

# Maricopa County Community College District

## Institutional Review Board Handbook

### *Standard Operating Procedures*

Prepared by the Research Policy Group

December 2017 Update

*TABLE OF CONTENTS*

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PURPOSE OF THE IRB</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>BASIC PRINCIPLES</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>AUTHORITY OF THE IRB</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS OF THE IRB</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>MEMBERSHIP OF THE IRB</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>MANAGEMENT OF THE IRB</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWING APPLICATIONS</b>	<b>14</b>
SUBMITTING THE APPLICATION ONLINE	14
TYPES OF APPLICATIONS	14
EXCLUDED	14
EXEMPTED	15
EXPEDITED	17
FULL BOARD	18
ACTIONS OF THE IRB	19
APPROVED WITHOUT STIPULATION	19
NOT APPROVED	19
CONTINUING REVIEW	20
PROCEDURES PERTAINING TO BOTH INITIAL AND CONTINUING REVIEW	20
ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING GUIDANCE	20
CLOSE OUT OF STUDY FORM	21
OPERATIONS OF THE IRB	21
MEETINGS	21
REVIEWS	21
VOTING REQUIREMENTS FOR FULL BOARD REVIEWS	21
ONLINE COMMUNICATION	22
APPEALS	22
AMENDMENTS TO THE PROJECT	22
MINOR MODIFICATION/CHANGE	22

SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATION/CHANGE	23
LEVEL OF REVIEW FOR AMENDMENTS	23
SPONSOR AGENCY MODIFICATIONS	23
GRIEVANCES	23
COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES	24
RECORD REQUIREMENTS	24
INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM THE PI	25
PRINCIPLES OF INFORMED CONSENT	26
SPECIAL POPULATIONS	28
CHILDREN	28
PRISONERS	28
PREGNANT WOMEN, NEONATES, AND FETUSES	29
NATIVE AMERICANS	29
STUDENT SUBJECT POOLS	29
OTHER POPULATION GROUPS	29
STUDENT ENGAGED RESEARCH	29
CONFLICT OF INTEREST GUIDELINES	30
CONFIDENTIALITY GUIDELINES	31
COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEES	31
FUNCTION AND COMPOSITION	31
SAME IRB PROCEDURES APPLY TO CRRC	32
TYPES OF PROTOCOLS REVIEWED BY CRRC	33
<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>34</b>
ACRONYMS	34
GLOSSARY	34

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) Research Policy Committee acknowledges and thanks Sinclair Community College for permission to use their Institutional Review Board Charter and Operating Procedures as the model for developing Maricopa's Institutional Review Board Standard Operating Procedures Manual. Permission was obtained from the Director of the Grants Development Office at Sinclair Community College.

The MCCCD Research Policy Committee acknowledges and thanks Arizona State University for the use of their operating procedures and materials and the cooperation of their office that handles human subjects research reviews (the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects Administration (ORSPA)).

The Research Policy Committee acknowledges and thanks the MCCCD Faculty Executive Council for their support of the development of human subjects research policy and process at MCCCD.

The Research Policy Committee has worked diligently to develop a Human Subjects Research Policy, an Institutional Review Board, standard operating procedures, and supporting documents and forms. This work was made possible by dedicated members, including faculty, administration, and staff. The Committee thanks the members for their dedication, commitment and hard work; the Committee Chair who served as Facilitator; and also the Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs/Provost for support of policy development.

## INTRODUCTION

The Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) encourages and supports the scholarly endeavors of its faculty, staff, and students. Pursuit of scholarly work and research will often involve the participation of human subjects for data collection and analysis. MCCCD's Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviews human subjects research proposals to ensure that the rights and welfare of research participants are protected; that risks have been considered and minimized; that the potential for benefit has been identified and maximized; that all human subjects only volunteer to participate in research after being provided with legally effective informed consent; and that any research is conducted in an ethical manner and in compliance with established standards. Those individuals seeking to conduct such research may not solicit subject participation or begin data collection until they have obtained clearance by the MCCCD IRB.

While some research projects involving human participation are considered "exempt" from IRB approval requirements, they must still go through a review process. The types of research generally "exempt" from IRB approval requirements include normal educational practices such as work undertaken as a part of a course, educational tests when the participants are not identified, and surveys or interviews in which the participants volunteer and are not personally identified. They all need to be reviewed and only the IRB can determine "exempt" status.

The MCCCD IRB has the responsibility to oversee procedures for carrying out the District's commitment to protect human participants in research. The role of the IRB is to review proposed research projects that involve human participation and to ensure that the proposed research complies with the guidelines set forth by the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), within the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS).

The MCCCD IRB does not assume the role of evaluating the soundness of the proposed research study, the merits of the research design, or the potential contribution of the research to the scholarly literature. Rather, the MCCCD IRB is charged with evaluating each project's compliance with ethical standards in regard to issues such as informed consent, confidentiality, and any risk to the participants.

## **INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY**

These Standard Operating Procedures establish and empower the Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) human subjects protection committee. MCCCD has one committee, registered with the federal Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), within the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) as Institutional Review Board (IRB00005745). This committee is hereinafter referred to as “the IRB.”

## **PURPOSE OF THE IRB**

The primary purpose of the IRB is to protect the rights and welfare of human research participants. This applies to research involving MCCCD employees and students either as participants or researchers.

## BASIC PRINCIPLES

- I. The basic principles that govern the IRB in assuring that the rights and welfare of subjects are protected as contained in *Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research* (“The Belmont Report”) by The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, published in the Federal Register on April 18, 1979. The three principles are Beneficence, Justice, and Respect for Persons. (For more information, visit this link: <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html>.)
- II. The following principles guide IRB review of all research, including student projects, involving human subjects at MCCCD:
  - A. Subjects’ legal rights will be respected; their rights to privacy, dignity, and comfort will also be considered in approving proposed research.
  - B. Risks to subjects must be reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits, if any, to subjects, and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result.
  - C. Adequate provision(s) must be made for all facilities, procedures, and professional attention necessary for the protection of the individual as a research subject.
  - D. Adequate provisions should be made for recruiting a subject population that is representative of the population base in terms of gender and minority representation, unless scientifically justified otherwise.
  - E. Research involving human subjects must be supervised by qualified persons, including qualified clinicians for all study-related health care decisions and faculty members for undergraduate research projects.
  - F. Participation of a human subject in research must be voluntary and the right to withdraw at any time must be provided. Information provided to gain subject consent must be adequate, appropriate, and presented in lay language appropriate to the subject population.
  - G. Any research project that involves human subjects must be reviewed by the IRB and it must be approved prior to its initiation or initiating any major changes to it. Additionally, research may be subject to periodic review.

