establishment of baseline equivalence of the groups being compared), can meet WWC standards with reservations, but cannot meet WWC standards without reservations, as described in the WWC Handbooks.

Relevant outcome means the student outcome(s) or other outcome(s) the key project component is designed to improve, consistent with the specific goals of the program.

Stopped-out student means a student who began pursuing postsecondary education and left an IHE prior to earning a certificate or degree.

What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Handbooks (WWC Handbooks) means the standards and procedures set forth in the WWC Standards Handbook, Versions 4.0 or 4.1, and WWC Procedures Handbook, Versions 4.0 or 4.1, or in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Version 3.0 or Version 2.1 (all incorporated by reference, see § 77.2). Study findings eligible for review under WWC standards can meet WWC standards without reservations, meet WWC standards with reservations, or not meet WWC standards. WWC practice guides and intervention reports include findings from systematic reviews of evidence as described in the WWC Handbooks documentation.

Waiver of Proposed Rulemaking: Under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553), the Department generally offers interested parties the opportunity to comment on proposed priorities, definitions, requirements, and selection criteria. Section 437(d)(1) of GEPA, however, allows the Secretary to exempt from rulemaking requirements regulations governing the first grant competition under a new or substantially revised program authority. This is the first grant competition for this program and, therefore, qualifies for this exemption. To ensure timely grant awards, the Secretary has decided to forgo public comment on the priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria under section 437(d)(1) of GEPA.


Note: Projects will be awarded and must be operated in a manner consistent with the nondiscrimination requirements contained in the Federal civil rights laws.

Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations in 34 CFR parts 75, 77, 79, 82, 84, 86, 97, 98, and 99. (b) The Office of Management and Budget Guidelines to Agencies on Governmentwide Debarment and suspension (Nonprocurement) in 2 CFR part 180, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3485. (c) The Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards in 2 CFR part 200, as adopted and amended as regulations of the Department in 2 CFR part 3474.

II. Award Information

Type of Award: Discretionary grant.

Estimated Available Funds: $4,950,000.

Contingent upon the availability of funds and the quality of applications, we may make additional awards in subsequent years from the list of unfunded applications from this competition.

Estimated Range of Awards: $600,000 to $1,000,000 for 24 months.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: $600,000 for 24 months.

Estimated Number of Awards: 5–8.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project Period: Up to 24 months.

III. Eligibility Information

1. Eligible Applicants: IHEs that are designated as eligible to apply under the HEA title III and V programs. For institutions applying as a consortium, the lead applicant must be eligible to apply under the HEA title III and V programs.

Note: The notice announcing the FY 2022 process for designation of eligible institutions, and inviting applications for waiver of eligibility requirements, was published in the Federal Register on February 7, 2022 (87 FR 6855). Only institutions that the Department determines are eligible, or which are granted a waiver under the process described in the December 16, 2021, notice, and that meet the other eligibility requirements described in this notice, may apply for a grant under this program. To determine if your institution is eligible for this grant program please visit, https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/ides/eligibility.html.

2.a. Cost Sharing or Matching: This competition does not require cost sharing or matching.

b. Supplement-Not-Supplant: This competition involves supplement-not-supplant funding requirements. This program uses the waiver authority of section 437(d)(1) of GEPA to establish this as a supplement-not-supplant program. Grant funds must be used so that they supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the funds that would otherwise be available for the activities to be carried out under the grant and in no case supplant those funds.

c. Indirect Cost Rate Information: This program uses the waiver authority of section 437(d)(1) of GEPA to limit a grantee’s indirect cost reimbursement to 8 percent of a modified total direct cost base. For more information regarding indirect costs, or to obtain a negotiated indirect cost rate, please see www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/intro.html.

d. Administrative Cost Limitation: This program does not include any program-specific limitation on administrative expenses. All administrative expenses must be reasonable and necessary and conform to Cost Principles described in 2 CFR part 200 subpart E of the Uniform Guidance.

