

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

#### Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* New collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:*

Application for Transmission of Citizenship Through a Grandparent.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form N-600/N-643 Supplement A. Office of Examinations, Adjudications, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or households. This form is required so that information on a grandparent's residence may be collected to establish a child's eligibility for naturalization.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 4,000 responses at 30 minutes (.50) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 2,000 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 3, 1996.

Robert B. Briggs,  
Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 96-31202 Filed 12-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

## NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

### Notice of Cancellation of Previously Announced Open Meeting

**TIME AND DATE:** 5:00 p.m., Friday, December 6, 1996.

**PLACE:** Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3428.

The National Credit Union Administration Board has canceled its previously announced open meeting scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on Friday, December 6, 1996.

The previously announced items were:

1. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Community Charter.

2. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Group Community Charter.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Becky Baker, Secretary of the Board, Telephone 703-518-6304.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96-31349 Filed 12-5-96; 2:31 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535-01-M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Proposed Data Collection: Comment Request

Title of Proposed Collection: National Science Board and National Science Foundation Staff Task Force on Merit Review Discussion Report

#### Merit Review at NSF

For every proposal that receives funding from the National Science Foundation, two do not. To determine which get funded and which do not, NSF relies on a rigorous, competitive process of merit review based on peer evaluation.

Merit review is the cornerstone of the NSF's work. Virtually all of the 30,000 new proposals submitted to NSF annually undergo external merit review. NSF receives over 170,000 reviews each year to help evaluate these proposals. Through the use of merit review, NSF seeks to maintain the high standards of excellence and accountability for which it is known around the world.

#### Why Consider Changing NSF's Merit Review Criteria?

NSF's current criteria were adopted by the National Science Board in 1981. They remain an effective means for determining the optimal allocation of NSF's valuable resources. From time to time, it is nevertheless prudent to examine the review criteria—in the spirit of improving an already outstanding system.

Furthermore, there are also a number of important factors that deserve consideration in any assessment of NSF's review criteria:

—First, NSF's 1994 strategic plan established long-range goals and core strategies for the Foundation.  
—Second, several studies suggest that there is room for improvement in

NSF's highly successful system of merit review. For example, surveys of reviewers and program officers have revealed that the current criteria are not always well understood and often ignored.

—Third, seminal events over the past fifteen years—notably the end of the Cold War and the rise of global economic competition—have altered the context for public support of research and education. It is now more important than ever to highlight and document the returns to society on NSF's investments in research and education.

It is worth noting in addition that maintaining flexibility in the application of criteria may be as important as the criteria themselves. Most reviewers will only address those elements that they feel they are capable of judging. Similarly, NSF also does not pre-assign weights to the criteria; given the variation across NSF's many different programs, any such "one size fits all" approach would be counterproductive. Overall, excellence will continue to be the hallmark of all NSF-sponsored activities.

Furthermore, NSF will continue to employ special criteria when proposals are expected to respond to the specific objectives of certain programs and activities. Examples include teacher training projects and the development of large research facilities.

#### Opportunity for Input and Comments

At the November 1996 meeting of the National Science Board, the Board's Merit Review Task Force recommended that the current merit review criteria be simplified and that the language be harmonized with the NSF strategic plan. The current criteria and the Task Force's recommended criteria are shown below.

With the release of the Task Force's discussion report, NSF and the Board aim to stimulate discussion within and outside the Foundation. NSF is seeking input and comments from all interested persons—especially current and potential grant applicants and reviewers, as well as informed observers and followers of science and engineering research and education. To encourage the broadest possible comment and discussion, we have posted a summary of this document along with a comparison of current and proposed merit review criteria on our homepage (<http://www.nsf.gov>). The summary includes "hotlinks" to the full NSB Task Force report, NSF strategic plan, and other related documents. Most important, there is a response box for you to provide the agency with your feedback electronically.

We hope you will provide us with your thoughts on the proposed criteria. Comments on any aspect of the merit review criteria are welcome. In particular, we are interested in your views on questions such as:

- Are the proposed criteria clear? Would they be easier to use than the current criteria?
- Would the proposed criteria elicit useful input and comments from reviewers?
- Would the proposed criteria improve NSF's ability to foster linkages (e.g. across disciplines and between academe and industry)?
- Would the proposed criteria contribute to the integration of research and education?
- Are there further improvements to the criteria that you would recommend?

Thank you for taking the time to share your ideas with us. Please feel free to raise any specific questions or concerns you may have regarding the proposed criteria or the merit review process generally. (A set of FAQs (frequently asked questions) is available for your reference.)

Also, please let us know via the response forms if you would like to receive information describing what changes to the criteria (if any) are eventually adopted by the Board. A final decision is expected by the summer of 1997.