## AUTHORITY OF THE IRB

- I. MCCCDC holds a Federalwide Assurance (FWA) through OHRP. As part of this Assurance, MCCCDC agrees to consider all human subjects research as being subject to federal regulations, regardless of the source of funding, if one or more of the following apply:
  - A. The research is sponsored by MCCCDC (unless the research is conducted at another institution with which MCCCDC has an “IRB Authorization Agreement” as specified in MCCCDC’s FWA);
  - B. The research is conducted by or under the direction of any employee or agent of MCCCDC (unless the research is conducted at another institution with which MCCCDC has an “IRB Authorization Agreement” as specified in MCCCDC’s FWA);
  - C. The research is conducted by or under the direction of any employee or agent of MCCCDC using any property or facility of MCCCDC;
  - D. The research involves the use of MCCCDC’s information systems, personnel, or facilities to identify or contact research participants; or
  - E. The research is part of any grant application.
  - F. A human subject and human subjects research are defined thus:
    1. According to 45 CFR 46.102 (e) of HHS: A human subject is a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research who (i) obtains information or biospecimens through intervention or interaction with the individual, and uses, studies, or analyzes the information or biospecimens or (ii) obtains, uses, studies, analyzes, or generates identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens. Intervention includes both physical procedures by which information or biospecimens are gathered (e.g., venipuncture) and manipulations of the subject or the subject’s environment that are performed for research purposes. Interaction includes communication or interpersonal contact between investigator and subject. Private information includes information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, and information that has been provided for specific purposes by an individual and that the individual can reasonably expect that will not be made public (e.g., a medical record). Identifiable private information is private information for which the identity of a subject is or may readily be ascertained by the investigator or associated with the information. An identifiable biospecimen is a biospecimen for which the identity of the subject is or may readily be ascertained by the investigator or associated with the biospecimen.

2. Human subjects research is any research involving a human subject as defined above. Research means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. The definition of research excludes the following activities: (1) scholarly and journalistic activities (e.g., biography, literary criticism, and oral history), (2) public health surveillance activities, (3) collection and analysis of information, biospecimens, or records by or for a criminal justice agency for activities authorized by law or court order solely for criminal justice or criminal investigative purposes, and (4) authorized operational activities in support of intelligence or national defense missions.
- G. All human subjects research as defined in the section above is covered by this policy except:
1. Assessment done in the context of a class for the purpose of evaluating student performance, for the purpose of improving teaching or augmenting class content so long as the rights and privacy of individuals are not violated.
  2. Research and reporting done in the context of responding to required Federal or State submissions or accrediting bodies so long as the rights and privacy of individuals are not violated.
  3. Research that involves no intervention nor interaction as defined above, and where identifiable private information is protected.
- II. The IRB reviews all projects involving human subjects in accordance with these Standard Operating Procedures, applicable federal regulations, and sponsor policies and guidelines.
  - III. The IRB provides continuing advice and counsel to personnel engaged in human subjects research.
  - IV. In some instances, students may be involved in research activities. The student's faculty supervisor is responsible for ensuring that IRB processes are followed.
  - V. The IRB has approval authority of human subjects projects, and can approve, modify, or disapprove studies based upon consideration of any issue it deems relevant to human subject protection. Research that has been approved by the IRB may be subject to further appropriate review and approval or disapproval by the college or MCCCDC as appropriate. However, the college or MCCCDC may not approve the non-exempt research if it has not been approved by the IRB.
  - VI. The IRB has authority to require progress reports from the principal investigator (PI) and oversee the conduct of the study.
  - VII. The IRB has authority to suspend or terminate approval of a study, or to place restrictions on a study, when such actions are deemed to be in the best interests of the subjects in that study.
  - VIII. The IRB has authority to observe the informed consent process as practiced by any investigator or authorized person in any approved project.

- IX. The IRB has the authority to access, and to make copies of, records related to any research approved by the IRB (or another body under an IRB Authorization Agreement) regardless of the location of the records if they are needed to investigate an adverse incident. Where feasible, appropriate notice will be given of the need to review, copy or duplicate records while being sensitive to causing the least inconvenience or disruption of ongoing research.

## **FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS OF THE IRB**

- I. The IRB functions administratively through the Division of Academic and Student Affairs within MCCCDC. This structure provides for administrative coordination for the IRB with the various academic and administrative units at MCCCDC.
- II. The IRB advises and makes recommendations to the Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs/Provost (Provost, for short), to policy and administrative bodies, and to any member of the MCCCDC community on all matters related to human subjects research.

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE IRB

- I. The IRB is composed of a representative from each of the colleges, the District Office (DO), and a community member who is not affiliated with MCCCD. Alternates and non-voting members may also be selected, with alternates authorized to vote at convened meetings only in the absence of the member for whom they are designated to alternate. The representatives from the colleges are selected by their respective Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA), and the representative from the DO and the community member are selected by the Provost.
- II. The IRB is composed of members with varying backgrounds and expertise in special areas to provide complete and adequate review of the research. Committee members should possess not only specific competencies sufficient to comprehend the nature of the research, but also other competencies necessary for judgments as to acceptability of the research in terms of MCCCD regulations, relevant law, ethical standards, and standards of professional practice. Consultants may be used to review proposals for which additional expertise is needed.
- III. The IRB must include both men and women, at least one member whose primary concerns are in scientific areas and at least one member whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas (such as lawyers, members of the clergy, ethicists), and at least one member who is not otherwise affiliated (either directly or through immediate family) with MCCCD. The diversity of its membership shall include race, gender, cultural background, and sensitivity to issues such as community attitudes to promote respect for and offer counsel in safeguarding the rights and welfare of research participants. Appointment of members shall be identified to OHRP – by name, earned degrees, position or occupation, and representative capacity.
- IV. No person shall be excluded from serving on the IRB based on race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin.

## MANAGEMENT OF THE IRB

- I. The Provost selects a member of the IRB to serve as IRB Chair. The term for the Chair position is three years, to be renewed at the discretion of the Provost. The Chair has authority to sign all IRB action items.
- II. Members of the IRB select one of them to serve as Alternate Chair, who presides over all convened IRB meetings and has authority to sign all IRB action items, in the absence of the IRB Chair.
- III. The Provost, in consultation with the IRB and relevant departments in the DO, selects the IRB Coordinator whose responsibilities focus on management of IRB processes and procedures, which include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - A. Updating federal paperwork;
  - B. Preparing IRB meeting agendas and minutes;
  - C. Assisting investigators in submitting applications;
  - D. Prescreening proposals and applications;
  - E. Educating MCCCDC employees on IRB business;
  - F. Communicating IRB determinations to investigators and relevant parties;
  - G. Keeping apprised of current developments in human subjects research;
  - H. Designing and maintaining content for the IRB webpage; and
  - I. Working with the IRB Chair to orient new IRB Members.

The IRB office will maintain files, track protocols, and ensure continuing reviews of applications.

- IV. The VPAA of each college must appoint one of its faculty or staff members to represent that college on the IRB, becoming an IRB Member, with voting rights. Once appointed as such, the IRB Member, by default, becomes chair of their College Research Review Committee (CRRC) (see the College Research Review Committee section). The Provost will appoint the DO IRB Member and the community member.
- V. Initial formal training is required of all IRB Members at the time of their initial appointment, and thereafter as required by the IRB. IRB Members must update their training once every three years. The IRB office will maintain a log of continuing education completion dates. Continuing education of IRB Members will also be supported through information resources on the IRB webpage.
- VI. Liability coverage for IRB Members and CRRC Members is provided through MCCCDC's liability insurance coverage.
- VII. Consultants or individuals with expertise in certain areas may be recruited when deemed appropriate by the IRB Chair and the Provost.

# PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWING APPLICATIONS

## SUBMITTING THE APPLICATION ONLINE

- A. All investigators and research personnel conducting human subjects research in MCCCDC must complete requisite training. MCCCDC accepts training certificates offered by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI Program) as well as other similar, nationally recognized, programs.
- B. The PI must obtain institutional approval from the VPAA(s) of the college(s) involved in the study. If the study involves more than five colleges or the DO, the PI must obtain institutional approval from the Provost.
- C. The IRB will not consider any application without written documentation of institutional approvals and documentation of human subjects research training for all investigators and research personnel.
- D. The application and supporting documentation must be submitted through the online application system. The PI must obtain the login information for that system from the IRB Coordinator.
- E. The initial review of an application may take up to two weeks so investigators must plan accordingly. The approval process may take longer, depending on the extent of the revisions, if required by the IRB. Full Board reviews may take up to three weeks for the initial review to be completed.

## TYPES OF APPLICATIONS

A human subjects research project may be determined by the IRB to be **Excluded**, **Exempted**, or **Expedited** (if the research involves no more than minimal risk to research participants), or the IRB may require a **Full Board** review (if the research involves more than minimal risk to research participants). These categories are further detailed below. The PI may make the initial determination of the type of research submitted, but ultimately it is the IRB, not the PI, that issues the final determination.

### EXCLUDED

Exclusion from the required IRB review process is determined within categories that fall into three groups: (1) Activities that should be deemed not to be research, (2) are inherently low risk, or (3) where protections are separately mandated. Exclusions include:

- 1) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public health behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or indirectly; (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or (iii) the activity will involve a

collection of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act, E-Government Act and Privacy Act.

- 2) Secondary use of identifiable private information if it is for the use of protected health information regulated by HIPAA as “health care operations,” “research,” or “public health activities.”
- 3) Quality assurance or improvement activities involving the implementation of an accepted practice to improve the delivery or quality of care or services only if (i) limited to altering the utilization of accepted practice and the effects on the utilization of the practice.
- 4) Use of data collection and analyses of information or biospecimens for institutions’ own internal purposes if limited to (i) the use of data or biospecimens originally collected for another purpose, or (ii) obtained through oral or written communication.
- 5) Research involving the collection or study information that has been or will be collected in a manner in which identifiers are not recorded per the following: (i) the researcher can see identifiers but does not record them; (ii) the researcher does not include biospecimens (though data may be from biospecimens); (iii) does not require that the data exist as of the time the study commences.
- 6) Research or data collection related to oral history, journalism, biography or historical scholarship that focus directly on the specific individuals about whom the information is collected.
- 7) Research involving the secondary use of non-identified biospecimens to produce information about an individual that is already known.
- 8) Research involving government generated data and biospecimen collection and analysis for the purpose of criminal justice or criminal investigative purposes.
- 9) Government research related to public health surveillance activities, only if (i) authorized by a public health authority; and (ii) is related to public health signals, onset of disease outbreak, injuries or conditions of public health importance.
- 10) Government functions or government generated information by authorized intelligence, homeland security, defense or other national security activities.
- 11) Federally conducted research involving government generated or government collected data.

## EXEMPTED

Under federal regulations, certain types of research are exempt from federal policy unless the appropriate federal agency heads have determined otherwise (for more information, visit this link:

<https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/45-cfr-46/index.html#46.101>).

Exemptions include:

- 1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management

methods that are not likely to harm students' opportunity to learn what is required or harm the assessment of educators who provide instruction.

- 2) Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the criteria is met: (i) Information obtained is recorded in a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot be readily ascertained, either directly or indirectly; (ii) Disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or (iii) Information obtained is recorded in a manner that the identity of the human subjects can be readily ascertained, either directly or indirectly and an IRB conducts a limited IRB review.
- 3) Research involving benign behavioral interventions with collection of information of data from an adult subject through verbal or written responses or audiovisual recording if the subject prospectively agrees and at least one of the following criteria is met: (i) Information obtained is recorded in a manner in which subjects cannot be readily identified either directly or indirectly; or (ii) Disclosure of subjects' responses outside of research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation; or (iii) Information obtained is recorded in a manner in which subjects can be readily identified either directly or indirectly and an IRB conducts a limited review.
- 4) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted or supported by a federal department or agency, or subject to their approval and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; and is (ii) Published on a publicly available list prior to starting research.
- 5) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) If wholesome foods without additives are consumed; or (ii) If a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- 6) Secondary use of identifiable private information if notice is given when (i) Information has been or will be acquired for non-research purposes and where prior notice has been given to the individuals to whom the identifiable private information pertains, that such information may be used in research; and (ii) Secondary use adheres to privacy protections.

Exempt research classified under exemptions 2 and 3 above may also be subject to limited IRB review. The reviewer should determine that there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of data.

## EXPEDITED

Under federal regulations, certain types of research qualify for an expedited review (for more information, visit this link:

<https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/45-cfr-46/index.html#46.110>.

These are activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures specified in federal regulations. The activities listed should not be deemed to be of minimal risk simply because they are included on this list. Inclusion on the list merely means that the activity is eligible for review through the expedited review procedure when the specific circumstances of the proposed research involve no more than minimal risk to human subjects.

The list of categories of research that may be reviewed by the IRB through an expedited review is as follows:

- 1) Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) or (b) is met. (a) Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21 CFR Part 312) is not required. (Note: Research on marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the product is not eligible for expedited review.) (b) Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application (21 CFR Part 812) is not required; or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling.
- 2) Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows: (a) from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; or (b) from other adults and children, considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.
- 3) Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means. Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a non-disfiguring manner; (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat); (e) uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the

process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings; (j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

- 4) Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.) Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject's privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c) magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.
- 5) Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for non-research purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from federal regulations for the protection of human subjects. This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)
- 6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.
- 7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from federal regulations for the protection of human subjects. This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

## **FULL BOARD**

Human subjects research projects that involve more than minimal risk must go to Full Board review. The PI should allow at least three weeks for projects for Full Board review. In the application form, the PI assures the IRB that he/she will follow the principles, procedures, and guidelines established in the present document and agrees to allow the IRB access to pertinent records or research. In addition, the PI (1) should present all information that will aid in evaluating the proposal for compliance with this policy, and (2) must be available to discuss the project and/or consent forms at the discretion of the IRB.

## **ACTIONS OF THE IRB**

The IRB may take one of the following actions in regard to the proposed project: (1) Approved without Stipulation, or (2) Not Approved. The IRB may request modifications to the study to secure approval. Communication between the IRB and the PI, including notification of determination, will be conducted through the online application system.

