2018 Metrics on Human Research Protection Performance for Academic Institutions
About the Metrics

Improving the quality of human research protection programs (HRPP) is a top priority of AAHRPP. Effective and efficient systems of oversight within organizations provide better protections for research participants and produce higher quality research. And collectively, they raise the global bar to ensure research participants are safe and respected. AAHRPP is pleased to present the 2018 metrics for hospitals’ HRPP performance.

These metrics are collected from annual reports, as well as step 1 and step 2 applications, submitted by clients. All the metrics were based off the most recent data reported by AAHRPP clients as of December 31, 2018. From data supplied by our client organizations in 2018, AAHRPP has compiled an information database to help research organizations, researchers, sponsors, government agencies, and participants identify and support high-performing practices for HRPPs. The data range from types of research and conformance with regulations and guidance, to financial and personnel resources and IRB review times.
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Of the 115 accredited academic institutions, 82% of academic institutions conduct research within their home state/province/region, other states/provinces/regions, and countries other than their home country; 9% of academic institutions conduct research within their home state/province/region and other states/provinces/regions within their home country; 6% of academic institutions conduct research in their home state/province/region only; 3% of academic institutions conduct research in their home state/province/region and countries other than their home country.
95% of academic institutions conduct biomedical research; 95% conduct social/behavioral research.
89% of academic institutions reported conducting research on investigational drugs; 89% of academic institutions reported conducting research on investigational devices; 33% of academic institutions reported conducting planned emergency research without consent in the 12 months before their most recent report. Two academic institutions conduct biomedical research but did not specify which kinds.
100% of academic institutions conduct research with children; 99% conduct research with students; 98% conduct research with employees; 98% conduct research with adults with diminished capacities; 98% conduct research with pregnant women; 87% conduct research with prisoners; 13% conduct research with other vulnerable groups.
For academic institutions a median of 57% of research is internally sponsored; a median of 20% of research is federally sponsored; a median of 12% of research is industry sponsored; a median of 8% of research is externally sponsored.
Of the academic institutions that disclosed the source of their federal funding, 68% receive federal funding from only the US government; 29% receive funding from both US and non-US governments; and 3% receive federal funding from only non-US governments.
92% of accredited academic institutions follow DHHS regulations; 91% follow FDA regulations; 87% follow state and local regulations; 79% follow DOD regulations; 57% follow ED regulations; 52% follow DOJ regulations; 49% follow ICH or ICH when requested by a sponsor; 32% follow non-US country-specific law; 30% follow VA regulations; 28% follow EPA regulations; 25% follow DOE regulations.
IRBs per Academic Institution

- One IRB: 29%
- Two IRBs: 25%
- Three IRBs: 16%
- Four IRBs: 7%
- Five or More IRBs: 23%

Legend:
- One IRB
- Two IRBs
- Three IRBs
- Four IRBS
- Five or More IRBs
91% of academic institutions compensate IRB Chairs; 65% compensate IRB vice chairs; 57% compensate non-affiliated members; 40% compensate affiliated members.
Of the academic institutions which compensate IRB chairs, 96% provide financial compensation; of the academic institutions which compensate IRB vice chairs, 93% provide financial compensation; of the academic institutions which compensate non-affiliated members, 91% provide financial compensation; of the academic institutions which compensate affiliated members, 76% provide financial compensation.
Mean Number of Active Protocols Overseen by Academic Institutions

- Exempt Protocols: 290
- Reviewed by the Expedited Procedure: 1299
- Reviewed by the Convened IRB: 604
- Total Protocols: 2203
Median Number of Active Protocols Reviewed by an Academic Institutions Based on Number of IRBs

- **All**: 1529
- **One IRB**: 744
- **Two or Three IRBs**: 1195
- **Four or More IRBs**: 3862
Mean Number of Active Protocols Reviewed by an Academic Institutions Based on IRBs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of protocols</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>One IRB</th>
<th>Two or Three IRBs</th>
<th>Four or More IRBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>3959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of protocols is plotted against the mean number of active protocols reviewed by academic institutions based on IRBs, categorized into four groups: All, One IRB, Two or Three IRBs, and Four or More IRBs.
99% use a database to track IRB protocols; 96% use an online electronic system for distribution of materials; 89% of academic institutions use an online system for IRB review; 88% use an online IRB application.
## IRB Staffing and Funding Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol Category</th>
<th>Median Number of Staff</th>
<th>Median Number of Protocols</th>
<th>Median Protocols per FTE</th>
<th>Median Dollars Budgeted for IRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$664,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$191,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>$304,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>$657,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-4000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$1,539,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5481</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>$2,593,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>