2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/23/2024 04:23:09 PM

1. Department or	Agency	2. Fiscal Year		
Department of Health and Human Services			2024	
3. Committee or Subcommittee			3b. GSA Committee No.	
National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Special Emphasis Panel			238	
4. Is this New Du Fiscal Year? No	ring 5. Current Charter 01/26/1993	Renewal Date	•	
8a. Was Termina FiscalYear?	ted During Ter	Specific mination hority	8c. Actual Term Date	
No 9. Agency Recommendation FiscalYear	n for Next Rec	. Legislation to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?	
ContinueNot ApplicableNot Applicable 11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law				
12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effectiv Date	14. ve Commitee Type	14c. Presidential?	
42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16) 11/20/1985 Continuing No 15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel				
Number of	lo Reports for his FiscalYear			
17a. 0 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 0 Open Meetings and Dates				
No Meetings				

Current Next

	FY	FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to	\$0.	00\$0.00
Non-Federal Members		
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to	¢0	00\$0.00
Federal Members	ψ0.00ψ0.00	
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to	ድብ	00\$0.00
Federal Staff	Ф О.	00 \$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to	ድር	00 00 00
Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00\$0.00	
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to\$0.00\$0.0Non-Federal Members\$0.00\$0.0		00 00 00
		00\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.00\$0.00	00 00 00
Federal Members	\$0.00\$0.00	
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.00\$0.00	
Federal Staff	Φ0.00 Φ0.00	
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to	ድር	
Non-member Consultants	\$0.00\$0.00	
18c. Other(rents,user charges,	ድር	
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?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary. . .shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications. . . ; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. . . This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of funding applications and proposals, including but not limited to grant and cooperative agreement applications and contract

proposals, for research projects and for research and training activities in areas relevant to communication sciences and disorders, such as hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech, and language. During this reporting period, the committee reviewed 229 applications requesting \$171,329,737.00 in direct costs and recommended 229 applications.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee has a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. The reviewers for each meeting are selected to evaluate grant applications and/or contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently cover the number and breadth of applications requiring review. Members and chairs are authorities who are knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to communication sciences and disorders, such as hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech and language.

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

The National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Special Emphasis Panel held 26 meetings during this reporting period. The flexibility in review allowed by this committee structure has proved both efficient and effective.

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

The evaluations and recommendations provided by the expert members cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

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

The meetings of the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property, such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

Reports: The committee did not issue any reports during this fiscal year. This committee held 26 meetings this year but only 14 chairs are listed in the annual report because 6 of the reviewers chaired more than 1 meeting. Membership: The members of this Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) do not have standing appointments and serve on an as needed basis for meetings throughout the fiscal year. Therefore, the Members list reflects meeting dates, not appointment start and end dates. While only one meeting date is listed as an appointment start and end date, a member may have attended several meetings, either as a chairperson, co-chair, or as a member, throughout the fiscal year. As a result, the Members list, including the number of chairs, may not align or directly match to specific meeting dates. Meeting rosters, including members' affiliations and zip codes are available online at

https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/.

Designated Federal Officer

MELISSA J. STICK CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BRANCH

Narrative Description

The National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) provides advice to the Director, NIDCD. This advice is in the form of recommendations resulting from the review of grant/cooperative agreement applications for research projects/research and training activities in the communication sciences (hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech, and language). In spite of the greatly increased number of reviews over the past two years, the NIDCD s SEP continues to successfully fulfill its mission. The mission of the SEP should not be changed, as it is currently meeting the needs of the Institute and its Director for high quality, timely reviews of applications and proposals submitted to the NIDCD. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary. . .shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. . .

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	

Other

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	
Unable to Determine	\checkmark
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	

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

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

5,067

Number of Recommendations Comments

5,067 is the number of grants reviewed from 2003-2023.

What is the approximate <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Fully</u> implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations

.....

and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Partially</u> implemented by the agency? 0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes 🗹 No 🗌 Not Applicable 🗌

Agency Feedback Comments

Information resulting from closed initial peer review meetings is subject to the Freedom of Information Act. The public can view information on research projects funded by NIH on the RePORT (Research Portfolio Online Reporting Tool) website located at http://report.nih.gov.

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

An action of approved or recommended for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility., and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes What is the estimated <u>Number</u> of grants reviewed for approval 229 What is the estimated <u>Number</u> of grants recommended for approval 229 What is the estimated <u>Dollar Value</u> of grants recommended for approval \$171,329,737

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

	Checked if Applies
Contact DFO	\checkmark
Online Agency Web Site	\checkmark
Online Committee Web Site	\checkmark
Online GSA FACA Web Site	\checkmark
Publications	
Other	\checkmark

Access Comments

Contact NIDCD Committee Management Officer, Ms. Nanette Stephenson, 301-402-3588.