### **APPROVED WITHOUT STIPULATION**

Approval of the project will be based on the following:

- 1) The extent to which the project makes explicit in design and procedures the protection of participants' rights.
- 2) Sufficient justification that the potential benefits to the participant or the importance of the knowledge to be gained outweighs any potential risks that may be present as a result of any such deception, should a degree of deception and/or withholding of information be necessary for adequate testing of the hypotheses and in the absence of any practical alternative.
- 3) Assurances of acceptable debriefing, if appropriate. It is the responsibility of the PI to give each participant an explanation to questions ensuing from participation in the research project following its conclusion. It is strongly recommended that this occur immediately following participation for each person, but if such information could adversely affect subsequent data collection in the same study according to the judgment of the IRB, the full explanation may be delayed for a reasonable period of time. There is an exception to this delay: In those cases in which it is unavoidable to mislead the participants and/or in which it is possible that the experimental treatment may result in emotional stress for individuals, it is mandatory that they receive a full debriefing immediately following their participation.
- 4) The adequacy of facilities and other resources necessary for completion of the study and protection of participants' rights.
- 5) Anticipated benefits, if any.
- 6) The personal risk to the participant in relation to expected benefits.
- 7) The adequacy of procedures for securing informed consent from the participant.
- 8) The adequacy of measures for minimizing of risk and the protection of the health, safety, comfort, and legal rights of the participant.
- 9) The adequacy of measures for protecting the privacy of participants and maintaining confidentiality of data.

### **NOT APPROVED**

An application is not approved if it fails to meet requisite approval criteria or if it seems to violate scientific or ethical standards. In that case, the PI may revise and resubmit the application for another review. "Not Approved" may be issued only in the case of a Full Board review.

## **CONTINUING REVIEW**

The IRB may conduct continuing review of research at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk, but not less than once per year. Unless an IRB determines otherwise, continuing review of research is not required in the following circumstances: (1) the research is eligible for expedited review, (2) the research is in accordance with limited review, (3) the research has progressed to the point that it involves at least one of the following: (a) data analysis, including analysis of identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens, or (b) accessing follow-up clinical data from procedures that research participants would undergo as part of clinical care. The IRB shall have authority to observe or have a third party observe the consent process and the research. The PI will be informed of the continuing review through the online application system. When a continuing review request is submitted, the reviewer shall consider the following: changes to the research, project deviations and violations since the last scheduled review, adverse event reports, reports of unanticipated problems involving risks to participants and, if available, data safety monitoring reports, and PI's compliance.

## **PROCEDURES PERTAINING TO BOTH INITIAL AND CONTINUING REVIEW**

- I. The IRB shall have authority to determine which studies need verification from sources other than the PI that no material changes have occurred since previous IRB review, particularly: (1) complex projects involving unusual levels or types of risk to participants; (2) projects conducted by a PI that previously failed to comply with the requirements of the HHS regulations or the requirements or determinations of the IRB; (3) projects where concern about possible material changes occurring without IRB approval have been raised based upon information provided in continuing review reports or from other sources; and (4) projects where the PI changes the purpose or use for which participants were informed for providing the data.
- II. PIs shall be informed at the time of project approval (both initial and continuing) that changes in approved research may not be initiated without IRB review and approval except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants.
- III. PIs shall be informed at the time of project approval (both initial and continuing) that any serious or ongoing problems are to be reported promptly to the IRB.
- IV. Serious or continuing noncompliance by a PI, or any suspension or termination of activities, is to be reported promptly to the IRB Chair or Designee so that appropriate remedial action can be taken, including, but not limited to, appropriate reporting to the granting agency.

## **ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING GUIDANCE**

- I. The OHRP recognizes that any adverse event in a trial is a potentially important occurrence because it may reflect additional risks to participants. In accordance with their requirements, these regulatory bodies have charged Institutional Review Boards with the responsibility of conducting continuing review of research. Included in this

review is the monitoring of adverse reactions and unexpected events (21 CFR 56.108 and 45 CFR 46.103).

- II. The PI must promptly notify the IRB Chair and IRB Coordinator of any adverse events in the research protocol (within 48 hours).
- III. Per federal regulations, all adverse events will be reported to the Provost and the OHRP.

### **CLOSE OUT OF STUDY FORM**

- I. The PI shall submit a close-out form for non-exempt research when data collection and analysis are completed within the scope of the IRB approved protocol.
- II. If the PI intends to deviate from the original purpose stated on the application and approved by the IRB, the PI must submit a new application to the IRB.

### **OPERATIONS OF THE IRB**

#### **MEETINGS**

- I. IRB meetings are scheduled as required.
- II. IRB Members are notified of the place and time of meeting and the agenda at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

#### **REVIEWS**

- I. The IRB Coordinator assigns the CRRC Chair of the research study site (i.e., the college where the study will be conducted) as primary reviewer and one or more members of that CRRC as secondary reviewers. The primary reviewer is responsible for issuing the IRB decision to the PI and carrying out any subsequent communication with the PI and IRB Coordinator pertaining to this application. If the proposed study is to be conducted at more than one college, then one of the Chairs of the CRRCs in question can serve as primary reviewer. Members, preferably Chairs, of the other CRRCs in question serve as secondary reviewers. Reviewers are advised to seek assistance, through the IRB Chair and IRB Coordinator, if specialized knowledge or expertise is needed to conduct a complete and thorough review of a given application. If external reviewers are assigned, they must be subject to the same policies of conflict of interest and confidentiality that apply to IRB Members.

#### **VOTING REQUIREMENTS FOR FULL BOARD REVIEWS**

- I. Except when an expedited review procedure is used, a quorum of the IRB, duly convened through formal notice, shall be a majority of voting members (including at least one external community member) with varying backgrounds to promote complete and adequate review of research activities, including at least one member whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas.
- II. In order for the research to be approved, it shall receive the approval of a majority of those voting members present at the meeting. IRB meetings conducted via telephone conference call are permitted pursuant to OHRP guidelines.

- III. PIs, including those who may also be IRB Members, may offer information and answer questions about their projects at a convened meeting.
- IV. No members of the IRB shall be involved in either the initial or continuing review of an activity in which they have a professional responsibility, except to provide information requested by the IRB. They may not be present during voting, and will not vote on any activity in which they have a conflicting interest (even if this means being unable to continue the meeting because of quorum requirements).
- V. In cases where research activities were initially approved under expedited procedures and subsequently reviewed by non-expedited procedures, the decisions reached at the convened meeting shall supersede any decisions made through the expedited review.
- VI. Although convened meetings of the IRB are open to the public, materials submitted for review, discussions of projects, and individual votes are considered confidential and should not be discussed outside of the meeting context. If during an IRB meeting the IRB Chair moves the meeting to executive session, any visitors will be asked to leave the room until after the executive session has ended.
- VII. Prior to service, all IRB Members must sign two agreements:
  - A. confidentiality agreement, and
  - B. conflict of interest statement.

## **ONLINE COMMUNICATION**

Once the application is submitted through the online system (after the PI has received the login information from the IRB Coordinator), the IRB will use this system to communicate with and notify the PI of its decisions, conditions, and requirements.

## **APPEALS**

The PI may appeal the decision of the IRB when a project has been disapproved and mutual agreement cannot be reached as to an acceptable alternative. Upon written notification of appeal from the PI, the appeal will go back to the IRB. The IRB Chair will convene an ad hoc committee to review the appeal and make a recommendation to the IRB. Then the IRB will make a final determination. The IRB is the final determiner by law. Final disapproval of the IRB cannot be overridden by any institutional official.

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE PROJECT**

If a project is to be modified, then the PI must submit all necessary documentation in the online application system within three business days of the changes if they are minor. If the changes are significant, then the PI must seek approval from the IRB prior to implementing the changes to the study. These types of changes are discussed below.

