

2022 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of Nursing Research Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 02/07/2023 01:13:19 AM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2022

3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Institute of Nursing Research
Special Emphasis Panel

3b. GSA

Committee

No.

2086

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

Fiscal Year?

No

Charter

09/29/1995

Renewal Date

7. Expected

Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency

Recommendation for Next FiscalYear

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b.

Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 USC 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total

Number of Reports

No Reports for
this FiscalYear

17a.

Open

0

17b. Closed

4

17c. Partially Closed

0

Other Activities

0

17d. Total

4

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
NIH Peer Review	11/02/2021	- 11/02/2021
NIH Peer Review	02/10/2022	- 02/10/2022
NIH Peer Review	03/04/2022	- 03/04/2022
NIH Peer Review	06/03/2022	- 06/03/2022

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 4

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel		
Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$9,100.00	\$9,100.00
18a(2). Personnel		
Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel		
Pmts to Federal Staff	\$332,208.00	\$411,629.00
18a(4). Personnel		
Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$3,692.00
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	\$2,112.00
18d. Total	\$341,308.00	\$426,533.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	1.80	2.10

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 16 grant applications requesting \$24,171,695.

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.

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. 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.

Designated Federal Officer

Weiqun Li Chief, Office of Review

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
ALLEN, JERILYN	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	M. Adelaide Nutting Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Aouizerat, Bradley	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor and Deputy Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Arch, Joanna	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

BENDER, CATHERINE	03/04/2022	03/04/2022	Professor and Nancy Glunt Hoffman Endowed Chair in Oncology Nursing	Peer Review Consultant Member
CALDWELL, CLEOPATRA	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor and Chair of Health Behavior & Health Education	Peer Review Consultant Member
CARMICHAEL, SUZAN	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
CORONADO, GLORIA	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Distinguished Investigator, Mitch Greenlick Endowed Senior Scientist	Peer Review Consultant Member
Christian, Lisa	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Associate Professor, Psychiatry & Behavioral Health	Peer Review Consultant Member
Corwin, Elizabeth	03/04/2022	03/04/2022	Professor and Vice Dean for Research	Peer Review Consultant Member
DEVON, HOLLI	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
DUNBAR, SANDRA	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor and Associate Dean	Peer Review Consultant Member
Donnelly, Joseph	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Federman, Alex	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Groer, Maureen	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
HERR, KEELA	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor and Associate Dean for Faculty	Peer Review Consultant Member
Heitkemper, Margaret	11/02/2021	11/02/2021	Professor and Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Hickman, Ronald	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Associate Dean for Research	Peer Review Consultant Member
Huang, Jeannie	11/02/2021	11/02/2021	Professor and Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
JIM, HEATHER	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

KUTNER, JEAN	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor and Associate Dean	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kwekkeboom, Kristine	11/02/2021	11/02/2021	Professor and PhD Program Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
LYON, DEBRA	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor and Executive Associate Dean	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lindley, Lisa	06/13/2022	06/13/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Moore, Shirley	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor and Associate Dean for Research	Peer Review Consultant Member
Moser, Debra	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor and Linda C. Gill Endowed Chair of Nursing	Peer Review Consultant Member
Penedo, Frank	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor of Psychology and Medicine	Peer Review Consultant Member
Peter, Inga	03/04/2022	03/04/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Pickler, Rita	06/13/2022	06/13/2022	Professor and Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Redeker, Nancy	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Beatrice Renfield Term Professor of Nursing	Peer Review Consultant Member
SMALDONE, ARLENE	11/02/2021	11/02/2021	Professor of Nursing & Assistant Dean	Peer Review Consultant Member
STEEL, JENNIFER	06/13/2022	06/13/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SUN, VIRGINIA	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Santos, Hudson	03/04/2022	03/04/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Starkweather, Angela	11/02/2021	11/02/2021	Professor and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	Peer Review Consultant Member
Stein, Karen	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Stevens, Jan	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Sullivan, Mary	06/13/2022	06/13/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
TJIA, JENNIFER	06/13/2022	06/13/2022	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
TREMONT, GEOFFREY	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tapia, Ignacio	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
WEBEL, ALLISON	03/31/2022	03/31/2022	Professor and Associate Dean for Research	Peer Review Consultant Member
Williams, Lovoria	02/10/2022	02/10/2022	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 42

Narrative Description

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. 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

NA

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 Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

1,920

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant Review

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully 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 Percentage 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
- 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 16

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 16

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$24,171,695

Grant Review Comments

The number of grants reviewed during FY22 are significantly lower due to the IC's decision to eliminate a mechanism.

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

