operational expenses such as equipment, overhead, and support staff.

As reflected in item 12 below, the burden hours attributable to the collection by the universe of respondents is estimated to be 3,500 hours. It is estimated that the cost to plans to complete the collection will range from $20 to $25 per hour. Therefore, the estimated aggregate cost to respondents is approximately $70,000 to $87,500 in the first year, and $49,000 to $61,250 in succeeding years.

12. Provide estimates of the burden of the collection of information including both recordkeeping and reporting requirements. The statement should:

• Provide number of respondents, frequency of response, annual burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not make special surveys to obtain information on which to base burden estimates. Consultation with a sample of potential respondents is desirable. If the burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size or complexity, show the range of estimated burden and explain the reasons for the variance.

An estimated 10,000 delinquent employee benefit plan administrators are expected to file under the Program in the first year, and an estimated 7,000 filings are expected in subsequent years. Participation in the Program is voluntary, and filing under the Program would not be necessary more often than annually, and most participants would probably participate one time only. The annual burden per filing is estimated to be approximately 21 minutes, based on a pilot pretest of not more than nine people from both Federal employment and the private sector. The burden on respondents is not expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size or complexity.

• If the request for approval is for more than one form, provide separate burden estimates for each form for which approval is sought and aggregate the burdens on the Paperwork Reduction Act Submission form. If only one form is submitted, you need not duplicate the information entered on the Paperwork Reduction Act Submission form.

Not applicable.

13. For amendments to existing collections, explain reasons for changes in burden, including the need for any increase.

Not applicable.

14. For collections of information whose results are planned to be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

The Form 5500 Series collection, and by extension, this DFVC Program collection, are not a collection of information for statistical use. Once collected, however, the information is available to the Department and the public, and it is used for purposes other than enforcement and disclosure.

[FR Doc. 95–7742 Filed 3–29–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–22–M

Evaluation of the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Labor.

ACTION: Expedited review under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

SUMMARY: The Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, in carrying out its responsibilities under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, 5 CFR 1320 (53 FR 16618, May 10, 1988)), is submitting a study to examine the range of practices currently being used in the Summer Youth Employment and Training Administration (SYETP) to deliver educational services. It will assess the quality of training and evaluate contributions to the educational deficiencies of participants.

DATES: The Employment and Training Administration has requested an expedited review of this submission under the Paperwork Reduction Act; this Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review has been requested to be completed by April 14, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Comments and questions regarding the Evaluation of the SYETP should be directed to Mr. Kenneth A. Mills, Departmental Clearance Officer, Office of Information Resource Management Policy, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Room N–1301, Washington, DC 20210, (202) 219–5095.

Comments should also be sent to OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: OMB Desk Officer for ETA, NEOB Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395–7316.

Any member of the public who wants to comment on the information collection request which has been submitted to OMB should advise Mr. Mills of this intent at the earliest possible date.

Average Burden Hours/Minutes Per Response: 113 minutes

Frequency of Response: One time

Number of Respondents: 9,115

Total Annual Burden Hours: 17,167 hours

Total Annual Responses: 9,115

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Non-for-profit institutions; State, Local or Tribal Government

Respondents Obligation to Reply: Voluntary

Signed at Washington, DC, this 24th day of March 1995.

Kenneth A. Mills,

Departmental Clearance Officer.

I. Introduction

This document represents a request for approval of the data collection protocols to be used in the *Evaluation of the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program*, being conducted by Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) and Brandeis University's Center for Human Resources, under contract to the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The study uses qualitative (case study) and quantitative data collection and analysis methods to examine training practices being used in the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYETP), Title II–B of JTPA. The Introduction to this document provides a brief overview of the study and its purposes, and it discusses the data collection procedures and analysis plans. Subsequent sections respond to the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) specific instructions for justification and address issues related to the collection of information using statistical methods.

Background

Funded under Title II–B of the Job Training Partnership Act, SYETP has its origins in a thirty-year federal commitment to create summer jobs for disadvantaged youth. However, developments in recent years have as well affirmed an emphasis on providing educational services. For example, amendments to Title II–B enacted in 1986 enumerated the enhancement of basic educational skills and encouragement of school completion as explicit goals of the program. Further, SDAs were required to assess the reading and mathematics skill levels of SYETP participants and to provide remedial and basic education services where appropriate. Subsequent DOL issuances reinforced the educational emphasis of the Summer Youth program and encouraged efforts to link work and learning.

Purposes of the Study

The changing focus of SYETP raises questions about the proper role of the program's educational component and the feasibility of diagnosing and meaningfully redressing the basic skills deficiencies of large numbers of youth within the compressed time frame of the summer program. Thus, the objectives of the evaluation are to examine the range of practices currently being used to deliver educational services, explain variation in service designs, assess the quality of training being provided, and evaluate its ability to meet the needs of participants and make significant contributions to their educational deficiencies. Ultimately the study will enable DOL to gauge the adequacy of services currently being provided, identify areas of weakness and, conversely, service designs that appear especially efficacious, and provide leadership and technical assistance to improve training practices.

Conceptual Framework

Guiding the data collection and analysis efforts are a client-level model of high quality educational services and a system-level model of factors that determine training practices. The client-level model of training quality, presented in Exhibit I, depicts how clients flow through the SYETP program, the quality indicators for each type of service that the program provides, and the intended consequences of high-quality services for youth. Steps identified in this model are:

• Recruitment, assessment, and service planning practices. Quality indicators associated with this phase of service delivery include whether programs have a clear strategy for which youth should be targeted and effective procedures to recruit them, whether they conduct a comprehensive assessment of youths' skills and interests, and whether the assessment results are used to develop an individualized service strategy tailored to the skills and interests of each participant.

