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Agenda

• Welcome and introductions
• Presentations
  ► Brief Q&A session following the first 3 presentations
• Q&A session with all presenters
• Instructions for obtaining CME credits

Note: After today’s webinar, a copy of the slides will be e-mailed to all webinar participants.
How to Submit a Question

• At any time during the presentation, type your question into the “Questions” section of your GoToWebinar control panel.
• Select “Send” to submit your question to the moderator.
• Questions will be read aloud by the moderator.
Research Collaboration with the University of Iowa

Jeanette M. Daly, RN, PhD
Associate Director
Iowa Research Network (IRENE)
Today’s Presenters

University of Colorado Denver- COMIRB and the INSTTEPP Study

Tabria Winer, MPH
Coordinator
Shared Network of Collaborative Ambulatory Practices & Partners (SNOCAP)
Oregon Health & Science University Research Integrity Office: Ceding oversight across multiple IRBs

LeAnn Michaels
Manager
Oregon Rural Practice-based Research Network (ORPRN)
Today’s Presenters

The Collaborative Ohio Inquiry Network (COIN) & the Ohio Reliant IRB System

Amanda Ross
Administrative Director
Collaborative Ohio Inquiry Network (COIN)
Research Collaboration
With the University of Iowa

“I SHOULD LIKE TO KNOW ABOUT RISKS… OUT OF POCKET EXPENSES…
TIME REQUIRED AND REMUNERATION… AND SO FORTH –
BY WHICH HE MEANT: WHAT AM I GOING TO GET OUT OF IT?
AND, AM I GOING TO COME BACK ALIVE?”
J.R.R. Tolkien, The Hobbit, Ch.1
All human subjects research conducted at the UI (or under its auspices) must be *reviewed and approved* by an Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to the start of the research. This includes cooperative research.
Cooperative Research

US DHHS and FDA provide federal regulations [21 CFR 56.114 & 45 CFR 46.114] that allow for cooperative research projects which involve more than one institution as multiple IRB applications would be redundant.
Cooperative Research

Minimally involves one practice-based research network (PBRN) at an academic center with multiple family physician offices who may or may not have their own IRB.
Community-based research often involves collaboration with non-UI entities, whom we call community partners.
Community partners generally fall into two basic groups:
Those who have their own IRBs, and those who don’t
The purpose of our community-based research program is to facilitate community-based research by providing mechanisms to extend UI IRB oversight to community partners.
Collaborative research is considered community-based research when:

1) The project meets the federal definition of “research”
   a systematic investigation including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge

2) The research participants are “human subjects”
   living individuals about whom identifiable private information is obtained or data is obtained through an intervention or interaction

3) The community partners are “engaged” in the research
   actively obtaining data as above, or obtaining informed consent of the research subjects.

4) The project is no more than “minimal or moderate risk”
   risk is defined as the probability of harm or injury (physical, psychological, social, or economic) occurring as a result of participation. Both the probability and magnitude may vary from minimal to significant
UI IRB oversight is extended to cover a community partner through...

An Individual Investigator Agreement (IIA)
Research collaboration with the University of Iowa

**Community Partner Check List**

**December 2012**

**Each Community Partner (CP):**

- **Letter of Agreement** – submitted to the UI PI confirming, in detail, the CPs understanding of and role in the project.
- **Human Subjects Protection Training** certification for all “engaged” CP staff submitted to HSO
- **HIPAA letter** - from the CPs Privacy Officer (if project involves protected health information PHI)
- **FERPA** training for all “engaged” CP staff (if project involves educational records)

**Community Partners without FWAs or IRBs:**

- **Individual Investigator Agreement** for an Individual (IIA-I), or Organization (IIA-O)
  
  - CP agrees to conduct the project in accordance with the UI’s FWA
  - CP acknowledges the UI as their IRB of record
  - CP acknowledges the Human Subjects and FERPA educational requirements

**Community Partners with FWAs but without IRBs:**

- **FWA** provided to PI (even if not funded)
  
  - CP accepts and acknowledges the UI IRB as their IRB of record
  - CP acknowledges the Human Subjects and FERPA educational requirements
The “Letter of Agreement” confirms:

1. That the community partner is committed to participating in the research.

2. That the community partner understands their role in the research.

3. That a collaborating site will allow conduct of the research on their premises and/or using their information and/or resources.

Organizations serving as community partners affirm that they will maintain copies of all professional licenses and verification of background checks on all staff members.

