

10:00-11:15 AM ET

Opening General Session: Welcome from Conference Co-Chairs and Keynote Address: Lessons from Researchers to Institutional Review Processes and Outcomes



- **Co-Chairs:** Andrew Hedrick, The Ohio State University, and Andrea McDowell, Seattle University
- **Keynote Speaker:** H. Richard Milner, IV, Cornelius Vanderbilt Chair of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning; Professor of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning; Professor of Leadership, Policy and Organizations, Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations; Professor of Sociology, Vanderbilt University

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member; HRPP Leadership and Institutional Officials; HRPP Educators; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

11:15-11:30 AM ET

Break

Breakout Sessions Series A, 11:30 AM-12:30 PM ET

A1: With Great Data Comes Great Responsibility—Data Lifecycle Review Strategies



Tracks: SBER Track; Research Involving Data and Biospecimens Track

Tonya Ferraro, Boston Children's Hospital; Jaime Hernandez, OHRP resource person;

Julie Simpson, University of New Hampshire

Backup: Patricia Condon, UNH

While IRBs spend a lot of energy ensuring the protection of people in SBER, they may not spend equal time reviewing the management of the resultant data once a person's corporeal participation has ended in a study. Those data, however, represent real individuals and have a lifecycle all their own. Thus, one could argue, IRBs and researchers should expend equal energy developing and reviewing plans for the protection and management of the data throughout the entirety of a study—from inception to the sharing of the data after publication. Doing so requires that IRBs and researchers understand the data protection and management issues that may arise during collection and handling, sharing, re-use, and access in addition to regulatory, sponsor, journal, and professional association requirements. This session will focus on the data management and protection issues that may arise in each stage of the lifecycle of an SBE study involving human subjects and strategies for IRBs and researchers to address them.

Learning Objectives:

- Understand the value and importance of responsible data management and protection to the success of an SBER study
- Identify data-related issues that may arise during the lifecycle of a research study
- Share strategies that IRBs and researchers can employ to address data obstacles

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

A2: To Consent or Not to Consent: It's About the Question, Not the Answer



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Operations Advanced Track

Cecilia Brooke Cholka, University of Nevada, Reno; Mikaela Myers, Harvard University (CSP confirmed); Melissa McGee, University of New Hampshire

There are standard expectations for how to conduct a consent process. However, there are a multitude of situations in SBER where the standard consent process is not appropriate and/or can be a barrier to research. These situations present unusual challenges and require researchers and reviewers to consider ethical alternatives. This session will present several scenarios that require creative solutions to the consent process (e.g., Photovoice, Action Research, Community Based Participatory Research, etc.). This session will not include a review of the regulations; rather, attendees are expected to be familiar with 116 and 117 and the Belmont Report. There are not definitive answers to these issues, so come for the discussion. Remember, "it depends."

Learning Objectives:

- Problematicize the standard consent process in SBER contexts
- Differentiate between regulatory consenting and ethical consenting
- Discuss approaches to consenting that complement the research, rather than create obstacles

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	

A3: A Case Study in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Efforts—An Office of Research Administration's Social Working Group

Robert Nobles, Emory University; Maria Davila, Emory University; Jumionne Tiako, Emory University

Backup: Jessica Blackburn, Emory University



Tracks: SBER Track; Advancing Justice and Equity Track

The human subjects research community has been reflecting and responding to the current magnification of concerns surrounding DEI and justice. Even when people agree that efforts are important, there are logistical implementation questions. This session will share Emory University's HRPP's approach and coordination efforts, and will help attendees determine next steps for their own institutions, whether that's generating a plan, positioning HRPP DEI efforts within the institution, or getting stakeholder buy-in across their institution.

