2003 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board

Report Run Date: 04/26/2024 01:15:05 AM

1. Department or Agency 2. Fiscal Year

Department of Education 2003

3b. GSA

Committee No.

National Educational Research Policy and

Priorities Board

4. Is this New During 5. Current 6. Expected 7. Expected Fiscal Year? Charter Renewal Date Term Date 10/01/2002 11/05/2002

8a. Was Terminated During 8b. Specific Termination Authority 8c. Actual Term Date

Yes 20 U.S.C. 9516 11/05/2002

9. Agency 10b.

Recommendation for Next Req to Terminate?

| The standard of t

Terminate Yes Enacted

11. Establishment Authority Statutory (Congress Created)

12. Specific 13. 14.

Establishment Effective Committee

Authority Date Type Presidential?

20 U.S.C. 6021 10/01/1994 Continuing No

15. Description of Committee National Policy Issue Advisory

Board

16a. Total

No Reports for this FiscalYear

Reports

17a

0 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 0 Open

pen

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

Current Next

FY FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00 0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Congress created the National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board to work collaboratively with the Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) to forge a national consensus with respect to a long-term agenda for educational research, development, dissemination, and the activities of the Office. The Board reviewed and approveed the Research Priorities Plan developed by the Assistant Secretary in collaboration with the Board, and reviewed and approveed standards for the conduct and evaluation of all research, development, and dissemination carrried out under the auspices of OERI pursuant to the Educational Research, Development,

Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994. The Board served in a liaison capacity with the education research field and the public, and had responsibilities to strengthen the educational research and development system. It enjoyed substantial independence in gathering information, commissioning studies, and communicating with the American people and the United States Congress about educational research. The operations of the Board were required to be collaborative, carried out in concert with the Assistant Secretary for OERI as well as with the providers and consumers of research. The Board has been grateful for the cooperation of its ex officio members from numerous federal agencies in which research is a prominent component. In FY 2001, the Board, wishing to strengthen and make more explicit how the scientific method is used in educational research, invested a substantial part of its resources in contracting with the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council for a study on scientific principles in educational research and how they might be strengthened in a federally-funded agency. The study report, Scientific Research in Education, was issued in November 2001 and published in 2002. As the publication was widely anticipated, it was immediately requested by Congressional staff working on the legislation which became the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. Two sessions were devoted to the report at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in April 2002. Agency and Board personnel participated as speakers and panelists in these presentations. National, state, and local policymakers have found the report a valuable resource for sorting out the requirements for evidence-based curricula. In addition, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 reflects

many of the recommendations, especially in the area of peer review and standards, as well as staffing, made by the Board in previous publications and white papers.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

As specified in the Board's authorizing legislation, the Board consisted of 15 (appointed and voting) members from diverse backgrounds, representing educational researchers, the practitioner community, and others with informed perspectives on education from the public and private sectors. The Secretary of Education solicited nominations from numerous associations, education-related organizations, and interested members of the public. This formulation, required by law, assured that a wide spectrum of stakeholders and interest groups have representation and allows for collaboration between the theoretical and practical points of view. The Board's committees, which conducted its specialized activities, such as program preparation, peer review and standards, and research and development, also reflect the tripartite structure of the whole. The Board's legislation likewise specifies a number of non-voting ex officio members from other federal agencies with a substantial research component.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Board was set up to meet at least four times a year, usually in January, March, June, and September, and its subcommittees meet on an as-needed basis in the interim to provide advice and recommendations pertaining to emerging initiatives in OERI and to advance its own work plan.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

When the Board was created, the Congress sought to establish a forum of 15 individuals distinguished for their accomplishments in the field of education. This body was to provide non-partisan leadership and direction over a sustained period to the Federal effort in educational research. It would also forge a consensus on focusing resources where needs are greatest and where research will yield practical benefits in a timely manner. Input from the Board was a valuable resource to the agency and congressional staff as they planned for the reauthorization of OERI. It is to be noted that the new legislation has a board with a structure and duties that have notable parallels with NERPPB.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

21. Remarks

The Board terminated by the passage of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, P.L. 107-279 on 11/5/2002.