For independent community partners, “Letters of Agreement” are required from each organization on whose premises the research will be conducted and/or whose resources or information will be accessed. Individuals serving as community partners are asked to provide a copy of their current CV or Résumé to the UI Principal Investigator.
Human Subjects Protection Training

All community partner staff deemed to be “engaged” in research are required to complete Human Subjects Protection training.

An online course, Certification in Human Subjects Protections (CITI) is required https://www.citiprogram.org/
HIPAA

If a community-based research project will access *protected health information (PHI)*, the Privacy Officer of the organization where PHI will be collected will need to provide written authorization.
Sample text for an Institution with a Federalwide Assurance (FWA) to rely on the IRB/IEC of another institution (institutions may use this sample as a guide to develop their own agreement).


Name of Institution or Organization Providing IRB Review (Institution/Organization A):

________________________________________________________________________

IRB Registration #: ______________________ Federalwide Assurance (FWA) #, if any: ______________________

Name of Institution Relying on the Designated IRB (Institution B):

________________________________________________________________________

FWA #:

The Officials signing below agree that ___________________________ may rely on the designated IRB for review and continuing oversight of its human subjects research described below: (check one)

( ) This agreement applies to all human subjects research covered by Institution B’s FWA.

( ) This agreement is limited to the following specific protocol(s):

Name of Research Project:
Name of Principal Investigator:
Sponsor or Funding Agency: ___________________________ Award Number, if any: ___________________________

( ) Other (describe):

The review performed by the designated IRB will meet the human subject protection requirements of Institution B’s OHRP-approved FWA. The IRB at Institution/Organization A will follow written procedures for reporting its findings and actions to appropriate officials at Institution B. Relevant minutes of IRB meetings will be made available to Institution B upon request. Institution B remains responsible for ensuring compliance with the IRB’s determinations and with the Terms of its OHRP-approved FWA. This document must be kept on file by both parties and provided to OHRP upon request.

Signature of Signatory Official (Institution/Organization A):

________________________________________________________________________

Print Full Name: ___________________________________________________________________ Institutional Title: ___________________________

NOTE: The IRB of Institution A may need to be designated on the OHRP-approved FWA for Institution B.

Signature of Signatory Official (Institution B):

________________________________________________________________________

Print Full Name: ___________________________________________________________________ Institutional Title: ___________________________
IRB Ceding Process

- Gives control of IRB review, approval and oversight of human subjects research to another IRB
- Allows one IRB to rely on another IRB
- Reduces duplication of effort
- Increases efficiency by designating a single IRB
Polling Question
For more information contact:

Jeanette Daly, RN, PhD
Associate Research Scientist
Department of Family Medicine
University of Iowa
Phone: (319) 384-8995
jeanette-daly@uiowa.edu
Polling Question:
Does the IRB at your institution have ceding forms?
Various Types of IRB Cooperation In Support of Practice-Based Research

University of Colorado Denver- COMIRB and the INSTTEPP Study

Tabria Winer, MPH
COMIRB Background

• Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board
• Affiliated sites include:
  • University of Colorado Denver (Anschutz and Downtown Campuses)
  • Denver Health and Hospital Authority
  • University of Colorado Hospital
  • Veteran’s Administration Hospital
  • Children's Hospital Colorado
COMIRB Background

- Comprised of five IRB panels
  - 4 review protocols for UCD and its affiliates and biomedical protocols
  - 1 reviews social and behavioral protocols
  - Adult and pediatric
- Ensures that appropriate safeguards exist to protect rights and welfare of research subjects
Conducting Practice Based Research In Colorado

- SNOCAP is the collaborative affiliation of practice based research networks in Colorado
  - 4 Primary Care PBRNs, 1 Public Health PBRN
- Department of Family Medicine, UC Denver- Anschutz
- Practices are located throughout the state- may not have formal IRB affiliation
- Member practices are not research practices- do “research on the side”
- SNOCAP contract with Colorado Central Area Health Education Center (CCAHEC)
  - Established in 2007
  - FWA on behalf on these unaffiliated practices
  - CCAHEC provides required human subjects training to practices
Conducting Practice Based Research In Colorado

• Responsibilities of CCAHEC:
  • Require that each practice have at least 1 lead clinician and 1 research coordinator complete the Human Subjects training
  • Train all practice personnel on the research study and COMIRB policies
  • Develop project specific MOUs with each SNOCAP practice
  • Monitor the conduct of research- recruitment and consent of subjects
  • Provide the COMIRB with all data related to university research studies
Conducting Practice Based Research In Colorado

- Responsibilities of the University of Colorado
  - Management of projects
    - Conduct research within practices
  - Provider on-going support of research
  - House all records of research projects
  - Provide evaluation and quality control of studies
Collaboration with Non-Affiliated Sites