Send comments via the feedback mechanisms provided on the NSF homepage at (<http://www.nsf.gov>). Comments also can be mailed to Office of Policy Support, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 1205, Arlington, VA 22230.

All comments should be received by January 31, 1997.

Dated: December 4, 1996.

George T. Mazuzan,  
*Acting Director, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs.*

#### Current and Proposed Merit Review Criteria

##### *Current Criteria (adopted in 1981)*

1. Research performer competence—This criterion relates to the capability of the investigators, the technical soundness of the proposed approach, and the adequacy of the institutional resources available.

2. Intrinsic merit of the research—This criterion is used to assess the likelihood that the research will lead to new discoveries or fundamental advances within its field of science or engineering, or have substantial impact on progress in that field or in other science and engineering fields.

3. Utility or relevance of the research—This criterion is used to assess the likelihood that the research can contribute to the achievement of a goal that is extrinsic or in addition to that of the research itself, and thereby serves as the basis for new or improved technology or assist in the solution of societal problems.

4. Effect on the infrastructure of science and engineering—This criterion relates to the potential of the proposed research to contribute to better understanding or improvement of the equality, distribution, or effectiveness of the nation's scientific and engineering research, education, and manpower base.

##### *Proposed Criteria*

1. What is the intellectual merit and quality of the proposed activity?

The following are suggested questions to consider in assessing how well the proposal meets the criterion: What is the likelihood that the project will significantly advance the knowledge base within and/or across different fields? Does the proposed activity suggest and explore new lines of inquiry? To what degree does the proposer's documented expertise and record of achievement increase the probability of success? Is the project conceptually well designed? Is the plan for organizing and managing the project credible and well conceived? And, is there sufficient access to resources?

2. What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?

The following are suggested questions to consider in assessing how well the proposal meets the criterion: How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while concurrently promoting teaching, training, and learning? Will it create/enhance facilities, instrumentation, information bases, networks, partnerships, and/or other infrastructure? How well does the activity broaden the diversity of participants? Does the activity enhance scientific and technological literacy? And, what is the potential impact on meeting societal needs?

[NSB/MR-96-15]

National Science Board and National Science Foundation Staff

##### *Task Force on Merit Review; Discussion Report*

November 20, 1996.

National Science Board

DR. F. ALBERT COTTON, Distinguished Professor, Department of Chemistry, Texas A&M University

- \* DR. CHARLES E. HESS, Director of International Programs, University of California—Davis
- \* DR. JOHN E. HOPCROFT, Joseph Silbert Dean of Engineering, Cornell University
- \* DR. SHIRLEY M. MALCOM, Head, Directorate for Education and Human Resources Programs, American Association for the Advancement of Science
- \* DR. JAMES L. POWELL, President & Director, Los Angeles Museum of Natural History
- DR. FRANK H.T. RHODES, President Emeritus, Cornell University
- DR. IAN M. ROSS, President-Emeritus, AT&T Bell Laboratories
- \* DR. RICHARD N. ZARE (Chairman), Professor, Department of Chemistry, Stanford University
- DR. SANFORD D. GREENBERT, Chairman & CEO of TEI Industries, Inc.
- DR. EVE L. MENGER, Director, Characterization Sciences & Services, Corning Incorporated
- DR. CLAUDIA I. MITCHELL-KERNAN, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs and Dean, Graduate Division, University of California
- \* DR. DIANA S. NATALICIO (Vice Chairman), President, The University of Texas at El Paso
- DR. ROBERT M. SOLOW, Institute Professor Emeritus, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- DR. WARREN M. WASHINGTON, Senior Scientists and Head, Climate Change Research Section, National Center for Atmospheric Research
- DR. JOHN A. WHITE, JR., Regents' Professor and Dean of Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology
- \*\* DR. JOHN A. ARMSTRONG, IBM Vice President for Science & Technology (Retired)
- \*\* DR. MARK K. GAILLARD, Professor of Physics, University of California, Berkeley
- \*\* DR. M.R.C. GREENWOOD, Chancellor, University of California, Santa Cruz
- \*\* DR. STANLEY V. JASKOLSKI, Vice President, Eaton Corporation
- \*\* DR. EAMON M. KELLY, President, Tulane University
- \*\* DR. JANE LUBCHENCO, Wayne and Gladys Valley Professor of Marine Biology and Distinguished Professor of Zoology, Oregon State University
- \*\* DR. VERA RUBIN, Staff Member (Astronomy), Department of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington
- \*\* DR. BOB H. SUZUKI, President, California State Polytechnic University
- \*\* DR. RICHARD TALIA, Professor, Department of Computational & Applied Mathematics, Rice University
- \* DR. NEAL F. LANE (Chairman, Executive Committee), Director, NSF
- DR. MARTA CEHELISKY, Executive Officer

Members of the Task Force

##### *National Science Board Members:*

Dr. Warren M. Washington, Chair, Dr. Shirley M. Malcom.

