1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to define the process by which the office of Research Compliance and Quality Assurance (RCQA) conducts Quality Reviews of human subject research at the University of Miami. These reviews are intended to assess the research team’s level of compliance with Federal and State regulations and guidelines, and University policies and procedures, as well as to provide guidance and recommendations for good research practices.

2. DEFINITIONS

AVP – Associate Vice President, Regulatory Affairs and Assessment
CAPA – Corrective and Preventative Action
CRF – Case Report Form
CRORS – Clinical Research Operations and Regulatory Support
CTO – Clinical Trials Office at JHS
DSMC – Data Safety Monitoring Committee at the SCCC
FDA – Food and Drug Administration
HIPAA – Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
HSRO – Human Subjects Research Office
ICH-GCP- International Conference on Harmonization Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice
IDE – Investigational Device Exemption
IND – Investigational New Drug (Application)
IRB – Institutional Review Board
IRB system - Electronic protocol submission and tracking system
JHS – Jackson Health System
NIH – National Institutes of Health
OHRP – Office for Human Research Protections
PI – Principal Investigator
PRMC – Protocol Review and Monitoring Committee
QA – Quality Assurance
QA Auditor- A member of RCQA that performs Quality Reviews
RCQA – Research Compliance and Quality Assurance
SCCC – Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center
UM - University of Miami
University – University of Miami
Velos – Clinical Trial Management System
VPR – Vice Provost for Research
3. RESPONSIBILITY

3.1 VPR and AVP

- The VPR may request Quality Reviews of human subject research protocols
- Both receive copies of Quality Review reports
- Both receive notification of potentially serious non-compliance issues

3.2 Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center (SCCC)

- Provides RCQA with an annual list of studies to be reviewed at SCCC
- Receives Quality Review reports

3.3 Human Subjects Research Office (HSRO)

- HSRO Director receives notification of potentially serious non-compliance issues
- Receives Quality Review reports and PI CAPA Plans and distributes them to the appropriate IRB committee
- Notifies RCQA of required follow-up actions requested by the IRBs
- Notifies RCQA of Quality Review closures and IRB determination letters

3.4 Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)

- May request a Quality Review of a human subject research protocol
- Receive and review Quality Review reports and PI CAPA Plans
- Determine the need for additional required follow-up actions

3.5 QA Function of RCQA

- Assigns QA Auditors to conduct Quality Reviews
- Notifies investigators of planned Quality Reviews and schedules Quality Reviews
- Performs Quality Reviews
- Issues Quality Review reports and facility observation reports

3.6 Principal Investigator (PI)

- Schedules Quality Review with RCQA QA Auditor
- Is available for meetings during the Quality Review
- Provides all study-related documents
- Allows study staff to be available to answer questions
- Responds to Quality Review observations
4. QUALITY REVIEW PROCESS

4.1 Quality Review Assignment

The RCQA Executive Director or designee prioritizes the schedule of Quality Reviews based on several factors such as the expected level of risk to subjects and the University, and the availability of resources. Directed Quality Reviews have priority over previously scheduled routine reviews.

4.2 Quality Review Notification

4.2.1 Notify the PI

The QA auditor will email a Quality Review Notification Memo to the PI of the selected study and copy the following leadership personnel:

- Departmental Chairperson, Division Chief and Center Director (if applicable)
- AVP
- VPR
- CRORS Director or designee (if study is monitored by CRORS)
- RCQA Executive Director and QA Manager
- RCQA CAPA Manager
- For audits at the SCCC, include the SCCC central email address: sccrcqa@miami.edu, and the applicable Site Disease Group Leader
- For Quality Reviews at Bascom Palmer Eye Institute (BPEI), include the BPEI Vice Chair and Director Clinical Research Services

- The following documents will be attached to this notification email:
  - Essential Documents Checklist for Quality Review
  - RCQA Electronic Quality Review Process Flow

- The Quality Review will be scheduled for three (3) days; however, less time may be needed if subject enrollment is low.

4.2.1.1 Focused Quality Reviews

- Notify the PI as stated in step 4.2.1
- Attach the following to the email notification:
  - Essential Documents Checklist for Quality Review
  - RCQA Electronic Quality Review Process Flow
- The Quality Review will be scheduled for one (1) day
4.2.2 Notify JHS CTO

If the study to be reviewed is also conducted at JHS and/or includes JHS patients, the QA Auditor will email the JHS Quality Review Notification memo to the JHS CTO, stating the scheduled review dates.

4.3 Quality Review Preparation

4.3.1 To prepare for the Quality Review, the QA Auditor will review the study documentation found in the IRB and Velos systems, prior to conducting the Quality Review.