Learning Objectives:

- Demonstrate how to develop and implement a DEI HRPP program with perspectives from stakeholders
- Discuss communication with leadership about DEI efforts and lessons learned
- Consider how to leverage internal institutional resources to support DEI efforts

Target Audience: HRPP Leadership and Institutional Officials; HRPP Educators; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; SBER Professionals; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; SBER Professionals

A4: Understanding and Applying Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) in Higher Education



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Operations Advanced Track; Research Involving Data and Biospecimens Track

Casey Mumaw, Indiana University; Nalinee Patin, Clemson University

Backup: Shannon Seward, Harvard University

This session will focus on FERPA-related issues and how they apply to research in higher education, including what is and is not FERPA-protected data, how that impacts research, and how to interpret FERPA guidelines. Several scenarios will be presented illustrating common pitfalls in research with FERPA-protected data, and the audience will be encouraged to identify problems and come up with solutions. Before attending this session, attendees should have an understanding of the revised Common Rule and exemption categories, as well as a foundation in human research protections ethics and principles, including the criteria for approval and definitions from DHHS regulations.

Learning Objectives:

- Review what data is covered by FERPA
- Demonstrate how to safeguard FERPA-covered research
- Share strategies for assisting researchers with FERPA compliance

Target Audience: HRPP Educators; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member; SBER Professionals

A5: During the Best of Times and the Worst of Times: Communication Between IRBs and Researchers



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Operations Advanced Track; Leadership Track; Flexibility and Innovation in IRB Processes Track

Ada Diaconu-Muresan, University of Nevada, Reno; Myra Luna Lucero, Columbia University

Backups:

Declined: Roxanne R. Johnson, Tulane University (no response)

During the best of times, effective communication between IRBs and researchers is central to successful research. The COVID-19 pandemic turned the world on its ear, and during these times outreach was critical. Pandemics are not the only time when the IRB needs to be prepared, because emergencies can arise, like hurricanes, floods, fires, etc. This session will discuss communication at the worst of times and explore the relationship between IRBs and researchers to help prepare for future disruptions.

Learning Objectives:

- Share researcher and IRB experiences during the pandemic
- Consider what we can learn from pandemic experiences for implementation post-pandemic
- Discuss how to prepare for future emergency situations

Target Audience: HRPP Educators; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member; SBER Professionals

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	

A6: Research With Non-Traditional Vulnerable Populations in SBER



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Basics Track; Populations Requiring Additional Protections Track

Juliette Roddy, Northern Arizona University; Yvonne Lau, OHRP; Mariette Marsh, University of Arizona

This session will review how to apply the notion of vulnerability (to coercion and undue influence) in non-traditional populations of research subjects in SBER. For example, how do we think about vulnerability and appropriate protections in research involving sex workers, drug users, undocumented individuals (including minors), etc. Are additional protections needed beyond an assurance of confidentiality?

Learning Objectives:

- Review the notion of vulnerability in the revised Common Rule and how to apply it in SBER studies
- Consider new types of protections for vulnerable (or potentially vulnerable) individuals and groups in SBER with those who might be vulnerable for non-traditional reasons

Target Audience: IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion SBER Professionals

A7: Research in K-12 Settings



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Operations Advanced Track

Julie Slayton, University of Southern California; Linda Mayo, University of New Mexico

Session Note: This session was presented at the 2020 AER Conference. We're replaying here for added access to SBER content during the SBER Conference.

Research conducted with students in elementary and secondary school settings presents specific considerations for IRBs and researchers. Using case studies, speakers will examine various topics as they relate to research conducted in K-12 schools.

Learning Objectives:

- Review considerations that affect research in K-12 settings
- Discuss consent considerations (e.g., assent, parental permission, possible alternatives)
- Go over the Family Education Rights and Protections Action, the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, and common misconceptions about the IRB's role in ensuring investigator compliance with these laws
- Share scenarios that may be encountered in the classroom (e.g., undue influence as a result of teachers as investigators, incidental subjects, how to respect the rights of students who do not wish to participate)
- Explore the potential benefits of "flex policies" for institution.
- Address other IRB considerations (e.g., privacy and protection of data)

Target Audience: IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated Member; SBER Professionals

A8: Confidentiality, Privacy, and Anonymity in SBE Research



Tracks: SBER Track; Legal Considerations in HRPPs Track

Julie Simpson, University of New Hampshire; Naline Patin, Clemson University

Session Note: This session was presented at the 2020 AER Conference. We're replaying here for added access to SBER content during the SBER Conference.

