

batters, 56 per cent of the facial injuries were to the left side of the face (the side toward the pitcher); 28 per cent were to the right side of the face; in the remaining 16 per cent, the location of the injury on the face was unknown.

For the youngest children, ages five through seven years old, facial injuries represented a high proportion of all injuries (59 to 84 per cent). Facial injuries accounted for 50 per cent or more of all injuries for players younger than 10 years of age.

For five-year-olds, facial injuries were divided almost evenly between organized play (53 per cent) and unorganized play (47 per cent). Facial injuries in organized play predominated in all other age groups, consisting of 72 to 96 per cent of all injuries.

The Commission staff estimates that 2.1 to 3.5 million protective batting helmets are in use by players in all organized youth leagues during a single season. About 4 to 10 per cent of these helmets are likely to have face guards. The Commission staff also estimates that about 125,000 to 200,000 face guards were sold during the years 1994 and 1995.

The results of the 1995 survey of injuries to children associated with baseball and other information contained in the Final Report were not available when the Commission requested comments on the petition in 1994. Therefore, the Commission now solicits comments on the petition and those portions of the Final Report concerning facial injuries and face guards.

Additionally, the Commission solicits information on the following topics:

- The expected useful life of face guards;
- The number and types of any injuries associated with the use of face guards;
- The number of children who participated in organized and/or unorganized play, by age;
- Any information about the effectiveness of face guards to prevent or reduce injuries; and
- Information about annual sales of face guards for the past ten years, and projected sales for the next five years.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Sadye E. Dunn,

*Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.*

[FR Doc. 96-19882 Filed 8-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-P

## CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

### Revision of the National Senior Service Corps' Project Progress Report (A-1020)

**AGENCY:** Corporation for National and Community Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of 30-day OMB review of Project Progress Report.

**SUMMARY:** On June 4, the National Senior Service Corps (NSSC) announced a 60-day review and comment period during which project sponsors and the public were encouraged to submit comments suggesting revisions to the NSSC Project Progress Report (PPR) used by project sponsors (grantees) to report progress made toward work plan accomplishment, problems encountered, resources generated and budget variances from the grant awarded.

Comments were invited on (1) whether the existing PPR appropriately meets project oversight and operational management, planning and reporting needs of the Senior Corps programs; (2) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the PPR; (3) accuracy of agency estimates of reporting burden; and (4) ways to further reduce burden on respondents.

NSSC is requesting extension of the authorization to use the PPR in its current form with grants funded in 1997. However, revising and phasing in of a new form in conjunction with planned implementation of the impact programming initiative and redesign of the Project Grant Application is anticipated for grants funded in 1998.

**DATES:** The National Senior Service Corps and the Office of Management and Budget will consider written comments on the Project Progress Report and record keeping requirements which are received within 30 days from the date of publication.

Addressess to Send Comments to both:

Janice Forney Fisher, NSSC, Rm 9403A, Corp. for National Service, 1201 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20525

Deborah Bonds, Office of Info. & Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503

Estimated Annual reporting or Disclosure Burden: 18,400 hours.

Established projects (over 80 percent of NSSC grantees) report twice annually. First-year projects, new components, demonstrations, and projects experiencing problems or with substantial project revisions will

continue to report quarterly, as identified in the Notice of Grant Award (NGA).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Janice Forney Fisher (202) 606-5000 ext. 275.

This document will be made available in alternate format upon request. TDD (202) 606-5000 ext. 164.

Regulatory Authority: National Service Trust Act of 1993.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Thomas E. Endres,

*Deputy Director, National Senior Service Corps.*

[FR Doc. 96-19929 Filed 8-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050-28-M

### Proposed Changes to AmeriCorps State, National, and Tribes and Territories Application Guidelines for the Program Year 1997 Grant Cycle

**AGENCY:** Corporation for National and Community Service.

**ACTION:** Request for comment on proposed changes in policy and guidelines for AmeriCorps State, National, and Tribes and Territories applications.

**SUMMARY:** The Corporation for National and Community Service is proposing changes to and inviting comments on its application guidelines for AmeriCorps programs: AmeriCorps State and National programs; and AmeriCorps Tribes and Territories. The proposed changes were developed in response to recommendations from programs and experience over the last two years. The changes were also developed to reduce the federal cost of AmeriCorps programs to meet specific benchmarks over the next three years. A broad range of areas is covered by the proposed changes, including the following: the timeline for distribution of guidelines and submission of applications; new targets and caps on program costs per Member; revised priorities for service activities in the areas of education, public safety, the environment, and other human needs; and criteria for evaluating the quality of program applications. The Corporation invites all interested parties to submit written comments on the issues discussed in this notice. Comments received will be given careful consideration in the development of final Program Year 1997 policies and grant application guidelines.

