

*Expiration Date of Approval:* Not applicable.

*Type of Request:* Intent to seek approval to carry out a new information collection.

### 1. Abstract

This document has been prepared to support the clearance of data collection instruments to be used in the follow up study of the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Graduate Research Traineeship (GRT) Program. GRT supported graduate students in peer-review selected institutions to achieve a doctorate (PhD) in critical or emerging areas of science, mathematics, and engineering. The study addresses the following questions: What positions do graduates obtain following completion of the doctorate? What academic awards or private/public sector attainments do graduates receive? What impacts do traineeships have on the sponsoring institution, faculty, and colleagues? How do GRT trainees who stopped their pursuit of a PhD characterize their GRT experience? Is there a relationship between the average time of GRT funding support for a trainee and the average number of years required for completing a PhD? Despite not completing the doctorate, did former GRT recipients find the traineeships?

The data to address these questions will be gathered via two survey instruments. The first instrument is an Institutional Impact Survey that GRT project Principal Investigators (PI) will complete 2 years after their final year of funding. The second instrument is an individual survey that all trainees who have received doctorates or withdrawn from the GRT program will be asked to complete.

### 2. Expected Respondents

The expected respondents are the Principal Investigators and GRT funding recipients (trainees) from GRT projects funded by NSF since 1993.

### 3. Burden on the Public

The total annual burden hours for this collection are 290 for a maximum of 373 respondents, assuming an 80–100% response rate. The average annual reporting burden is one hour or less per respondent. The burden on the public is limited because the study is limited to GRT project participant and no other individuals.

Dated: November 7, 2001.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*NSF Reports Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 01-28424 Filed 11-13-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection, Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request clearance of this collection. In accordance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we are providing opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting OMB clearance of this collection for no longer than 3 years.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received by January 14, 2002, to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date would be considered to the extent practicable.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments regarding the information collection and requests for copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Rm. 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by e-mail to [splimpo@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpo@nsf.gov).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Suzanne Plimpton on (703) 292-7556 or send mail to [splimpo@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpo@nsf.gov).

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title of Collection:* An Evaluation of the Impact of Adoption and Use of the Office of Science Education Curriculum Supplements on Students' Scientific Knowledge.

*OMB Control No.:* 3145-NEW.

*Expiration Date of Approval:* Not applicable.

*Type of Request:* Intent to seek approval to carry out a new information collection.

### 1. Abstract

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has provided funding for systematically developed, research-based curriculum materials beginning in the 1960s. NSF has the responsibility of coordinating evaluations of mathematics and science education programs across government, including agencies such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Since its establishment as part of NIH, the Office of Science Education (OSE) has engaged in the development of science curriculum supplements and other educational materials related to medicine and research. NSF and NIH will partner in this evaluation because both desire information on the effectiveness of curriculum materials and the effective means to collect this information. Over the years, there have been changes in the levels of funding for such instructional materials, reflecting changes in public support and concerns for such endeavors. However, concerns about student achievement in science have focused attention on the need for strong curriculum materials to support "systemic reform" (O'Day & Smith, 1993). NSF has responded to these needs by increasing support to research-based instructional materials that have been reviewed by content experts and found to be of high quality and meet the demands of the National Science Education Standards (NSES).

The proposed evaluation's study questions to be addressed are: Do the curriculum supplements promote better science education? Do the curriculum supplements reduce academic inequity? Do the curriculum supplements deepen students' understanding of the importance of basic research to advances in medicine and health? Do the curriculum supplements foster student analysis of the direct and indirect effects of scientific discoveries on their individual and public health? Do the curriculum supplements encourage students to take more responsibility for their own health?