Confidentiality, privacy, and anonymity are three terms frequently used, and misunderstood, in SBER involving human subjects. Contributing to the confusion are changing laws and regulations affecting privacy and confidentiality, advances in technology, and shifting expectations by individuals about use of their personal information, including in research. In this session, participants will learn about these concepts and the legal and regulatory environment affecting them in SBER; identify how these concepts play out in the lifecycle of a research study; and discuss strategies for IRBs and researchers to minimize risk in SBER studies related to these concepts.

Learning Objectives:

- Describe the concepts of confidentiality, privacy and anonymity, and laws and regulations impacting them in SBER
- Identify how confidentiality, privacy and anonymity come into play in the lifecycle of a research study
- Evaluate best practices for minimizing risk to participants in SBER related to these concepts

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member; HRPP Leadership and Institutional Officials

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	

A9: Fundamental Issues in Qualitative Research



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Basics Track

Patricia Condon, University of New Hampshire; Andrew Hedrick, The Ohio State University

Session Note: This session was presented at the 2020 AER Conference. We're replaying here for added access to SBER content during the SBER Conference.

In qualitative inquiry, researchers study phenomena in their natural settings where the purpose is contextualization, interpretation, and/or understanding the perspectives of others. The role of qualitative researchers in a study is characterized by their personal involvement and empathetic understanding. This session will help IRB members facilitate the review of qualitative research applications by providing a better understanding of this type of research and the challenges faced by researchers using this paradigm, and will educate qualitative researchers on issues this research paradigm can present during review. Attendees should have a basic knowledge of SBER methodologies and of 45 CFR 46 before attending this session.

Learning Objectives:

- Examine the foundations of qualitative inquiry, and review its basic characteristics, including nomenclature and common data collection methods
- Identify the ethical issues qualitative research may present to study participants, including recruitment, informed consent, privacy and confidentiality, and conducting research online
- Share strategies for minimizing harm to participants in qualitative research studies

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

12:30-1:15 PM ET

Mid-Day Break

Breakout Sessions Series B, 1:15-2:15 PM ET

B1: Reviewing Exercise Science Research at Primarily SBER Institutions



Tracks: SBER Track

Summer B. Cook, University of New Hampshire; Michael Leary, Lindenwood University

Declined: Meghan Felicia Pronovost, Tufts University (no response)

This session will offer IRB administrators, chairs, and members a comprehensive review of issues related to reviewing exercise science research in primarily SBER institutions. This session will describe key ethical and regulatory issues related to exercise performance, sports nutrition, and related interventions, and differentiate these issues from similar questions encountered in SBER. Best practices for IRB applications, review processes, risk minimization, data and safety monitoring, informed consent documents, and postapproval monitoring (PAM) will be provided through case study discussions.

Learning Objectives:

- Describe key ethical and regulatory distinctives of exercise science research relative to SBER
- Review best practices for the review, approval, and documentation of interventions unique to exercise science research
- Identify practical solutions for effective review of exercise science research in the SBER environment through enhancements to IRB applications, review processes, informed consent materials, PAM, and related human subjects protections

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

B2: Omnium-Gatherum—A SBER Variety Show



Tracks: SBER Track

Andrew Hedrick, The Ohio State University; Alma Castro, Longwood Medical Area

Backups: Cindy Shindledecker, University of Michigan; Tonya Ferraro, Boston Children's Hospital; Ashley Hicks, Tufts University

Due to diverse methodologies, interdisciplinary nature, and broad implications, SBER IRBs are presented with unique challenges. This session will share comprehensive brief summaries on common issues and practical strategies of that arise in SBER review: terms of service agreements, student subject pools, and PhotoVoice/visual qualitative methods. Before attending this session, attendees should have a basic knowledge of 45 CFR 46 and bring questions on other SBER-related challenges.

