

# ESF MO Forum WG1

TITLE : ACTIVITY TO RAISE AND SHARE  
AWARENESS on “Good Scientific Practice” (GSP)

OBJECTIVE: Identify, develop and implement activities aimed at raising awareness and sharing information on “Good Scientific Practice” in order to promote Research Integrity.

## MEMBERS of WG1:

1. Soňa Ftáčniková, SRDA, SK (Chair)
2. Milda Naujokaite, Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation, LT
3. Claire Ribault, Scientific Red Cards, FR
4. Evie Vereecke, FWO, BE
5. Thomas Dantes, Max Planck Society, DE
6. Rüdiger Klein, ALLEA, NL



Soňa Ftáčniková, SRDA, SK: Chair ESF MO Forum WG1

1. Main issue (at this stage):  
how to disseminate relevant information?
2. What is the most effective way to do so?
3. How is this organized in ESF Member Organizations?

- 1/ Overview of state-of-the-art in ESF Member Organisations (result of survey)
- 2/ according to the results of step 1, identify the most successful approaches to RI and their methods of implementation in the different countries (old and new MO)
- 3/ develop a „Clearing house“ – in which all relevant information about current activities in different countries, guidelines in good scientific practice and all relevant documents will be available, concentrated in one site (WG1, WG2, WG3, WG4)

## NEEDED ACTION of WG1 and TIMELINE

- electronic discussion among WG1 members - suggestions on how to approach the task of WG1 (March - April 2009)
- developing the first draft of survey by WG1 (April-May 2009)
- developing of final survey and sending to the MO in collaboration with ESF coordinator (May-June 2009)
- collecting responses – analysing survey data and results - identifying the most successful RI activities according to methods in all countries and development of recommendations for future implementation (Sept–Oct 2009)
- preparation of the first draft of WG1 results for plenary workshop of the MO Forum on RI (October 2009)



Soňa Ftáčniková, SRDA, SK: Chair ESF MO Forum WG1

**SURVEY  
RAISING AWARENESS  
ON GOOD SCIENTIFIC PRACTICES  
TO PROMOTE RESEARCH INTEGRITY**

WG1 - Sonia Ftacnikova

## SURVEY RETURNS

1. Health Research Board – IE
2. Research Councils UK – UK
3. Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation – LT
4. Inserm - FR
5. CNRS – FR
6. Ministry of Higher Education and Research - FR
7. Swedish Research Council – SE
8. Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences - NL
9. Research Foundation - Flanders (FWO) - BE
10. Academy of Finland - FI
11. Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences – CH
12. Swiss National Science Foundation – CH
13. Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation - DK
14. Slovak Research and Development Agency – SK

QUESTIONS

1. What kind of activities your institution has organised in order to (nationally and/or internationally) promote research integrity and good scientific practice (workshops, conferences, webpages, advisory boards, articles, publications, training courses, etc.)?
2. What awareness activities do you consider to be the most successful and why?
3. Do you have formal educational training on RCR?
4. What kind of difficulties are you facing in your activities to promote research integrity?
5. Which do you think should be the role of ESF in promotion of research integrity and good scientific practice?

Q1. What kind of activities your institution has organised in order to (nationally and/or internationally) promote research integrity and good scientific practice (workshops, conferences, webpages, advisory boards, articles, publications, training courses, etc.)?

**A) Guidelines on Good Research Practice and Investigations of Allegations of Misconduct in Research (publication, websites)**


- Adoption of the General European Charter

**B) Publication “Good Research – What is it?”/Website**

- Publication of brochure on scientific integrity – Rules and Discussion of cases - teaching material, discussion material for the furthering of scientific integrity

- Journal Articles





C) Surveys of RO's - to check policies and procedures dealing with Scientific Integrity, esp. prevention of misconduct & procedures for investigation of allegations  
National Policy Conference on the Management of GRC  
National Consultation on Management of GRC  
Feedback on Consultation

D) **National Research Integrity Workshop**, university workshops for PhD-Students, conferences (governance of universities and RO's and in a public way)  
Meetings with main stakeholders (3-6 pers.), regional and national  
**OECD-GSF Workshop**

E) National Advisory Board on Research Ethics  
National Expert Group, Research Integrity Bureau – national coordination and harmonisation of dealing with allegations of misconduct  
Ethics Committee at Universities to advise the rector

2. What awareness activities do you consider to be the most successful and why?

- Any one activity on its own will have only limited effect unless it is targeted at a very particular objective. The build-up of survey, consultation and new policy development has been a synergetic and programmatic development to raise consciousness in this area. We have also sponsored sessions at general and subject research conferences to parallel and reinforce the overall development
- Report “Good Research Practice – What is it?” is very popular
- website Codex has a lot of readers mostly among junior researchers and postdoc students
- Publication of brochure (discussion and cases)
- Promotional activity of ethical committee of Academy
- Participation in the work of the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics



Soňa Ftáčniková, SRDA, SK: Chair ESF MO Forum WG1

3. Do you have formal educational training on RCR?

N.B.: just one country reports formal education !