• Providing effective educational services, either through classroom or work-based instruction. Quality indicators for both training content and instructional methods are identified in the exhibit, including whether the training objectives are well-specified, whether they promote the educational skills needed in the workplace, whether training is provided in a functional context, whether participants' progress is documented, whether there are ample opportunities to learn, and whether the style of instruction promotes active learning that is adaptive to the needs of individual participants.

• Providing linkages with continuing educational activities, to sustain and build on learning gains.

In contrast to the client-level model, the system-level model, shown in Exhibit II, is intended as a casual (rather than a temporal) model and identifies factors that influence service delivery, including those that facilitate or impede the development of high-quality educational services. The far right box of this model contains the elements of high-quality SYETP educational services that were described in the client-level model. The exhibit schematically identifies aspects of Federal and State policies and the local environment that can affect an SDA's program design, and it shows how design decisions and educational provider characteristics, in turn, affect the quality of educational services provided. Specifically, it identifies:

• Federal, State, and local influences on programs' designs, including federal Title II–B policies, other Federal initiatives and policies, State JTPA and educational policies, and characteristics of local youth and of the local area.

• SDA design factors, including program goals, target groups, and service delivery arrangements.

• Attributes of the service providers who deliver educational services to participants, including the types of institutions, their history, objectives, and funding sources.

Questions for the Evaluation

The preceding conceptual frameworks give rise to a number of specific questions to be investigated in the project. These include issues relating to the design of services at the SDA level, the design of services at the level of the educational provider, and the quality and impact of educational services.

• The design of SYETP at the SDA level.

—What general objectives have SDAs established for their Title II–B programs? What specific objectives (in terms of skills to be conveyed, benchmarks to be achieved) have been established for the Title II–B educational components?

—Do programs identify priority client groups? If so, what target groups have they established? Who makes those decisions, and how and why were they made?

—What types of providers are used by the SDA for educational instruction? How were these providers selected and why were they selected?

—How are other services, including supportive services and stipends, used in the summer youth program? How are these services used to support educational and other goals for the program?

—What linkages has the SDA established between its Titles II–B and II–C programs?

—What ''front-end'' and ''back-end'' linkages has the SDA established with public schools? Who instigated these linkages and who maintains them? Are the linkages formal or informal?

—What role have federal and state policies and local influences played in the SDA's design decisions? How have these policies been perceived and implemented?

• The design of SYETP at the provider level

—What types of organizations provide educational instruction? What objectives have been established for their programs?

—Why did the provider decide to participate in the summer youth program and how was it selected?

—What objectives has the provider established for its educational program? What skills (e.g., basic skills, SCANS skills) is it endeavoring to teach? Is it attempting to link learning and work?

—What service design is it using to meet these objectives? Who developed the design and why? Was the design established explicitly for the summer youth educational program?

—How are educational services sequenced? How was the curriculum developed?

—How did it recruit and train its staff?

—How have the SDA's objectives for the summer youth educational program been communicated to the service provider and how have they been acted upon?

—What role has the SDA played in designing the provider's educational services, including its content and method of delivery? How does the SDA monitor the services that are being provided and how does it suggest changes?

—How does the provider's design reflect other elements of the local context, including the needs of the community, the characteristics of youth in the area, and the characteristics of the school district?

• The quality and impact of educational services

—What procedures are used by SDAs to recruit youth for the summer program? Do recruitment methods correspond to their targeting goals?

—How is the participant's initial assessment conducted and how is

subsequent progress assessed and documented?

—How are individual service plans developed? Are the service plans truly individualized to the needs, skills, and interests of each participant? Does the youth play an active role in formulating the service plan? Are the resulting goals clear and ambitious (without being unrealistic)?

—Does the educational instruction that is being provided have well-specified objectives? Do the objectives indicate skills to be acquired (rather than knowledge to be learned)?

—Does the instruction emphasize skills needed in the workplace? Are the skills taught in a functional context?

—Does the instruction promote active learning and training for transfer?

—Is instruction adaptive and provided by capable and caring adults who view their role as a ''facilitator''?

—Have linkages been established to provide feedback to schools or other programs serving the youth?

—What implications do service provider characteristics and design decisions have for the quality of educational services?

—What implications does participation in SYETP, in general, have for stabilizing or improving academic or other achievements, promoting school completion, and increasing the motivation to learn?

—What implications do alternative designs for delivering educational services (e.g., provider characteristics, the locus on instruction) have for these same youth outcomes?

Study Design

To address the research questions identified above, this study uses two evaluation components—a process study and a client-level study of outcomes.

The Process Study

The process study uses a series of ''nested'' qualitative case studies to examine the design and operation of SYETP services at 30 SDAs nationwide and approximately 3 educational providers at each of these SDAs (up to 90 providers total). The data collection activities will consist of a review of plans for the Summer Program as well as 4-day on-site visits to each selected SDA and its associated providers, during which time researchers will meet with SDA and provider administrators and staff, classroom instructors, and worksite supervisors, and they will observe educational instruction. While on site, researchers also will conduct 1 focus group with approximately 5–6 youth participants at each educational provider visited and review case files for 2 youths at each provider. Follow-up telephone discussions also will be conducted with youths selected for the case file reviews and with their parents and school counselors to learn of retrospective impressions of and satisfaction with the SYETP experience and perceived impacts on subsequent achievements and behaviors in school.