Learning Objectives:

- Identify issues that arise in each situation presented
- Explore tips and tricks on how to effectively navigate IRB review
- Share practical strategies and solutions to unique SBER challenges

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	

B3: Much Ado About Virtual Research: Considerations, Challenges, and Opportunities



Tracks: SBER Track; Research Conducted in the Digital World Track

Mary Hanabury, Director, Research Administration, Northern Arizona University [IRB]; Joe Zurba, Harvard Medical School (Information Security and IT Compliance Officer, IRB member; co-chairs the Harvard Catalyst Emerging Tech group) [IT/IRB]; Christine Suver

Backups: Sage Bionetworks; Kim Serpico, HSPH; Linda Mayo, University of New Mexico; Sara Stevenson, Research Compliance Manager, College of Charleston; Adam Bailey, IRB Manager, Stanford

Declined: Alecia Magnifico, University of New Hampshire [researcher] (no response)

The pandemic necessitated that researchers transition, where possible, in-person research activities to virtual/online modalities. This form of research is not new, yet, the move from in-person to virtual as a necessity versus a methodological choice raises issues for researchers and IRBs, particularly those not well-versed in conducting research in this environment, including: Are the ethical principles in the Belmont Report flexible enough to address virtual research? What aspects of virtual research do the regulations not address and how should researchers and IRBs respond? Does not being able to conduct research in-person affect research studies and the data collected? In addition, there are the challenges, including obtaining informed consent, paying participants, safeguarding data and participants' privacy, and ensuring participant representativeness. What was learned during the pandemic about conducting virtual research that could be helpful and/or augment practices in the future?

Learning Objectives:

- Discuss how to apply the Belmont Report principles and the federal regulations to online research
- Explore solutions to challenges that arise in online research
- Review lessons learned from conducting online research during a pandemic, and what might be carried over into the future, including new opportunities in research

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

B4: Deception, Lies, and Fake News: Discussing the Unintended Consequences of Online Research



Tracks: SBER Track; Research Conducted in the Digital World Track

Casey Mumaw, Indiana University; Ivor Pritchard, OHRP; Benjy Silverman, Harvard Medical School

Backups: Andrew Hedrick, OSU; Ioana Literat; Luke Gelinas, Advarra;

Decline: Melissa Abraham, Harvard Medical School

Research that involves deception is often controversial, ostensibly contrary to the basic principles of the Belmont Report, though also a valuable source of data. Online research has enabled researchers to deceive subjects en masse, often with very little interaction and little, if any, opportunity to debrief subjects and inform them of the deception. This session will include a discussion of the ethical challenges of online deception research and where the boundaries of responsibility lie. What, if any, limits should there be on research conducted online using deception? What topics are okay for researchers to post deceptive information about, and how far and how long can they deceive subjects? Do researchers have obligations to prevent subjects from spreading false information after their participation? Should researchers inform and debrief individuals from whom they never collect data? Before attending this session, attendees should have an understanding of the revised Common Rule including the criteria for approval, waivers and alterations of informed consent, and definitions from DHHS regulations, as well as a foundation in human research protections ethics and principles.

Learning Objectives:

- Recognize some of the ethical problems created by posting misinformation online
- Identify the potential harms that can result from non-subjects being exposed to false information
- Explore the potential ramifications of HRPPs extending their domain beyond intended subjects

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	

B5: The Use of Social Media in Research—The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly



Tracks: SBER Track; Research Conducted in the Digital World Track

Darren Linvill, Clemson University [researcher]; Brenda Curtis, NIH [researcher/IRB/IT]; Adam Bailey, Stanford University [IRB]
Backups: Sara Stevenson, College of Charleston; Elizabeth Buchanan, Marshfield Clinic

Social media are pervasive and fully integrated into the lives of many individuals. Accordingly, they are excellent tools for researchers, not only in terms of recruiting and communicating with participants but also as a rich source of data. But, social media is a collective term for a range of online tools that are constantly evolving, making it tricky for IRBs and researchers to stay on top of the issues related to human subjects protections. Further, much of the public may not fully understand who can see the information they post and how that information may be used by researchers. Speakers will explore topics such as what is human subjects data on social media, legal or contractual issues, private-public continuum considerations, recruitment and informed consent issues, data identifiability and risk assessment.