3. Subgrantees: A grantee under this competition may not award subgrants to entities to directly carry out project activities described in its application.

4. Evaluation: This program uses the waiver authority of section 437(d)(1) of GEPA to require a grantee to conduct an independent evaluation of the effectiveness of its project.

5. Other Requirement: This program uses the waiver authority of section 437(d)(1) of GEPA to require applicants to specify the IHE’s annual percentage of stop-out students for academic years 2017–2021. This information must be included in the program abstract.

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
December 27, 2021 (86 FR 73264) and available at www.federalregister.gov/d/2021-27979. Please note that these
Common Instructions supersede the
version published on February 13, 2019, and, in part, describe the transition from the
requirement to register in SAM.gov
a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number to the implementation of the Unique Entity Identifier (UEI).
More information on the phase-out of DUNS numbers is available at https://
www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ojcfdocs/unique-entity-identifier-transition-fact-sheet.pdf.

2. Intergovernmental Review: This
program 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
is in the application package for this
program.

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 40 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,
references, and captions as well as all
text in charts, tables, figures, and
graphs.
- Use a font that is either 12 point or
larger, and no smaller than 10 pitch
(characters per inch).
- 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 one-page abstract.
However, the recommended page limit
does apply to all of the application
narrative.

Note: The Budget Information-Non
Construction Programs Form (ED 524)
Sections A–C are not the same as the
narrative response to the Budget section
of the selection criteria.

V. Application Review Information

1. Selection Criteria: The following
selection criteria for this program are
from 34 CFR 75.210. The points
assigned to each criterion are indicated
in the parentheses next to the criterion.
An applicant may earn up to a total of
100 points based on the selection
criteria. All applications will be
evaluated based on the selection criteria
as follows:

(a) Need for Project. (Maximum of 15
points)
(1) The Secretary considers the need
for the proposed project.
(2) In determining the need for the
proposed project, the Secretary
considers the following factors:
(i) The magnitude or severity of the
problem to be addressed by the
proposed project. (Up to 10 points)
(ii) The extent to which the proposed
project will provide services or
otherwise address the needs of students
at risk of educational failure. (Up to 5
points)
(b) Significance. (Maximum of 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 likelihood that the proposed
project will result in system change or
improvement. (Up to 5 points)
(ii) The extent to which the proposed
project is likely to build local capacity
to provide, improve, or expand services
that address the needs of the target
population. (Up to 5 points)
(c) Quality of the Project Design.
(Maximum of 5 points)
(1) The Secretary considers the
quality of the design of the proposed
project.
(2) In determining the quality of the
design of the proposed project, the
Secretary considers the extent to which
the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be
achieved by the proposed project are
clearly specified and measurable. (Up to
5 points)
(d) Quality of Project Services.
(Maximum of 30 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. (Up to 10
points)
(3) In addition, the Secretary
considers the following factors:
(i) The extent to which the services to
be provided by the proposed project are
appropriate to the needs of the intended
recipients or beneficiaries of those
services. (Up to 10 points)
(ii) The likelihood that the services to
be provided by the proposed project
will lead to improvements in the skills
necessary to gain employment. (Up to
10 points)
(e) Quality of the Management Plan.
(Maximum 10 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
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. (Up to 10 points)
(f) Quality of the Project Evaluation.
(Maximum 30 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
evaluation are thorough, feasible, and
appropriate to the goals, objectives,
and outcomes of the proposed project. (Up
to 5 points)
(ii) 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. (Up to 5 points)
(iii) The extent to which the methods
of evaluation will, if well implemented,
produce evidence about the project’s
effectiveness that would meet the What
Works Clearinghouse standards with or
without reservations as described in the
What Works Clearinghouse Handbook
(as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(e)). (Up to 20
points)

2. Review and Selection Process: Potential
applicants are reminded 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).

A panel of non-Federal reviewers will review and score each application in accordance with the selection criteria. A rank order funding slate will be made from this review. Awards will be made in rank order according to the average score received from the peer review.