Selecting the Sample

As part of the study, samples are being drawn of 30 SDAs and up to 3 educational activities in each SDA (or 90 total). To ensure that the resulting sample will be nationally representative, the 30 SDAs are being selected using stratified random sampling. In selecting the sample, all SDAs nationwide are being assigned to one of 4 strata. The first 3 of these groups are defined according to the percent of their Summer Youth participants who receive educational instruction, with the first stratum consisting of those SDAs with percents between 1% and 41%, the second between 42% and 73%, and the third between 73% and 100%. These cutoffs were chosen so that approximately equal numbers of youths receiving educational instruction are in each of the three strata. The 4th stratum consists of those SDAs for whom information on the number of participants in educational instruction is not available.

Within each strata, SDAs were sampled with the odds of selection proportionate to the number of participants being served,[1] so that the resulting sample of SDAs is approximately self-weighting.

Because this study is intended to describe and compare the effectiveness of a wide variety of approaches to building the educational skills of SYETP participants, educational providers are selected within each of the 30 SDAs using purposive selection methods. Specifically, all educational providers used by these SDAs are to be categorized according to their:

- Content emphasis (e.g., basic skills only; SCANS foundation skills and/or competencies; or other academic subjects, such as science, history, or art).
- Locus of educational instruction (e.g., classroom-based, work-based, or both).
- Type of provider (e.g., SDA; secondary school, other educational institution such as community college or technical college, or other).
- Targeted participants (e.g., 14–15 year olds, 16–18 year olds, other target groups).

Providers are being selected to ensure the diversity of the sample (both within the SDA and across all 30 SDAs) with respect to these dimensions.

Data Collection

The field protocols, or topic guides, developed for this process study are designed to guide the data collection activities. These protocols will permit site visitors to tailor discussions and observations on a standardized set of issues to the particular context of each case study SDA and sampled educational activity. The following topic guides have been developed and are submitted for OMB's review:

- SDA Guide #1 includes the topics to be covered in discussions with SDA policy, planning, and administrative staff, including those relating to the goals, design, and management of the Summer Program.
- SDA Guide #2 includes the discussion topics to be used with SDA staff responsible for direct operation or oversight of client recruitment, assessment, service planning, and case management services for Title II–B participants.
- Program Guide #1 includes the topics to be covered in discussions with administrators of the selected educational activity, staff that participated in the planning and development of the detailed curriculum, and supervisors responsible for hiring, training, and overseeing instructors/work site supervisors involved in educational activities.
- Program Guide #2 includes the topics to be used in discussions about the classroom-based learning approach with classroom instructors or other staff whose primary responsibility is to support learning in a classroom or individual study setting (e.g., tutors, educational resource staff).
- Program Guide #3 includes the topics to be used in discussions with work project coordinators and worksite supervisors who are involved in work-based learning. This guide includes topics for projects using the 100% work-based learning approach as well as topics for staff involved in work activities that are closely coordinated with classroom-based learning.
- Program Guide #4 is a guide for structured observations of educational activities.
- Program Guide #5 is a guide for structured review of curriculum materials.
- Client Guide #1 describes the topics to be addressed in focus group

[1] Dollar allocations for the Summer Youth program were used in the fourth stratum, because the number of participants receiving educational instruction is not available for these SDAs.

discussions with approximately 5 youth participating in each selected educational activity.

- Client Guide #2 will be used to extract relevant information for the case history sample from the participants' written case files at the SDA or provider.
- Client Follow-Up Guide describes the topics to be discussed with selected youth participants (i.e., those selected for the case file review) several months after their Summer Program's participation has ended.
- Parent/Guardian Guide will guide the issues to be addressed with these youths' parent or guardian during the follow-up period.
- Counselor Guide describes the topics to be addressed with the youths' secondary school counselors during the school year following the youths' summer participation.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the case studies will begin with a *within-site* explanatory analysis. This task will consist of bringing to bear the data that has been collected to arrive at a comprehensive picture of the practices in each of the SDAs and service providers that were selected for the study and how they have contributed to the needs of the participants. A particular objective will be to uncover especially innovative practices, with an eye to understanding how they were implemented and what makes them work so well.

The next step will consist of *cross-site* comparisons to synthesize the findings. This analysis will clarify further the unique procedures that programs adopt to deliver high quality training in a variety of environments and arrive at an understanding of commonalities and differences between programs and how these are related to effective practices.

Client-Level Study of Outcomes

In addition to collecting and analyzing information from the case studies about program practices, this study also will gather and analyze quantitative information for a sample of approximately 1,800 youths who participate in the Summer Program in 1994 and an additional 4,000 youths who participate in the 1995. By compiling and analyzing information for a sample of participants on the services that were received and the outcomes that were obtained, the study will draw inferences regarding the relative efficacy of various service design and delivery methods.

