2019 Metrics on Human Research Protection Programs 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. Collectively, they raise the global bar to ensure research participants are safe and respected. AAHRPP is pleased to present the 2019 metrics for academic institutions’ HRPP performance.

These metrics are collected from annual reports, as well as step 1 and step 2 applications, submitted by accredited organizations. All the metrics were based off the most recent data reported by AAHRPP clients as of December 31, 2019. From data supplied by our organizations in 2019, 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, IRB review times, to conformance with regulations and guidance, to financial and personnel resources.
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Of the 119 accredited academic institutions, 82.3% of academic institutions conduct research within their home state/province/region, other states/provinces/regions, and countries other than their home country; 9.2% of academic institutions conduct research within their home state/province/region and other states/provinces/regions within their home country; 5.9% of academic institutions conduct research in their home state/province/region only; 2.5% of academic institutions conduct research in their home state/province/region and countries other than their home country.
98.3% of academic institutions conduct biomedical research; 96.6% conduct social/behavioral research.
90.5% of academic institutions reported conducting research on investigational drugs; 89.7% of academic institutions reported conducting research on investigational devices; 30.4% of academic institutions conducted 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 types.
100% of academic institutions conduct research with children; 98.3% conduct research with students; 98.3% conduct research with employees; 98.3% conduct research with adults with diminished capacities; 95.8% conduct research with pregnant women; 87.4% conduct research with prisoners; 12.6% conduct research with other vulnerable groups.
For academic institutions, a median of 15.7% is federally funded; a median of 12% is industry sponsored; a median of 8.2% of research is externally sponsored; a median of 56.3% of research is internally sponsored.
Of the academic institutions that disclosed the source of their federal funding (97), 70% receive federal funding from only the US government; 26% receive funding from both US and non-US governments; and 4% receive federal funding from only non-US governments.
92.4% of accredited academic institutions follow DHHS regulations; 88.2% follow FDA regulations; 86.6% follow state and local regulations; 77.3% follow DOD regulations; 58.0% follow Department of Education regulations; 56.3% follow ICH in some form; 50.4% follow Department of Justice regulations; 29.9% follow non-US country-specific law; 28.6% follow VA regulations; 26.9% follow EPA regulations; 24.4% follow Department of Energy regulations.
89.9% of academic institutions compensate IRB chairs; 64.7% compensate IRB vice chairs; 42.9% compensate affiliated members; 60.5% compensate affiliated members.
Of the academic institutions that provide compensation for IRB chairs, 93.4% provide financial compensation; of the academic institutions that provide compensation for vice chairs, 93.3% provide financial compensation; of those that provide compensation for affiliated members, 76.4% provide financial compensation; of those that provide compensation for non-affiliated members, 88.6% provide financial compensation.
Reviewed by the Convened IRB: 312
Reviewed by the Expedited Procedure: 865
Determined to be Exempt: 202
Total Protocols: 1,399
Mean Number of Active Protocols Overseen by Academic Institutions

- Reviewed by the Convened IRB: 572
- Reviewed by the Expedited Procedure: 1692
- Determined to be Exempt: 412
- Total Protocols: 2807
Median Number of Active Protocols Reviewed by an Academic Institution Based on IRBs

- All: 1399
- One IRB: 542
- Two/Three IRBs: 1158
- Four/Five IRBs: 2874
- 6 or more IRBs: 4109
Mean Number of Active Protocols Reviewed by an Academic Institution Based on IRBs

- All: 2177
- One IRB: 720
- Two/Three IRBs: 1793
- Four/Five IRBs: 3001
- 6 or More IRBs: 4408
Median IRB Review Times by Type of Review

- Time from Submission to Review by the Convened IRB: 16 days
- Time from Submission to Approval by the Convened IRB: 44.25 days
- Time from Submission to Review by the Expedited Procedure: 8.5 days
- Time from Submission to Approval by the Expedited Procedure: 21 days
- Time from Submission to Exempt Determination: 13 days
98% of academic institutions use a database to track protocols; 96% use an electronic system for distribution of materials; 90% use an online system for IRB review; 89% use an online IRB application.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocols</th>
<th>Median Protocols</th>
<th>Median IRB Staff</th>
<th>Median Protocols/Staff</th>
<th>Median IRB Budgets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-500</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>$ 243,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>163.6</td>
<td>$ 293,564.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>172.1</td>
<td>$ 668,397.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-4000</td>
<td>2645</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>160.3</td>
<td>$ 1,383,007.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000+</td>
<td>5308</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>225.4</td>
<td>$ 2,733,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>