The data to address these questions will be gathered using mixed methods. In addition to assessing student achievement data and using surveys, the mixed-methods evaluation model will include pre-observation questionnaires, observations, and interviews of teachers. Interviews and observations, for example, will enable research evaluators to clarify vague responses in surveys or

confirm findings. As part of the evaluation, pre- and post-assessment will be used for NIH Curriculum Supplement Series for Grades 9–12 to compare students' learning of scientific concepts and skills when a supplement of NIH materials will be used, with students who do not receive the NIH materials. Teacher and student surveys, interviews, site visits, document reviews, standardized performance measures, and student work samples will provide the basis for comparison.

## 2. Expected Respondents

The expected respondents and observation subjects are pre-college teachers and students.

## 3. Burden on the Public

The total annual burden hours for this collection are 2,632 for a maximum of 3744 respondents, assuming an 80–100% response rate. The average annual reporting burden is one hour or less per respondent. The burden on the general public is small because the study is limited to a 10 percent random sample of the 12,000 teachers who have requested the materials being studied, a sample of impacted students, and 60 treatment and 60 comparison teachers.

Dated: November 7, 2001.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*NSF Reports Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 01–28431 Filed 11–13–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.  
**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) is announcing plans to request clearance of this collection. In accordance with the requirement of section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, we are providing opportunity for public comment on this action. After obtaining and considering public comment, NSF will prepare the submission requesting OMB clearance of this collection for no longer than 3 years.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility,

and clarity of the information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received by January 14, 2002 to be assured of consideration. Comments received after that date would be considered to the extent practicable.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments regarding the information collection and requests of copies of the proposed information collection request should be addressed to Suzanne Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Rm. 295, Arlington, VA 22230, or by e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov).

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Suzanne Plimpton on (703) 292–7556 or send e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov). Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title of Collection:* Survey of Colleges, Universities Providing Graduate Degrees and Specializations in Evaluation, and Providers of Professional Development Offerings.

*OMB Control No.:* 3145–NEW.

*Expiration Date of Approval:* Not applicable.

*Type of Request:* Intent to seek approval to carry out a new information collection.

## 1. Abstract

This document has been prepared to support the clearance of data collection instruments to be used in the Surveys of Colleges and Universities Providing Graduate Degrees and Specializations in Evaluation, and Providers of Evaluation Professional Development Offerings. A major problem that NSF faces is the lack of qualified evaluators to serve as resources to NSF-funded projects. Therefore, the Evaluation Program has set as part of its mission the building of capacity in the field of evaluation. NSF's efforts will serve both to guarantee that there will be adequate numbers of trained evaluators to meet NSF's needs and to aid in creating a solid knowledge base for this relatively new professional field. Fundamental to both of these purposes is the collection of data on current capacity in the evaluation field to conduct training.

This includes both formal education that leads to the granting of degrees, and informal education that fosters the acquisition of specific knowledge and skills through short courses, workshops, or Internet offerings. The approach encompasses two surveys. One is of university and college-based formal evaluation training programs leading to a major or minor course of graduate degree studies; the other is of professional training activities in evaluation that are regularly provided and may result in continuing education certificates.

## 2. Expected Respondents

The expected respondents are twofold. Those responding to the college and university degree programs will be those institutions that offer formal degree or specialization programs in the field of evaluation. Those receiving the second type of survey will be institutions, companies and organizations that provide regular, short-term, intensive training programs, such as institutes and short courses for both current and novice evaluators.

## 3. Burden on the Public

The total elements for these two collections are 32 burden hours for a maximum of 120 participants annually, assuming an 80–100% response rate. The average annual reporting burden is under 20 minutes per respondent. The burden on the public is negligible, as the survey is limited to colleges, universities and other entities that provide degrees, areas of specialization, and professional development in the field of evaluation.

Dated: November 7, 2001.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*NSF Reports Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 01–28484 Filed 11–13–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–331]

### Nuclear Management Company, LLC; Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) has issued Amendment No. 243 to Facility Operating License No. DPR–49 issued to Nuclear Management Company, LLC (the licensee), which revised the Operating License and Technical Specifications (TS) for operation of the Duane Arnold Energy Center (DAEC) located in Linn County, Iowa. The