\* Member, Executive Committee

\*\* NSB nominee pending U.S. Senate confirmation

*National Science Foundation Staff*

Dr. Mary E. Clutter, Dr. John B. Hunt,  
Mr. Paul J. Herer, Executive Secretary.

I. Context of the Report

The merit review process is the modus operandi for the evaluation of proposals at the National Science Foundation (NSF). While almost all of the 30,000 proposals submitted to NSF annually undergo external merit review, NSF has the resources to fund only about one third of them. NSF receives over 170,000 reviews each year to help evaluate these proposals. Through the use of merit review, NSF seeks to maintain its high standards of excellence and accountability for which it is known around the world.

In 1981, the National Science Board (NSB) adopted four generic criteria for the selection of research projects, titled: (1) research performance competence, (2) intrinsic merit of the research, (3) utility or relevance of the research, and (4) effect of the research on the infrastructure of science and engineering. (A detailed description of these criteria may be found in Appendix A.) Because education programs had been eliminated from the budget at that time, the 1981 criteria addressed on research proposals. In the 1980s, they were adapted to suit education programs as those were reestablished.

Also, since 1981, the portfolio of projects solicited and supported by NSF has expanded to include, among other things, broad education initiative and focused center-based activities. Further, the NSF Strategic Plan (NSF95-24) embraces new long-range goals and core strategies, and the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) emphasizes the importance of linking NSF's goals and strategies to the results of its portfolio of investments in science and engineering. In light of these changes, an assessment of the appropriateness of the NSB criteria seems warranted.

At its May 1995 meeting, the NSB stated that re-examining the criteria in light of the new Strategic Plan was a matter of high Board interest. Subsequently, an NSF staff task group on review criteria, formed by the Deputy Director, found that the criteria are unevenly applied by reviewers and NSF staff in the proposal review and selection process, and reported that, "The NSB criteria are in need of clarification and should be rewritten." The task group also recommended that options be explored for more effective application of the criteria.

In May 1996, the Board established the NSB-NSF Staff Task Force on Merit Review, and charged it with examining the Board's generic review criteria and

making recommendations on retaining or changing them, along with providing guidance on their use. This paper presents the Task Force's deliberations and findings. It is not intended as a final set of recommendations but as a means of stimulating discussion within and outside of the Foundation.

II. Task Force Membership and Activities

The Task Force has the following membership:

*National Science Board Members*

- Dr. Warren M. Washington, Chair, Senior Scientist, Climate and Global Dynamics Division, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado
- Dr. Shirley M. Malcom, Head, Directorate for Education and Human Resources Programs, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C.

*National Science Foundation Staff*

- Dr. Mary E. Clutter, Assistant Director for Biological Sciences
- Dr. John B. Hunt,\* Acting Assistant Director for Mathematical and Physical Sciences

*Executive Secretary*

Mr. Paul J. Herer, Senior Advisor for Planning and Technology Evaluation, Directorate for Engineering

The Task Force met several times for extensive discussions, and reviewed a number of previous studies, surveys and reports, including the following:

- (1) Criteria for the Selection of Research Projects by the National Science Foundation, adopted by the National Science Board at its 228th meeting on August 20-21, 1981.
- (2) Federally Funded Research: Decisions for a Decade. U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment (1991).
- (3) The Track Record of NSF Proposal Review: Reviewers Rate the Process. NSF Program Evaluation Staff and Science Resources International (SRI) (1991).
- (4) Peer Review. Reforms Needed to Ensure Fairness in Federal Agency Grant Selection, United States General Accounting Office (1994).
- (5) Report of the NIH Committee on Improving Peer Review (1996).
- (6) NSF Proposal Review Project Reports (1996, by internal teams):
  - Task Group on Review Criteria (P. Stephens, Chair)
  - Task Group on Review Variations (D. Schindel/D. Chubin)
  - Task Group on Calibration and Disaggregated Ratings (C. Eavey)

\* Replaced Dr. William Harris.

III. Current Criteria and Their Use

The four generic criteria established by the NSB in 1981 for the selection of projects are: (1) research performance competence, (2) intrinsic merit of the research, (3) utility or relevance of the research, and (4) effect of the research on the infrastructure of science and engineering. For reference, the full NSB guidance for these criteria are provided in Appendix I.

The table below summarizes the results of two surveys and highlights some of the problems with the current criteria from two different perspectives.

- A cross-section of reviewers in a 1991 NSF/SRI survey (first column) considered the first two NSB criteria (intrinsic merit and PI competence) to be considerably more important than the last two. Less than half of the respondents said they usually commented on all four criteria; as many as 20% said they ignored the NSB criteria altogether.
- A 1995 electronic survey of NSF program officers (P.O.) in 35 divisions on reviewer responsiveness (second column) revealed that program officers experience difficulty in obtaining useful input from reviewers with respect to criterion 3 (utility/relevance) and criterion 4 (infrastructure).

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE AND USEFULNESS OF CURRENT REVIEW CRITERIA

[In percent]

	1991 SRI survey of reviewers <sup>1</sup>	1995 survey of NSF P.O. <sup>2</sup>
(1) Competence	94	0
(2) Intrinsic Merit .....	98	2
(3) Utility/Relevance .....	56	31
(4) Infrastructure	26	46

<sup>1</sup> Percent of reviewers who said criterion was "extremely important".

<sup>2</sup> Percent of program officers expressing difficulty in obtaining useful input.

In addition to these surveys, the NSF Office of Policy Support (OPS) recently conducted an informal content analysis on a small sample of reviews of research project proposals to gain an empirical perspective of how reviewers use the four NSB criteria. By far the criterion most frequently used by reviewers was research performance competence. Almost every reviewer commented on some variation of competence. The intrinsic merit of the proposed research was addressed in about 80% of the reviews; utility/relevance in about 40%; and infrastructure in about a third of the reviews. For criterion 4, reviewers

referred to such potential "products" as trained researchers/graduate students, hardware, and information data bases. The goals and core strategies in NSF's strategic plan, such as the integration of education and research, were rarely mentioned in the reviews.

These studies imply that there are a number of problems with the current NSB generic criteria, including:

- Lack of clarity in wording encourages the use of "unwritten" criteria.
- Reviewers and Program Officers do not apply to the current criteria uniformly (e.g., criterion #3 and #4 are not well understood and often ignored).
- Criteria do not easily encompass non-research activities, e.g., education and human resources, large-scale facilities, and centers.
- Criteria do not track very well with NSF Strategic Plan.
- Considerable variation exists in use of criteria across NSF.

In February 1996, the NSF staff *Task Group on Review Criteria* (Chair, Pamela Stephens) reported that, "The NSB criteria are in need of clarification and should be rewritten", with consideration given to: (a) making the criteria clearer to evaluators; (b) emphasizing important attributes such as innovation, clarity of thought and soundness of approach; and (c) encouraging substantive comments on the quality of proposals. The Task Group further recommended that NSF explore more effective ways to apply the infrastructure criterion, and should continue the practice of allowing programs to employ additional specific criteria as needed.

The staff Task Group suggested a number of interrelated components that contribute to the evaluation of a proposal's overall merit, including: Intrinsic Merit, Significance, Innovative, Approach, Feasibility, and Effect on Infrastructure. This served as a starting point for the NSB-NSF Task Force.

#### IV. Revised Generic Merit Review Criteria

The Task Force recommends the *two generic criteria* (below) to replace the current four NSB criteria. Within each criterion is a set of contextual elements, defined by questions to assist the reviewer in understanding their intent. These elements are non-inclusive; i.e. it is recognized that, for some programs, other considerations not identified below may be important for the evaluation of proposals. Further, reviewers are requested to address only those elements that they consider relevant to the proposal at hand and that

they feel qualified to make judgments on.

#### #1 *What is the intellectual merit and quality of the proposed activity?*

The following are suggested questions to consider in assessing how well the proposal meets the criterion: What is the likelihood that the project will significantly advance the knowledge base within and/or across different fields? Does the proposed activity suggest and explore new lines of inquiry? To what degree does the proposer's documented expertise and record of achievement increase the probability of success? Is the project conceptually well designed? Is the plan for organizing and managing the project credible and well conceived? And, is there sufficient access to resources?

#### #2 *What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?*

The following are suggested questions to consider in assessing how well the proposal meets the criterion: How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while concurrently promoting teaching, training, and learning? Will it create/enhance facilities, instrumentation, information bases, networks, partnerships, and/or other infrastructure? How well does the activity broaden the diversity of participants? Does the activity enhance scientific and technological literacy? And, what is the potential impact on meeting societal needs?

