

interaction with any individual.

Office of Institutional Ethics & Compliance For Ouestions and Consultations: Main Email: IRB.Research@umassd.edu DIEC Email: spena4@umassd.edu

(3.9) Non-Engagement in Research IRB Decision Path: Initial Review, Determinations, and Approvals Continuing Review required (3.3) Determination by Actions by Actions by IRB Actions by (3.10.2) Educational Research: PI and/or IRB Chair or DIEC Yes Goal is to improve personal teaching practices, not Does the research mee designed to contribute to generalizable knowledge, no Red Text, Preliminary IRB Requests, Regulatory Review (6.1) No. Full Board Review Required (3.2.4) the criteria for IRB dissemination beyond the institution. Brown Text, Designated Member Requests, Non-Committee Review (6.3) approval without any Purple Text, Full Board Requests for Full Board Review (6.4) RB Denies approval additional changes or (3.10.3) Classroom Projects: Exempt Review (3.2.2), or Teal Text in (#.#.#), Identifes Section of User Guide to Refer to. information? Goal is to educate students, not designed to contribute to Expedited Review (3.2.3): genralizable knowledge, and involves no dissemination No Iodifications as required \*\*Start Here\*\* Is the study "minimal beyond classroom context. Yes Can the criteria risk" and the Is IRB Review Required? for IRB approval (3.10.4) Program/Service Evaluation//Reporting: procedures fit into a Does the research be met with Goal is to improve specific program or service, not category of research Are substantive changes meet the Criteria for designed to contribute to generalizable knowledge, –Yes-► specific, minor that can be reviewed or additional information If generalizable knowledge, sensitive information, dissemination limited to stakeholders. IRB Approval (4.2)? changes? by exempt or needed to allow the IRB identifiable data, or vulnerable populations expedited process? to determine in the Yes (3.10.5) Quality Improvement (QI) Projects: No. IRB criteria for approval Is the research a systematic RB marks submission Goal is to improve practice/process within an institution, Requests Yes. have been met? not designed to contribute to generalizable knowledge, no Clarification as Approval Pending investigation designed to Reviewer Not Research Yes dissemination beyond institution. PI Provides minor revisions develop or contribute to Assigned Info to IRB IRB Returns generalizable knowledge? PI Provides IRB Request Not Human **IRB Review Not** Is the application Info to IRB submission to PI Minor **Subjects** Required to make changes complete, clear, Clarify areas of application, Revisions Research concise, consistent, provide additional information. Yes. If PI Makes -PI Makes Revisions-Will the investigator be: Returned (3.10.6) Social Media Research: and has all necessary edit or make changes, or Revisions Not Human interacting/intervening with Full Board Data avoids quoting posts verbatim, posts are intended for elements for IRB to provide materials, as requested. Review public engagement, and involves no direct interaction with living individuals? AND/OR determine the criteria Did the PI make the Required No. IRB Requests any individual. for approval have utilizing identifiable, private No. IRB requested changes? Additional Revisions been met? Requests 118 -Not Yet information or biospecimens? (3.10.7) Use of Publicly Available Data Sets: Clarification Rea Reviev Data set is published and publicly available without Yes Info IRB Accepts restriction, the data is deidentified and uncoded, and Submission Clarifies Yes, but stripped of identifiers or variables which could reidentify. not by (4.1)NOT UMassD (3.2.5)(3.10.8) Secondary Data Analysis: PI submits IRB UMassD Reliance Nonengaged Data is de-identified, involves no identifiable/sensitive/ Reliance IRB application for Complete Agreement private info, no potential for re-identification, original Recruitmen Review Oversight review/approval consent allows for seondary data analysis, and no direct