4.4 Initial Meeting with PI and Study Team

The QA Auditor will conduct an initial meeting with the PI and study team at the beginning of the Quality Review to discuss the scope of the review, the process, and what to expect from the auditors. The PI will be asked to describe the protocol, and the roles and responsibilities of the team during the conduct of the study.

4.5 Quality Review Conduct

4.5.1 The standards used to conduct Quality Reviews of human subject protocols will include:

- Applicable Federal and State regulations (FDA, OHRP, NIH, HIPAA, etc.)
- ICH-Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice
- University of Miami Policies and Procedures
- External IRB Policies and Procedures (if applicable)
- Research Site-specific Standard Operating Procedures
4.5.2 Quality Reviews will consist of the following, at a minimum:

- Review of 100% of all consent documentation, up to a maximum of 50 signed consent forms.
  - For studies with high enrollment (> 50 subjects), a percentage of the consent forms may be selected by the auditor in conjunction with the RCQA Executive Director and QA Manager.
  - Confirm that all eight required elements of consent are included in the consent form. Verify that the six additional elements are included, as applicable.
  - Verify that the ClinicalTrials.gov statement is included verbatim, where applicable.
- Confirm the number of study subjects.
- For Screen Failures, review informed consent and documentation supporting the reason for screen failure.
- Review of correspondence records and meeting minutes for IRB, PRMC, DSMC, etc., where applicable.
- Review of key regulatory documents, such as Form FDA 1572, financial disclosures, delegation of authority logs.
- Review of protocol training and human subject research training records for all key study staff.
- Review of study team members’ qualifications.
- Records of receipt, storage, usage, and return of, as well as subject compliance with investigational product, if applicable.
- Review of other study-related materials, equipment and/or documentation will be done at the discretion of the QA Auditor.
- A review of subject records:
  - A sampling of subject records to be reviewed will be determined by \( \sqrt{n} \), where \( n \) is the total number of subjects that started study procedures (except screen failures); or 5 subject records, whichever is the larger number of subject records.
  - This review will include adherence to the protocol and protocol required procedures, verification of source data against data entered in CRFs or electronic data capture systems, review of the identification, PI review and assessment, recording and reporting of serious adverse events, adverse events, and unanticipated problems, review of PI oversight, etc. as outlined in the Quality Review report template.
- For studies where University faculty members are holding an IND or IDE; compliance with sponsor responsibilities in addition to PI responsibilities will be reviewed and assessed.
Note: Focused Quality Reviews will focus on a particular topic such as informed consent where only related documentation will be reviewed.

4.5.3 The QA Auditor may also conduct interviews of current or past study staff.

4.5.4 During the course of the Quality Review, the QA Auditor will notify the RCQA Executive Director of any issues that may jeopardize the safety and welfare of human subjects or data integrity, as well as of any potential observations related to JHS. The Executive Director will then immediately notify the VPR, AVP, Director for Human Subject Research, and the office of the Executive Dean for Research, as applicable.

4.6 PI Debriefing

At the conclusion of the Quality Review, if possible on the last day of the review, the QA Auditor will review the main observations with the PI and study team at a debrief meeting.

4.7 HSRO Debriefing

If observations relating to the review and approval of research are identified, the QA Auditor will summarize the observation in an email to the Director for Human Subject Research and schedule a debrief meeting. The following will be copied on this email:

- RCQA Executive Director
- QA Manager
- CAPA Manager

4.8 Quality Review Report

4.8.1 Observations will be reported in a standardized format as defined in SOP RCQA-402.

4.8.2 RCQA will issue a Draft Quality Review Report within ten (10) business days of the completion of a full Quality Review and within five (5) business days for focused Quality Reviews. If additional time is needed, it will be discussed with the RCQA Executive Director and QA Manager and will be documented in the RCQA database.
4.8.3 The Draft Quality Review Report will be reviewed within RCQA prior to issuance.

4.8.4 The Draft Quality Review Report will be issued to the PI and main study team members via email with instructions to review it for factual content.

4.9 Exit Meeting

4.9.1 The QA Auditor will aim to schedule an exit meeting with the PI and study team within three (3) business days of issuing the draft report to review the draft report for accuracy and to clarify any issues.

4.9.2 Based on discussions at the exit meeting, the QA Auditor will finalize the Quality Review report and issue the Final Report as per SOP RCQA-403.

4.10 Quality Review Response (CAPA Plan)

4.10.1 Responses to the Quality Review observations should be submitted to the RCQA CAPA Manager within ten (10) business days.

4.10.1.1 Additional time to provide responses may be granted, if requested. Additional time must be approved by the RCQA Executive Director and CAPA Manager.

