IRB ANNUAL SURVEY 2010

The Office of Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) uses this survey to evaluate and improve the Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP).

Demographics:

- Total respondents: 473
- Source of responses: ⅔ HSC, ⅓ UPC
- Faculty and staff comprised 61% of total respondents, students and study staff 39%
- 76% of respondents had prior experience using IRB
- The survey was composed of 25 statements about the IRB. Respondents used a Likert scale from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" to rate each statement
- The survey concluded with 5 open-ended questions, which less than half of respondents answered

Strengths	Weaknesses
"**Strengths"** represent statements to which 60% or more of respondents chose to "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"	"**Weaknesses"** represent statements to which 50% or more of respondents chose to "Disagree" or label "Not Applicable"
– Knowledgeability of the IRB – IRB facilitates/promotes research – timeliness of reviews – IRB addressing scientific validity – IRB not overstepping its bounds – reasonable IRB determinations – IRB working to find solutions when disagreement exists – IRB treating researchers with respect – IRB provides adequate rationale when requesting change – providing education resources to choose correct level of review – PI/Study staff use online templates – Positive experience with CITI program – ISTAR easy to navigate – IRB/OPRS website (valuable resource) – Majority of respondents read the Human Subjects Newsletter	– Finding approved documents in ISTAR – IRB overestimating the magnitude and probability of risk – Attending in-person IRB ed sessions – IRB acknowledges unexpected delays (Majority Response: "Don't Know") – Turnaround time on IRB approval reflects level of risk (Majority Response: "Don't Know") – CITI/ISTAR help desk/in-person ed sessions (50% of respondents reported not using these services; "Not Applicable")

May 26, 2010

Comments/Suggestions to be Implemented from Survey

- **Provide in-person ISTAR training**
- **Make approved study documents easy to find and lock-out expired documents.**
- **"The istar website is clunky and difficult to navigate between places. Please change to a more easily navigated frame."**
- **"Improve the website workflow. Remove no longer valid consent forms and documents from the same location as the ones that are current and should be used."**
- **"The section on biorepository and data sharing have import in human subject research. Having easy to follow sections and policy guidelines would help researchers."**
- **"personal training courses on submissions to IRB"**
- **"More short video instruction"**
- **"More (and more accessible) online information, more complete initial review … the ability to file multiple protocol deviations on the same form …"**
- **"… Ability to submit several different amendments and reportable events at the time (specially if they are memos or letters from the Sponsor). Currently, only one attachment is allowed per Reportable event."**
- **Improve ISTAR guidance online.**
- **"It would be great if there is an estimate of how long the IRB application is going to take. Sometimes an amendment gets approved within days, sometimes it takes weeks..."**
- **I would suggest making it a requirement that dissertation chairs go through IRB training..."**
- **"a FAQ list that indicates the risk levels (and review requirements) of a few typical experimental designs might be helpful in determining whether the application requires a full board review..."**
- **"…we should be able to retain information from earlier studies so that we don not need to enter everything all over again when we are proposing a very similar study or extension of earlier work which is often the case…"**
- **In-person educational sessions, specifically to orient doctoral students.**
- **"Faster turnaround on minor amendments (especially those adding additional research assistants to a project) would be most helpful."**
- **Timeline or timetable of how long the process would take.**
- **"…there are sometimes waves when everybody seems to submit protocols at the same time. What would be nice to have would be a notification what the estimated review time is."**

Open-ended Comments from both Campuses