Designated Federal Officer

Mary G. Lucier DFO

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Acosta, Adela	06/18/2001	11/05/2002	Principal, Cesar Chavez Elementary School, Hyattsville, MD	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Baltz, Patricia	02/24/1995	11/05/2002	Teacher, Camino Grove (CA) Elementary School	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Bottoms, James	02/24/1995	11/05/2002	Senior Vice President, Southern Regional Education Board, Georgia	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Braddock, Jomills	02/24/1995	11/05/2002	Professor of Sociology, University of Miami, Florida	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Carnine, Douglas	06/01/2001	11/05/2002	Professor of Education at University of Oregon and Director of National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators	Employee (SGE)
Cole, Bruce	12/10/2001	11/05/2002	Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Colwell, Rita	08/03/1998	11/05/2002	Director, National Science Foundation	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Evers, Williamson	06/18/2001	11/05/2002	Research Fellow, Hoover Institution	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Ferris, William	11/13/1997	11/05/2002	Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Foorman, Barbara	06/11/2001	11/05/2002	Professor of Pediatrics, University of Texas-Houston Medical School	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Goren, Paul	03/11/1999	11/05/2002	Vice President, Spencer Foundation	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hakuta, Kenji	02/24/1995	11/05/2002	Professor of Education, Stanford University, California	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Kirschstein, Ruth	06/01/1998	11/05/2002	Acting Director, National Institutes of Health	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Lappan, Glenda	02/24/1995	11/05/2002	Professor of Mathematics, Michigan State University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Marley, Robert	02/24/1995	11/05/2002	Teacher, Wichita State University, Kansas	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Mason, Eileen	02/01/2002	11/05/2002	Acting Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Ortiz, Alba	03/29/1995	11/05/2002	Professor, College of Education, U. of Texas at Austin	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Palincsar, Annemarie	05/29/2001	11/05/2002	Associate Dean for Graduate Affairs, School of Education, University of Michigan	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Pelton, Claire	03/29/1995	11/05/2002	Educational Consultant	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Schelke, E.	03/08/1999	11/05/2002	Teacher, Trenton High School, MI	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Whitehurst, Grover	07/23/2001	11/05/2002	Assistant Secretary, Office of Educational Research and Improvement	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Zerhouni, Elias	05/20/2002	11/05/2002	Director, National Institutes of Health	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 22

Narrative Description

This Board no longer exists, the P.L. 107-279 revoked this Board's authority and it terminated on November 5, 2002.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

	Checked if
	Applies
Improvements to health or safety	
Trust in government	
Major policy changes	✓
Advance in scientific research	✓
Effective grant making	
Improved service delivery	
Increased customer satisfaction	
Implementation of laws or regulatory	√
requirements	·*i
Other	
Outcome Comments NA	
What are the cost savings associated with thi	s committee?
	Checked if Applies
None	
Unable to Determine	✓
Under \$100,000	
\$100,000 - \$500,000	
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	
Over \$10,000,000	
Cost Savings Other	

NA

What is the approximate <u>Number</u> of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

Number of Recommendations Comments This Board never met in FY 2002.
What is the approximate $\underline{\text{Percentage}}$ of these recommendations that have been or will be $\underline{\text{Fully}}$ implemented by the agency? 0%
% of Recommendations <u>Fully</u> Implemented Comments NA
What is the approximate $\underline{\text{Percentage}}$ of these recommendations that have been or will be $\underline{\text{Partially}}$ implemented by the agency? 0%
% of Recommendations <u>Partially</u> Implemented Comments NA
Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered? Yes No Not Applicable
Agency Feedback Comments NA

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

	Checked if Applies
Reorganized Priorities	✓
Reallocated resources	✓
Issued new regulation	✓
Proposed legislation	
Approved grants or other payments	
Other	

Action Comments

NA

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants? No		
Grant Review Comments NA		
How is access provided to the inform	nation for the Committee's documentation?	
	Checked if Applies	
Contact DFO	✓	
Online Agency Web Site	✓	
Online Committee Web Site	✓	
Online GSA FACA Web Site	✓	
Publications	✓	
Other		
Access Comments		
NA		