

Version: 1

Effective Date: 06/02/2023

108: Adverse Events, Unanticipated Problems, and Non-Compliance

The intent of this Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is to describe how adverse events, unanticipated problems, and non-compliance related to the use of human subjects in research are handled in compliance with federal regulations, state law, and other institutional policies. As part of its responsibility to oversee the protection of research participants, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) investigates all complaints of adverse events, unanticipated events. Or non-compliance hereinafter referred to collectively as “Incidents.”

Table of Contents

1. Definitions	2
2. Incident Reporting	3
3. Investigation.....	4
4. IRB Review.....	5

1. Definitions

Incidents:

Adverse Events: Any untoward or unfavorable occurrence in a human subject, including both physical and psychological harm, contemporaneously associated with participation in the research, whether or not considered related to the subject's participation in the research activities.

Unanticipated Problem: Any incident, experience, or outcome that meet all of the following criteria:

1. Unexpected (in terms of nature, severity, or frequency) given (a) the research procedures that are described in the protocol-related documents, such as the IRB-approved research protocol and informed consent documents, and (b) the characteristics of the subject population being studied;
2. Related or possibly (within reason) related to participation in the research; and
3. Suggests that the research places subjects or others at a greater risk of harm (including physical, psychological, economic, or social harm) than was previously known or recognized.

Note: Incarceration of a participant while participating in a study that is not approved to include incarcerated individuals is considered an unanticipated problem.

Non-Compliance: Failure (intentional or unintentional) to comply with applicable federal regulations, state or local laws, the requirements or determinations of the IRB, or University policy regarding research involving human subjects. Non-compliance can result from action or omission. Non-compliance may be serious or non-serious (minor), and may also be continuing.

Non-serious or Minor Non-Compliance: Non-compliance that does not increase risk to research participants, compromise a participant's rights or welfare, or affect the integrity of the research/data or the Human Research Protection Program (HRPP). Minor non-compliances includes, but are not limited to, lapses in continuing IRB approval, minor changes or deviations from an approved protocol, administrative errors, failing to add trained personnel to an approved protocol. Exceeding the approved number of participants by less than 10% of the total is considered a minor non-compliance. Failure to obtain exempt determination before exempt research is conducted will initially be reviewed as a minor non-compliance but may be escalated to serious non compliance depending on the circumstances.

Serious Non-Compliance: Non-compliance that increases the risk to research participants



compromise a participant's rights or welfare, or affects the integrity of the research/data or the HRPP. Examples include, but are not limited to, conducting or continuing non-exempt human subjects research without IRB approval, failure to follow approved IRB protocol, lack of legally effective informed consent from research participants, failure to report or review serious adverse events, unanticipated problems, or substantive changes in research; or inappropriate oversight of the study. Non-compliance related to the use of subject pools is considered serious.

Continuing Non-Compliance: Includes non-compliance that has been previously reported, or a pattern of that may affect participants or research validity and suggest personnel may repeat non-compliance in the future. Examples include, but are not limited to, repeated failure to submit renewal requests, inadequate oversight of research personnel or procedures, or failure to respond to previous sanctions imposed by the IRB. Continuing non-compliance may be considered serious non-compliance by the IRB depending on the circumstance.

IRB Non-Compliance: Any failure on the part of the IRB to follow federal regulations, state laws, or institutional policies relevant to human participants research.

2. Incident Reporting

Study teams must notify the Illinois State University IRB promptly of any potential incident occurring in their research. Reports from the study team are made via the Incident Submission Form in the electronic IRB submission system.

For collaborative research, potential incidents involving risks to participants or others occurring at a non-ISU research site must be reported to the ISU IRB if (a) the potential incident poses risks to ISU participants, or (b) the ISU IRB is serving as the reviewing IRB for the site at which the potential incident occurred.

Potential Incidents can also be reported by other individuals not involved with the research project, but who have relevant information, including but not limited to, IRB members or staff, participants or potential participants and their family members, members of staff of another IRB, REC staff or other University personnel.

- The report can be made to the Director of Research Ethics and Compliance (REC or designee) by phone or email and may be made anonymously. Reports may also be made through the University Ethics Office Complaint system. Reports will be handled in accordance with the University Whistleblower protections.
- For reports made to REC, the reporter will be asked to provide the following information:
 - Detailed information about the potential incident, including relevant dates.
 - How the person reporting obtained the information provided in the report.
 - Information about any injury, potential harm, or risk to the participant or others.
 - How the reporter may be contacted for further information, if needed.

- Any other relevant information requested by the REC Office.

Potential incidents may also be encountered in the course of administrative review (review of a protocol, a grant proposal/compliance protocol congruence review, audit, etc.). Upon discovery or upon receipt of a report of a potential incident from someone other than the investigator or study staff, the Director of REC will notify the Principal Investigator (PI) on the study when appropriate.

3. Investigation

1. Reports of potential incidents are initially evaluated by the Director of REC or designee to determine whether the problem likely constitutes an incident. The Director may:

- Interview the PI and co-investigators, selected human subjects, and others;
- Examine research records requested from the investigators; and
- May personally inspect research facilities and equipment.

