

## Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. DOT/FAA/AM-25/25	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle CogStudy Independent Review Panel Report of Recommendations		5. Report Date August 2025	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Kurt Geisinger ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3179-2026">https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3179-2026</a> ) Charles Golden ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3888-5601">https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3888-5601</a> ) Leonard Simms ( <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8081-380X">https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8081-380X</a> )		8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Chickasaw Health Consulting, LLC 2600 John Saxon Blvd. Norman, OK 73071		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No. 6973GH-22-D-00062/ 6973GH-25-F-00859	
12. Sponsoring Agency name and Address Office of Aerospace Medicine Federal Aviation Administration 800 Independence Ave., S.W. Washington, DC 20591 <a href="#">FAA Office of Aerospace Medicine</a>		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Report	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplemental Notes Technical Report DOI: <a href="https://doi.org/10.21949/1529721">https://doi.org/10.21949/1529721</a> Technical report authors: Kurt Geisinger is the Director of the Buros Center for Testing and a Professor at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Charles Golden is a Professor at the Department of Clinical and School of Psychology, Nova Southeastern University, Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Leonard Simms is a Professor at the Department of Psychology, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York.  This document/record belongs to the Federal Aviation Administration and may be used for official Government purposes only. It may not be released without the expressed permission of the Federal Aviation Administration. Refer requests for the document to the Office of Aerospace Medicine (see box 12).			
16. Abstract  Objective: This project aimed to provide independent subject matter expertise to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) by evaluating alternative neurocognitive tests for aeromedical certification, including consideration of what, if any, future validation research should be performed. Methods: An Independent Review Panel (IRP) of neuropsychology and cognitive-testing experts reviewed neurocognitive test batteries and informational documents and responded to a questionnaire provided by the FAA. The panel produced a consensus report to document their findings and recommendations. The panel deliberated on data collection approaches to promote validity and reliability, and to guide a decision on best practices for utilizing the alternative neurocognitive tests. Results: The IRP provided recommendations on whether validation research should be conducted, along with caveats, implementation considerations, and conditions to support safe, evidence-based integration into aeromedical decision-making. Conclusions: The IRP findings are deliberative and intended to inform FAA aeromedical certification, balancing practical considerations with rigorous scientific standards to safeguard aviation safety.			
17. Key Words Neurocognitive, Testing, Pilot, Medical Certification		18. Distribution Statement  <div style="text-align: center;">FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY</div> Public availability to be determined under 5 USC 552	
19. Security Classification (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classification (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 27	22. Price