The NSB-NSF Task Force believes that the proposed new criteria offer several advantages over the existing criteria, such as:

- NSF is increasingly asked to connect its investments to societal value, while preserving the ability of the merit review system to select excellence within a portfolio that is rich and diverse. Having two criteria, one for intellectual quality and the other for societal impact, should serve to reveal the situations where proposals have high quality but minimal potential impact (and vice-versa). Quality will continue to be the threshold criterion, but will come to be seen as not sufficient by itself for making an award.
- The two new criteria are more clearly related to the goals and strategies in the NSF Strategic Plan. For example, "NSF in a Changing World" states (page 31) that: "We rely on our proven system of merit review, which weighs each proposal's technical merit, creativity, educational impact, and its potential benefits to society."
- The criteria are simplified by reducing their number from four to two, and are defined for reviewers and

proposers by a set of suggested contextual elements. Reviewers are asked to describe the proposal's "strengths and weaknesses" with respect to each criterion using only those contextual elements that they consider relevant to the proposal at hand.

#### V. Application of the Proposed Generic Criteria

The Task Force was charged not only with examining the Board's generic review criteria but also recommending accompanying guidance on their use. There are a number of important "process" issues that help to frame this guidance.

Because of the great range and diversity of activities supported by NSF, it is evident that maintaining flexibility in the application of criteria is as important as the criteria themselves. Most reviewers will only address those elements that they feel they are capable of judging. Asking proposers and reviewers to address all of the contextual elements in each and every proposal, regardless of the nature of the proposed activity, is not only unrealistic but, in fact, may be counterproductive. Also, pre-assigning weights to the criteria will, if applied to all proposals, incorrectly appraise some of them.

It is important to take into account the relative roles of the external expert reviewers and the NSF program staff. Specifically, NSF proposals are evaluated by the Program Officer and other NSF staff with the help of the written reviews from expert peers. These external reviews are always advisory; the final funding decision rests with the NSF staff. Hence, while the external reviewer applies the review criteria to the individual proposal, the Program Officer must evaluate the proposal within the context of managing a balanced portfolio of projects that will achieve the program's objectives and contribute to NSF's overall mission. In particular, reviewer assessment of criterion #2 (potential impact and societal value) is intended to provide NSF with input from reviewers, but the ultimate responsibility for judging the potential impact of the investment of public funds must rest with NSF. Hence, the Task Force recommends that the NSF staff be provided flexibility and discretion in the application and weighting of criteria.

#### *The Use of Special Criteria*

NSF supports an extremely diverse set of activities ranging from individual investigator projects to teacher training to large research facilities. Many of these activities have special objectives

and require proposals that are responsive to them. Program solicitations and announcements are frequently used to solicit proposals from the community, and, in some cases, the NSB generic criteria are modified or augmented to make the review process responsive to the special objectives.

For example, the CISE Minority Institutions Infrastructure Program Announcement (NSF 96-15) lists nine additional factors that will be used to evaluate the proposals, including such factors as: (1) institutional cost-sharing, commitment, and related support to the projects, and (2) institutional track record in graduating minority scientists and engineers.

The EHR/CISE Networking Infrastructure for Education Program Solicitation (NSF 93-13) adds six additional criteria, including: "Sustainability: The Potential to leverage the ability of the education community to carry out full scale, self-sustaining and scaleable educational networking models."

In other cases, a set of criteria are provided in-lieu of the NSB generic criteria. For example, the Academic Research Infrastructure (ARI) Program (NSF 96-12) specifies the following criteria headings: Research and Research Training Merit; Infrastructure Need; Project Impacts; and Plans & Funding. Under the latter category, "the institutional management plan for maintenance and operation of the requested facility" is cited.

Revising the NSB generic criteria will lessen but not eliminate the need for special criteria. However, it is important that the additional or replacement criteria be consistent with the intent and spirit of the NSB generic criteria. Since each new program announcement or solicitation receives considerable NSF internal review before it is issued, it is appropriate that this be considered during the publication's clearance process.

#### *Options for Rating Proposals*

Whatever the criteria, reviewers and panelists must be encouraged to provide substantive comments on proposals, not merely "check boxes" to satisfy some proposal rating scheme. Moreover, NSF should not impose a rigid system of multiple criteria and sub-criteria, each with a separate score. The end result is often a review with too much weight given to less significant aspects of the proposal.

In terms of adjectival proposal ratings and numerical scoring, the Task Force extensively discussed the pros and cons of several options, including the following:

1. No ratings or scores. Reviewer comments on proposal's strengths and weaknesses; then provides a summary narrative statement.

#### *Pros:*

- Encourages more substantive reviewer comments while avoiding "box checking".

- Avoids dependence on "uncalibrated" scores.

- Results in fewer NSF staff callbacks to reviewers to clarify ratings and reconcile comments with ratings.

- Encourages reviewer to give equal attention to both criteria.

- Makes it easier for program officer to go against the "collective wisdom"; i.e., to recommend "high risk" proposals that may not be as highly rated as some "low risk" proposals.