• Ceding/serving as the IRB of record

• On a case-by-case basis may choose to provide oversight or cede to other institutions
  • Formal agreement established
    • MOU or IAA
  • Each institution is responsible for safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects
  • Each institution must comply with federal regulations
Collaboration with Non-Affiliated Sites

- COMIRB ceding to outside IRB
  - Protocol packet is submitted to COMIRB
  - COMIRB Director and Principle Investigator determine if appropriate to cede and if another IRB is appropriate to use
  - Relationship is established with outside IRB and COMIRB adds IRB to FWA
  - IAA is signed by both institutions
  - IRB of record receives protocol packet submitted to COMIRB for final approval
  - Once final approval is received, COMIRB will keep a copy of all approval letters, approved documents and signed IAAs
  - COMIRB remains responsible for ensuring compliance with the outside IRB’s determination
Collaboration with Non-Affiliated Sites

- COMIRB as IRB of record for multi-site studies
  - Principal investigator and COMIRB director determine if appropriate to be oversight IRB
  - IAA established between the IRBs before study can be approved/research can be conducted
  - Non affiliated sites must add COMIRB panels to its FWA
  - “Multi-site studies” study attachment submitted with COMIRB application
  - All approval letters are available to outside IRB as needed
The INSTTEPP Study

• Implementing Network Self-management Support Tools Through Engaging Patient and Practices
• Multi-Site Study- ORPRN, IRENE, SNOCAP, WREN
• Determine best way to implement elements of the AHRQ Self-Management Support Toolkit

• Study Design:
  • Stepped Wedge Study Design
  • Qualitative Comparative Analysis

• Method:
  • Boot Camp Translation
  • CS-PAM/Theory of Planned Behavior
  • PAM
The INSTTEPP Study

• 16 practices across 4 states
  • Small to medium sized primary care practices
  • Begun to implement PCMH principles
• 80 clinic staff participants
  • Preform care management functions
• 320 patient participants
  • Have at least 1 chronic illness
  • Targeted for care management
Collaboration for the INSTTEPP Study

- IRB Application submitted to COMIRB
  - IRB of record
  - Expedited review
  - Data housed at UC Denver
  - Study coordination at UC Denver
  - Data collected at 4 study sites
- IRB of record process
- IAAs signed and collected
  - Kept on file at both sites
- 3 non-affiliated sites added COMIRB panels to FWA
- COMIRB Approval received
Questions?

COMIRB- 303-724-1055

COMIRB@ucdenver.edu

Campus Mail Box F490  13001 E. 17th Place,  Room N3214  Aurora, CO 80045
Polling Question:
At your institution, what materials must be provided to cede to another institution’s IRB?
Oregon Health & Science University Research Integrity Office: Ceding oversight across multiple IRBs

LeAnn Michaels, Manager
Oregon Rural Practice-based Research Network (ORPRN)
Meta-network Learning And Research Center (Meta-LARC)
Overview

- ORIO timeline for ceding oversight
  - Various health systems
  - Independent practices
- Meta-LARC goals and experience
- Lessons learned
- IRB Share
2002: Unaffiliated Investigator Agreement

- Investigators engaging in research at independent clinic or institution lacking FWA
  - Extends federal-wide assurance to cover collaborating independent or institutional individual investigator
  - Investigator completes human subjects training, conflict of interest and form
  - Submit modification
  - Takes 4-6 weeks to approve
Waiver of Oversight 2009: Memorandum of understanding

- IRBs of regularly collaborating institutions agree to rapid approval to accept oversight
- Requested through new project submission
  - Memorandum of understanding (MOU)
  - IRB approval of overseeing IRB
- Process not used for full review projects
- Takes 2-3 weeks to approve

- IRBs of smaller health systems not initiating research agree to waive oversight
- Collaborating investigator submits letter requesting local (relying) IRB waives oversight
- Modification + IAA submitted for approval
- Process takes 6-8 weeks
Independent Authorization Agreement

OHSU accepts oversight

• Terms of authorization
  – Comply to laws outlined in the CFR
  – Both IRBs maintain FWA
  – Any (of 4) IRBs may review
  – Describes IRB review cycle
  – Relying institution will report unanticipated problems, protocol deviations, complaints, etc.
  – What relying institution must do (10 items)
    • Compliance, safe conduct, trained personnel, cooperate
Waiver of oversight

• In 2012, the OHSU IRB (ORIO) reviewed 659 new projects.
  – OHSU waiving oversight to another institution: 31
  – OHSU accepting oversight from another institution: Unknown