**DATES:** Only written comments will be considered. Comments must be submitted no later than October 7, 1996. Faxes will not be accepted.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to Deborah Jospin, Acting General Counsel, Corporation for National Service, 1201 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20525.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Peter Heinaru, Deputy Director, AmeriCorps State/National, at (202) 606-5000, ext. 302 or (202) 565-2799 (T.D.D.). For visually impaired individuals, this information will be made available in alternative format upon request.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Applications**

The Corporation invites comments on its guidelines as set forth in the 1995 AmeriCorps State and National Direct Program Application Guidelines and the 1996 AmeriCorps Renewal Application Guidelines. Copies of these applications are available through the individual State Commissions and the Corporation for those who wish to review them and provide feed back to the Corporation. For copies of the guidelines, contact Rosa Harrison at (202) 606-5000, ext. 433.

**I. Specific Program Requirements and Guidelines**

**A. Renewals, Re-competition, and New Applications**—State Commissions will have the option to allow programs in their first or second year of operation with Corporation funds to renew their grants. AmeriCorps National and AmeriCorps Tribes and Territories grantees in their first or second year of operation with Corporation funds may also submit renewal applications to the Corporation. All Corporation-funded programs in their third year of operation, including those funded through the State Commissions, must re-compete with other new applicants as new programs. States will have latitude in the type of program outreach they choose to conduct. The National and Community Service Act of 1990, as amended (the Act), is due to be reauthorized next year. Changes could be made in appropriations or reauthorization language that affect 1997 applications. Potential applicants will be apprised of any changes.

**B. Continuing Grants**—Programs have suggested that they could more easily raise funds if they receive multi-year grants which indicate anticipated levels of support in the outyears. To accommodate the needs of our programs, the Corporation's initial grant award agreement with all newly-competed programs will include estimated levels of support for the second and third years and indicate that

the grant may continue for three years, if annual review determines that the program meets quality standards and if funds are available. The process of approving the second and third year awards will be similar to the current renewal process and will be conducted separately from any new competition. States will have the option of making continuing grants for up to three years. When the Act is reauthorized by Congress, all programs, regardless of a continuing grant award, must meet any new requirements established under the reauthorization.

**C. Planning Grants**—The Corporation will not support any planning grants. States, however, have the option to support small planning grants under their formula allotment.

**D. Summer Programs**—The Corporation encourages applicants to consider operating summer programs as an adjunct to their regular full-time or part-time schedule. The application guidelines will specify how those programs will meet part-time requirements.

**E. State Coordination with National Direct Applications**—One of the criteria for evaluating the State Commission in its application for Administrative funds will be the extent to which the Commission provides support for the National Direct operating sites in the State. The National Direct Application instructions will ask the Parent Organizations to describe how they worked with the State Commissions in selecting operating sites in the specific States. The National Directs will be evaluated on that process during the peer and staff reviews. They will also be encouraged, but not required, to include support letters from the State Commissions in their applications.

**F. Preferences**—"Preference" means that the Corporation, as authorized by the Act, has designated certain types of national service programs for priority consideration. During the staff selection process, a program that addresses the following issues may be given a preference over other programs that do not.

**1. Issue Area Specialization**—The four national issue areas established by law are education, public safety, environment, and other human needs. The Corporation will continue to encourage programs to develop issue area specialization instead of trying to meet all of the Corporation's issue areas. The Corporation recognizes that certain programs (e.g., volunteer generator models or programs operating in rural areas) may not be able to focus on single issues to the extent that others can. However, program experience to date

indicates that it is difficult to demonstrate impact on communities when programs try to meet many needs all at once.

**2. Localities**—The Corporation will give a preference to applicants who propose to sponsor AmeriCorps service activities in areas officially designated as Empowerment Zones or Enterprise Communities by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and/or the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Corporation will also give preference to areas affected by military downsizing.

**G. New Priority: Children and Youth, Especially Education**—The four national issue areas established by law remain the same: education, public safety, environment, and other human needs. In 1997, the new priority will be children and youth, especially in education. While this priority supersedes the 1994 and 1995 priorities, the focus on children and youth can fit within any of the four issue areas and need not be the sole focus of the program. A program will be considered to meet the priority if it plans to recruit and coordinate youth volunteers to assist in projects that may be in any of the four issue areas. The Corporation does expect to fund high quality programs that do not fall into the priority category.