#### *Cons:*

- More difficult to "bin" proposals (i.e., into categories such as those that definitely should be funded, those that might be funded, and those that definitely should not be funded).

- More difficult to evaluate the effectiveness and fairness of the merit review system (i.e., cannot compare ratings scores with proposal decisions).

- Introduces more subjectivity into the review process because of difficulty in interpreting the narrative statement alone.

2. Separate rating for each of the two criteria.

#### *Pros:*

- Sends message to community that both criteria are important.

- NSF program staff has flexibility to determine relative application (weighting) of the two criteria to the funding decision.

- Provides program officers with better information for making funding decisions and can provide more precise feedback to applicants.

- Eliminates mere averaging of ratings as a means of ranking proposals.

- Ends semantic arguments about whether a proposal is, e.g., "excellent" or merely "outstanding", or somewhere in between.

#### *Cons:*

- May complicate the ranking of proposals in the panel review process and lead to proposal ranking that do not reflect consensus.

- May encourage even greater degree of "box checking" in place of substantive comments, i.e., could result in shorter and less detailed written comments.

3. Single composite rating (for the two criteria).

#### *Pros:*

- Simplest to understand and use.

- Easy to relate proposal ratings to proposal decisions.

#### *Cons:*

- Reviewers will implicitly weigh each criterion; may not give much attention to criterion #2 in assigning overall rating.

- Encourages "box checking" rather than substantive comments.

- Scores may be arbitrary or uncalibrated (i.e., too lenient or strict).

In order to determine which is the most effective rating scheme (i.e., one that optimizes rationality, excellence, and fairness) the Task Force encourages the Foundation to experiment with various options. In designing these experiments, NSF should be fully cognizant of recent NIH efforts to redesign its peer review system.

NSF instructions and guidance to reviewers are very important. The system will be improved only if the reviewer use the criteria when evaluating the proposal. Thus, whatever criteria the NSB decides upon, they must be formatted for maximum use. This means redesigning the review form and the Grant Proposal Guide so that both the P.I.'s and reviewers understand what is to be evaluated. In fact, it may be advisable to design different review forms for different classes of proposals; for example, for investigator initiated research proposals, for large facility proposals, for systemic education reform projects, etc.

In order to illustrate how the new criteria might be presented to the merit reviewer, a sample draft NSF Proposal Review Form is provided in Appendix B. While option #2 (i.e., provide a rating for each criterion) is being used in this case for illustration purposes, this does not imply that it is the recommendation of the Task Force.

A draft one-page synopsis of NSF's strategic plan, NSF in a Changing World, is also provided in the Appendix C. This plan provides a context for shaping the Foundation's future through a set of principles, goals, and core strategies that are aimed at developing a greater sense of interdependence between the research and education communities and the public. While a one-to-one mapping of the generic review criteria to the NSF strategic plan is not necessary, the Task Force believes that outside expert reviewers should be exposed to at least a summary of the strategic plan. This may be accomplished by attaching the synopsis to the proposal review form.

The new criteria imply that changes to NSF's guidelines for preparing proposals are needed. This should be carefully looked at by NSF management. At the very least changes will have to be made in the Grant Proposal Guide. Additionally, in all NSF program

solicitations and announcements, NSF should carefully explain the full set of criteria that will be used to evaluate the proposal, including those related to the program's investment portfolio.

#### VI. Future Action

On October 17, 1996, the National Science Board approved the release of the Task Force Discussion Report, subject to final clearance by the Executive Committee, not as NSB policy, but as a proposal for broader discussion inside and outside of the Foundation. Specifically, the Director, NSF, is authorized to: "share the report with the Nation's research and education community for comment, for the purpose of informing the Task Force on Merit Review". The NSB also requested the Task Force to provide its recommendations at the March 1997 Meeting of the National Science Board, with respect to the nature and content of the new general criteria for review of

proposals submitted to NSF (see Appendix D).

Note. To encourage the broadest possible comment and discussion, NSF has posted a summary of this document along with a comparison of the current and proposed merit review criteria on its homepage (<http://www.nsf.gov>). Most important, there is a response box for you to provide the agency with your feedback electronically. NSF wants to hear your views and specific suggestions on this report.

#### Appendices

##### Appendix A—Current Criteria (adopted in 1981)

1. Research performer competence—relates to the capability of the investigators, the technical soundness of the proposed approach, and the adequacy of the institutional resources available.

2. Intrinsic merit of the research—the likelihood that the research will lead to new discoveries or fundamental

advances within its field of science or engineering, or have substantial impact or have substantial impact on progress in that field or in other science and engineering fields.