• Not huge demand ... yet
We are moving toward ceding oversight when both institutions are engaged in research – what does that look like?
2012 AHRQ P30: Meta-network Learning And Research Center

• AHRQ Centers for Primary Care Practice-Based Research and Learning emphasized nimble response using funded infrastructure
• Envisioned high level of IRB agreement and waiving oversight through MOU or rapid IAA, perhaps encouraged through CTSA
• We’re not there yet
Lessons learned:
IRB change is slow

“Let that be a valuable lesson for you...nobody likes a smart Neanderthal”
Lessons learned

• IRB reviews take time, no matter what
• Waiving/Ceding oversight can be more efficient (modifications) and increase safety (adverse events)
• It may not accelerate study start-up
• IRB chairs aren’t necessarily in favor of doing this with greater frequency
• One waive, all waive can limit PBRN recruitment
2014: VA agreement

• Despite reluctance from Chair, 2014 brought new Joint submission agreement with Veterans Affairs Medical Center
  – Shared IRB that is separate board
  – Assumes equal/identical implementation of project
  – Separate tools (e.g. consent), but equivalent burden to subjects
IRB Share

45 institutions   11 projects

• IRBshare is a new joint IRB review model for multisite studies that facilitates the sharing of IRB-approved documents between IRBs, accelerates the IRB review process by enabling a temporary reliance between IRBs, and minimizes the need for all sites to conduct a full board review — thereby helping to accelerate study start up.

https://irbshare.org/#what
Polling Question:
Does your institution use IRBShare?
How to Submit a Question

• At any time during the presentation, type your question into the “Questions” section of your GoToWebinar control panel.
• Select “Send” to submit your question to the moderator.
• Questions will be read aloud by the moderator.
The Collaborative Ohio Inquiry Network (COIN) & The Ohio Reliant IRB System

9/10/2014

Amanda Ross
Administrative Director, PBRN Shared Resource
Collaborative Ohio Inquiry Network (COIN)
The Collaborative Ohio Inquiry Network (COIN) is a PBRN learning community that develops the capacity of PBRNs for research, conducts high-impact practice-based research, and translates research into practice.

COIN is an AHRQ Center for Primary Care Practice-Based Research and Learning - P30 HS021648
Ohio CTSAs provide a backbone for collaboration

COIN’s 9 PBRNs are affiliated with 4 academic health centers, 3 of which have Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSAs) that support practice-based research in their 8 affiliated networks.
History of IRB collaboration in Cleveland

Initially, Cleveland Institutional Review Board (IRB) administrators and institutional officials used *Inter-Institutional Authorization Agreements* in order to be able to “rely” on the review and oversight of a main IRB.

Initial Collaborating Cleveland institutions
- University Hospitals Case Medical Center, MetroHealth Medical Center, and Case Western Reserve University
- Cleveland Clinic joined in 2005
Caveats

- Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) does not have a Biomedical IRB so they cannot be “relied upon”
  - CWRU investigators were/are referred to one of the affiliate Biomedical IRBs if reliance is desired
- Cleveland Veterans Administration (VA) cannot participate
  - VA IRB must review all projects
Evolution of IRB collaboration in Ohio

V 1.0 – Cleveland’s “Facilitated Review” Process (2010)

• Leveraged the MetroHealth electronic IRB platform

• Each institution used its own forms – consent forms, etc.

• Each institution performed a FULL local review for context and to approve data use agreements
Evolution of IRB collaboration in Ohio


8 participating IRBs

- Case Western Reserve University
- MetroHealth Medical Center
- University Hospitals Case Medical Center
- Cleveland Clinic
- Ohio State University
- Nationwide Children’s Hospital
- University of Cincinnati
- Cincinnati Children’s Medical Center
Evolution of IRB collaboration in Ohio

V 2.0 - “Reliance Agreement” across the 3 Ohio CTSAs

- Electronic IRB HUB is created – leveraged MetroHealth system
- **IRBs no longer complete local reviews**
  - Two page electronic application to be completed by the administrator for IRB of Record
  - System of review for “relying” IRBs regarding DUAs
- The only “decision” of the relying IRB is whether or not to rely on the IRB of Record
Goals & Benefits of Reliant Review

• Decrease burden on investigators while maintaining integrity of IRB review

• Streamline multi-center research and grow collaborative research across Ohio

• Create a transparent and accessible electronic IRB process
Key elements of **Reliant** Review