Selecting Participants for the Study

A key element of the overall research design is to tie the results from the case study observations of classroom instruction and appraisals of training quality to the analysis of participants' outcomes. In this way, inferences can be drawn regarding the relationship between the training practices observed in the field to the consequences of those practices for the youth who receive them. For this reason, participants selected for the client-level study of outcomes will be those whose SYETP instruction was delivered by the service providers whose practices were observed on site. Specifically, participants will be selected in the following ways:

- Preliminary information received from the 30 SDAs has led us to determine that approximately 15 of them require pre-tests and post-tests of basic skills for all participants receiving academic instruction. All youth served in the summer of 1994 by the 3 selected providers in these SDAs will be included in the study. This will yield an expected sample of approximately 1,800 respondents.
- The service providers visited for the case studies in the 30 SDAs included in the study will each be asked to administer a common pre-test/post-test in the summer of 1995, as well as a brief instrument measuring self-esteem. All youth served by these providers will be included in the study. This will yield approximately an additional 3,600 respondents.
- A randomly chosen sample of 400 youths not receiving educational instruction also will be included in the study as a comparison group.

Data Collection

The plan for the client-level study of outcomes is based on the analysis of information for the sampled participants drawn from a variety of sources and that, to a large degree, already exists. Thus, the compilation of these data for analysis purposes entails data gathering at least as much as new data collection. Specific data sources to be used are these:

- The SDA's MIS. Although the specific types of information doubtless will vary from one SDA to the next, most SDAs' MIS will include: participant's demographic and background characteristics (e.g., race, school status, gender), barriers to employment (e.g., whether the youth is a limited-English speaker or has a disability), and summary information about services received. SDAs will be requested to transmit these data to the contractor electronically (e.g., on data diskette).
- SDA's Client Files. Those SDAs able to provide pre-test/post-test scores for youth served in the summer of 1994 will forward those scores to the contractor for data entry. All participating SDAs will forward the hard-copy pre-test/post-tests and self-esteem surveys of sampled participants served in 1995 to the contractor for scoring and keypunching.
- School Records. An important objective of the study is to learn how participants (at least those who are students) fare in their subsequent schooling. Outcomes of interest include measures of academic achievement (e.g., grade-point-average), but also evidence of behavioral problems (e.g., as evidenced by absenteeism, suspensions/expulsions). Thus, school record information will be abstracted for sampled summer 1995 youths who sign and have their parents/guardians sign a consent form.

Exhibit 3 summarizes the variables to be measured from these sources.

Data Analysis

A preliminary analysis will be conducted using SDA MIS data and pre-test/post-test scores for the 1,800 youth who participated in the summer program in 1994, selected as described above. A more comprehensive analysis for a larger sample will be conducted when school record data are collected, for youths who participated in the summer of 1995. Additional outcomes to be examined with these data include: self-esteem, school attendance, grade completion, grade-point average, and absenteeism. Two types of analysis will be conducted:

- Descriptive analyses, which will paint a picture of the characteristics of persons receiving educational instruction in the sampled programs, the types of services received, and the outcomes obtained.
- Explanatory analyses that will examine the efficacy of alternative service designs and delivery mechanisms for subsequent outcomes.

Reporting

The project's major deliverables include:

- An Interim Report. This report will detail the results of the process analysis, describing results from the case studies regarding how services are designed and delivered. It also will include the preliminary results from the study of outcomes based on the data collected for youth who participated in the summer of 1994.

• A Technical Assistance Guide (TAG). The TAG will be a practitioner's guide describing effective practices in the delivery of educational services, focusing especially on how educational instruction can be delivered in a functional, work-related context.

• A Final Report. This report will represent a summation of the study's findings and recommendations. As such, it will include the content of the Interim Report, combined with the comprehensive results of the study of outcomes.

II. Supporting Statement

A. Justification

1. Circumstances Making the Data Collection Necessary

The Department of Labor (DOL) is considering ways of improving the educational component of the JTPA Title II-B Summer Youth Employment and Training program (SYETP), in keeping with Secretary Reich's ''First Jobs/New Jobs/Better Jobs'' initiative. Its objectives for SYETP are to improve the program's effectiveness in assisting young people acquire strong workplace foundation skills (including basic skills, thinking skills, and interpersonal skills) and gain an appreciation of the inextricable connection between learning and success in the workplace. As part of its effort to foster program improvements, DOL needs to obtain a thorough understanding of educational services currently being provided to summer youth participants—including how participants are assessed, the curriculum being used, and how the educational and work components of SYETP are integrated—and identify particularly efficacious practices.

As part of its response to Executive Order No. 12862 requiring all Federal agencies to develop customer service standards, DOL also needs to know participants' views about the services they received in SYETP, including their service needs and how well the program responded to those needs. This information is critical to implementing changes that can improve program responsiveness.

2. Use of Information and Consequences if Not Collected

The information being collected in this study will be used to address these objectives:

1. Describe variation in the design of SYETP educational services across service delivery areas (SDAs) and their service providers, with respect to general goals and objectives they have established for the program, their targeting decisions, assessment procedures, specific skills being taught, the locus of instruction, linkages between work and learning, and linkages with public schools and year-around Title II–C JTPA services.

2. Describe variation in the quality of educational services, including whether assessments are comprehensive, whether service strategies are individualized to the needs and interests of participants, whether the participants are actively involved in formulating the service plan, whether educational instruction has well-specified objectives relating to skills to be acquired, whether skills are taught in a functional context and emphasize skills needed in the workplace, and whether instruction is adaptive.

3. Identify factors that explain variation in how educational services are being designed and delivered, such as federal policies, opportunities for technical assistance and training, state-level partnerships between JTPA and the school system, and other local influences.

4. Document consequences of participation in SYETP educational services, especially high quality services, for participants' skill levels, subsequent academic achievement, and school attendance and performance.

