SESSION 1125 (SYMPOSIUM)

THE NUTS AND BOLTS OF NIH PEER REVIEW: THE CENTER FOR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW

Chair: Elia Femia, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Massachusetts, United States
Co-Chair: Dana Plude, National Institute on Aging/National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, United States
Discussant: George W. Rebok, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, United States

The National Institutes of Health is the largest public funder of biomedical and bio-behavioral research in the United States. The mission is to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce illness and disability. To achieve this mission, the NIH provides support for cutting-edge research and technology development in a variety of fields, ranging from translation of innovative ideas in technology to basic science on major health challenges and disease. There are many types of research and training opportunities and technology development programs that are supported by the NIH across the 24 institutes and centers that provide funding. The majority of grant applications are reviewed by the NIH Center for Scientific Review (CSR). In this symposium, attendees will get 1) an overview of the types of applications submitted to the NIH for support; 2) the basics of the NIH peer review process and criteria and scoring system for evaluating applications, and 3) tips for writing a more successful grant application.

Peer review is the cornerstone of the NIH grants process, and an insider’s view can lead to a better understanding of how the most meritorious projects are identified that lead to innovative re-search in the biomedical and bio-behavioral sciences.

THE REVIEW PROCESS AND TAKING STEPS TOWARD A SUCCESSFUL APPLICATION

Elia Femia,1 and Dana Plude2, 1. National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Massachusetts, United States, 2. National Institute on Aging, Bethesda, Maryland, United States

Applications reviewed by the Center for Scientific Review go through a process that starts with assignment to a review panel and ends with the assignment of a priority score and the production of a written evaluation (summary statement). This process is overseen by a Scientific Review Officer, who enlists expert reviewers to evaluate the scientific and technical merit, and the potential contribution and impact of the application to the research field. The goal is to ensure that applications are expertly and fairly evaluated in accordance with the NIH policies of rigor, reproducibility, transparency, and research integrity. In this presentation, learn about the criteria for review of an application, how reviewers shape their evaluation, and what applicants should be addressing in their grant applications. From the field, hear tips from successful applicants and experienced reviewers about what they do and what they look for in a well-written application.

TYPES OF APPLICATIONS AND PUTTING YOUR BEST FOOT FORWARD

Dana Plude,1 Dana Plude,2 and Elia Femia1, 1. National Institute on Aging/National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, United States, 2. National Institute on Aging, Bethesda, Maryland, United States

The majority of peer review is conducted through the NIH Center for Scientific Review (CSR), which works closely with the institutes and centers who ultimately fund projects of high scientific merit and high potential impact. CSR conducts the review of 90% of R01s, 85% of Fellowships, and 95% of SBIR applications as well as many other research and training opportunity activities. The playing field for successful funding from NIH is highly competitive. Understanding about different application types, who to talk to about your application, finding the right review panel, and learning about the policies pertaining to review are important steps in preparing an application. In this presentation, learn about the important aspects of the grant submission process and how CSR conducts the review of application in close coordination with NIH’s 24 institutes and centers.

SESSION 1130 (SYMPOSIUM)

PRESIDENTIAL SYMPOSIUM: THE TIES THAT BIND: THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY IN THE LIVES OF OLDER ADULTS

Chair: Tamara A. Baker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, United States
Discussant: Lewina O. Lee, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, United States

Data show that seven out of every ten adults, over the age of 50, own a smartphone, with one out of ten owning a tablet. While traditional activities dictate the use of technology among this cohort, there is growing evidence that adults similarly use devices to also manage their medical care and to learn online. This increase has guided scholars in recognizing the utility of technology from designing interventions to understanding how technology may serve as a barrier and/or facilitator to one’s general well-being. This symposium features four presentations from nationally recognized scholars that will expand traditional perspectives on technology use, and how it influences social ties among older adults. Dr. Charness will examine the population-level trends in social network use by aging adults and discuss a recent CREATE intervention study (PRISM), that used a computer-based platform to reduce social isolation and loneliness among older adults. Dr. Czaja will similarly present findings from CREATE, and other trials, on the access to and use of email, social media sites, and online support groups among older adults, and the resultant impact on social connectivity, loneliness and social support. Dr. Rogers will discuss technologies that currently exist (e.g., apps, mobile devices, social networking) or are being developed (e.g., robotics, telepresence, virtual reality) to support social engagement. Dr. Antonucci will examine aspects of new technologies and their influence on health and well-being, while underscoring the perspective that new and emerging technologies hold great promise in overcoming traditional barriers to maintaining social contact and exchange.

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA NETWORKS FOR AGING ADULTS: PANACEA, PLAGUE, OR BEEN THERE, DONE THAT?

Neil H. Charness1, 1. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, United States
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