

UC, May 15 2017

Scope of Work of Working Group

We ask the committee to review the IRB Survey Report, benchmarking data that we have gathered from our peer institutions, and existing UW-Madison HRPP policies. To facilitate the review of the benchmarking data, the VCRGE staff will provide a summary of the initiatives at our peer institutions to increase the efficiency of the IRB review process. Also, the VCRGE staff will be available to the committee to gather any additional information needed. If the committee determines that new policies need to be written or existing policies revised, the VCRGE also can assist in drafting such policies.

Charge questions

1. How are IRB policies reviewed at UW-Madison and potentially changed? What is the present committee structure in place for this process and should it be modified?
2. The survey results indicated that a substantial number of faculty perceived IRB oversight as overly conservative by imposing a set of regulations on investigators that unnecessarily exceed the federal standards. The office of the VCRGE seeks the committee's advice about whether there are any current practices and university-wide policies that could be modified to reduce the regulatory burden without in any way violating federal policy or jeopardizing UW-Madison's accreditation status, which the campus is committed to maintaining.
3. What changes could be made to current IRB policies, processes, and procedures to address faculty concerns raised in the IRB Survey?
Faculty suggestions:
 - Develop protocol templates
 - Provide additional training of staff – to ensure better consistency in review, better understanding of role and not overreaching into scientific issues
 - Streamline IRB process especially for minimal risk studies, continuing reviews
 - Provide more staff consultation
 - Reduce or eliminate redundancy within a protocol
 - Consider developing an appeals process
4. Based on the available benchmarking data compiled by the VCRGE, what initiatives at our peer institutions might we adopt?
5. Are the IRB offices sufficiently staffed and resourced?
6. Currently there are three IRBs: two minimal risk IRBs (Educational and Social Behavioral Sciences, Health and Health Sciences Minimal Risk) and the Health Sciences IRB. Is the current administrative and funding model for the IRBs optimal? Given the volume of protocols at the UW-Madison, what is the optimal number of IRBs to serve the research enterprise?
7. Are there sufficient opportunities for input from faculty and staff PIs? If greater input is warranted, how might this be achieved?
8. Are the IRB and HRPP websites well-organized to allow study teams easy access to information needed for protocol development and submission? How can this be improved? How can communication in general and consistency of communication between the PIs and IRB staff be improved?
9. Are there ways to shorten time to review protocols?