Before making awards, we will screen applications submitted in accordance with the requirements in this notice to determine whether applications have met eligibility and other requirements. This screening process may occur at various stages of the process; applicants that are determined to be ineligible will not receive a grant, regardless of peer reviewer scores or comments.

Tiebreaker: If there is more than one application with the same score and insufficient funds to fund all the applications with the same ranking, the application with the highest percentage of degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students who are Pell grant recipients will be funded.

3. 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, subpart D; has not fulfilled the conditions of a prior grant; or is otherwise not responsible.

4. 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 200.206a(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 Awardee 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.

5. 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);

(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. You may review the GAN also incorporates your approved grant/apply/appforms/www.ed.gov/reporting, please go to www.ed.gov/information to FAPIIS semiannually. The Secretary may also require more frequent performance reports 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: Under 34 CFR 75.110, the following five performance measures will be used in assessing the performance of the Postsecondary Success Program:

(a) Number and percentage of stopped-out students who reenrolled at the institution.

(b) Number and percentage of stopped-out students who were served by the grant and who reengaged and earned a certificate, an associate degree, or a bachelor’s degree.

(c) Number and percentage of currently enrolled students who were served by the grant and who were still
enrolled at the institution in the following academic year.

(d) Number and percentage of currently enrolled students who were served by the grant and who earned a certificate, an associate degree, or a bachelor’s degree.

These measures constitute the Department’s indicators of success for this program. Consequently, we advise an applicant for an award under this program to consider the operationization of the measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation for its proposed project.

If funded, you will be required to collect and report data in your project’s annual performance report (34 CFR 75.590).

VII. Other Information

Accessible Format: On request to the program contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT, individuals with disabilities can obtain this document and a copy of the application package in an accessible format. The Department will provide the requestor with an accessible format that may include Rich Text Format (RTF) or text format (txt), a thumb drive, an MP3 file, braille, large print, audiotape, compact disc, or other accessible format.

Electronic Access to This Document: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. You may access the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations at www.govinfo.gov. At this site you can 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.

Michelle Asha Cooper,
Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Postsecondary Education.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket No.: ED–2022–SCC–0104]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; Generic Clearance for Federal Student Aid Customer Satisfaction Surveys and Focus Groups Master Plan

AGENCY: Federal Student Aid (FSA), Department of Education (ED).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, ED is proposing an extension without change of a currently approved collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before October 11, 2022.

ADDRESSES: To access and review all the documents related to the information collection listed in this notice, please use http://www.regulations.gov by searching the Docket ID number ED–2022–SCC–0104. Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at http://www.regulations.gov by selecting the Docket ID number or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. If the regulations.gov site is not available to the public for any reason, ED will temporarily accept comments at ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Please include the docket ID number and the title of the information collection request when requesting documents or submitting comments. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the PRA Coordinator of the Strategic Collections and Clearance Governance and Strategy Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave. SW, LBJ, Room 6W208D, Washington, DC 20202–8240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact Beth Grebeldinger, (202) 377–4018.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public’s reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department’s information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

Title of Collection: Generic Clearance for Federal Student Aid Customer Satisfaction Surveys and Focus Groups Master Plan.

OMB Control Number: 1845–0045.

Type of Review: Extension without change of a currently approved collection.

Respondents/Affected Public: Individuals or Households.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 8,050,000.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 400,000.

Abstract: The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 established Federal Student Aid (FSA) as the first Performance-Based Organization (PBO). One purpose of the PBO is to improve service to student and other participants in the student financial assistance programs authorized under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, including making those programs more understandable to students and their parents. To do that, FSA has committed to ensuring that all people receive service that matches or exceeds the best service available in the private sector. The legislation’s requires establish an on-going need for FSA to be engaged in an interactive process of collecting information and using it to improve program services and processes. The use of customer surveys and focus groups allows FSA to gather that information from the affected parties in a timely manner so as to improve communications with our product users.