**H. Capacity Building**—While the Corporation will continue to require that all AmeriCorps Members perform direct service, they may also engage in activities we call "capacity building"—such as developing community partnerships, coordinating activities of other Members, and creating new programs. Programs should not, however, focus AmeriCorps Members' service hours solely on capacity building activities.

**I. Leveraging Volunteers**—The Corporation encourages all programs to place a greater emphasis on involving other community members as volunteers to assist them in service activities. In keeping with the Corporation's new priority on children and youth, programs are especially encouraged to find ways to involve children and youth in service as volunteers. This does not mean, however, that a program's sole purpose must be to recruit and supervise volunteers.

**J. Program Focus and Service Ethic**—The Corporation believes that it is important for all programs to impart the service ethic to their Members. Accordingly, the Corporation will not fund any programs whose major purpose is job training rather than service.

K. *Living Allowance*—The Corporation encourages programs to offer living allowances that are not more than the average annual subsistence allowance provided to VISTAs. (For 1996, the figure was \$7,945 per year.)

L. *Corporation Cost Per Member*—The Corporation is committed to reducing its overall average cost per AmeriCorps Member over the coming three years. In order to do so, State Commissions, National Direct, and Tribes and Territories applicants must also reduce the amount of Corporation funds per Member they are requesting from the Corporation. The Corporation wants to give the States and National Direct applicants as much flexibility as possible to allow for different program models. Therefore, we have set an average per State and National Direct applicant of \$11,750. Individual programs within the State or operating sites under the National Direct applicant may propose costs per Member that are higher or lower than this figure as long as the average cost meets the target. In addition, no individual program or National Direct operating site may propose a Corporation share that exceeds \$14,500 per Member. The average cost per Member should decrease each year. While specific targets have not been set, the average proposed Corporation cost is anticipated to be \$11,300 for 1998–1999 and \$10,800 for 1999–2000.

## II. Timelines

The Corporation is recommending the following timeline for submission of applications from States:

A. Corporation application guidelines will be disseminated by December 1, 1996.

B. States review all their programs and decide which to put forward in the competitive pool and which to support with their formula funds. States submit the State narrative and competitive program applications to the Corporation by April 15, 1997.

C. The Corporation makes decisions on the State competitive programs and notifies States by June 20, 1997.

D. States have the option to make changes to their formula package based on the Corporation's decisions and submit their formula packages for approval to the Corporation by June 30, 1997.

The Corporation is recommending the following timeline for submission of applications from AmeriCorps National applicants:

A. Application guidelines will be available by December 1, 1996.

B. AmeriCorps National applications are submitted to the Corporation by March 15, 1997.

The Corporation is recommending the following timeline for submission of applications from AmeriCorps Tribes and Territories applicants:

A. Application guidelines will be available by December 1, 1996.

B. AmeriCorps Tribes and Territories applications are submitted to the Corporation by March 28, 1997.

## III. Application Evaluation and Selection for New Programs

The Corporation is looking for high-quality programs that are innovative, have the potential to be replicated in other areas, and can be sustained with State and local support when Corporation support ends. Applications will be reviewed by outside experts and then by Corporation staff.

The review by outside experts (peer review) serves as the first stage in the AmeriCorps State, National, and Tribes and Territories review and selection processes for new applications. The peer review is a basic evaluation of a program's quality, which is determined based on the following criteria:

1. Impact and Program Design—65%
  - a. Getting Things Done (25%)
  - b. Strengthening Communities (10%)
  - c. Developing Members (10%)
  - d. Evaluation and Continuous Improvement (20%)
2. Other Quality Indicators—35%
  - a. Organizational Capacity (20%)
  - b. Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability (15%)

Evaluation and Continuous Improvement has been given greater weight as a selection criteria to emphasize its importance as a demonstration of impact and a way to ensure program quality. The role of the State Commission and Parent Organization (in National Direct) is important in monitoring quality. To that end, the Corporation is considering setting guidelines related to how difficult a program is to monitor. Programs that are inherently difficult to monitor would be at a disadvantage unless they can persuasively demonstrate that they have developed ways to overcome that problem. Examples of programs that may be inherently difficult to monitor include:

- Individual placements that are spread out geographically;
  - Programs attempting to address many issue areas at once; and
  - Programs with vague objectives.
- Some programs have found innovative ways to maintain high quality despite the difficulties. Examples include:

- Aggressive recruiting leading to greater selectivity of Members;
- Enrolling more experienced, more mature Members;
- Strong orientation, training, and other regular means of on-going communication;
- Narrowing the range of tasks performed so as to make long-distance monitoring easier; and
- Strong host sites.

Corporation staff will also analyze the quality of the proposal and review the proposal taking into consideration the preferences and priorities described previously, as well as the following:

1. Geographic diversity—The Corporation will ensure that the programs funded are geographically diverse and include projects in urban and rural areas.
2. Diversity—The Corporation seeks a broadly-diverse participant pool of AmeriCorps Members that includes a representation of young adults; a proportionate ratio of individuals who have not attended college and those with college-education experience; approximately equal numbers of men and women; individuals with physical and cognitive disabilities; individuals of all races and ethnicities; and diverse economic backgrounds. The Corporation anticipates funding a range of program types with various approaches to addressing community needs and that will yield the desired participant pool.

## IV. Application Evaluation and Selection for Renewal Programs

Renewal applications are not required to be evaluated by peer reviewers. Program staff and consultants will evaluate renewal applications using quarterly reports, site visit reports, the renewal applications, the State Commission narrative and information from the Management Information System (MIS) system (MIS information could include retention rates and diversity of AmeriCorps Members, impact data, etc.). Evaluation of renewal applications will be based on progress to date (50%) and year two/three plans (50%).

## V. State-Funded Program Review Processes

A. *Commission Role and Responsibilities*.—As in 1996, each State Commission will be responsible for conducting a complete review of its program applications and preparing recommendations to the Corporation for programs to fund from its formula allotment and under the competitive pool. It is up to each State Commission to design its review processes and decide how to use the State

Commissioners—as long as all conflict of interest requirements are followed and the process meets Corporation standards as described in the State administrative application guidelines. Commissioners can participate in the review and recommendation processes and as the decision-makers after staff have prepared their recommendations.

**B. *Renewal Applications.***—States have the option to renew programs that have completed only one or two years of operation under funding from the Corporation. Those that have received three years of funding from the Corporation must apply as new programs. The process for evaluating the program's progress and plans for the upcoming year has not change from that followed in 1996 and described above in section IV.

**C. *New Applications.***—Each state must develop a process that uses groups of experts to evaluate the comparable quality of all the applications received. The experts can either be outsiders to the Commission or members of the staff and board or a combination of these individuals. Each state must use the minimum criteria issued by the Corporation to evaluate the quality of the applications as described in Section III, but may add other criteria determined by the State.

Once comparable quality has been established, the results of that review are analyzed by the commission and recommendations submitted to the commission board for decisions. During this process, the commission may bring into the selection process additional factors that the state Commission Board and staff have approved and previously published in the state's application guidelines. Examples of such factors are:

- Geographic diversity
- Program model diversity
- Member diversity
- Preferences and priorities
- Diversity among priorities and issue areas

**D. *Corporation Review of Competitive Applications.***—As mandated by the Act, the Corporation is responsible for making decisions concerning competitive programs. Therefore, it must conduct a complete quality review of the AmeriCorps State Competitive program applications submitted by the states. The Corporation will convene panels of outside experts to evaluate the quality of these applications. Staff will analyze the panel results, then make recommendations for funding, taking into consideration other preferences and priorities published in the application guidelines or mandated by statute. The Corporation will consider factors such as:

- Capacity of the state commission to monitor and oversee programs
- Geographic diversity across the country
- Program model diversity
- Member diversity
- Diversity among priorities and issue areas

The capacity of State Commissions will be evaluated according to the criteria published in the Guidelines for State Administrative Fund Applications.

#### VI. AmeriCorps National and AmeriCorps Tribes and Territories Review Process

The National Direct applications will come directly to the Corporation and the Corporation will conduct both a peer review (using outside experts to

determine comparable quality using criteria listed above) and a staff analysis and recommendation process identical to the process describe above for the States.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

Deborah Jospin,

*Acting General Counsel, Corporation for National and Community Service.*

[FR Doc. 96-19874 Filed 8-5-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050-28-P-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

[Transmittal No. 96-59]

#### 36(b) Notification

**AGENCY:** Defense Security Assistance Agency, Department of Defense.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Defense is publishing the unclassified text of a section 36(b) arms sales notification. This is published to fulfill the requirements of section 155 of Public Law 104-164 dated 21 July 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. A. Urban, DSAA/COMPT/FPD, (703) 604-6575.

The following is a copy of the letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Transmittal 96-59, with attached transmittal and policy justification pages.

Dated: July 31, 1996.

L.M. Bynum,

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M