### **MINOR MODIFICATION/CHANGE**

A proposed change in research related activities that does not significantly affect an assessment of the risks and benefits of the study and does not substantially change the specific aims or design of the study. Examples of minor changes to a research study include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Addition or deletion of study team members;
- Addition of procedures that do not significantly increase risk to participants, considering the original purpose and study design of the approved study;
- Removal of research procedures that would thereby reduce the risk to participants;
- Addition of non-sensitive questions to unvalidated survey or interview procedures;
- Addition of or revisions to recruitment materials or strategies; and
- Administrative changes to the approved documents (e.g., correction of spelling, grammatical or typographical errors).

### **SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATION/CHANGE**

A proposed change in research related activities that significantly affects an assessment of the risks and benefits of the study or substantially changes the specific aims or design of the study. Examples of significant changes to a study may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Addition of a new and/or separate subject population (e.g., control group, additional cohort, vulnerable population, etc.);
- Addition of research procedures that involve greater than minimal risk to participants;
- Addition of surveys/questionnaires/interview procedures that could have adverse psychological consequences for participants or damage their financial standing, employability, insurability, or reputation;
- Removal of follow-up visits that appear necessary for monitoring subject's safety and welfare; and
- Change in the purpose of the original project or study or use of the data, from that initially provided to participants and to the IRB

### **LEVEL OF REVIEW FOR AMENDMENTS**

Amendments will be examined by the original primary reviewer to determine whether they qualify as minor or significant modifications. If an amendment is determined to increase the level of risk beyond minimal risk, the amendment will be referred to the full IRB. The PI must await the decision of the IRB before implementing significant modifications to the study.

### **SPONSOR AGENCY MODIFICATIONS**

Modifications can be made only to IRB approved studies. A sponsor agency may modify the research project before the study has received final approval from the IRB. If this occurs, the PI must immediately notify the IRB and await receipt of the IRB approval before making changes to the research project. Sponsor agency generated modifications (or addenda) require review and approval by the IRB. The PI must provide all sponsor documentation and summarize how the changes affect the approved project, including the recruitment, enrollment, and treatment of research participants.

### **GRIEVANCES**

The IRB Coordinator shall be informed of all grievances (e.g., of a research subject

against a PI) and inform the IRB. If the grievance is by a research participant, the grievance will go to the IRB. If the grievance is by a PI, the grievance will go to the Provost.

## **COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES**

Cooperative activities relating to human subjects are those which involve MCCCD and another institution. Normally, research involving MCCCD students and employees as participants must be reviewed and approved by the MCCCD IRB, even if it has already been approved by the IRB of the other institution. However, the IRB of one institution may rely on the IRB of the other institution under the following conditions:

- 1) Both institutions have Federalwide Assurances (FWAs) approved by OHRP;
- 2) Both institutions have entered into an Authorization Agreement (or equivalent document) that stipulates the responsibilities of both parties; and
- 3) The appropriate section of the FWA of the deferring institution designates the IRB of the approving institution.

In the absence of these conditions, the PI must secure the approval of the IRB at each institution engaged in the research and submit documentation of such approvals to the other IRB(s). The IRB Coordinator will verify (via the OHRP website) that the other institutions have approved FWA's.

## **RECORD REQUIREMENTS**

The IRB prepares and maintains adequate documentation of IRB activities, including the following:

- I. Copies of all research proposals reviewed, approved sample consent documents, and continuing reports submitted by the PI
- II. Detailed minutes of IRB meetings, showing:
  - A. Members present (any consultants/ guests/other shown separately)
  - B. Results of discussions on debated issues and record of IRB decisions
  - C. Record of voting (showing votes for and against, as well as abstentions)
- III. Records of continuing review activities, updated consent documents, and summaries of ongoing project activities
- IV. Copies of all correspondence between IRB and the PI
- V. Any statements of significant new findings (unanticipated risks or adverse reactions) provided to participants
- VI. Adverse reactions reports and documentation that the IRB reviews such reports
- VII. Emergency use reports
- VIII. General project information provided to participants (e.g., informed consent, fact sheets, brochures)

These documents and records shall be retained for at least three years after completion of the research, and the records shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized representatives of the Department of Health & Human Services, the Food and Drug

Administration, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other federal regulatory agencies, at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner. In addition, the IRB maintains a permanent record of the list of current IRB Members and written procedures for the IRB. The IRB will provide an annual report to MCCCD – for the Chancellor's Executive Council (CEC) and the Governing Board.

### **INFORMATION REQUIRED FROM THE PI**

- I. Professional qualifications to do the research (including a description of necessary support services and facilities);
- II. Appropriate MCCCD human subjects research application form (including project summary);
- III. Appropriate certification of training in human subjects research
- IV. Complete study project which includes/addresses:
  - A. Abstract Describing Project and Purpose: Briefly describe (1) the project or study and its purpose, and (2) what research participants will experience during the proposed study or project. Describe all strategies or experimental methods to be used, design, and program activities. Indicate what data, measures, or observations will be collected and used in the study or for the project. If any questionnaires, tests or other instruments are to be used, include a brief description and a copy of the instruments. (Special note to Grant Project Directors: In the case of educational or training grants, data collected about the participants served, assessment testing, pre- and post-testing and other aspects of project evaluation plans are critical.)
  - B. Methodology: Specify who the research participants will be. Indicate how they will be solicited, recruited, or contacted. Include any recruitment letters and materials with this document. State how much time will be required of each subject. Describe procedures to which individuals will be subjected. Use additional pages if necessary.
  - C. Voluntary Participation: Specify the steps that will be taken to ensure that each individual's participation is voluntary. State what, if any, inducements will be offered for their participation.
  - D. Confidentiality of Data and Privacy Protection: Describe the methods to be used to safeguard the privacy of research participants and ensure the confidentiality of data obtained, including plans for publication, disposition and destruction of data, including that of computer, print, videotape and audio materials.
  - E. Informed Consent/Assent: Attach a copy of all consent/assent forms to be signed by the participants and/or any statements to be read to or provided to the participants.
  - F. Risks to Subjects: Describe (1) any potential risks to participating individuals—physical, psychological, social, legal, or other; (2) include all known and anticipated risks to the participants such as side effects, risks of placebo

(inert) treatments, etc.; and (3) in research that proposes substantial risk to participants, list emergency backup procedures that are in place such as medical or counseling interventions.

- G. Benefits: (1) Describe the benefits and/or any compensation that the participating individuals can expect, and (2) describe the gains in knowledge that may result from the project or research study.