3. Utility or relevance of the research—the likelihood that the research can contribute to the achievement of a goal that is extrinsic or in addition to that of the research itself, and thereby serves as the basis for new or improved technology or assist in the solution of societal problems.

4. Effect on the infrastructure of science and engineering—the potential of the proposed research to contribute to better understanding or improvement of the quality, distribution, or effectiveness of the nation's scientific and engineering research, education, and manpower base.

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## APPENDIX B

## Sample NSF Proposal Review Form

Proposal No.	Institution	Principal Investigator
<b>Title</b>		
Please evaluate this proposal according to the two NSB criteria, which are explained on the reverse side of this form. While ratings are requested for each criterion, your substantive written comments on the proposal's strengths and weaknesses are critical to the evaluation. (Continue on additional sheet(s) if necessary)		
Criterion 1.	What is the intellectual merit and quality of the proposed activity? (Provide detailed comments)	
<p>Rating:      <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent      <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good      <input type="checkbox"/> Good      <input type="checkbox"/> Fair      <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>		
Criterion 2.	What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity? (Provide detailed comments)	
<p>Rating:      <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent      <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good      <input type="checkbox"/> Good      <input type="checkbox"/> Fair      <input type="checkbox"/> Poor</p>		
Reviewer's Name/Address/E-mail/Phone/Fax (Typed)	Other Suggested Reviewers (Optional)	
<b>Reviewers Signature and Date</b>		

**Sample NSF Proposal Review Form - Page 2****Important! Please Read Before Reviewing Proposal!**

In evaluating this proposal, you are requested to provide detailed comments for each of two merit review criteria. Following each criterion is a suggested set of questions to consider in assessing how well the proposal meets that criterion. *Please address only those questions that you believe are relevant to this particular proposal. If appropriate, please include comments on the quality of the prior work described in the "Results from Prior NSF Support" section.*

**1. What is the intellectual merit and quality of the proposed activity?**

The following are suggested questions to consider in assessing how well the proposal meets the criterion: What is the likelihood that the project will significantly advance the knowledge base within and/or across different fields? Does the proposed activity suggest and explore new lines of inquiry? To what degree does the proposer's documented expertise and record of achievement increase the probability of success? Is the project conceptually well designed? Is the plan for organizing and managing the project credible and well conceived? And, is there sufficient access to resources?

**2. What are the broader impacts of the proposed activity?**

The following are suggested questions to consider in assessing how well the proposal meets the criterion: How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while concurrently promoting teaching, training, and learning? Will it create/enhance facilities, instrumentation, information bases, networks, partnerships, and/or other infrastructure? How well does the activity broaden the diversity of participants? Does the activity enhance scientific and technological literacy? And, what is the potential impact on meeting societal needs?

**Conflict of Interests**

If you have an affiliation or financial connection with the institution or the person submitting this proposal that might be construed a conflict of interests, please describe those affiliations or interests on a separate objective, we would like to have your review. If you do not attach a statement we shall assume that you have no conflicting affiliations or interests.

**Confidentiality of Proposals and Peer Reviews**

The Foundation receives proposals in confidence and is responsible for protecting the confidentiality of their contents. In addition, the identity of reviewers will be kept confidential to the maximum extent possible. For this reason, please do not copy, quote, or otherwise use material from this proposal. If you believe that a colleague can make a substantial contribution to the review, please consult the NSF Program Officer before disclosing either the contents of the proposal or the applicant's name. When you have completed your review, please destroy the proposal.

**Privacy Act and Public Burden Statements**

The information requested on this reviewer form is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. It will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals and may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the review process and to other Government agencies needing names of potential reviewers. See Systems of Records, NSF-50. "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records" and NSF-51. "Reviewer/Proposals File and Associated Records, 56 Federal Register 54907 (October 23, 1991). It is the policy of the Foundation that reviews, and reviewers identities, will not be disclosed to persons outside the Government, except that verbatim copies of reviews without the name and affiliation of the reviewer will be sent to the principal investigator. The Foundation considers review and reviewer identities to be exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552) but cannot guarantee that it will not be forced to release them under FOIA, Privacy Act, or other laws. Submission of the requested information is voluntary.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 5 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to:

Herman G. Fleming  
Reports Clearance Officer  
Division of Human Resource Management  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550

and to

Office of Management and Budget  
Paperwork Reduction Project (3145-0058)  
Washington, DC 20503

Appendix C—Synopsis of NSF Strategic Plan; NSF in a Changing World (NSF 95–24)

In 1995, the National Science Foundation issued its strategic plan, NSF in a Changing World, which reiterated the Foundation's mission and established its strategic goals. The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–507) set forth NSF's mission and purpose.

