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1 Noncompliance

This section provides definitions and procedures for the reporting and review of known or suspected noncompliance for research under the oversight of the MaineHealth IRB. Research under the oversight of an external IRB must comply with the reporting requirements of the external IRB and the internal reporting requirements outlined in Section 8.3.

In conducting its review of protocol deviations, unanticipated problems, subject complaints, and other reportable events, the IRB will also consider whether the event or issue was caused by, contributed to, or otherwise related to noncompliance.

1.1 Definitions

Noncompliance is defined as the failure to follow federal, state, or local regulations governing human subject research, institutional policies related to human subject research, or the requirements or determinations of the IRB. Noncompliance may be minor or sporadic or it may be serious or continuing.

Serious Noncompliance is defined as noncompliance that, in the judgment of the convened IRB, creates an increase in risks to subjects, adversely affects the rights, welfare, or safety of subjects, or adversely affects the scientific integrity of the study. Willful violation of policies and/or federal regulations may also constitute serious noncompliance.

Continuing Noncompliance is defined as a pattern of noncompliance that, in the judgment of the convened IRB, suggests a likelihood that instances of noncompliance will continue unless the IRB or institution intervenes.

Allegation of Noncompliance. Allegation of Noncompliance is defined as an unproved assertion of noncompliance.

1.2 Reporting

Investigators and their study staff are required to report instances of possible noncompliance to the IRB within 7 working days of discovery using the MaineHealth – Progress Report/Study Completion/Reportable New Information wizard in IRBNet. Additionally, anyone may report concerns of possible noncompliance to the HRPP or IRB verbally, by email, or other means. In such cases, the reporting party is responsible for making these reports in good faith, maintaining confidentiality and, unless reporting anonymously, cooperating with any subsequent fact-finding in relation to the report.

If an individual, whether investigator, study staff or other, is uncertain whether there is cause to report noncompliance, he or she may contact the ORC Director, IRB Manager, or Chair directly to discuss the situation informally.

1.3 Review Procedures

1. Upon receipt of the submission package, the IRB staff pre-reviews the submission and, if needed, contacts the investigator for corrections or additional information. If the report came from someone other than the investigator or study team verbally, by email, or by other means, the ORC Director, IRB
Manager, or assigned staff will develop a written report summarizing the available information and will upload the report into the IRB electronic system. If the information provided suggests that subjects may be at risk of harm without immediate intervention, the ORC Director, IRB Chair, and, when appropriate, the IO, will be notified so that they can take any necessary steps to ensure the safety of subjects and investigate the matter, and contact appropriate institutional officials responsible in accordance with other applicable MaineHealth policies (e.g., research misconduct).

2. The IRB Chair or designated reviewer receives and reviews the report and makes an initial determination as to whether the event represents noncompliance, and, if so, whether the noncompliance may be serious or continuing. If needed, the reviewer may request additional information from the investigator or others. When circumstances warrant, the ORC Director or IRB Manager may bypass this step and assign the report for convened board review.

3. If the reviewer determines that the event or issue is not noncompliance, or is noncompliance but not serious or continuing, they will review any proposed corrective and preventative action plans and determine if the plan is acceptable as proposed or if modifications to the plan or additional actions are required. As warranted, the reviewer may refer the matter to the convened IRB for review. The results of the review will be recorded in the electronic system and communicated to the investigator.

4. If the reviewer determines that the event or issue may be serious or continuing noncompliance, the report will be referred for review by the convened IRB. The convened IRB will determine whether the event is serious or continuing noncompliance. The IRB will review any proposed corrective and preventative action plans and determine if the plan is acceptable as proposed or if modifications to the plan or additional actions, such as those outline below, are necessary to ensure the protection of human subjects. If needed, the IRB may request additional information from the investigator or others. The results of the review will be recorded in the IRB minutes and communicated to the investigator.

5. When the IRB determines that an event is serious or continuing noncompliance, the IRB may take any of the following actions, or others, to ensure the protection of human subjects:
   a. Requiring modifications to the protocol or research plan
   b. Revising the continuing review timetable
   c. Modifying the consent process
   d. Modifying the consent document
   e. Providing additional information to current participants (e.g., whenever the information may relate to the subject’s willingness to continue participation)
   f. Providing additional information to past participants
   g. Requiring additional training of the investigator and/or study staff
   h. Requiring that current subjects re-consent to participation
   i. Monitoring the research
   j. Monitoring consent
k. Reporting or referral to appropriate parties (e.g., the IO, Compliance, Risk Management, Privacy)

l. Suspending IRB approval

m. Terminating IRB approval

n. Other actions as appropriate given the specific circumstances

6. When the IRB determines that an event is serious or continuing noncompliance, the IRB staff will follow the procedures for reporting to regulatory agencies, sponsors, and organizational officials in Section 22. When appropriate, a preliminary report may be submitted while more information is obtained to inform the determination or actions.

7. Investigators may request that the IRB reconsider its determination by following the procedures in Section 11.4.