Learning Objectives:

- Learn about types of social media, how they can be used in research, and the different human subjects protections issues each raise
- Understand the implications for researchers who use social media in their research, including who are the media users and for what have media users consented
- Identify what IRBs need to consider when reviewing studies that involve the use of social media, including what is the IRB's purview and whether researchers have increased risk to social media users
- Explore what the use of social media data in research means for the future

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

B6: Assessing and Mitigating Risk in SBER: A Case Study Approach



Advanced

Tracks: SBER Track

Amy Ben-Arieh, Fenway Institute; Marianna Azar, OHRP; Lara Sloboda, Dana Farber Cancer Institute

Declined: Erin Sibley, Boston University

Backup: Alma Castro of Harvard Longwood Medical Area

The risks associated with SBER are often hard to identify, and are dynamic, subjective, and unpredictable. During this session, speakers will present SBER case studies that were designed to help reviewers identify and evaluate the risks presented by SBER participation, and will include a discussion on how to effectively spot issues and employ risk mitigation strategies. Attendees should have an understanding of 45 CFR 46 and different types of risk that SBER studies may present and how to assess risk: benefit ratios before attending this session.

Learning Objectives:

- Identify the nature of the risks associated with SBER and factors that may exacerbate the risk of harm
- Review applicable regulations and standards
- Evaluate strategies for risk mitigation

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

B7: College Students and Research: Challenges and Issues for IRBs



Andrea McDowell, Seattle University; Julie Simpson, University of New Hampshire

Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Operations Advanced Track; Legal Considerations in HRPPs Track

Session Note: This session was presented at the 2020 AER Conference. We're replaying here for added access to SBER content during the SBER Conference.

A considerable amount of research takes place on college/university campuses involving college students as subjects. This includes research on novel educational strategies and the use of departmental pools of introductory-level students to participate in research studies and other projects for credit (subject pools). This session will review regulatory and legal standards, as well as the specific ethical issues that arise when reviewing research in which college students on campus are subjects, and when they may serve as investigators or study staff.

Learning Objectives:

- Provide a high-level overview of pertinent laws and regulations affecting this population (e.g., the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, Title IX)
- Identify the issues that frequently arise when conducting research on a university/college campus, including best practices for addressing ethical issues (e.g., instructors recruiting their own students, students who are minors, etc.)
- Discuss the issues that arise when college students conduct research, either as principal investigator or student investigator
- Outline the issues that arise with the operation of university/college subject pools and best practices for addressing these issues
- Review the role of the HRPP in educating student researchers

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member; HRPP Leadership and Institutional Officials

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	

B8: Scientific Merit and SBER

Julie Slayton, University of Southern California; Matt Stafford, Boston Children's Hospital



Tracks: SBER Track

Session Note: This session was presented at the 2019 AER Conference. We're replaying here for added access to SBER content during the SBER Conference.

Review for scientific merit is a perennial and often thorny issue. Is assessing scientific merit something IRBs should engage in? What are the differing perspectives regarding this issue? Before attending this session, attendees should have an understanding of SBER methodology and study challenges related to risk assessment, risk mitigation, and informed consent, as well as a working knowledge of 45 CFR 46. During this session, speakers and attendees will:

Learning Objectives:

- Discuss the concept of scientific merit in SBER
- Examine and discuss whether review for scientific merit is an IRB obligation (e.g., what do IRBs need to review and evaluate scientific merit in a study? If it's not the IRB's obligation, should it be conducted by someone else at an institution? Who and under what circumstances?)
- Share strategies for assessing scientific merit and training resources for IRB members)

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

B9: Exempt or Not? Don't Get Psyched Out by the Benign Behavioral Intervention Research Exemption



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Basics Track

John Horigan, NIH; Elicia Preslan, Virginia Commonwealth University; Michelle Stickler, University of Texas, Austin

Session Note: This session was presented at the 2020 AER Conference. We're replaying here for added access to SBER content during the SBER Conference.

