

**Supporting Statement for the  
Application for Grants under the  
Upward Bound Program for  
Federal TRIO Programs  
Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title IV-A**

**A. Justification**

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.

The U.S. Department of Education is requesting a reinstatement, with change of a previously approved collection to make new grants under the Upward Bound (UB) Program. The current collection has expired and as a result of the negotiated rulemaking process which was conducted to implement the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) revisions to the Higher Education Act (HEA), the authorizing statute for the program, a new application is necessary to implement regulatory and programmatic changes. Approval will allow the Department to use the application to award new grants and collect data under the UB program.

The UB program provides grants to institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations, community-based organization with experience in serving disadvantaged youth, combinations of such institutions, agencies and organizations, and secondary schools. The UB program provides grants to projects designed to generate in program participants the skills and motivation necessary to complete a program of secondary education and to enter and succeed in a program of postsecondary education.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA), as amended by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEOA), made changes to the UB program through the addition of statutory outcome criteria and required activities. Section 402A(c)(8)(C) of the HEA, as amended by the HEOA, has added requirements for a formal second review process for unsuccessful applicants. The UB program regulations were amended to reflect the changes resulting from the HEOA, which includes a new section that establishes processes and procedures for a second review of unsuccessful applications.

This application would include required and permissible services or activities; outcome criteria used in assessing prior experience; selection criteria; and a description of the processes and procedures for the second review of unsuccessful applications.

The UB program grant competition is authorized by Title IV, Part A, Section 402A, and C of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by the HEOA; and governed by the program regulations in 34 CFR Part 645; and the Education Department General Administrative

Regulations (EDGAR), Parts 74, 75 (except for §§ 75.215-75.221), 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98 and 99.

2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.

The application package requests programmatic and budgetary information needed to evaluate new applications and make funding decisions based on the authorizing statute, program regulations, and EDGAR. Failure to collect this information would prevent the awarding of appropriated funds; essential information would not be available for evaluating the applications in accordance with the statute and regulations.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or forms of information technology, e.g. permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision of adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration given to using technology to reduce burden.

For fiscal year 2012, as a part of the Department's goal to increase the electronic submission of applications, applications for grants under the UB program will be submitted electronically via the Grants.gov portal. We estimate that the Department will receive 95 percent of the applications electronically.

The application package has been prepared in a format for easier and faster posting of information on the Web. Prospective applicants will be able to view and download the application through the FIND function on Grants.gov at <http://www.Grants.Gov>.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.

Since the information submitted in the application is unique to each respondent, no duplication exists as far as can be determined. There is no other collection instrument available to collect the information that is being requested.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe any methods used to minimize burden.

This information collection does not involve small businesses or other small entities.

6. Describe the consequences to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

If the collection is not conducted or is collected less frequently, the Department cannot meet

its grant making responsibilities, including the publication of closing date notices, providing technical assistance to potential applicants, conducting peer reviews of grant applications, transmitting slates with funding recommendations to Department officials for approval, and making grant awards.

The Department needs to make grant applications available to its constituencies to give eligible applicants time to develop and submit applications, and to make new fiscal year grant awards in a timely manner.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:
  - requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;
  - requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;
  - requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;
  - requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records for more than three years;
  - in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results than can be generalized to the universe of study;
  - requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;
  - that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or that unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or
  - requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.

No information will be collected in the manner covered under any of the special circumstances outlined.

8. If applicable, provide a copy and identify the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments. Specifically address comments received on cost and hour burden.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instruction and record keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

Consultation with representatives of those from whom information is to be obtained or those who must compile records should occur at least once every 3 years – even if the collection of information activity is the same as in prior periods. There may be circumstances that may preclude consultation in a specific situation. These circumstances should be explained.

The Department will solicit informal views and comments from persons outside the Department during pre-application workshops for UB throughout the country as mandated by statute. The Department also published a 30-day Federal Register notice allowing public comment on this collection. Since this information collection request is being submitted under the Department’s Streamlined Process for Discretionary Grant Information Collections (1894-0001), the 30-day public comment period will be the only public comment notices published for this collection request.

9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

The Department will not provide any payments or gifts to respondents.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.

There is no assurance of confidentiality.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private. The justification should include the reasons why the agency considers the questions necessary, the specific uses to be made of the information, the explanation to be given to persons from whom the information is requested, and any steps to be taken to obtain their consent.

This application does not include questions about sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, or other items that are commonly considered sensitive and private.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should:

- Indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. Unless directed to do so, agencies should not conduct special surveys to obtain information on which to base hour burden estimates. Consultation with a sample (fewer than 10) of potential respondents is desirable. If the hour burden on respondents is expected to vary widely because of differences in activity, size, or complexity, show the range of estimated hour burden, and

explain the reasons for the variance. Generally, estimates should not include burden hours for customary and usual business practices.

- If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens.
- Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents of the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories. The cost of contracting out or paying outside parties for information collection activities should not be included here. Instead, this cost should be included in Item 14.

The estimated burden hours for this collection of information are 40,880 hours. We estimate approximately 1240 respondents, including those who respond under the second review process. Applications are submitted annually during a competition year.

In order to reach this current 40,880 total burden estimate, we reviewed the previous estimate when this application was last active, and factored in the changes resulting from the new regulations.

Additionally, the regulations include a formal second review process for unsuccessful applicants that fall within the funding band. We estimate that approximately 40 applications will score within the funding band, resulting in 80 additional burden hours from the previous applications (40 applications received x 2 hours) = 80 hours.

Estimated number of respondents under the first review	1200
Estimated preparation time under the first review	34 hours
Estimated burden hours under the first review	40,800 hours
Estimated number of respondents under the second review	40
Estimated preparation time under the second review	2 hours
Estimated burden hours under the second review	80 hours
Total estimated burden hours	40,880

Affected Public  
(Estimated Burden Hours):

Public, State, Local Institutions	876 respondents x 34 hours = 29,784 estimated burden hours
Private Non-Profits	324 respondents x 34 hours = 11,016 estimated burden hours
Affected Public (Estimated Burden Hours)	40,800 hours

(Estimated Burden Hours for Second Review):

Public, State, Local Institutions	Estimated burden hours for second review 32 respondents x 2 hours = 64 hours
Private Non-Profits	Estimated burden hours for second review 8 respondents x 2 hours = 16 hours
Affected Public (Estimated Burden Hours for Second Review)	80 hours

Total Affected Public Estimated Burden Hours.....40,880

Estimated Cost to Respondents for Regular Submission

Professionals: 1,200 personnel x 24 hours x \$30 per hour = \$864,000 Overhead at 50% of salary=\$432,000	\$1,296,000.00
Clericals: 1,200 personnel x 7 hours x \$12 per hour = \$100,800 Overhead at 50% of Salary = \$50,400	\$151,200.00
<i>Total estimated staff costs to respondents</i>	\$1,447,200.00

(a) One time cost to applicant: Use of computer equipment to search for data and generate application in required format. Computer time is \$200 and Printing is \$10.00 (1,200 applicants x \$210)	\$252,000
(b) Operation Cost Annual cost to applicant to find and maintain application materials is \$100. (1,200 applicants x \$100)	\$120,000
<i>Total estimated annual costs to respondents</i>	\$372,000

**Total Annual Costs to Respondents: \$1,819,200.00**

(Staff Costs: \$1,447,200.00 + Annual Costs for responding: \$372,000)

Estimated Cost to Respondents for Appeals Submission

Professionals: 40 personnel x 1 hour x \$30 per hour total =	\$1200.00
---	-----------

Clericals: 40 personnel x 1 hour x \$12 per hour total =	\$480.00
<i>Total estimated staff costs to respondents for Appeals</i>	\$1,680.00
(a) One time cost to applicant: Use of computer equipment to search for data and generate appeal in required format. Computer time is \$200 and printing is \$10 (40 applicants x \$210)	\$8,400.00
(b) Operation Cost Annual cost to applicant to compile materials for appealing is \$100. (40 applicants x \$100)	\$4,000.00
<i>Total Estimated annual cost to respondents for appeals.</i>	\$12,400.00

**Total Annual Costs to Respondents for Appeals: \$14,080**

(Staff Costs: \$1,680.00+ \$12,400.00 Annual Costs for Responding)

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. (Do not include the cost of any hour burden shown in Items 12 and 14.)

- The cost estimate should be split into two components: (a) a total capital and start-up cost component (annualized over its expected useful life); and (b) a total operation and maintenance and purchase of services component. The estimates should take into account costs associated with generating, maintaining, and disclosing or providing the information. Include descriptions of methods used to estimate major cost factors including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, the discount rate(s), and the time period over which costs will be incurred. Capital and start-up costs include, among other items, preparations for collecting information such as purchasing computers and software; monitoring, sampling, drilling and testing equipment; and acquiring and maintaining record storage facilities.
- If cost estimates are expected to vary widely, agencies should present ranges of cost burdens and explain the reasons for the variance. The cost of contracting out information collection services should be a part of this cost burden estimate. In developing cost burden estimates, agencies may consult with a sample of respondents (fewer than 10), utilize the 60-day pre-OMB submission public comment process and use existing economic or regulatory impact analysis associated with the rulemaking containing the information collection, as appropriate.
- Generally, estimates should not include purchases of equipment or services, or portions thereof, made: (1) prior to October 1, 1995, (2) to achieve regulatory compliance with requirements not associated with the information collection, (3) for reasons other than to

provide information or keep records for the government, or (4) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

Annual Costs to Respondents (capital/start-up, and operation and maintenance): The total for the capital and start-up cost components for this information collection is zero. This information collection will not require the purchase of any capital equipment nor create any start up costs.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government. Also, provide a description of the method used to estimate cost, which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses (such as equipment, overhead, printing, and support staff), and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information. Agencies also may aggregate cost estimates from Items 12, 13, and 14 in a single table.

Cost to Federal Government:

<b>Cost for Federally-supervised review of applications</b>	
Outside field reviewers – 400 UB readers @ \$1,100 each	\$440,000
Processing applications – staff (12 staff x 40 hours x \$48 per hours=\$23,040) (Overhead cost: \$23,040 x 50 percent = \$11,520)	\$34,560.00
Contractor logistical support for workshops, achieving prior unfunded applications, application processing, field reading and slate preparation (14 weeks-reading)	\$1,284,281.00
Staff time for conducting supervised review. (6 weeks x 5 control reviews, and 25 panel chairpersons) (30 staff x 240 hours x \$48 per hour=\$345,600) (Overhead cost: \$345,600 x 50 percent=\$172,800)	\$518,400.00
Staff time for generating slate (3 staff x \$48 x 40 hours=\$5,760) (Overhead cost: \$5,760 x 50 percent = \$2,880)	\$8,640.00
Staff time to review and approve funding recommendations (4 hours per grant award x 982 awards) (982 awards x 4 hours per awards x \$48 per hour = \$188,544) (Overhead cost: \$89,088 x 50 per cent = \$94,272)	\$282,816.00
Staff time to generate, approve, and issue grant awards (6 hours per award x 982 awards= 5,892 hours) (\$48 per hr x 5,892 hours = \$282,816) (Overhead cost: \$282,816 x 50 percent = \$141,408)	\$424,224.00
<i>Total estimate cost to government (competitive year)</i>	\$2,992,921.00



15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments to #16f of the IC Data Part 1 Form.

Since this collection is technically new, all 40,880 hours of burden are considered new burden and represent a program change. The current burden hour estimate is based on 1240 respondents, including those who respond under the second review process.

16. For collections of information whose results will 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.

Results of collected information will not be published.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

The Department will display on the form the expiration date for the OMB approval as required.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in the Certification of Paperwork Reduction Act.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

**B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical statement.**

The collection of information does not employ statistical methods.