To promote the progress of science: to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare: to secure the national defense \* \* \*

As described in NSF in a Changing World, the National Science Foundation has three long-range goals:

- Enable the U.S. to uphold a position of world leadership in all aspects of science, mathematics, and engineering. This grows from the conviction that a position of world leadership in science, mathematics, and engineering provide the Nation with the broadest range of options in determining the course of our economic future and our national security.

- Promote the discovery, integration, dissemination, and employment of new knowledge in service to society. This goal emphasizes the connection between world leadership in science and engineering on the one hand and contributions in the national interest on the other.

- Achieve excellence in U.S. science, mathematics, engineering, and technology education at all levels. This goal is worthy in its own right, and also recognizes that the first two goals can be met only by providing educational excellence. It requires attention to needs at every level of schooling and access to science, mathematics, engineering, and technology educational opportunities for every member of society.

To move toward the achievement of these goals, NSF employs a set of core strategies. These strategies reaffirm the Foundation's traditions, especially its reliance on merit review of investigator-initiated proposals, yet at the same time point to new directions for the Foundation.

- Develop intellectual capital. Selecting the best ideas in research and education and the most capable people to carry them out is at the heart of NSF's programmatic activities and the merit review system with which we implement those programs. Opening opportunities for all Americans to participate fully in an increasingly technological society is an essential part of NSF's mission.

- Strengthen the physical infrastructure. NSF's programs support

investments in new windows on the universe, through facilities planning and modernization, instrument acquisition, design and development, and shared-use research platforms.

- Integrate research and education. NSF aims to infuse education with the joy of discovery and to bring an awareness of the needs of the learning process to research, creating a rich environment for both.

- Promote partnerships. For NSF, success requires collaboration with many different partners, including universities, industry, elementary and secondary schools, other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and other institutions. We also carry out partnerships across national boundaries.

The Foundation's general goals and strategies are translated into a diverse portfolio of activities, which often embody more than one strategy and contribute to more than one goal. In turn, NSF's efforts interact with those of other Federal agencies, state and local governments, school districts, schools, and partners in the private sector to produce progress toward the three goals. NSF does not itself conduct research or educate students. Instead, it invests the Nation's resources in a portfolio of projects and activities performed by universities, schools, nonprofit institutions, and small businesses. NSF balances its investments among three broad program functions, research, projects, facilities, and education and training.

Appendix D—Resolution Approved by the National Science Board at its 339th Meeting, on October 17, 1996

[NSB-96-182]

October 17, 1996.

Whereas, competitive merit review, with peer evaluation, is the National Science Foundation's accepted method of informing its proposal decision processes;

Whereas, the Board requested that the general review criteria adopted by the Board in 1981 be re-examined in light of the Strategic Plan entitled "NSF in a Changing World," as approved by the Board in October 1994;

Whereas, a joint Task Force of Board members and Foundation staff, having reviewed a number of studies, surveys and reports and engaged in extensive discussions of criteria and related matters, have produced a report containing proposed new general criteria for the review of NSF proposals;

Whereas, NSF works in partnership with the Nation's research and education community in all its endeavors;

Now therefore be it resolved, that the National Science Board:

Receives the report of its Task Force on Merit Review containing proposed new general criteria for review of proposals submitted to NSF;

Authorizes the Director, NSF, to share the report with the Nation's research and education community for comment, for the purpose of informing the Task Force on Merit Review;

And asks the Task Force on Merit Review to provide its recommendations at the March 1997 Meeting of the National Science Board, with respect to the nature and content of any such criteria.

[FR Doc. 96-31214 Filed 12-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446]

### Texas Utilities Electric Company (Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Units 1 and 2); Order Approving Application Regarding the Corporate Restructuring of Texas Utilities Company, the Parent Holding Company, for Texas Utilities Electric Company, To Facilitate the Acquisition of Enserch Corporation

I

Texas Utilities Electric Company (TUEC) is sole owner of Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2. TUEC holds Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-87 and DPR-89 issued by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) pursuant to Part 50 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR Part 50) on April 17, 1990, and April 6, 1993, respectively. Under these licenses, TUEC has the authority to possess and operate Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Somervell County, TX. TUEC is currently a wholly owned subsidiary of Texas Utilities Company (TUC).

II

By letter dated September 20, 1996, TUEC informed the Commission that TUC was in the process of implementing a corporate restructuring to facilitate TUC's acquisition of ENSERCH Corporation (ENSERCH). The acquisition will be accomplished through the following merger transactions: (1) the formation of a new Texas Corporation, TUC Holding Company, and two new subsidiaries of TUC Holding Company (i.e., TUC Merger Corporation and Enserch Merger