Using case studies, this session will review the draft guidance issued by OHRP on the exemption at 104(d)(3) concerning benign behavioral intervention research. The session will review what kind of studies fall within the scope of the exemption, and what counts as prospective agreement, including prospective agreement and deception research.

Learning Objectives:

- Describe the key terms that define the scope of the exemption
- Consider what is meant by "prospective agreement" in the exemption
- Identify areas of discord between HRPP professionals and SBER researchers as to what constitutes a benign behavioral intervention
- Share conceptual framework/tools for better developing and implementing guidance on what constitutes benign behavioral interventions

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff; IRB Members, Chairs, and Vice Chairs; Non-Scientist/Unaffiliated IRB Member

2:15-2:30 PM ET

Break

Afternoon Networking Opportunities, 2:30-3:30 PM ET

It's a Virtual World, We're a Virtual HRPP: Show and Tell Virtual Tools Networking Session



Tracks: SBER Track; IRB Operations Advanced Track; Networking Track

Kim Serpico, Harvard Longwood Campus; Iris Jenkins, UMass Amherst

This hybrid, networking/presentation session will "showcase" three to five groups and their innovative approaches using virtual tools for various aspects of HRPP operations including: education and outreach, postapproval monitoring, IRB meeting management, etc. Each group will share effort highlights, obstacles, and lessons learned, and there will be time at the end for questions and networking.

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	

Challenges and Opportunities for Small IRB Offices at Small SBER Programs



Tracks: SBER Track; Small Research Programs Track; Networking Track

Carole Krus, John Carroll University; Aimee Huard, Great Bay Community College

Backup: Elaine Radmer, Gonzaga University

For SBER smaller IRBs with single or limited staffing, HRPP/IRB administrators and professionals often face unique challenges around processes, budgeting, resources, and interfacing with the larger campus community. At the same time, smaller SBER programs can often enjoy more flexibility and decisional authority. In this networking session, we invite you to share your strategies, tips, and tools for best practices; connect with professionals with similar institutional situations; and brainstorm other strategies for operating with potentially limited resources and support.

Target Audience: SBER Professionals; IRB Administrators, Managers, and Staff

Meet the Author: *Deliberately Divided: The Controversial Study of Twins and Triplets Adopted Apart*



Tracks: SBER Track; Networking Track

Moderator: Andrea McDowell, Seattle University

Author: Nancy Segal, California State University, Fullerton

The session focuses on the ethical aspects of a controversial study that secretly tracked separated identical twins in the 1960s-80s. During this session, the author will review the study, discuss whether current standards can be used to judge the study, and take questions from the audience. *Deliberately Divided* will be released in Fall 2021.

Learning Objectives:

- Review the knowledge of a controversial study by reputable researchers
- Discuss the current relevance of unethical, but legal, research activities
- Share the significance of twin research

Target Audience: SBER Professionals

ICON LEGEND

Livestreamed Session	On-Demand Session	Pre-Registration Required	Additional Fee
New Breakout Sessions in 2021	Call for Session Proposal	CIP Eligible	
Advanced: Assumes mastery of ethical concepts and principles, the regulations, and research oversight processes. Attendees should have sufficient experience and understanding to actively contribute to discussion and solutions. Sessions will not review basic concepts.		Basic: For those who have little or no knowledge of the topic or who are looking for a refresher. The focus is on introducing, explaining, and illustrating basic concepts, principles, regulations, policies, or best practices relevant to the topic.	