

## 2019 Current Fiscal Year Report: Communication Disorders Review Committee

Report Run Date: 04/07/2020 06:54:32 AM

**1. Department or Agency**  
Department of Health and Human Services

**2. Fiscal Year**  
2019

**3. Committee or Subcommittee**  
Communication Disorders Review Committee

**3b. GSA Committee No.**  
834

**4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?** **5. Current Charter** **6. Expected Renewal Date** **7. Expected Term Date**  
No 06/01/1986

**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. Establishment Authority** Authorized by Law

**12. Specific Establishment Authority** **13. Effective Date** **14. Committee Type** **14c. Presidential?**  
42 USC 282(b)(16) 11/20/1985 Continuing No

**15. Description of Committee** Grant Review Committee

**16a. Total Number of Reports** No Reports for this FiscalYear

**17a. Open** 0 **17b. Closed** 3 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 3

### Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
NIH Peer Review	10/18/2018	- 10/19/2018
NIH Peer Review	02/07/2019	- 02/08/2019
NIH Peer Review	06/20/2019	- 06/21/2019

**Number of Committee Meetings Listed:** 3

	Current FY	Next FY
<b>18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$32,400.00	\$32,400.00
<b>18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff</b>	\$319,048.00	\$324,753.00
<b>18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$47,548.00	\$47,939.00
<b>18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$58,834.00	\$59,422.00

<b>18d. Total</b>	\$457,830.00	\$464,514.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	2.10	2.10

**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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications in the fields of hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech and language. During the reporting period the committee reviewed 162 applications requesting \$59,244,876 direct costs and recommended 162 applications .

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the fields of academic medicine, basic research and clinical sciences related to the seven mission areas of the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD). The members provide primary scientific review of specialized grant mechanisms supported by the NIDCD.

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

The Communication Disorders Review Committee held three meetings during this reporting period.

**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. These evaluations and recommendations 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 Communication Disorders Review Committee 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 privacy.

## 21. Remarks

Reports: The committee did not produce any public reports during this fiscal year.

### Designated Federal Officer

MELISSA J. STICK CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BRANCH

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
AGRAWAL, YURI	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DIVISION OF OTOTOLOGY, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
AHVENINEN, JYRKI	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL	Peer Review Consultant Member
ALT, MARY	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	Peer Review Consultant Member
ANDERSON, JULIE	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON	Peer Review Consultant Member
BEDORE, LISA	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
BOYCE, SUZANNE	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI	Peer Review Consultant Member
BOZZA, THOMAS	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
BRADY, NANCY	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	Peer Review Consultant Member
CAMARATA, STEPHEN	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHENG, ALAN	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, STANFORD UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHERNEY, LEORA	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	PROFESSOR/DIRECTOR, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
COHEN, HELEN	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	PROFESSOR, BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE	Peer Review Consultant Member
COSLETT, H.	02/07/2019	02/07/2019	WILLIAM N. KELLEY PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA	Peer Review Consultant Member
CRAMER, KARINA	07/01/2017	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE	Peer Review Consultant Member

CRENSHAW, E.	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA	Peer Review Consultant Member
DRONKERS, NINA	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	RESEARCH SCIENTIST, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY	Peer Review Consultant Member
FABIANO-SMITH, LEAH	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	Peer Review Consultant Member
FONTANINI, ALFREDO	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
FROEMKE, ROBERT	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF OTOLARYNGOLOGY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
GAN, RONG	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	CHARLES E. FOSTER CHAIR AND PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA	Peer Review Consultant Member
GERRATT, BRUCE	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA- LOS ANGELES	Peer Review Consultant Member
GIFFORD, RENE	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
GILLAM, RONALD	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	RAYMOND AND ELOISE LILLYWHITE ENDOWED CHAIR, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
GOFFMAN, LISA	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	PROFESSOR AND NELLE C. JOHNSTON CHAIR IN EARLY CHILDHOOD COMMUNICATION DISORDERS	Peer Review Consultant Member
GRAY, SHELLEY	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
HAMMER, MICHAEL	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR; DIRECTOR, AIRWAY SENSORY PHYSIOLOGY LABORATORY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER	Peer Review Consultant Member
HASTINGS, MICHELLE	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ROSALIND FRANKLIN UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
HECK, DETLEF	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE MEMPHIS	Peer Review Consultant Member
HE, DAVID	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR, CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
HERTZANO, RONNA	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	Peer Review Consultant Member
HOCHBERG, LEIGH	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR, MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL	Peer Review Consultant Member
HUGHES, MICHELLE	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	DIRECTOR, COCHLEAR IMPLANT RESEARCH LABORATORY	Peer Review Consultant Member
HULLAR, TIMOTHY	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	DIRECTOR OF OTOTOLOGY, NEUROTOLOGY, AND SKULL BASE SURGERY	Peer Review Consultant Member