## PRINCIPLES OF INFORMED CONSENT

- I. When an activity does not involve therapy, diagnosis, or management, and a professional-subject relationship exists (e.g., participation in a research project), the subject is entitled to certain information. This information includes a full and frank disclosure of all the facts, probabilities, options, and opinions which a reasonable person might be expected to consider before giving his/her consent. A copy of the signed consent form must be kept on file with the investigator as indicated below, and a copy of the consent form must be given to the person signing the form.
- II. The informed consent of research participants will be obtained by methods that are adequate and appropriate. Consent must be obtained from the participants themselves except when the participants are not legally capable of giving informed consent because of age, mental incapacity, or inability to communicate. In the case of a minor, the IRB may accept the permission of the minor's parents (or parent) or legal guardian, along with the assent of the minor, in accordance with applicable federal regulations. In the case of other participants not legally capable of giving informed consent, the IRB may accept the consent from a legally authorized representative. The representative must be authorized either by a power of attorney or a court order.
- III. "Informed consent" means ensuring that research participants and/or their legally authorized representatives are fully informed of all aspects of their participation in a research project so as to be able to exercise free power of choice without undue inducement or any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, or other form of constraint or coercion. The basic elements of information necessary to such consent are found at these links:
  - A. <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/guidance/faq/informed-consent/index.html>
  - B. <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/guidance/informed-consent-tips/index.html>

MCCCD requires that all researchers use the approved informed consent template found on the IRB webpage. Other templates may be used provided all requisite elements are included. The IRB may approve the use of digital consent forms that include the subject's electronic signature. In such cases, a copy of the signed digital form, including the elements of the informed consent document, must be provided to the subject via email.

- IV. The IRB shall determine whether the consent is adequate in light of the risks to the subject and the circumstances of the research. The IRB shall also determine whether the information to be given to the subject or to qualified third parties, verbally or in writing, is a fair explanation of the procedure, the possible benefits, and the attendant hazards. Where debriefing procedures are considered a necessary part of the research plan, the IRB will ensure that plans for such debriefings will be complete and prompt. In addition, the language used should be clear and unambiguous with every attempt to eliminate technical terms and jargon (i.e., use lay language appropriate to the subject population).
- V. For research involving more than minimal risk to participants or if determined by the IRB during the ordinary review process to involve more than minimal risk, a compensation for injury statement will be required in the consent form. This statement should clarify who is responsible for any costs associated with any medical treatments required or any personal compensation for injuries received as a result of participation in the research.
- VI. Some research may not impose on the rights and welfare of research participants so as to make informed consent a requirement. Therefore, the IRB may choose to waive the requirement to obtain a signed consent form for some or all participants in some cases when it finds either:
  - A. That the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality; or
  - B. That the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to participants and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

In cases where the documentation requirement is waived, the IRB shall require the PI to provide research participants with a written statement regarding the research (e.g., a cover letter). Examples of such research where use of a cover letter is generally appropriate are collecting data by survey or interview.

Any waiver of documentation by the IRB must be based upon clearly defensible grounds. A request for waiver of documentation by the PI must include justifiable reasons in the project.

The IRB may also choose to approve a consent procedure which does not include or which alters some or all of the elements of informed consent, or waive the requirements to obtain informed consent provided the IRB finds and documents that:

- A. The research involves no more than minimal risk to the participants;
- B. The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the participants;

- C. The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration; and
  - D. Whenever appropriate, the participants will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.
- VII. Informed consent need not be based on full pre-study information. However, it is the responsibility of the IRB to set limits on the incompleteness of such information. Further, in those studies in which it is proposed to mislead the participants during data collection, the IRB has the responsibility of assessing the degree to which this violates the rights of the participants, and then setting the limits for such procedures.
- VIII. The IRB may approve a research proposal in which the PI will obtain information or biospecimens for the purpose of screening, recruiting, or determining the eligibility of prospective participants without informed consent if (1) the investigator will obtain information through oral or written communication with the prospective subject, or (2) the investigator will obtain identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens by accessing records or stored identifiable biospecimens.

## **SPECIAL POPULATIONS**

The law provides additional protections for research participants who are likely to be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence, such as children, prisoners, individuals with impaired decision-making capacity, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons.

### **CHILDREN**

The following considerations only apply to studies that intentionally target minors. The exemptions listed in 45CFR46.101(b)1 through (b)(6) apply to research involving children except for 45CFR46.101(b)(2) for research involving surveys, interview procedures, or observations of public behavior. Activities listed under 45CFR46.101(b)(2) do not apply to research covered by subpart D, except, research involving observation of public behavior when the investigators do not participate in the activities being observed. Nonexempt studies involving children require parental or guardian consent and participation assent.

### **PRISONERS**

The IRB will adhere to Subpart C of 45 CFR 46. The IRB will apply the prisoner specific definition of minimal risk as stated in 45 CFR 46.303(d) and will follow the requirements for IRB membership outline in 45 CFR 46.107. Investigators using prisoners as human subjects should provide specific detail and rationale in the human subjects application. Investigators are also required to take extra measures to ensure appropriate informed consent since prisoners may be influenced by their incarceration to participate in research. If at some point a participant in a study becomes incarcerated, it is the responsibility of the PI to notify the IRB. The protocol will then be re-reviewed according to Subpart C. Subpart C of 45 CFR 46 provides four research categories that the IRB may approve for prisoner researcher. The IRB will review the proposed research to ensure one of the four categories is applicable.

### **PREGNANT WOMEN, NEONATES, AND FETUSES**

The IRB reviews all guidelines as set forth in Subpart B of 45 CFR 46 and approves only the studies that it had determined to fulfill all necessary regulatory requirements. Investigators should describe the rationale and details for the inclusion of pregnant women, fetuses, or neonates in the research. Investigators should ensure that the informed consent form adequately addresses the risks to pregnant women, fetus, or neonate. The IRB ensures that there is adequate expertise, scientific and scholarly, to review the research and reserves the right to request expert consultation as needed.

### **NATIVE AMERICANS**

All studies that take place on tribal land will be reviewed by an IRB member familiar with the subject population and receive approval by the Tribal Council. Researchers must document Tribal Council approval or appropriate approval as part of the application process. All research conducted on Tribal Land involving Native Americans must be reviewed by the Full Board IRB except those studies that meet the federal definition as exempt.

### **STUDENT SUBJECT POOLS**

Subject pools are undergraduate students enrolled in particular departmental courses requiring participation in one or more research projects. The IRB provides guidance and oversight of departmental subject pools and review all research requesting subject pool participation. All student participation in subject pool research must be completely voluntary. Departments may provide students with incentives (usually extra credit) to participate in the subject pool.

### **OTHER POPULATION GROUPS**

Research involving population groups such as the mentally and physically infirm, and others in conditions of dependency, helplessness, or deprivation, may require additional precautions and procedures to assure their protection. Subjects may be paid to encourage their participation. Where subjects are drawn from particularly vulnerable groups, however, compensation may under certain circumstances cast doubt upon the voluntary nature of their consent. In such circumstances, the IRB may either limit or disapprove compensation.

### **STUDENT ENGAGED RESEARCH**

- I. Undergraduate research is to be encouraged. Learning the human subjects research process is an important part of a college education. It is recommended, however, that MCCCD students not engage in research that poses more than minimal risk to participants, as they are unlikely to have received sufficient training or experience at MCCCD to safely conduct such research. Faculty members can encourage course research activities such that students become familiar with developing research proposals that can fall into the exempt or expedited categories.
- II. Procedures
  - A. Classroom projects are considered research if they involve systematic collection of data and if their objective or design is to develop or contribute to

generalizable knowledge. This applies to human subjects research projects that students intend to publish or present in a public forum. Prior to conducting their study, students must seek approval from the College Research Review Committee (CRRC) at the research site.