4.10.1.2 The CAPA Manager will offer assistance in the creation of the CAPA Plan.

4.10.1.3 The CAPA Manager will review the draft CAPA Plan and provide feedback in order to obtain responses that are specific and measurable.

4.10.1.4 The RCQA Executive Director will conduct the final review of CAPA Plans.

4.10.2 After ten (10) business days, RCQA should receive the final CAPA Plan. The Final Quality Review Report and CAPA Plan will be submitted to the HSRO via email and leadership personnel will be copied on the email as per SOP RCQA-403.
4.11 Post Quality Review Customer Satisfaction Survey

Within two (2) business days after issuing the Final Quality Review Report, the QA Auditor will email the RCQA administrative assistant to request that a customer satisfaction survey be sent to the PI and study team.

4.12 IRB Determination Letter

The IRB will review the Final Quality Review Report and PI CAPA Plan and issue an IRB determination letter. This letter will notify RCQA, the VPR and AVP if a follow up Quality Review is requested by the IRB, or if this Quality Review is considered closed. If the Quality Review did not identify any observations, an IRB determination letter will not be issued.

5. DOCUMENTATION

RCQA will maintain electronic copies of the Final Quality Review Report, CAPA Plan, and any correspondence concerning the report in the RCQA shared drive indefinitely.

6. REFERENCES

- SOP RCQA-402: Quality Review Report Generation
- SOP RCQA-403: Issuing and Maintaining Quality Review Reports

7. TEMPLATES / FORMS / TOOLS

These templates and forms can be found on the RCQA shared drive:
S:/RCQA/Auditing/Auditing Forms/Audit Email Templates & Memos

- PI Quality Review Notification Memo
- JHS Quality Review Notification
- Draft Quality Review Report Submission Memo

The following templates and forms can be found on the RCQA shared drive:
S:/RCQA/Auditing/Auditing Forms/Current Templates & Forms

- Essential Documents Checklist for Quality Review
- RCQA Electronic Quality Review Process Flow
- Quality Review Report Template
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## General Quality Review Procedure for Human Subject Protocols

<table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Mar 11</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Jun 12</td>
<td>01 Jun 12</td>
<td>H. Miletic</td>
<td>Changed the name of the department from Office of Research Compliance Assessment (ORCA) to Regulatory Support and Quality Assurance (RSQA) throughout the document. Revised the Purpose section such that routine audits requested by the SCCC DSMC are conducted according to this SOP. Changed Compliance Officer to QA Auditor throughout the document. Added the Institutional Official (IO) and removed the OR and Research Administration Office from section 3. Added focused, follow-up, and investigator-requested audits to section 4.1. Changed the hotline number to CaneWatch in section 4.1. Changed the Vice Provost for Research to the IO throughout the document. Changed section 4.4 to remove the requirement for the PI to sign a Conflict of Interest Statement. Changed section 4.5 to state that PIs and facilities have 10 working days to respond to audit findings. Modified section 4.6.3 to state that Facility Findings reports will be sent to the facility and leadership will be copied on the email. Removed the attachment. Deleted the JMH Referral Form from sections 4.6 and 7. Added forms to section 7 and additional references to section 6. Reformatted the entire document. Updated the ORCA Director to the RSQA Executive Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Aug 13</td>
<td>21 Aug 13</td>
<td>H. Miletic</td>
<td>Changed CRRC to ORA in sections 2, 4.6 and 7. Updated section 3.5 to state that QA and Compliance function of RSQA reports to Vice Provost for Research. Removed the requirement to specify a date range for the audit in the PI notification in section 4.2.1. Replaced QA Director with QA Manager in sections 4.2.1 and</td>
</tr>
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 | | 25 Aug 2014 | H. Miletic | Changed the name of the office from Regulatory Support and Quality Assurance (RSQA) to Research Compliance and Quality Assurance (RCQA) throughout the document. Added IRB-7 to sections 2 and 4.3. A request for IRB minutes was added to section 4.2.2. Updated section 4.4.3 to include a review of the required elements in the ICF. Updated section 4.5.5 and 4.5.6 to state that RCQA will offer assistance to the PI to create a complete audit response and that RCQA Executive Director will review responses prior to sending to IRB. Modified section 4.5.6.1 to state that the audit report and responses will be sent to both the DSMC and HSRO simultaneously for DSMC-requested audits. Removed the Chief Medical Compliance Officer from section 4.6.1. Updated section 5 to state that audit reports, PI responses, etc. will be kept for a minimum of ten years. Updated section 6 to remove the document retention policy. Modified the revision history table.
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<td>H. Miletic</td>
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