



WORKSHEET: IRB Review of potential non-compliance

UCLA researchers are responsible for reporting to the IRB non-compliance that meets the threshold for reporting (see PAR Guidance) and IRB members share responsibility for ensuring that determinations of serious or continuing non-compliance are only found after following a consistent review process.

This worksheet guides review of non-compliance for both BIOMEDICAL/CLINICAL and SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH.

Note: Throughout the form “Investigator” is used to indicate “Principal Investigator, all research personnel, and all who are delegated to perform research-related activities under this protocol at any site for which the UCLA IRB is the reviewing IRB.”

1. Is the event(s)/incident(s) non-compliance?

- a. Did the investigator fail to comply with an *applicable law*?
 Yes No Unclear
 If yes, which *specific* law(s):
- b. Did the investigator fail to comply with *human subjects research regulations*?
 Yes No Unclear
 If yes, which *specific* regulation(s):
- c. Did the Investigator fail to comply with *institutional policies* (including OHRPP guidance) relating to the protection of human subjects?
 Yes No Unclear
 If yes, which *specific* institutional policy(s):
- d. Did the Investigator fail to comply with the *requirements of the IRB* (approved IRB application or stipulations in the current approval notice)?
 Yes No Unclear
 If yes, which *specific* IRB requirement(s):
- Note: if the **answer for any of a through d is “unclear”**, please request additional information before making any non-compliance determinations
- e. If any of the answers above are “unclear” *what information is needed* (from the investigator, another compliance office, and/or the OHRPP QIU) for the IRB to make a determination:
 ➤ Note: if the **answer for all of a through d is “no,”** stop here. There is no non-compliance.
 ➤ Note: if the **answer for any of a through d is “yes” and none are “unclear,”** there is non-compliance. Proceed to section 2.

2. Is the event(s)/incident(s) “continuing non-compliance”?

- a. Is there a pattern of non-compliance?
 - i. Are there **four or more instances** of the same or similar non-compliance events/incidents (in keeping with the definition of pattern from the PAR guidance)?
 Yes No Unclear
 - AND**
 - ii. Did the non-compliance **continue after it was brought to the attention of the PI**?
 Yes No Unclear

- Note: if the **answer for a i or ii is “unclear,”** please request additional information before making a continuing non-compliance determination.
- iii. If any of the answers above are “unclear” *what information is needed* (from the investigator, another compliance office, and/or the OHRPP QIU (for-cause monitoring and/or research)) for the IRB to make a determination:
 - Note: if the **answer for a i or ii is “no,”** there is no continuing non-compliance. Skip to section 3.
 - Note: if the **answer for a i and ii is “yes,”** continue with b.
- b. Does this pattern of non-compliance suggest an **inability** to comply with applicable laws, regulations, institutional policies, or the determinations of the IRB?

Yes No Unclear

If yes, **what information has led you to believe** that the Investigator is unable to comply:
- c. Does this pattern of non-compliance suggest an **unwillingness** to comply with applicable laws, regulations, institutional policies, or the determinations of the IRB?

Yes No Unclear

If yes, **what information has led you to believe** that the Investigator is unwilling to comply:
- Note: if the **answer for b or c is “unclear,”** please request additional information before making a continuing non-compliance determination.
- d. If any of the answers above are “unclear” *what information is needed* for the IRB to make a determination:
 - Note: if the **answer for b and c is “no,”** there is no continuing non-compliance. Continue to section 3.
 - Note: if the **answer for b or c is “yes” and neither are “unclear,”** there is continuing non-compliance. Continue to section 3.

3. Is the event(s)/incident(s) “serious non-compliance”?

- a. Did the non-compliance **significantly and negatively impact the rights and/or welfare of participants?** Yes No Unclear

If yes, how were the rights of participant(s) impacted:

If yes, how was the welfare of participant(s) impacted:
- b. Did the non-compliance **significantly and negatively impact the integrity of the data?**

Yes No Unclear

If yes, how was the integrity of the data impacted:
- Note: if the **answer for a or b is “unclear,”** please request additional information before making a serious non-compliance determination.
- c. If any of the answers above are “unclear” *what information is needed* for the IRB to make a determination:
 - Note: if the **answer for a and b is “no,”** there is no serious non-compliance. Continue to section 4.
 - Note: if the **answer for a or b is “yes” and neither are “unclear,”** there is continuing non-compliance. Continue to section 4.

4. Is the remediation plan sufficient?

- a. If the non-compliance is related to any of the following, has the relevant local privacy/compliance office participated in the development of the CAPA plan?
 Yes No N/A
- breach of confidentiality
 - failure to provide the California Research Participant's Bill of Rights
 - failure to obtain effective consent/parental permission for FERPA-covered educational records
 - failure to obtain effective HIPAA authorization
- b. Has the Investigator or other stakeholder conducted a root cause analysis? Yes No
If no, **is a root cause analysis needed at this time?** Yes No
- c. Is the corrective action plan sufficient to address the impact on relevant participants?
 Yes No
If no, what **additional corrective action** is needed:
- d. Is the preventive action plan sufficient to reduce the probability of this serious and/or continuing non-compliance from recurring? Yes No
If no, what **additional preventive action** is needed: