

2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: Communication Disorders Review Committee

Report Run Date: 04/27/2024 01:25:44 AM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human
Services

2. Fiscal Year

2024

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 Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

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 Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for
this Fiscal Year

17a. Open

0

17b. Closed

0

17c. Partially Closed

0

Other Activities

0

17d. Total

0

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 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 disorders affecting hearing, balance, voice,

speech, language, taste, and smell. During the reporting period the committee reviewed 127 applications requesting \$66,722,171 direct costs and recommended 127 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 on the following dates - 10/13-14/2022, 2/9-10/2023, and 6/15-16, 2023.

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 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. 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. Members: Dr. Ronna Hertzano resigned 2/10/2023. Dr. Melanie Fried-Oken was unable to complete her term (7/1/2020-6/30/2024) on the committee and resigned on 6/30/2022. The resignation was not reported in 2022. In general, initial/integrated review group (IRG) members serve up to six years, which is documented in the Members list. The permanent membership of this IRG may be supplemented at any meeting with temporary members who have experience or expertise in the disciplines and fields related to the IRG's function and are appointed to review some or all of the applications considered at that meeting. Therefore, the Members list reflects meeting dates, not appointment start and end dates for these members. While only one meeting date is listed as an appointment start and end date, an IRG temporary member may have attended several meetings throughout the fiscal year. 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

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
APOSTOLIDES, PIERRE	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF OTOLARYNGOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
ARUNAHALAM, SUDHA	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE SCIENCES & DISORDERS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
BEESON, PELAGIE	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	PROFESSOR AND DEPARTMENT CHAIR, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	Peer Review Consultant Member
BRIGANDE, JOHN	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	PROFESSOR, OREGON HEALTH AND SCIENCE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
EDDINS, DAVID	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA	Peer Review Consultant Member
FAROQI SHAH, YASMEEN	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF HEARING & SPEECH SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	Peer Review Consultant Member
FLETCHER, MAX	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF ANATOMY AND NEUROBIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER	Peer Review Consultant Member
GALLUN, FREDERICK	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	PROFESSOR AND RESEARCH INVESTIGATOR, OREGON HEALTH AND SCIENCE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
HENRY, MAYA	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professo, University of Texas at Austin	Peer Review Consultant Member
HUGHES, MICHELLE	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Director Cochlear Implant Research Lab, University of Nebraska	Peer Review Consultant Member
KLUG, ACHIM	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DENVER	Peer Review Consultant Member
KURUVILLA-DUGDALE, MILLI	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI	Peer Review Consultant Member

LIEBENTHAL, EINAT	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL, MCLEAN IMAGING CENTER	Peer Review Consultant Member
MAFFEI, ARIANNA	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor, State University of New York at Stony Brook	Peer Review Consultant Member
PATEL, RUPAL	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	PROFESSOR, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
PHAM, GIANG	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY	Peer Review Consultant Member
ROSEN, MERRI	07/01/2021	06/30/2025	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, NORTHEAS OHIO MEDICAL CENTER	Peer Review Consultant Member
SOTOMAYOR, MARCOS	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor, Ohio State University	Peer Review Consultant Member
WALTERS, BRADLEY	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF OTOLARYNGOLOGY-HEAD AND NECK SURGERY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI	Peer Review Consultant Member
WASHINGTON, KARLA	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 20

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 127 applications requesting \$66,722,171 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, and fellowships. 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trust in government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cost Savings Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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?

3,266

Number of Recommendations Comments

3266 is the number of grants reviewed from 2003-2023.

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

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	<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 127

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

approval

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval

\$66,722,171

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