Scientific Review Officer/Health Scientist Administrator - 601

A. **As the Designated Federal Official for the objective, thorough and fair peer review of grant applications and/or contract proposals; the objective of the peer review is to identify those applications and/or proposals that show the greatest promise of advancing biomedical, bioengineering, behavioral and/or clinical research, research infrastructure, and/or research training and career development: By the end of the calendar year or IC established timeframes:**

- Identify areas of scientific and technical expertise required for the review of assigned applications/proposals and potential conflicts of interest.
- Select reviewers based on their training and experience in relevant scientific and technical fields, showing awareness of emerging areas.
- Follow the regulations and procedures in consideration of real and apparent conflicts of interest, including full documentation for the official file and obtaining appropriate waivers for conflict of interest as needed; ensure that women, minorities and persons with disabilities are considered in the recruitment effort.
- Select review meeting dates and schedule work so sequential activities during the review cycle are accomplished in an orderly and efficient manner; meet standards of review unit for timeliness of each step in the review process. Select appropriate review format for assigned applications/proposals, if applicable.
- Follow I/C standards for administrative review of applications in terms of completeness and other elements deemed necessary for conduct of a proper review.
- Submits nomination slate of appropriate new committee members for chartered committees by established deadline (if applicable). Nomination slate approved by division director by June 30 of year of slate (if applicable, i.e., not required for SROs who do not handle chartered study sections; more flexible for newly formed committees)
- Exercise sound judgment in identifying and resolving problems that arise before, during and after the review meeting. Obtain information appropriate to make sound decisions. Resolve issues and problems according to policy.
- Conduct review meetings in a professional manner and in accordance with Federal laws and regulations as implemented via NIH and I/C policies and procedures; effectively schedule activities during the review meeting.
- Orient reviewers , applicants, and NIH staff to policy, procedures, expectations and requirements of the review meeting appropriately and professionally
- Strive to obtain complete, expert and fair reviews from reviewers.
- Mailing to study section members at least four weeks prior to main meeting, where applicable.
- At least 95% of review assignments completed at time of mailing.
- At least 98% of critiques posted in IAR two days prior to study section meeting; if less, evidence that the SRO actively encouraged posting.
- Work with the IRG Chief to achieve their goal of reviewing applications using an electronic meeting format (AED or VED).
- Work with the IRG Chief to achieve their goal of improving peer review by implementing cost avoidance measures for travel and review meetings and by facilitating reviewer participation.
- 85% of members on slates and meeting rosters are Professors, Associate Professors or comparable level scientists.
- Work with the IRG Chief to achieve their goal of informing permanent members of study sections of the opportunity to submit certain grant mechanisms at their own discretion with no deadline and conduct those reviews in a timely manner. The CSR intent is to have those reviews conducted within 90 days, but certainly within 120 days.

B. **As the Designated Federal Official for the review, prepare required documentation of review meetings, procedures and activities for advisory Councils/Boards that are complete, accurate and timely by established timeframes, as evidenced by:**

- Ensure that supporting DEAS staff has all necessary scores, codes, etc., to enter into the IMPAC II system, and reviews them prior to release of the meeting; meet established deadlines for release of scores and meetings.
- Summary statements/technical evaluation reports are appropriately edited, and Resumes and Summaries of Discussion clearly and accurately document the discussion and final opinions of the committee.
- Summary statements/technical evaluation reports/minutes include all required components.
- Meet deadlines for release of summary statements for review meetings. At least 95% of summary statements released within 30 days of meeting (85 summaries for study sections with 90 or more applications). Released all summary statements 30 days before council (except for applications that were appropriately reviewed late in the cycle, e.g., re-reviews, deferrals, etc.).
- Provide appropriate information about the review to program staff responding to appeals.
- Attend Advisory Council/Board meetings as appropriate; if called upon, represent review proceedings clearly and accurately.

C. **Demonstrate in depth understanding of current I/C, NIH, and DHHS policies and procedures relevant for peer review, as evidenced by:**

- Stay abreast of scientific advances in the field in areas of review responsibility through reading of scientific literature and/or attending at least one meeting, workshop, seminar, etc., per year in a relevant topic.
- Properly interpret and stay current on the laws, regulations, and policies related to conflict of interest, review criteria, human subject protections and inclusion, animal welfare, and other relevant factors related to peer review.
- Conform to CSR policies and procedures on peer review including SRO Handbook and guidance/practice documents.
- Provide clear and accurate information about review policy and procedures to applicants, reviewers, members of the scientific community, other NIH staff, and in response to inquiries from the public, as appropriate.
- Demonstrate knowledge of and appropriate use of computer systems, tools and databases relevant to peer review, such as word processing and spreadsheet programs, the NIH IMPAC II Peer Review and Committee Management modules, the Query/View/Reporting (QVR) system, the Internet Assisted Review (IAR), eRA Commons, and other databases as needed.
- Identify areas of professional development needs and obtain training to effect improvement in job performance.
- Participate regularly in staff meetings and informational meetings and seminars.

D. **Work effectively with reviewers, applicants, members of the scientific community, support staff, supervisors, and other NIH staff, as evidenced by the following:**

- Communicate orally and in writing in a clear, organized and concise manner.
- Provide clear and accurate information to reviewers, applicants, members of the scientific community, and other NIH staff about review policies and procedures.
- Respond to requests for information promptly and appropriately.

- Communicate effectively with supervisor about emerging issues.
- Communicate effectively with DEAS and I/C support and administrative staff to ensure that duties and responsibilities are clearly understood and can be completed in a timely manner. Appropriately distinguish tasks for SRO and support staff.
- Foster a teamwork environment, help identify and resolve issues that may impede communication, offer suggestions for improved working relationships, and is open to input from others.
- Cooperate to meet overall workload needs of the review unit. Display flexibility in situations with changing demands or priorities. Work with other staff to promote efficiency, eliminate bottlenecks, and coordinate review functions.
- Interact effectively with program and other NIH staff, when feasible and appropriate, regarding review issues
- Work effectively on assigned committees, working groups, teams, etc., keeping focus on team goals; maintain a professional demeanor and treats fellow employees and team members collegially and respectfully.