5. Document participants' satisfaction with the program, including their assessment of the helpfulness of the services they received.

If this information is not collected, DOL will not have the information it needs to evaluate how educational services are being delivered or their effectiveness, and thus it will not have the necessary foundation for implementing program improvements.

3. Considerations to Reduce Burden

The data collection activities have been designed to minimize the burden on respondents in four major ways. First, pre-existing information will be utilized wherever possible to minimize the need for new data collection. These pre-existing sources will include SDAs' plans for their Title II–B programs, RFPs and contracts written by SDAs to secure the services of the direct providers of educational instruction, data collected as part of last summer's study of SYETP, test scores, information from school records, and existing MIS data compiled by SDAs about their participants' characteristics, services, and outcomes. These data sources can be forwarded to the contractor with minimal burden to SDA or school or provider staff and to program participants. Where data abstraction requires hand-coding (e.g., from school records), abstractors will be compensated by the contractor.

Second, where feasible (and at least with respect to the MIS data), information will be transferred to the contractor electronically (i.e., via modem or data diskette), greatly facilitating the data transmission process.

Third, only data of direct relevance to the goals of the study will be collected.

Fourth, much time on site will be devoted to the unobtrusive observation of educational instruction and the review of written documents and participants' case files, and this too should be minimally burdensome to SDA and service provider staff or participants.

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

A study conducted of SYETP during the summer of 1993 included 50 on-site visits and a mail survey of all SDAs (1205–0327, expired 12/93). However, this data collection focused on general operational issues, did not entail on-site observations of classroom instruction to characterize its quality and did not attempt to study youth at any point beyond their period of participation.

Additional information available about SYETP comes from the SDAS's plans for their summer's activities. However, these documents provide no information about how or how well the plans are implemented, nor do they allow an assessment of the instruction's quality or effectiveness, nor do they speak to the participants' satisfaction with the services they received.

Finally, states are required to submit annual reports providing aggregate counts of participants served and their characteristics (1205–0200, expires 7/97). However, these simple summary reports are useful for little more than identifying the numbers of persons of different ages and education levels who were served.

5. Why Similar Information Cannot be Used

Information from the sources described above will be used to the fullest extent possible in the study being planned. Indeed, these data provide a strong foundation to support the study by providing essential background and other information. However, DOL has concluded, on the basis of the effort to identify duplication, that these pre-existing sources are not adequate to characterize the quality or education services, support an analysis of the factors associated with high quality services, describe the consequences of participation in SYETP for subsequent achievements, or document participants' satisfaction with the program. Nor are they adequate,

consequently, to support DOL's efforts to foster program improvements.

6. Burden on Small Businesses

Some activities associated with this study will involve the collection of data from the administrators or staff of organizations providing educational instruction as part of SYETP, and some of these entities may be small businesses. However, as described under #3, ''Considerations to Reduce Burden,'' only information of direct relevance to the study's objectives will be collected while on site. Secondly, much on-site data collection to be conducted at service providers will involve the unobtrusive observation of classroom instruction and the review of client case files, and it will thus entail minimal burden on the providers' administrators or staff. Finally, as part of the agreement allowing them to deliver services under JTPA, providers acknowledge DOL's right to evaluate and/or monitor their activities and services.

7. Consequences of Less Frequent Data Collection

The data collection activities associated with this study will be conducted one time only.

8. Collection Inconsistent With 5 CFR 1320.6

Data collection will be consistent with 5 CFR 1320.6.

9. Efforts to Consult With Persons Outside the Agency

Responsibility for devising and carrying out the data collection rests with DOL's contractor, Social Policy Research Associates (SPR), and its subcontractor, Brandeis University's Center for Human Resources. Key personnel associated with these institutions are nationally known experts in evaluation research and have in-depth knowledge of employment and training programs in general and Summer Youth programs in particular.

Additionally, the study team has enlisted the aid of additional experts, who are serving as consultants on the project. Their advice was solicited regarding the usefulness of the data elements to be collected, the feasibility of the data collection plan, and the clarity of instructions. These consultants are:

Ms. Nancy Bross, Public Policy Support, 1377 McLendon Ave., N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30307, (404) 581–9895

Ms. Lee Bruno, Consultant, 3106 Old Largo Road, Upper Marlborough, Maryland 20772, (301) 627–1415

Ms. Janice Hendrix, North Central Indiana PIC, 36 West Fifth St., Suite 102–B, Peru, Indiana 46970, (317) 473–5571

Mr. Gill Ritt, Career Resource Associates, 2932 Sumac Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30360, (404) 698–8427

Mr. Kip Stottlemyer, Consultant, 1408 Milestone Drive, Collierville, Tennessee 38017, (901) 854–1438

In addition, all the protocols guiding the conversations with key respondents have been pre-tested on not more than 9 respondents, and modifications to the protocols were made on this basis where it seemed appropriate.

10. Assurances of Confidentiality

The information to be collected will be held strictly confidential and will be used for research purposes only. To ensure confidentiality, DOL will require that the study team take the following measures:

- Access to the data will be limited to the contractor's project team members only.
- Reports to DOL will focus on describing and analyzing the range of service designs and training practices that were observed and will not associate a design or process with any specific SDA or service provider, except by way of providing an example of exemplary practices, and then only with the SDA's approval.
- Reports to DOL that contain individual vignettes based on the experiences of participants will not contain individual names or any other identifying information.
- The contractor's project team members will be trained in the confidentiality requirements and cautioned to use the data for research purposes only.