- A brief request form
- A single IRB submission to the IRB of record
  - Initial submission or amendment to a protocol within the IRB of Record
- Electronic HUB with all study documents and reviews from IRB of record, facilitated by IRB administrators
- Online review by all named IRB(s) with the ability to request additional site specific information
Preparing for a **Reliant** Review:  
A checklist

- Collaborative protocol – initial submission or amendment
- IRB of Record
- Communication with home (relying) IRB regarding the Reliant Review process
- Register ALL collaborating researchers and staff from collaborating institutions within the MetroHealth Electronic IRB system
The *IRB of Record’s* **Reliant** HUB Responsibilities

- Coordinate the submission of protocol into the HUB
  - Complete brief request form
  - Upload complete approved protocol, including all attachments, consent documents, required regulatory determinations, approval notices and IRB communications
  - Communicate with relying IRBs to confirm collaboration
Role of the **Relying IRB (RIRB)**

- Agree to review the protocol
- Conduct an **Institutional Requirements Review** of the application submitted into the HUB

- The only changes allowed are to the consent forms and include the addition of language pertaining to persons to contact at the RIRB organization with questions and concerns, and subject injury language
Role of the **Relying** IRB (RIRB)

- Approve (or disapprove) the protocol for local implementation
  - Issue an approval letter (or denial)
  - Record the date the Reliant Review was approved (or denied) at RIRB organization
  - If approved, place the approved consent language on their template and stamp it.
Continuing Reviews, Amendments, etc.

• Communication across collaborating study staff and IRBs is key
• Coordinated by the IRB of Record
• Uploaded into the IRB HUB for review by all “relying” IRBs
• RIRBs can complete administrative actions within the HUB, including adding documents of local significance, amending study staff or closing the local study site
Ongoing collaboration and growth

- 65-70 studies exist within the Ohio Reliant Review HUB
- The Ohio Reliant Review HUB is reviewed and refined on a regular basis to increase the opportunities for streamlined collaboration
COIN and the Ohio Reliant IRB System

- Case Western Reserve University, The Ohio State University and The University of Cincinnati, and their participating healthcare institutions, all have representation within the Ohio Reliant Review System.

- The Northeast Ohio Medical University, the 4th COIN partner, does not have representation but has agreed to “independently rely” on the appropriate IRB of Record for COIN projects on a case by case basis.
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Questions, Comments?
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Polling Question:
Would you be interested in accessing and expanding reliant-IRB in your local area?
How to Submit a Question

• At any time during the presentation, type your question into the “Questions” section of your GoToWebinar control panel.
• Select “Send” to submit your question to the moderator.
• Questions will be read aloud by the moderator.
This Live series activity, AHRQ Practice-Based Research Network Resource Center National Webinars, from 09/10/2014 - 09/10/2015, has been reviewed and is acceptable for credit by the American Academy of Family Physicians. Physicians should claim only the credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity. This webinar has been approved for **1.25 elective CME credit(s)**.

To obtain CME Credit for your participation in this webinar, please:

1.) Complete the online evaluation. You will be prompted to complete this online evaluation when you exit the webinar.

2.) E-mail **PBRN@abtassoc.com** to request a copy of your CME Certificate of Participation
Upcoming AHRQ PBRN Resource Center Webinars:

- **September 30, 2 – 3:30pm ET:** September 30 PBRN Webinar on PBRN Research Good Practices (PRGPs) Report

  Visit [http://pbrn.ahrq.gov/events](http://pbrn.ahrq.gov/events) for webinar registration information and details on other upcoming PBRN-relevant events

If you have a suggestion for a new topic or would like to be a presenter, send your feedback to: PBRN@abtassoc.com
PBRN and IRB Listservs:
Join the Conversation among PBRNs!

IRB Listserv:
The PBRN Resource Center hosts an IRB Listserv focused on IRB issues for PBRNs, including working with multiple IRBs. After participating in today’s webinar, you will automatically be added to this Listserv.
• To opt out of this IRB Listserv, e-mail PBRN@abtassoc.com

PBRN Listserv:
Are you interested in learning about:
• free, CME-earning National Webinars,
• research publications,
• practical guidance for administering or conducting research,
• funding opportunities, and
• employment opportunities that are relevant to PBRNs, especially around primary care?

PBRN Listserv members receive a bi-weekly digest and other announcements of interest, and are able to reach out directly to the PBRN community by posting to the PBRN Listserv (PBRNLIST@list.ahrq.gov). To join, simply send an e-mail to the AHRQ PBRN Resource Center (PBRN@abtassoc.com) with the subject “Please add me to the PBRN Listserv.”

Thank you for attending today’s PBRN webinar!