2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of Nursing Research Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/20/2024 01:52:40 PM

1. Department or Agency 2. Fiscal Year

Department of Health and Human Services 2024

3b. GSA

3. Committee or Subcommittee Committee

No.

National Institute of Nursing Research

Special Emphasis Panel

2086

4. Is this New During 5. Current 6. Expected 7. Expected

Fiscal Year? Charter Renewal Date Term Date

No 09/29/1995

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

Authority

No

9. Agency 10b.

Recommendation for Next Req to Terminate?

| Continue of the c

Continue Not Applicable Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific 13. 14.

Establishment Effective Committee Presidential?

Authority Date Type

42 USC 282(b)(16) 11/20/1985 Continuing No

15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total

No Reports for this FiscalYear

Reports

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 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?

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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals in the broad areas of nursing research. Operations of this committee are accomplished using a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. During this reporting period a group of panels reviewed a total of 27 grant applications requesting \$87,321,572.

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 contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications and contracts requiring review. Membership includes authorities who are knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to nursing research, such as acute and chronic illness, prevention, community health and other related areas of research

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

The Panel held 4 FACA 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?

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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals 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 of Nursing Research Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and contract proposals. 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: This committee did not produce any reports during this fiscal year. Chairperson: There were 4 meetings in FY23; 5 Chairpersons are identified in the Member section because (1) Docherty served as Chair for 2 meetings and (2) the 10/7/22 and 7/10/23 meetings required an Acting Chair for COI purposes of some reviews, resulting in 2 Chairs identified for each of those meetings. Website: This committee does not have a dedicated website. DFO/Committee Decision Maker: The DFO and Committee Decision Maker positions are held by the same individual based on the assignment of duties in this Institute. 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

Weigun Li Chief, Office of Review

Narrative Description

NIH's mission is to seek fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems and the application of that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce illness and disability. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary... shall by regulations 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

What are the cost savings associated with this 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	

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?

1,947

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant Review

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

% 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 t	aken to
impleme	nt recom	nmendations 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 **Number** of grants reviewed for approval 27

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for

approval 27

What is the estimated $\underline{\textbf{Dollar Value}}$ of grants recommended for approval

\$87,321,572

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information 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