



## **ESF and Research Integrity**

**Marja Makarow  
Vanessa Camp0-Ruiz**

# MO Forum on Research Integrity

## Background ESF MO Forum

- First World Conference on *Research Integrity, fostering responsible research*, Lisbon, 16-19 Sept. 2007.
- Proposal project *European Co-ordinated Approach to Research Integrity* (ESF, ALLEA, UKRIO). Funding EC rejected (May 2008), decision to go ahead anyway with own means.
- Workshop ESF Members (ESF & CSIC) *Research integrity: from principles to practice*. Madrid, 17-18 Nov. 2008.
- After Madrid: Establishing ESF Member Forum on Research Integrity with four Working Groups:
  - WG1 Raising awareness
  - WG2 Code of Conduct
  - WG3 Setting up national structures
  - WG4 Furthering research on RI

## Activities ESF MO Forum

- First meeting of the four working groups: Amsterdam, 23 May, 2009
- Joint meeting WG 2 and WG 3: Amsterdam, 11 Sept. 2009
- Second meeting of the four working groups : Strasbourg, 27 Oct. 2009
- ESF-ORI Workshop on Training: Strasbourg, 27-28 Oct. 2009
- Various between and within group communications through e-mail and telephone.
- Third meeting of the four working groups: Split, 22 March 2010
- Final report and European Code: July 2010 "Fostering Research Integrity in Europe"

# Scope European Code for Research Integrity

- CoC is not a body of law, but rather a canon for self regulation
- CoC applies to research in all sciences and fields of scholarship: natural and life sciences, social sciences and humanities.
- CoC confines itself to standards of integrity while *conducting* research, and does not consider the wider socio-ethical responsibility of scientists and scholars.

# Principles scientific integrity

- Researchers, research institutes, universities, academies and funding organisations commit themselves to observe and promote **principles** of scientific integrity. These include:
  - Honesty
  - Reliability
  - Objectivity
  - Impartiality and independence
  - Open communication
  - Duty of care
  - Fairness
  - Responsibility for future science generations
- Research employers have a responsibility to ensure that a **culture of research integrity** prevails.

# Violating norms of scientific integrity

- Two most serious violations:
  - **Fabrication**
  - **Falsification**
- Third category of misdemeanours:
  - Infringement of **intellectual property rights** (including plagiarism)
- Not or Improper **dealing** with violations of integrity
- **Petty misdemeanours** ('adjustment' of a figure, cutting a corner, trimming of data, omitting an unwelcome observation): unacceptable as well; may not give cause to a formal charge, but should be reprimanded and corrected.

# European Examples

Country	Agency/ Professional Body	Local wt National oversight	National
Croatia			✓
Denmark			✓
Finland		✓	
France	✓		
Germany	✓		
Hungary		✓	
Ireland	✓		
Latvia	✓		
Netherlands		✓	
Norway			✓
Poland	✓		✓
Spain	✓		
Sweden		✓	
Switzerland	✓		
UK		✓	

# RI Governance in practice

## Agencies/Professional bodies

Country	Organisation	Role	Scope/ Limitations
<b>Ireland</b>	Health Research Board	Advisory	HRB funded research. Rely on institutions to have mechanisms in place for dealing with misconduct
<b>Germany</b>	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) Ombudsman's Service + Max Planck Society	Advisory and investigatory	Require institutions to have mechanisms in place for dealing with misconduct. Investigatory in DFG or MPS funding only
<b>Switzerland</b>	Swiss Academies of Arts and Science in collaboration with Swiss National Science Foundation	Advisory, oversight and investigation	All publically funded research. Local investigation supported by legislation



# RI Governance in practice

## Local with national oversight

	Organisation	Role	Scope/ Limitations
<b>Netherlands</b>	National Board on Scientific Integrity (LOWI) (Secretariat in National Academy of Arts and Sciences)	Advisory, oversight and appeals	All universities and institutions under LOWI umbrella. Voluntary. Private sector not included
<b>UK</b>	UK Panel for Research Integrity in Health and Biomedical Sciences (UKRIO)	Advisory and oversight	Covers only health and biomedicine – public and private sector. Proposed National Advisory Body for all disciplines
<b>Finland</b>	Finish National Research Ethics Board	Advisory and appeals	University. Voluntary sign-up

# RI Governance in practice

## National Body

Country	Organisation	Role/Mandate	Scope/ Limitations
<b>Norway</b>	National Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct	Advisory and investigatory. National legal jurisdiction	All public and private sector institutions
<b>Denmark</b>	Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty	Investigatory, may proactively take cases. National legal jurisdiction	All public sector institutions and universities
<b>USA</b>	Office of Research Integrity	Advisory, oversight, investigatory, regulatory. National legal jurisdiction	Public Health Service institutions worldwide. Does not cover private sector

# Climategate: as example University of East Anglia

- Climate Research Unit
- Copenhagen
- Reviews
- Oxburgh-Science
- Muir-Russell-Process

Conclusions: Shutting stable door. Not totally credible.

## Science and Technology Grow

- No longer introspective
- Policy and Societal Impact

Hence rules must involve  
possible interactions with  
other actors

- Industry
- Media
- Politicians

# Science and Technology Grow but

- Isolated researchers
- Research environment
- Compare patent situation
- Publication with mandatory data archive
- Peer review-active. How?
- Public policy input-How?
- Correct politicians? Media?

# Climategate

## University of East Anglia

- Muir Russell Review

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/jul/07/finding-s-muir-russell-review>

- East Anglia/Royal society Review

<http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/CRUstatements/SAP>

## ESF Publications

- Fostering Research Integrity in Europe
- Stewards of Integrity