11. Justification of Questions of a Sensitive Nature

Two sources of data are potentially sensitive. First, pre-tests and post-tests will be administered to youth included in the study. Second, school record information will be abstracted for those youth in the sample who participated in the summer program of 1995 and who return to school in the fall. These data elements are imperative to examine learning gains for those who receive educational services and to examine if SYETP participation is associated with improved school performance.

However, for the most part these data elements do not represent new data collection activities. JTPA currently requires that all summer youth be administered a test of basic skills to determine their need for basic skills remediation, and many SDAs also administer post-tests to document learning gains.

Similarly, information about school performance will be abstracted from existing student files. Moreover, youths and their parents/guardians will be asked to sign a consent form before the abstraction will be conducted. This form will outline the objectives of the study and ask the youth and his/her parent to allow access to student records for purposes of the evaluation. It will be explained that participation in the study is completely voluntary and that a refusal to participate will not jeopardize the youth's receiving SYETP services.

12. Cost to the Federal Government and to Respondents

The total estimate cost to the federal government for the collection and analysis of these data is $849,543. Because the study will be conducted over 3 years,[2] the average per annum cost is approximately $283,000. This amount includes the costs of designing the field protocols, performing the on-site visits and telephone follow-up, recording observations from the site visits, collecting the client-level data for the study of outcomes, analyzing the data, and preparing two reports on the results (i.e., an Interim Report and a Final Report) and a Technical Assistance Guide (to disseminate information on effective practices). The method used to derive this figure entailed a quantification of hours of effort involved by each study team member and included expenses for materials and services (e.g., photocopying expenses and expenses involved in binding the report).

The costs to respondents result only from the time spent answering the questions. Estimates of the time to respond are presented below.

13. Estimate of Burden

Below is the estimate of the respondent burden. Time estimates are based on the pretest of the instruments (for the topic guides to be used in the process study) or from the use of the instruments in previous studies (for the pre-test/post-test and self-esteem scales). It is anticipated that these will be conducted within the next year and

[2] A separate PWR package will be submitted for any burden associated with follow-up work done after the first year.

the burden hours represent the first year burden claimed. If follow-up activities extend beyond one year, an Inventory Correction Worksheet will be submitted.

Instruments	Number of respondents	Minutes per respondent	Total hours
SDA Guides for Discussions With:			
1. Policy, Planning, and Administrator Staff	60	60	60
2. Recruitment, Service Planning, and Case Management Staff	60	45	45
Program Guides for Discussions With:			
1. Program Administrators	90	90	135
2. Classroom Instructors	85	20	28
3. Work Project Coodinators	10	20	3
Client Guides for:			
1. Focus Group with Participants	450	15	112
2. Participants, at Follow-up	120	15	30
Guide for Discussions with Parents	120	5	10
Guide for Discussions with Regular School Counselors	120	15	30
Pre-test and Post-test of Participant's Basic Skills (Workplace Literacy Test)	4,000	240	16,000
Self-Esteem Instrument (Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale)	4,000	10	667

Additional data collection to be used in the project represents the abstraction or review of existing information. There are no respondents for these guides and thus they entail minimal burden on SDA or provider personnel or program participants beyond copying documents or data files and shipping them to the contractor. Where hand-extraction of information is required (e.g., from student records , abstractors (SDA or service provider personnel) will be compensated.

14. Reason for Change in Burden

This is a new collection as reported in ETA's ICB (Information Collection Budget). The first year's burden of 17,120 hours is being submitted now. An Inventory Correction Worksheet will be submitted for any follow—up activities in the out years.

15. Plans for Statistical Analysis

Data to be collected for this project for the process study generally will not be analyzed using qualitative research methods, findings will be detailed in a narrative, and their implications for improving program quality will be detailed.

Data collected for the study of outcomes will be analyzed using statistical methods to address these research issues:

- What are the characteristics of persons receiving educational services in the Summer Youth program? Are educational services targeted to those who have a greater need for remediation?
- What types of educational services were provided? Specifically, in what subject areas (e.g., math, reading, other academic subjects, SCANS skills) was instruction provided? With what intensity?
- How does the intensity and nature of the training received relate to outcomes, including learning gains, school attendance rates, grades in school, rates of absenteeism, and suspensions and expulsions? How do the outcomes for youth who received educational instruction compare to those in the compoarison group?
- Data for this component of the project will be compiled in various phases:
- Phase I: Collect MIS and pre-test/post-test data for sample members who participated in the summer program in 1994. Collection of this information will occur during the winter of 1995.
- Phase II: Collect MIS, pre-test/post-test, and self-esteem data for sample members who participated in the summer program in 1995. Collection of this information will occur during the winter of 1996.
- Phase III: Collect school record information. These data will be collected during the summer of 1996, after the conclusions of the 1995–96 school year, so that school outcomes measured for those who participated in the 1995 summer program will reflect a full school year.

Methods to be used in analyzing these data will include univariate and multivariate statistics. Specifically, univariate distributions will be calculated to describe the characteristics of participants, their services, and their outcomes. Cross-tabulations will be used to examine the relationship between variables. Multivariate analyses, primarily regression analysis, will be used to examine how various participant characteristics and measures of services received relate to outcomes.