- B. Student classroom projects that meet the definition of human subjects research (see above) are to be reviewed by the CRRC at the institution where the study will be conducted. They may be reviewed by the District IRB only if they involve more than minimal risk. Each CRRC determines its own processes and procedures for reviewing student projects.
- III. Responsibility of Faculty as Course Instructors
- A. Faculty are responsible for overseeing their student's conduct of a research project. They have the primary responsibility for ensuring that research participants are treated ethically in research.
  - B. Faculty will inform students of the ethical principles for the protection of research participants in research and provide them with training in this area.
  - C. Supervising faculty are responsible for student research and thus must serve as the PI and provide their signature on the application. The student can be identified as the Co-PI.
- IV. Theses and Dissertations: Research for honor's theses, master's theses, dissertations, and independent research studies is not considered classroom research. As such, these proposals must go through the IRB.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST GUIDELINES

- I. Investigators will be asked in MCCCD's Conflict of Interest form whether they have a vested interest in any commercial enterprise associated with any aspect of the project and, if yes, to identify and fully explain the safeguards taken to prevent PI bias in subject recruitment and/or the consent process.
- II. Investigators and IRB Members who are MCCCD employees and who apply for federal grants and contracts are subject to the MCCCD Conflict of Interest Policy.
- III. The Grants Office will forward to the IRB any financial interest disclosures received in connection with proposals for extramural funding that involve human participation.
- IV. An IRB Member is said to have a conflicting interest whenever that IRB Member, or spouse, or dependent child of the member:
  - A. Is an investigator or co-investigator on the project;
  - B. Has a "significant financial interest" in the sponsor or agent of the sponsor of a study being reviewed by the IRB, whereby the outcome of the study could influence the value of the financial interest (for the definition of "significant financial interest," see the MCCCD Conflict of Interest Policy, <https://district.maricopa.edu/legal/business-law-contracts/applying-arizonas-conflict-interest-laws>;
  - C. Acts as an officer or a director of the sponsor or an agent of the sponsor of a study being reviewed by the IRB; or

- D. Has identified himself or herself for any other reason as having a conflicting interest.
- V. It is the responsibility of all IRB Members to identify and avoid any situations in which they, either personally or by virtue of their position, might have a conflict of interest, or may be perceived by others as having a conflict of interest, arising in connection with a matter before an IRB of which they are a member. If IRB Members feel that they may have a conflict of interest, they must notify the IRB Chair immediately so the matter may be reassigned to another reviewer. In order not to delay the review process, it is essential that potential reviewers peruse the matters for which they are assigned reviewers immediately upon receipt to determine whether they may have a conflict. If the IRB Chair or another IRB Member should perceive a conflict of interest, they have a responsibility to bring this matter to the attention of the IRB.
- VI. Typically, in a Full Board review, there are three distinct phases of an IRB's consideration of a matter: discussion, deliberation and actions (including vote). In general, IRB Members who have a real or perceived conflict of interest may remain in the meeting room at the discretion of the IRB Chair during the discussion of the matter in order to provide answers to questions, clarifications, etc. However, said Members must leave the meeting room for deliberations and actions/votes regarding the matter.
- VII. Minutes of IRB meetings will reflect the absence of Members (by name) when they leave the meeting during deliberations and actions regarding matters for which they have, or may be perceived to have, a potential conflict of interest.

## **CONFIDENTIALITY GUIDELINES**

- I. Research proposals and grant applications often include confidential, sensitive or competitive data and information. Examples include identifiable private information which is outside the scope of what is considered "directory information" provided on MCCC students and employees, financial information about students or programs, and innovative programmatic activities.
- II. IRB Members will keep such data and information confidential and refrain from discussing them outside of the IRB meeting. This information will remain confined to the IRB meeting (unless federal, state or MCCC regulations should require its release through a formal request or funding requirement).

## **COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEES**

### **FUNCTION AND COMPOSITION**

- I. There are ten Research Review Committees, one at each college. The Research Review Committee may be referred to as the College Research Review Committee (CRRC).
- II. The CRRC serves as a panel of the IRB and operates under its direction. The CRRC provides timely reviews of research protocols that will be conducted at the college site. The CRRC, however, is not the IRB, nor does it have the authority and legal standing of the IRB.

- III. The CRRC will adhere to the guidelines established for the IRB, including membership, training, procedures and review of protocols.
- IV. The CRRC Chair is a voting member of the IRB.
- V. The VPAA at each college will determine the composition, tenure, and administrative location of the CRRC at their site.
  - A. Each college has the opportunity to establish a CRRC. The CRRC may include representatives from instruction, research and administration.
  - B. The VPAA of each college appoints the individual to serve as the CRRC Chair. Members of the CRRC can select one of them to serve as Alternate Chair. In the absence of the Chair, the Alternate Chair will fulfill the duties of the Chair on the CRRC and the IRB if designated by the Chair to do so.
  - C. The CRRC Chair shall attend IRB meetings. If the CRRC Chair is not able to attend an IRB meeting, the CRRC Chair shall designate the Alternate Chair to attend in his/her stead.
  - D. The CRRC Chair shall be the primary reviewer of all applications involving his/her college. The Alternate Chair shall be a secondary reviewer (as shall other CRRC Members, if there is a need for that). If the CRRC Chair is not able to serve as primary reviewer, then he/she shall designate the Alternate Chair to do so. Only the CRRC Chair or the Alternate Chair can sign off on an application--other CRRC Members may not do so.
  - E. The CRRC Chair shall provide annual updates to the IRB Coordinator on CRRC membership (with names and current training certificates).
  - F. The CRRC Chair shall serve a term of at least three years. CRRC Chairs who find themselves unable to attend IRB meetings or review applications must inform the IRB Chair and their VPAA so that a replacement can be selected. Additionally, IRB Members may be removed from the IRB before their term is completed for non-participation (unless there is reasonable justification). In either event, the IRB Chair will communicate with the college VPAA to find a replacement.
  - G. The Alternate Chair and other CRRC Members are encouraged to attend and participate in IRB meetings.

#### **SAME IRB PROCEDURES APPLY TO CRRC**

Unless specifically noted otherwise, the CRRC shall follow the same procedures as outlined above in all aspects (as in this document, MCCCD IRB Handbook).

- I. More than one individual should review each application and then discuss his/her evaluations, to ensure consistency of determinations. Consistency will be critical across all CRRCs, as each CRRC Chair serves as a member of the IRB.
- II. All CRRCs shall use the same forms (e.g., application form to conduct human subjects research, record of determination), as those developed by and for use of the IRB. The purpose is to ensure consistency of procedures and determinations.

- III. If in a very rare and unusual circumstance where both the CRRC Chair and Alternate Chair are absent, the VPAA can forward the request to the IRB Chair or the IRB office administrator for assistance. Through pre-planning and scheduling of reviews of student, faculty, staff and administrative proposals by the CRRC, however, these situations can be avoided.

#### **TYPES OF PROTOCOLS REVIEWED BY CRRC**

- I. The CRRC shall review exempt and minimal risk applications submitted by students at that college. Student applications must be submitted directly to the CRRC. The procedures for that are determined by the individual CRRC.
- II. The CRRC shall review exempt and minimal risk applications submitted by students from other colleges in MCCCD intending to conduct research at that college. Student applications must be submitted directly to the CRRC. The procedures for that are determined by the individual CRRC.
- III. The CRRC shall review exempt and minimal risk applications submitted by investigators other than students (such as employees at that college and external researchers) intending to conduct research at that college. These applications are submitted through the IRB online application system. Reviewers shall be assigned from the relevant CRRC by the IRB Coordinator.