The Director may also consult with the General Counsel and the Institutional Official (IO) as necessary. Individuals with potential conflicts of interest shall not participate in the investigation.

a. If the REC Director determines that a reported problem may require immediate intervention to protect participants or others from serious harm, the Director will immediately forward the report to the IRB Chair (or designee).

b. The REC Director has the authority, in consultation with the IRB Chair as necessary, to address minor non-compliance matters administratively. The Director may require modifications to the approved protocol, further documentation of the circumstances leading to the minor non-compliance, or other action as appropriate. The Director also has the authority to bring continuing minor non-compliance to the IRB for consideration.

c. If the REC Director determines that the report constitutes a potential incident that is not minor, the REC Director will refer the report to the IRB Chair (or designee).

- i. After reviewing the report, the IRB Chair (or designee) will determine whether further consultation is needed to assess whether the problem posed risks to participants or others.

2. If the IRB Chair (or designee) determines that the report (i) does not constitute an incident or (ii) does not require any action and that the research may continue without change, the IRB Chair (or designee) will promptly notify the study team in writing when appropriate

a. If a report suggests that participant safety is at risk, the IRB Chair may immediately suspend the protocol temporarily, pending IRB review.

b. The IRB Chair (or designee) may consult with other IRB members if special expertise is needed to assess whether the problem posed risks to participants or others.



- c. Any report that appears to constitute a non-minor potential incident will be referred to the convened IRB for review at the next available IRB meeting for review.
 - i. If a report did not come from the study team, IRB staff may provide the study team with an opportunity to respond to the report before forwarding it to the IRB.
 - ii. When appropriate, the IRB Chair (or designee) may make recommendations to the convened IRB as to what actions should be taken in response to the report.

4. IRB Review

The IRB will review reports of potential incidents referred to it by the IRB Chair (or designee). At any point in this process the IRB may invite the study team to present additional information.

- a. All IRB members will be given access to the complete protocol file, including the incident report, in the electronic IRB submission system.
- b. If a report suggests that participant safety is at risk, the IRB may immediately suspend or terminate the research.
- c. After considering the report and additional information, if any, the convened IRB will make final determinations on the following issues:
 - i. Whether the reported problem constitutes an incident involving risks to participants or others according to the definition in this policy
 - ii. What action in response to the report is appropriate
 - iii. Whether suspension or termination of approval is warranted, and
 - iv. Whether further reporting to University officials, federal agencies, and department heads is required.
- d. Regardless of whether the IRB determines that the problem is an incident involving risks to participants or others, according to the definition in the policy, and beyond the actions that may be undertaken by other bodies, the IRB may take any of the following actions:
 - i. Modifying the consent document and/or process
 - ii. Monitoring of the research and/or consent process
 - iii. No action
 - iv. Other actions appropriate for the local context
 - v. Providing additional information to past and/or current participants (e.g., whenever the information may relate to the participant's willingness to continue participation)



- vi. Reconsidering approval
 - vii. Referral to other organizational entities (e.g., legal counsel, Risk Management, Institutional Official)
 - viii. Requirement that current participants re-consent to participation
 - ix. Requiring additional training of the investigator and/or study staff
 - x. Requiring modifications to the protocol
 - xi. Revising the continuing review timetable
 - xii. Suspending the research
 - xiii. Terminating the research
 - xiv. Disallowing the use of data collected without IRB approval
- e. After making its determinations, the IRB will:
- i. Notify the investigator in writing of its decisions.
 - ii. If the IRB determines the problem constituted an incident, it may notify any of the following individuals, institutions, or organizations:
 - The Chair of the investigator's department and/or unit
 - Other administrative officials as relevant, such as the Dean and/or division head, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, and Institutional Official
 - Deferring institution if the continuing or serious noncompliance involves or may affect that institution's investigator(s) or participants
 - Other campus entities, such as the Data Stewardship Council, Minors Activity Compliance Committee, and the Research Integrity Officer
 - Any other individuals, institutions, or organizations as appropriate

When the IRB suspends approval for a research project, research involving human subjects must be halted until and unless the IRB lifts the suspension. The PI must submit to the IRB modifications to the protocol sufficient to satisfy the conditions of the suspension and the modifications must be approved by the IRB before the research can be resumed. When the IRB terminates a research project no further research involving human subjects under the project may be undertaken. This includes analysis of data collected under the study. Any further research would require the submission and approval of a new study.

Suspension or termination of IRB approval can result in the freezing of internal or extramural grant accounts, the return of equipment or other resources, and further investigation by other



entities. Flagrant or repeated violation of IRB policies and procedures is a violation of the [University's Integrity in Research, Scholarly, and Creative activities policy](#). If the investigation contains facts that suggest research misconduct, the Research Integrity Officer must be notified.

Appeals may be submitted in writing to the REC Director and must be based on new information that was not previously available or considered by the IRB during the meeting at which the determination was made. The IRB will notify the PI in writing of the final determination.