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About Science Europe

- An association of major public research organisations in Europe: Research Funding Organisations and Research Performing Organisations with a public mission
- Founding General Assembly, Berlin, October 2011
- 43 RFOs and RPOs from 27 countries, representing c.€30bn per annum (2017)
- Policy organisation, no programme management
- Role:
  - Collaboration platform
  - Think-tank for science policy issues
  - Advocacy and interest representation
Members of Science Europe: Country Coverage
SE Working Group on Research Integrity

 Established by Science Europe in 2013
 First ‘kick-off’ meeting, May 2013
 RI included as one of nine ‘Priority Action Areas’ in the SE Roadmap, December 2013
 Three-year mandate, extended by one year (to March 2017)
 WG (2014/15): 27 members from ROs in 21 countries
 Survey – undertaken spring 2014
  – first report 4th World Congress, Rio, 2 June 2015
  – full report published 5 July 2016*
  – workshop, Brussels, 22 February 2017
 (+ several other outputs)

* http://scieur.org/integrityreport
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Survey – aim and methods

- **Goal**: to provide data and recommendations to the SE members
- **Six weeks, spring 2014**
- **Addressed to members of Science Europe**: at that time 52 RFOs and RPOs (“ROs”)
- **ca. 34 main questions**
- **Answered by 27 respondents, representing 33 members**
Survey - coverage

- Definitions of research integrity
- Policies and instruments
- Raising awareness and commitments to research integrity
- Support for training
- Legal instruments
- Mobility
- Whistle-blowers
- Sanctions for research misconduct
- Appeal
- Number of cases and trends
- Processes and initiatives to strengthen collaboration
- Self-assessment
Definition of research integrity

Does your organisation have a definition of research integrity?

- A basis for developing a policy and regulation
- Yes: 18; No: 8; Not applicable: 1
Research Integrity Policy and Instruments - 1

Does your organisation, and/or any other organisations or authority in your country, state or region, have a policy or similar instrument on research integrity?

- Yes: 24; No: 2 (though one was planning to); no response: 1

Does your organisation promote its policy (or similar instrument)?

- Yes: 17; No: 3; no response: 7
Research Integrity Policy and Instruments - 2

Does your organisation promote its policy, or similar instrument, on research integrity?
- Yes: 17; No: 3; no response: 7

Does your organisation publish its research integrity policies and/or processes on its website?
- Yes: 22; No: 4; no response: 1
Number of cases and trends

Information requested in the survey, but…..

- Likely lack of awareness of allegations/proven cases
- Data not substantial enough to publish numbers or draw conclusions

- Trends in proven cases:
  - Increase: 4; decrease: 1; stable: 9; no response 13
  - Trends may reflect changes in reporting, rather than actual numbers

![Bar chart showing number of allegations and proven cases](image)
Policies & Procedures - recommendations

1. As a basis for research integrity policies and procedures, RFOs and RPOs should clearly describe what they mean by research integrity.

2. Both RFOs and RPOs should develop a policy on research integrity which includes promotion of good research practice, clear procedures for dealing with allegations of research misconduct and a description of the possible sanctions that can be employed in proven cases of misconduct.

3. RFOs and RPOs should have a published policy that protects employees from disciplinary action where they raise concerns about alleged misconduct. The types of misconduct covered should be described within the policy.

4. RPOs and/or Regulators should aim to make public the outcomes of all proven cases of research misconduct; ideally this should include the names of the researchers involved, but this will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

5. RFOs and RPOs should also support the central collection of data on research integrity, including data on cases – either under investigation or proven.
Objectives

- to promote the implementation of the report’s recommendations;
- to explore the challenges of taking them forward for both Science Europe Member Organisations and for research institutions in general.

Covered: Policies and Procedures, Raising awareness and training, Collaboration and mobility

Programme based around case studies

42 invited participants from 17 countries

Report - available on Science Europe website*

* [http://scieur.org/integrity-practices](http://scieur.org/integrity-practices)
Policies and Procedures – Definitions & Processes

Highlighted the difficulties of adopting clear definitions, ensuring that processes were consistent across organisations, and that researchers were aware of them.

- All stakeholders need to be clear about their own responsibilities and agree on general principles
- Institutions should take the lead in developing their processes
- In developing procedures within countries, the different disciplinary cultures and their different approaches should be taken into account
- Research funders’ routine financial audits could be extended to non-financial risks
Policies and Procedures – Whistle-blowers

Some suggestions:

- Terminology - ‘witness’ better
- Appoint an external (independent) ombudsman
- Provide extra support for PhD students/junior staff
- Ensure associated parties who are innocent are publicly absolved of guilt by association
Policies and Procedures – Making information about misconduct available

- Openness is very important in order to protect those surrounding the accused, and to clear the name of any innocent parties.
- Research that is compromised should be made public, including the reasons why it has been compromised – integrity of the scientific record.
- Journals should identify the reasons for retraction (as some retractions are the result of genuine mistakes).
- Public naming and shaming should be avoided.
- Once a case is proven, funders/publishers/institutions should be informed so that they may implement their own processes.
- National Research Integrity Offices or committees should maintain a database of proven cases.
Further Information

www.scienceeurope.org

Science Europe
Rue de la Science 14
1040 Brussels
Belgium

+ 32 2 226 0300
office@scienceeurope.org
Science Europe in a nutshell

- Association of major public research organisations in Europe: Research Funding Organisations and Research Performing Organisations with a public mission
- 43 member organisations from 27 countries
- Policy organisation, no programme management
- Role:
  - Collaboration platform
  - Think-tank for science policy issues
  - Advocacy and interest representation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>FWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>FWO, FNRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>BAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>HRZZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>GAČR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>DFF/DCIR, DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>ETAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>AKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>ANR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>DFG, MPG, WGL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>MTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Rannís</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>HRB, Irish Research Council, SFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>CNR, INFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Lzp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>LMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>FNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>NWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>RCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>NCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>FCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>APVV, SAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>ARSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>CSIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>FORMAS, FORTE, VR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>SNSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>AHRC, BBSRC, EPSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC, STFC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>