The project's major deliverables include:

- An Interim Report. This report will detail the results of the process analysis, describing results from the case studies regarding how services are designed and delivered. It also will include the preliminary results from the study of outcomes based on the data collected for youth who participated in the summer of 1994. This report will be completed at the end of the Summer of 1995.
- A Technical Assistance Guide (TAG). The TAG will be a practitioner's guide describing effective practices in the delivery of educational services, focusing especially on how educational instruction can be delivered in a functional, work-related context.

The TAG will be prepared in the Spring of 1996.

- A Final Report. This report will represent a summation of the study's findings and recommendations. As such, it will include the content of the Interim Report, combined with the comprehensive results of the study of outcomes. This report will be prepared in the Spring of 1997.

B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods

This process study utilizes qualitative case study data collection and analysis methods. In terms of identifying appropriate respondents in each local site and analyzing case study data, qualitative rather than statistical methods will be used. Discussions of estimation procedures and degree of accuracy (power analysis) in generalizing sample findings to the universe of all potential respondents are not applicable to the process study, because findings will not be expressed in quantitative terms.

The study of outcomes will employ statistical methods, however. These methods are described in the rest of this section.

1. Potential Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods

Approximately 625,000 youths can be expected to participate in the Title II–B program during each of the summers of 1994 and 1995, if current levels of funding are maintained. Of these, about 40%, or 250,000, will be receiving educational services. These youth are served by the nation's approximately 640 service delivery areas (SDAs).

The youths to be included in the study will be served by approximately 90 service providers used for educational instruction in 30 SDAs that were selected for examination in the process study. To ensure that the sample of SDAs is nationally representative, the 30 SDAs are selected using stratified random sampling. In selecting the sample, all SDAs nationwide are assigned to one of 4 strata. The first 3 of these groups are defined according to the percent of their Summer Youth participants that receive educational instruction, with the first stratum consisting of those SDAs with percents between 1 % and 41%, the second between 42% and 73%, and the third between 74% and 100%. These cutoffs were chosen so that approximately equal numbers of youths receiving educational instruction are in each of these three strata. The 4th stratum consists of those SDAs for whom information of the number of participants in educational instruction is not available.

Approximately an equal number of SDAs were drawn from each stratum and, within each stratum, SDAs were sampled with the odds of selection proportionate to the number of participants being served,[3] so that the resulting sample would be approximately self-weighting. The number of SDAs in each stratum and the number selected for the study are shown below.

Percent of the SDA's youths receiving educational instruction	Total number of SDAs	Number of SDAs in the sample
Low: 1% to 41%	273	8
Med. 42% to 73%	132	8
High: 74% to 100%	101	8
Information missing	117	7

[3] Dollar allocations for the Summer Youth program were used in the fourth stratum, because the number of participants receiving educational instruction is not available for these USAs.

Because this study is intended to describe and compare the effectiveness of a wide variety of approaches to building the educational skills of SYETP participants, educational providers are selected within each of the 30 SDAs using purposive selection methods. Specifically, all educational providers used by these SDAs are to be categorized according to their:

- Content emphasis (e.g., basic skills only; SCANS foundation skills and/or competencies; or other academic subjects, such as science, history, or art).
- Locus of educational instruction (e.g., classroom-based, work-based, or both).
- Type of provider (e.g., SDA; secondary school, other educational institution such as community college or technical college, or other).
- Targeted participants (e.g., 14–15 year olds, 16–18 year olds, other target groups).

Providers are being selected to ensure the diversity of the sample (both within the SDA and across all 30 SDAs) with respect to these dimensions.

Because most providers serve fairly few youths, all youths served by the selected providers during the summer of 1995 will generally be selected for the study of outcomes. However, for large providers (those serving more than approximately 70 participants), youths will be selected who attended classes served by the instructors who were observed by the site visitors, the 400 youth to be selected for the comparison group will be selected randomly, approximately 15 from each SDA.

Following the above procedures, an approximately equal number of youths will be selected from each SDA. MIS data for each of these youth, should be available without exception, as will pre-test and post-test scores and the measure of self-esteem. Similarly, because SDAs typically require access to school records as part of the assessment process, we anticipate that high percentages of sampled youths and their parents/guardians will sign the consent forms allowing the researchers' access to this information. At least an 80% rate of cooperation is anticipated.

2. Procedures for the Collection of Information

Sample Selection. As discussed above, the sample has been drawn in a two-stage process. First, a sample of SDAs and their providers was chosen, and next participants served by these providers are selected, along with a randomly chosen sample of participants for the comparison group.

Degree of Accuracy. To meet DOL's objectives for the survey, the sample size must be sufficient to allow reliable estimation of relatively small differences in outcomes across various service strategies. Let us suppose that the outcome variable is a percentage (e.g., the percentage of participants who complete their next grade level), that the average of the outcome is 50%, that we can explain 25% of the outcome's variation with all predictor variables combined, and that 10% of the variance in the educational components can be explained by other control variables. Under these circumstances, the sample size to be used for this study would be able to detect an approximately 3 percentage points difference in outcomes across a dichotomous measure of service (e.g., instruction is provided in a functional context or not). Note that these are generally fairly conservative assumptions. For example, sample size requirements would be less stringent if the average of the outcome were either higher or lower than 50%.

Estimation Procedures. As described in Section A, Item 15, several estimation techniques will be used. First, means and univariate distributions will be calculated to describe the sample. Second, t-tests of means (for outcomes measured on a continuous scale) and chi-square tests (for categorical variables) will be calculated to determine whether outcomes vary significantly for participants with different characteristics (e.g., age) or who received different services. Third, multivariate analysis methods will be used, with various measures of outcomes as the dependent variable. Independent variables will include participant characteristics (e.g., age, gender, pre-test scores) and measures of the types of services received.