Soňa Ftáčniková, SRDA, SK: Chair ESF MO Forum WG1

4. What kind of difficulties are you facing in your activities to promote research integrity?

### GENERAL

- Underestimation of the problem
- Idea that research misconduct is a very rare phenomenon
- Idea that peer review system should take care of it
- Worries about crossing the boundaries between research integrity and intrusion into areas of academic freedom
- Fear of “tutelage”
- Misunderstanding of the difference between research integrity and ethics and the supports required by both

4. What kind of difficulties are you facing in your activities to promote research integrity (continued)?

INVESTIGATION

- Institutional (employer) reticence about such issues getting into the public domain where misconduct is not black/white
- Concerns about unfounded allegations used to score points
- Danger of libel where hard evidence is difficult to ascertain
- Possibility of resignation from posts to avoid full investigations to be undertaken
- Academic debate about appropriate methods (e.g. about appropriate design, strength of evidence, selection of evidence, inclusion or exclusion of authorship, declaration of conflicts of interest, summary of existing work vs. plagiarism)
- Subject in itself is something like a taboo; cases are often treated in silence



Soňa Ftáčniková, SRDA, SK: Chair ESF MO Forum WG1

4. What kind of difficulties are you facing in your activities to promote research integrity (continued)?

### INSTITUTIONAL

- Resources to support a national framework
- Willingness of individual host institutions to put in place structures
- Very few structures aware of international discussion concerning integrity
- Lack of a national framework stipulating an obligation for universities and other (private) bodies doing research to be aware of RM, and necessity for investigations to be done by an independent body (besides the university VC's)
- Hesitation of universities/institutes to openly discuss cases of misconduct, unwillingness to disclose breaches
- Different stakeholders (national government, regional government, universities and research performing organizations) different approach
- Overwhelming administrative activities of researchers.

5. Which do you think should be the role of ESF in promotion of research integrity and good scientific practice?

- Trying to establish agreed **European standards**:  
Need to cover not just PFF, but also the more difficult areas of conflict of interest, misrepresentation, duty of care, and informed consent which have at times seriously undermined public confidence in science and research in Europe.  
“I think the **Forum** is doing a good job in this regard. The resulting **guidelines** will be very useful at a national level.”
- ESF could participate in the harmonising and implementing guidelines for GSP and RI all European countries.
- Other ongoing similar European or worldwide activities should be used in this effort to prevent unnecessary duplication of work (e.g.: avoid different statements for the same issues – definition of SM, QRP).
- Define basic points in collaboration with the national boards on scientific integrity.

5. Which do you think should be the role of ESF in promotion of research integrity and good scientific practice (continued)?

- all Project Leaders of ESF-supported projects should sign an adherence to a GSP act (“**ESF international guidelines**”) which would be a constituent part of the funding agreement;
- if not the ESF itself then partner organisations participating in ESF-supported projects should be obliged to set up rules on what to do in case of misconduct (as ESF-supported projects are truly international and misconduct while implementing them might be difficult to deal with by a single funding organisation);
- *help to introduce a European standard, help to start introduce national standards for GSP specially in countries which do not have yet national guidelines;*



5. Which do you think should be the role of ESF in promotion of research integrity and good scientific practice (continued)?

- **guidelines** will be very useful at a national level;
- a continuous platform for exchange of practice should be established, with a two or three years periodicity;
- the “**stewardship**” **analysis** should be repeated within some years, improving the quality and depth of the data;
- ESF should prepare world conferences in the name of its members;
- European clearinghouse;
- European database;
- Promotion of activities in countries without boards on scientific integrity;
- and, hopefully, **funding of collaborative work in this field.**

## CONCLUSIONS? (SUGGESTIONS?)

- Improve the survey and redistribute the survey more broadly
- Identification and description of good practices (GSP, RI, RM, SM.... )WG2, WG3
- Benefit from the work of the US ORI in creating an inventory on training (need for formal training)
- European clearinghouse formally integrate in activities of WG1?

..



**THANK YOU FOR ATTENTION**