MANAGEMENT OF OBJECTIVITY IN RESEARCH

Educational outreach consisted of one-on-one meetings with researchers and nine webinars focused on objectivity in research management. A monthly newsletter is widely distributed to inform researchers about upcoming educational venues along with protocol submission tips and other helpful information. A comprehensive educational segment on objectivity in research was featured in the newsletter, covering topics such as the importance of objectivity, strategies for maintaining it, and examples of best practices. The educational outreach also included management of objectivity in research workshops that were conducted in various locations across the campus, providing researchers with an opportunity to learn more about the topic and ask questions directly. The workshops were attended by a total of 16 researchers, and attendees were provided with a comprehensive workbook that included key points, definitions, and examples of objectivity in research management.

A monthly newsletter is widely distributed to inform researchers about upcoming educational sessions, outreach activities, and other helpful information. The newsletter includes a section specifically dedicated to objectivity in research management, where researchers are encouraged to share their experiences and insights. The newsletter also features Q&A sessions with the IRB Program Coordinators, where researchers can ask questions and receive feedback on their work. The newsletter has a circulation of 38 for the year, and is distributed to the entire campus, including researchers, faculty, and staff. The newsletter also provides links to other resources, such as online courses and webinars, and encourages researchers to take advantage of these resources to improve their understanding of objectivity in research management.
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IRB Quality Improvement (QI) Review

The QI Review is an ongoing process that involves periodic review and evaluation of the IRB processes and procedures. The review is conducted by the IRB Program Coordinators, who are responsible for ensuring that the processes and procedures are in compliance with the AAHRPP standards. The review includes a checklist of all of the AAHRPP standards and requirements, and the program coordinators evaluate the processes and procedures to ensure that they meet the standards. The review also includes an evaluation of the processes and procedures for objectivity in research management, and the program coordinators provide feedback to ensure that the processes and procedures are in compliance.
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