2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 04/24/2024 05:21:20 PM

1. Department or Agency				2. Fiscal Year	
Department of H	ıman Services		2024		
3. Committee o	ittee		3b. GSA Committee No.		
National Institute Disparities Spec	Health and Health Panel		5166		
4. Is this New D Fiscal Year?	uring 5. Cur Chart		pected wal Date	7. Expected Term Date	
No	03/08/	2001			
8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?		8b. Specific Termination Authority		8c. Actual Term Date	
No					
9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear		10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?		10b. Legislation Pending?	
Continue		Not Applicable		Not Applicable	
11. Establishme	ent Authorit	y Authorize	ed by Law		
12. Specific Establishment Authority		13. Effective Date	14. Commite Type	14c. Presidential?	
42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16), section 402(b)(16) of the PHSA		11/20/1985 Continuing No			
15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel					
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports this FiscalY				
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?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review--(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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications (and/or contract proposals) that focus on scientific areas relevant to minority health and health disparities. Operation of this committee is accomplished using a fluid membership, with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. In FY 2023, the Special Emphasis Panel reviewed 159 grant applications requesting \$679,619,309 in support.

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 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 or contracts requiring review.

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

The committee held 12 FACA and 5 working group 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 Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications and/or contract proposals. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permits 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 public reports during the fiscal year. Website: There is no dedicated website for this committee. Chairs: The 6/6/23-6/8/23 and 3/22/23 meetings had a co-chair. 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

Yujing Liu Chief, Scientific Review Branch

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 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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications (and/or contract proposals) that focus on scientific areas relevant to minority health and health disparities.

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

Checked if Applies Improvements to health or safety

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	Y
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 disease.

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

10,639

Number of Recommendations Comments

159 Grants applications

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 Partially 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	\checkmark
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 159 What is the estimated <u>Number</u> of grants recommended for approval 159 What is the estimated <u>Dollar Value</u> of grants recommended for approval \$679,619,309

Grant Review Comments

159 grant applications requesting \$679,619,309.00

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	
Online GSA FACA Web Site	✓
Publications	
Other	

Access Comments

N/A