ISHYAMA, AKIRA	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	PROFESSOR, SURGERY, UCLA	Peer Review Consultant Member
KANDLER, KARL	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH	Peer Review Consultant Member
KERBER, KEVIN	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
KING, WILLIAM	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
KIRKWOOD, KEITH	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	PROFESSOR, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO	Peer Review Consultant Member
KOHRMAN, DAVID	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN MEDICAL SCHOOL	Peer Review Consultant Member
KREIMAN, JODY	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	PROFESSOR IN_RESIDENCE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES	Peer Review Consultant Member
KURLAND, JACQUIE, PHD, CCC-SLP	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST	Peer Review Consultant Member
LANG, HAINAN	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA	Peer Review Consultant Member
LAUER, AMANDA	07/01/2018	05/30/2022	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
LIN, WEIHONG	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	Peer Review Consultant Member
LI, XIN	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
LOVE-GEFFEN, TRACY	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR, SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCCREERY, RYAN	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	DIRECTOR, BOYS TOWN NATIONAL RESEARCH HOSPITAL	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCGANN, JOHN	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
MESGARANI, NIMA	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
MIRMAN, DANIEL	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM	Peer Review Consultant Member
MONGEAU, LUC	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	PROFESSOR, MCGILL UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
MOSELEY, MARTIN	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IN MEDICINE, DUKE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member

NAGARAJAN, SRIKANTAN	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO	Peer Review Consultant Member
PARKER, DENNIS	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	MARK H. HUNTSMAN PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH	Peer Review Consultant Member
PARRISH, TODD	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	PROFESSOR, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
PICHICHERO, MICHAEL	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	DIRECTOR UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER MEDICAL CENTER	Peer Review Consultant Member
POLLEY, DANIEL	07/01/2015	06/30/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, EATON-PEABODY LABORATORY	Peer Review Consultant Member
PRIEVE, BETH	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	PROFESSOR, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHNUR, TATIANA	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE	Peer Review Consultant Member
SFEIR, CHARLES	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH	Peer Review Consultant Member
STEPP, CARA	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, BOSTON UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
STOODLEY, CATHERINE	06/20/2019	06/21/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
TJADEN, KRIS	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	PROFESSOR, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO	Peer Review Consultant Member
TREMBLAY, KELLY	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON	Peer Review Consultant Member
VAN HORNE, AMANDA JEAN	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE	Peer Review Consultant Member
WANG, XIAOQIN	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	PROFESSOR, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
WITHNELL, ROBERT	10/18/2018	10/19/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, INDIANA UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
YAKUSHEVA, TATYANA	02/07/2019	02/08/2019	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
YUNUSOVA, YANA	07/01/2016	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO	Peer Review Consultant Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 69**

## **Narrative Description**

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 in the fields of hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech and language. During the reporting period the committee reviewed 162 applications requesting \$59,244,876 direct costs. The Committee provides advice to the Director, NIDCD on programs and activities in the areas of communication science. The committee reviews grant applications, National Research Service Award training grants, conference grants, Career Development Awards, fellowships, and special projects in the communication and chemosensory sciences. To accomplish its mission, the committee, which is composed of members who are identified from academic medicine, basic research and the clinical sciences related to the mission of the NIDCD and invited to serve for overlapping terms of four years, meets and reviews grant applications three times a year. The committee is an essential component of the Institute and continues to provide important information to the Director, NIDCD.

**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?**

2,760

### **Number of Recommendations Comments**

2760 is the number of grants reviewed from 2003-2019.

### **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. 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. 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**

Meeting minutes, oral presentations, and written reports.

**What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?**

Checked if Applies

- |                                   |                                     |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Reorganized Priorities            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Reallocated resources             | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Issued new regulation             | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Proposed legislation              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Approved grants or other payments | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other                             | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**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 included 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 162

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 162

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$59,244,876

**Grant Review Comments**

The dollar amount recommended is for grant applicant's direct costs.

**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**

N/A