# APPENDIX

## ACRONYMS

- CRRC: Research Review Committee at each college and at the District Office. The Committee may be referred to as the College Research Review Committee (CRRC), since 10 of the 11 Research Review Committees are located at the colleges and one is located at the District Office. The Committee may also be referred to as the RRC.
- DHHS: (U.S.) Department of Health & Human Services
- DO: District Office (Administrative Office of the Maricopa County Community College District)
- FDA: Federal Drug Administration
- FERPA: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
- FWA: Federalwide Assurance
- HHS: Health & Human Services
- HIPAA: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
- IRB: Institutional Review Board
- IRB Handbook: Handbook of Standard Operating Procedures for the IRB
- MCCCD: Maricopa County Community College District
- OHRP: Office for Human Research Protections (within the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services)
- PI: Principal Investigator
- “Provost”: Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs/Provost
- “The IRB”: (Maricopa County Community College District) Institutional Review Board
- VPAA: Vice President of Academic Affairs

## GLOSSARY

- ADVERSE EVENT. An undesirable and unintended, although not necessarily unexpected, result of therapy or other intervention.
- ASSENT. Explicit agreement by an individual not competent to give legally valid informed consent (e.g., a child or cognitively impaired person) to participate in research.
- AUTONOMY. Personal capacity to consider alternatives, make choices, and act without undue influence or interference of others.
- BELMONT REPORT. A statement of basic ethical principles governing research involving human subjects issued by the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects.
- BENEFICENCE. An ethical principle discussed in the Belmont Report that entails an obligation to protect persons from harm. The principle of beneficence can be expressed in two general rules: (1) do not harm; and (2) protect from harm by maximizing possible benefits and minimizing possible risks of harm.

- **COHORT.** A group of subjects initially identified as having one or more characteristics in common who are followed over time. In social science research this term may refer to any group of persons who are born at about the same time and share common historical or cultural experiences.
- **CONFIDENTIALITY.** Pertains to the treatment of information that an individual has disclosed in a relationship of trust and with the expectation that it will not be divulged to others without permission in ways that are inconsistent with the understanding of the original disclosure.
- **DEBRIEFING.** Giving subjects previously undisclosed information about the research project following completion of their participation in research. (Note that this usage, which occurs within the behavioral sciences, departs from standard English, in which debriefing is obtaining rather than imparting information.)
- **EXPEDITED REVIEW.** Review of proposed research by the IRB chair or a designated voting member or group of voting members rather than by the entire IRB. Federal rules permit expedited review for certain kinds of research involving no more than minimal risk and for minor changes in approved research.
- **FEDERALWIDE ASSURANCE (FWA).** Agreement that fulfills the requirements of 45 CFR part 46 approved by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. MCCCDC has an approved FWA on file with DHHS – Assurance Number FWA00006192. A copy of the assurance is available upon request from the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs/Provost.
- **FULL BOARD REVIEW.** Research that is reviewed at a convened meeting at which a majority of the membership of the IRB are present, including at least one member whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas. For the research to be approved, it must receive the approval of a majority of those members present at the meeting.
- **GRANT.** Financial support provided for a project or research study designed and proposed by the principal investigator(s). The granting agency exercises no direct control over the conduct of approved research supported by a grant.
- **GUARDIAN.** An individual who is authorized under applicable state or local law to give permission on behalf of a child to general medical care.
- **HUMAN SUBJECTS.** Individuals whose physiologic or behavioral characteristics and responses are the object of study in a research project. Under the federal regulations, human subjects are defined as living individuals about whom an investigator conducting research (1) obtains information or biospecimens through intervention or interaction with the individual, and uses, studies, or analyzes the information or biospecimens; or (2) obtains, uses, studies, analyzes, or generates identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens. (Also referred to as RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS in this document.)
- **INFORMED CONSENT.** A person's voluntary agreement, based upon adequate knowledge and understanding of relevant information, to participate in research or to undergo a diagnostic, therapeutic, or preventive procedure. In giving informed consent, subjects may not waive or appear to waive any of their legal rights, or release or

appear to release the investigator, the sponsor, the institution or agents thereof from liability for negligence.

- **INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD.** A specially constituted review body established or designated by an entity to protect the welfare of human subjects recruited to participate in biomedical or behavioral research.
- **INTERACTION.** Communication or interpersonal contact between investigator and subject.
- **INTERVENTION.** Physical procedures by which information or biospecimens are gathered and/or manipulations of the subject or the subject's environment.
- **JUSTICE.** An ethical principle discussed in the Belmont Report requiring fairness in distribution of burdens and benefits; it is often expressed in terms of treating persons of similar circumstances or characteristics similarly.
- **LEGALLY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.** A person authorized either by statute or by court appointment to make decisions on behalf of another person. In human subjects research, an individual or judicial or other body authorized under applicable law to consent on behalf of a prospective subject to the subject's participation in the procedure(s) involved in the research.
- **MINIMAL RISK.** A risk is minimal where the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the proposed research are not greater, in and of themselves, than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. For example, the risk of drawing a small amount of blood from a healthy individual for research purposes is no greater than the risk of doing so as part of routine physical examination.
- **MONITORING.** The collection and analysis of data as the project progresses to assure the appropriateness of the research, its design, and subject protections.
- **OFFICE FOR HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTIONS (OHRP).** The office within the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, responsible for implementing DHHS regulations (45 CFR Part 46) governing research involving human subjects.
- **PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR.** The person primarily responsible for a research study or project.
- **PRIVACY.** Control over the extent, timing, and circumstances of sharing oneself (physically, behaviorally, or intellectually) with others.
- **PRIVATE INFORMATION.** Information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, and information that has been provided for specific purposes by an individual and that the individual can reasonably expect will not be made public.
- **PROTOCOL.** The formal design or plan of an experiment or research activity: specifically, the plan submitted to an IRB for review and to an agency for research support. The protocol includes a description of the research design or methodology to be employed, the eligibility requirements for prospective subjects and controls, the treatment regimen(s), and the proposed methods of analysis that will be performed on the collected data.

- RESEARCH. A systematic investigation (i.e., the gathering and analysis of information) designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.
- RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS. See HUMAN SUBJECTS.
- RESPECT FOR PERSONS. An ethical principle discussed in the Belmont Report requiring that individual autonomy be respected and that persons with diminished autonomy be protected.
- RETROSPECTIVE STUDIES. Research conducted by reviewing records from the past (e.g., birth and death certificates, medical records, school records, or employment records) or by obtaining information about past events elicited through interviews or surveys. Case control studies are an example of this type of research.
- RISK. The probability of harm or injury (physical, psychological, social, or economic) occurring as a result of participation in a research study. Both the probability and magnitude of possible harm may vary from minimal to significant. Federal regulations define only "minimal risk". (See also: Minimal Risk.)
- VOLUNTARY. Free of coercion, duress, or undue inducement. Used in the research context to refer to a subject's decision to participate (or to continue to participate) in a research activity.