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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.


- 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
MO Forum on Research Integrity

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
• Various between and within group communications through email 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agency/Professional Body</th>
<th>Local wt National oversight</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RI Governance in practice

### Agencies/Professional bodies

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Scope/ Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Netherlands</strong></td>
<td>National Board on Scientific Integrity (LOWI) (Secretariat in National Academy of Arts and Sciences)</td>
<td>Advisory, oversight and appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td>UK Panel for Research Integrity in Health and Biomedical Sciences (UKRIO)</td>
<td>Advisory and oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finland</strong></td>
<td>Finish National Research Ethics Board</td>
<td>Advisory and appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Role/Mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>National Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct</td>
<td>Advisory and investigatory. National legal jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty</td>
<td>Investigatory, may proactively take cases. National legal jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Office of Research Integrity</td>
<td>Advisory, oversight, investigatory, regulatory. National legal jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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/findings-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