

# Research Compliance Office

---

## **IRB Annual Update**

---

Jennifer Howden  
IRB Manager, Panel 4  
May 18, 2009



# Overview



- **Accreditation and Organizational Updates**
- **Participant Withdrawal**
- **Short Form Consent Process**
- **Scientific Review of Protocols**
- **Privacy and Confidentiality**
- **Institutional Conflict of Interest (ICOI)**
- **Reviews by Continuous Quality Improvement Group and Common Observations**



# Accreditation and Organizational Updates

# AAHRPP Accreditation



- FULL Re-Accreditation, March 2009
- Met all 77 Elements, 5 with Distinction
  - Scientific Review of Research Projects
  - Institutional Official's Role in Human Research Protection Program (HRPP)
  - Design and Ease of Use of eProtocol System
  - Communication among various entities comprising HRPP
  - Institutional Conflict of Interest (ICOI) Policy

# Organizational Updates



- Economic Downturn
- Fewer Staff, More Responsibilities
- Help is still available...
  - [IRBeducation@stanford.edu](mailto:IRBeducation@stanford.edu) or 724-7141
  - Panel Managers (<http://humansubjects.stanford.edu>)
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) team
  - HelpSU ticket for eProtocol technical issues



# Participant Withdrawal

# Participant Withdrawal

## Partial vs. Complete



- **New draft guidance from the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) (11-7-08)**
  - Partial Discontinuation – for example, discontinue *intervention* but allow continued *interaction* (interviews, physical exams), review of *medical record*, and research on *specimens* that were already collected if described in the IRB approved protocol.
  - Complete Discontinuation – *all further activities* described in the IRB approved protocol involving participation are *stopped*.
- **Harmonizes with Food and Drug Administration (FDA) guidance:**
  - *Data collected* on participant to point of withdrawal may be required – might not be allowed to remove it from database

# Participant Withdrawal

## IRB's Expectation



Researchers will:

- **Communicate** with participants when participation terminates, thus have the opportunity to discuss “partial” vs. “complete” withdrawal,
- **Anticipate** that withdrawals may occur, and include details of continued interaction in consent form and protocol application, and
- **Report** to IRB at continuing review the number of and reasons for withdrawals.





# Short Form Consent Process

# Short Form Consent Process



- Indicate your intention to use short form consent process: Add “Short Form Consent Process” in section 13 - Consent Background.
- If the RCO-provided translated short form consent documents are to be used, do not attach the actual form.
  - Chinese
  - Farsi
  - Japanese
  - Korean
  - Russian
  - Spanish
  - Vietnamese

# Short Form Consent Process

## What to submit for IRB approval



- Check box to confirm that you will follow the procedures for obtaining consent using the short form consent process.
- I have read and will follow the above procedures.





# Scientific Review of Protocols

# Criteria for IRB Approval



- Procedures are consistent with **sound research design**
- Risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the **importance of the knowledge** that may reasonably be expected to result.

# Scientific Review – Who performs it?



- NIH Study Section (or NSF, DOE, DOD, NCI)
- FDA during IND or IDE evaluation
- VA Research & Development Committee
- Cancer Center Scientific Review Committee
- CTRU
- Industry Sponsors

# If no other scientific review is performed?



- Required: Review of Scientific or Scholarly Validity by the Division Chief, Department Chair, or appropriate School Dean or designee (or Faculty Sponsor when student is PD).
- Required: Scientific Review Protocol when study is **medium** or **high** risk and has no other scientific review.

# The Scientific Review Protocol



- 10 point outline sent by Panel manager.
- <http://humansubjects.stanford.edu> – see Medical Research Forms





# Privacy & Confidentiality

# Privacy of Participants



- Respecting an individual's right to be free from **unauthorized or unreasonable intrusion**.
  - Extent, timing and circumstances of **obtaining personal information from or about an individual**.
- Examples
  - **Recruiting**, screening, meeting & enrolling **people**
  - **Collecting** data from **people** (where are physical exams, tests, interviews, surveys taking place?)



# What's new?

## eProtocol Section 11 updated....



### Privacy Protections (a)

Describe how the **conditions under which interactions will occur** are adequate to protect the privacy interests of participants (e.g., privacy of physical setting for interviews or data collection, protections for follow-up interactions such as telephone, email and mail communications).

# Confidentiality of Data



- Respecting a potential or current participant's right to be free from **unauthorized release of information**.
  - relationship of trust
  - expectation that data will not be given to others **without permission**
- An agreement (via ICF or HIPAA Authorization) established between **investigator & participant**
- Agreement maintained by **handling, management & dissemination** of research data



# What's new?

## eProtocol Section 11 updated....



### Confidentiality Protections (b) – (i)

- Specify the PHI – what data will be used?
- How data will be maintained?
- How data or specimens will be labeled?
- Who will have access?
- How will data be coded?
- Who will maintain the key to the code?
- How will data be transferred or transmitted?
- How will you educate research staff?



# Institutional Conflict of Interest (ICOI)



## **The Policy addresses:**

- Institutional conflicts of interest arising from the financial holdings or investments of **Stanford University**
- Potential conflict of interest when an **institutional leader** has a financial interest related to human subjects research

**<http://rph.stanford.edu/4-7.html>**

# e-Protocol Application –

## 12. Potential Conflict of Interest



### **Two items have been revised:**

b) To your knowledge, does **anyone in a supervisory role** to you have a conflict of interest related to this study?

c) To your knowledge, does **Stanford University** have an ownership or royalty interest in any intellectual property utilized in this protocol?





# Continuous Quality Improvement Review Activities (CQI)

# CQI Review Activities



- Informed Consent Forms (ICF) - performed regularly
- Observations of Consent Process - performed periodically.
- Sponsor-Investigator Research (SIR) Compliance - performed annually.
- Other Compliance Reviews - in process
- Reviews of RCO processes

# Some Noted Issues



## ▪ Informed Consent Form

- ❑ signed ICFs substantially inconsistent with IRB approved versions
- ❑ signed HIPAA authorization missing
- ❑ hand written alterations to IRB approved ICF
- ❑ persons obtaining consents (POC) did not sign and/or date consent
- ❑ Inattention to completion of dates and signatures

## ▪ Sponsor-Investigator Research

- ❑ Lack of document retention such as original FDA applications, financial disclosures, delegation of authority logs

## ▪ Other Compliance Reviews

- ❑ Studies with children: Both parents' signatures missing when required, Reasons for lack of signatures from both parents not documented when required, Incomplete "*Description of Representative's Authority to Act*" section



**Questions?**

**Thank you!**