Ordinary least squares (OLS) will be used as the estimation technique for most of these multivariate models, because of its desirable properties. However, OLS is inefficient when the dependent variable is categorical (e.g., whether the next school grade was completed). In these cases, logit analysis will be used.

3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates

Most data to be used for the client study represent pre-existing records collected by SDAs and schools. For this reason, response rates should be quite high for all components of the data collection. Potentially, however, some participants or their parents may deny the researchers access to school records. To minimize this possibility, SDAs and their service providers will be contacted far in advance of the start of the 1995 summer program, and their cooperation will be enlisted. Thus, when youth are

first enrolled in the program they can be told immediately that they are being asked to participate in the study and the study's importance can be explained carefully to them.

4. Tests of Procedures

The data collection for the client-level study involves no new survey or other instruments. Therefore, no test of procedures is deemed necessary.

5. Contractor and Individuals Consulted

The Department of Labor has contracted with Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to design, conduct, and analyze the study of outcomes. Key personnel at SPR at Dr. Ronald D'Amico, Dr. Katherine Dickinson, and Mr. Richard West. They may be contacted at: Social Policy Research Associates, 200 Middlefield Road Suite 100, Menlo Park, CA 94025. Their phone is (415) 617–8625.

[FR Doc. 95–7743 Filed 3–29–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–22–M

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice (95–026)]

NASA Advisory Council (NAC), Minority Business Resource Advisory, Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announces a forthcoming meeting of the NASA Advisory Council, Minority Business Resource Advisory Committee.

DATES: April 26, 1995, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: NASA, Langley Research Center, Building 1219, Room 225, Hampton, Virginia 23681–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ralph C. Thomas, III, Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Room 9K70, 300 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20546, (202) 358–2088.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting will be open to the public up to the seating capacity of the room. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

—Call to Order
—Reading of Minutes
—Overview of Langley Research Center SDB Program
—Report on Action Items from Last Meeting
—Subcommittee Reports
—Update on NASA SDB Program
—Committee Goals for 1995
—Public Comment
—Adjournment

It is imperative that the meeting be held on this date to accommodate the scheduling priorities of the key participants.

Dated: March 24, 1995.

Timothy M. Sullivan,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–7747 Filed 3–29–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 40–40–8027–MLA–3, ASLBP No. 94–700–04–MLA–3]

Sequoyah Fuels Corp., (Source Material License No. SUB–1010); Notice of Hearing

March 24, 1995.

Notice is hereby given that the Presiding Officer in this proceeding has determined that there should be made available an Opportunity for Intervention in the on-going proceeding which involves a license amendment application of Sequoyah Fuels Corporation for its facility at Gore, Oklahoma. During the course of the course of this proceeding, the Licensee has proposed modifications to the original license amendment application dated May 6, 1994. Because the modifications are significant, a new opportunity for intervention is warranted. The new amendment application seeks to change the existing structure of the Licensee's management team at its facility.

This proceeding is being conducted under the Commission's Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials and Operator Licensing Proceedings, set forth in 10 CFR part 2, subpart L. Further details appear in the Statement of Considerations, Informal Hearing Procedures for Materials Licensing Adjudications, 54 Fed. Reg. 8269 (February 28, 1989). Documents relating to this proceeding are available for public inspection and copying at the Commission's Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L St., N.W., Washington, D.C.

Sequoyah Fuels Corporation, Native Americans for a Clean Environment INACE) and The Cherokee Nation (Nation) are parties to this proceeding. In accordance with 10 CFR 2.1205(i)(4), any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may, within 30 days of publication of this Notice, file a petition for leave to intervene. Such petition must identify (1) the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, (2) how that interest may be affected by he results of the proceeding, with particular reference to the factors set out in 10 CFR 2.1205(g), (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the licensing activity which must be germane to the subject matter of the proceeding, and (4) the circumstances establishing that the petition is timely and that the petitioner has the requisite standing to intervene in the hearing.

Each petition must be submitted to the Secretary of the Commission, ATTN: Chief, Docketing and Service Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. Copies should be served upon the Presiding Officer; the Special Assistant; the Assistant General Counsel for Hearings and Enforcement; and the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555. Copies should also be served on the Licensee, through its attorney Maurice Axelrad, Esq., Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; Native Americans for a Clean Environment, through its attorney Diane Curran, Esq., c/o IEER, 6935 Laurel Avenue, Suite 204, Takoma Park, MD 20912; and The Cherokee Nation, through its attorney James Wilcoxen, Esq., Wilcoxen & Wilcoxen, P.O. box 357, Muskogee, OK 74402–0357. Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.1205(j)(2), any party may file an answer to a petition to intervene within 10 days of service of such petition.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.1211(a), any member of the public who is not a party to this proceeding may make a written statement in order to express his or her views of the issues involved in this license renewal proceeding. These statements are not evidence and do not become part of the decisional record under 10 CFR 2.1251(c). Written statements should be submitted to the Secretary of the Commission, ATTN: Chief, Docketing and Service Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555.

Rockville, Maryland, March 24, 1995.

James P. Gleason,

Presiding Officer, Administrative Judge.

[FR Doc. 95–7801 Filed 3–29–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review

Summary: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44