up to 45 days (which can be renewed) for situations involving weapons or drugs; and (c) asking a hearing officer to order a student be placed in an interim alternative educational setting for up to 45 days (which can be renewed) if it is demonstrated that the student is substantially likely to injure himself or others in his current placement. School officials may also seek a Honig injunction as discussed previously if they are unable to reach agreement with a student's parents and they feel that the new statutory provisions are not sufficient.

On January 25, 2001 the General Accounting Office (GAO) submitted a report entitled Student Discipline: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. Following the 1997 Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), there was a perception of a double standard for student discipline for students with disabilities. As a result, Congress directed the GAO to conduct a study to determine how the IDEA Amendments of 1997 affect the ability of schools to maintain a safe environment conducive to learning. Some of the results of the GAO study, which primarily involved a survey of principals of 272 middle and high schools from around the country, indicate, for example, that (a) students with disabilities are receiving the same punishments as their general education peers for violent acts they commit in school, contrary to what some lawmakers stated in legislation last year; (b) the same proportion of each group of students who commit violence, about one in six, is expelled from school or placed in an alternative educational setting as a consequence of their actions; (c) 74 percent of responding principals generally regarded their overall special education discipline policy, which is essentially a combination of IDEA and local policies, as having a positive or neutral effect on their schools' levels of safety and orderliness; and (d) the remaining 26 percent of responding principals rated the policies as having a negative effect.

During the 2001 calendar year, two "discipline" amendments relating to children with disabilities were offered and accepted during Congressional debates on H.R.1 (107th Congress), the No Child Left Behind Act. Both amendments would have altered the scope of protection and procedural safeguards for certain IDEA eligible students. These two amendments did not survive the joint House-Senate Conference on H.R.1 but are sure to

make their way into IDEA Reauthorization debates.

NCD needs to hear from the community:

- 1. Are the discipline procedures under IDEA clear and understandable?
- 2. To what extent is the current IDEA discipline policy properly implemented?
- 3. What are challenges and obstacles to implementing the IDEA discipline policy?
- 4. To what extent are resources available to school districts, educational personnel, and parents to ensure implementation of the IDEA discipline policy?
- 5. Šhould changes be considered to the current IDEA discipline policy?
- 6. To what extent are state and local school districts not complying with the current IDEA discipline policy? How can this policy be enforced?

#### Conclusions

One of the nation's best tools in promoting education equity and excellence is a public education system that is focused directly on accountability, achievement, and enforcement. To deal with the existing realities when it comes to Federal education policymaking, during IDEA reauthorization, NCD will use a variety of forums and mechanisms to solicit stakeholders' input to advise the Administration and Congress regarding a range of critical policy issues. These policy issues and suggested policy options for reauthorization go to the heart of education reform for over 6 million students with disabilities and involve: (a) Accountability in Federal education spending, (b) achievement and progress in the K-12 arena, and (c) fidelity of implementation in all aspects of the IDEA entitlement program.

Signed in Washington, DC, on March 28, 2002.

#### Ethel D. Briggs,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 02–8005 Filed 4–2–02; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6820–MA–P

### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

## Advisory Committee for Cyberinfrastructure; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92– 463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

*Name:* Advisory Committee for Cyberinfrastructure (#10719).

Date/Time: Friday, April 19, 2002, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. EST.

Place: Room 555 Stafford II, National Science Foundation, 4121 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA.

Type of Meeting: Open Meeting. Persons wishing to attend the meeting at NSF should contact Richard Hilderbrandt to arrange for a visitor's pass.

Contact Persons: Dr. Richard Hilderbrandt, Program Director, Division of Advanced Computational Infrastructure and Research, Suite 1122, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22230, Tel: (703) 292–7093, e-mail: rhilderb@nsf.gov.

*Purpose of Meeting:* To present a first draft of the committee report.

## Agenda

(Meeting will begin promptly at 1:00 PM EST)

- 1. Review of status of the panel's activities and goals for this meeting.
- 2. Reports from the authoring subcommittees.
- 3. Review and discussion of the working draft of the report.
- 4. Discussion of primary recommendations.
- 5. Stewardship and additional use of the material gathered by the Panel.
- 6. Summary of additional activities to create final version of report.
  - 7. Matters arising.

Dated: March 28, 2002.

#### Karen J. York,

Committee Management Officer. [FR Doc. 02–8006 Filed 4–2–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of pending NRC action to submit an information request to OMB and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC is preparing a submittal to OMB for review of continued approval of information collections under the provisions of Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Information pertaining to the requirement to be submitted:

1. The title of the information collection: 10 CFR part 33—Specific Domestic Licenses of Broad Scope for Byproduct Material.

2. Current OMB approval number: 3150–0015.