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Call for Proposals: Focus Tracks

Purpose
To broaden programme planning, Co-Chairs of the 6th World Conference on Research Integrity (WCRI) welcome proposals from members of the WCRI Foundation Governing Board and 6th WCRI Programme Committee for focus tracks. Focus tracks are structured discussions between participants on a clearly defined topic. The proposed topic should be relevant to a broad range of participants and be clearly linked to the conference theme (“New Challenges for Research Integrity”).

Structure
Focus tracks will be held during the conference. A focus track can be held in one session (normally 90 minutes), or more than one session.

Application
All proposals have to be submitted by members of the WCRI Foundation Governing Board and 6th WCRI Programme Committee by May 15, 2018. Input and inspiration on the content of the proposal from other individuals and organisations are welcome, provided that a member of the WCRI Foundation Governing Board or 6th WCRI Programme Committee takes the responsibility and submits the proposal.

Selection
The proposals will be reviewed by the conference organisers. Focus track should not be dependent on 6th WCRI support for speakers.

Deadline for submission of proposals is May 15, 2018.

Call for Proposals: Focus Tracks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>How can we improve organizational assessment of researchers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Assessment of researchers is necessary for decisions of hiring, promotion, and tenure. The current system of faculty incentives and rewards is perceived by many as perverse, possibly rewarding questionable behaviors, and misaligned with the needs of society and disconnected from the evidence about the causes of the reproducibility crisis and suboptimal quality of the scientific publication record. A set of six principles for better assessing scientists and associated research and policy implications is proposed. Using these principles as a basis, this focus track will review the six principles along with participant discussion about their nomination, selection, and merit (session 1). Similarly, the focus track will look at how these principles, and other evidence-based principles might be endorsed and implemented in different institutions and disciplines. Reference: Moher D, et al (2018) Assessing scientists for hiring, promotion, and tenure. PLoS Biol 16(5): e2004089.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to the conference theme “New Challenges for Research Integrity”</td>
<td>Improving the current system of faculty incentives and rewards is a crucial complement to other attempts, such as training, to improve research integrity, but has been relatively neglected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended outcome/result</td>
<td>A paper summarizing both audience collective experiences in improving the assessment system, and concrete ideas to implement the principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended audience</td>
<td>Researchers, funders, academic institutions, publishers, and research administrators interested or involved in research and researcher assessment policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of sessions (with provisional sub-title)</td>
<td>Preferably 2 sessions (normally 90 minutes per session)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(100 words max.)

(100 words max.)

(100 words max.)
The goal of developing the Hong Kong manifesto?

• Provide ‘guidance’ for those completing assessments of researchers that strengthen research integrity
  • promotion and tenure committees (PTCs)
• Concentrates primarily on what universities and other research institutions can do to modify the criteria used by PTCs for career assessments
• Implementation is a key feature
• Integrates evaluation as another key feature in assessing the usefulness of the 5 principles
Iteration of the Hong Kong Manifesto
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Iteration of the Hong Kong Manifesto

• Version 1 on WCRI website in early May
  • 50 pages of feedback
• Version 2 on WCRI website in late May
**Hong Kong Manifesto principles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assess researchers based on responsible practices in all aspects of the research enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Value the reporting of all research, regardless of the results and reward honest and transparent reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Value the practice of open science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Value a broad range of research activities, such as innovation, replication, synthesis, and meta-research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Value a range of other contributions to research, such as peer review for grants and publications, and mentoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Iteration of the Hong Kong Manifesto

• Plenary presentation
• 2 Focus track sessions
  • Breakout session/principle
  • Ginny Barbour; Lex Bouter; Anne-Marie Coriat; Paul Glasziou; David Moher
  • Synthesis session to review and discuss breakout session

• Overall, we’ve had active engagement from hundreds of people
Transparency – our ‘research’ process & data

- 2 x 90-minute sessions
- 5 subgroups
- Joint feedback session
The Re-drafted Principles

• Principle 1: Assess researchers (and institutions) on responsible practices from conception to delivery, including the development of the research idea, research design, methodology and execution and effective dissemination

• Principle 2: Value the accurate and transparent reporting of all research, regardless of the results and reward honest and transparent reporting

• Principle 3: Value the practices of open science - such as open methods, materials and data - when feasible.

• Principle 4: Value a broad range of research and scholarship, such as replication, synthesis, and meta-research

• Principle 5: Value a range of other contributions to responsible research and scholarly activity, such as peer review for grants and publications, mentoring, outreach, and knowledge transfer
Principle 2: Value the accurate and transparent reporting of all research, regardless of the results

Standards of reporting: Standards of reporting guidelines help authors to ensure that they have provided a comprehensive description of their research, making it easier for others to assess and reproduce the work; for more detail and a comprehensive overview, see the FAIRSharing initiative. Available reporting guidelines for biological research can be found using the MIBBI Foundry filter on the FAIRSharing website; the EQUATOR network provides a comprehensive list of reporting guidelines for health research.

Specifically, articles in Wellcome Open Research that report clinical trials must adhere to the CONSORT reporting guidelines. We ask authors to include a copy of the original trial protocol and a completed CONSORT checklist and flow diagram as supporting files, which will be published alongside the article. The trial registration number and registration date must be included in the Methods section. Any deviation from the original trial protocol must be explained in the article.

Reproducibility: Wellcome Open Research is committed to serving the research community by ensuring that all articles include sufficient information to allow others to reproduce the work. With this in mind, Methods sections should provide sufficient details of the materials and methods used so that the work can be repeated by others. The section should also include a brief discussion of allowances made (if any) for controlling bias or unwanted sources of variability. Any limitations of the datasets should be discussed.

Other funders: NC3R, NIHR, etc have similar requirements
Principle 3: Value the practices of open science - such as open methods, materials and data

**Study Protocols**

We welcome protocols for any study design, including epidemiological studies and systematic reviews, or protocols defining research questions and empirical methods in social sciences and humanities. All protocols for randomised clinical trials must be registered and follow the SPIRIT guidelines. Study pre-protocols (i.e. discussing provisional study designs) may also be submitted and will be clearly labelled as such when published. Study Protocols for pilot and feasibility studies may also be considered.
Principle 5: Value a range of other contributions to responsible research and scholarly activity, such as peer review for grants & publications, mentoring, outreach, and knowledge transfer.

12. Scientific and societal impact of research

- total number of publications and, e.g., 10 most important and/or most cited publications according to a relevant database (a list of publications according to the Publication Type Classification used by the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture as a separate attachment)
- artistic works and processes
- merits related to the production and distribution of research results and research data
- merits related to the application of research results
- invention disclosures, patents and other commercialisation-related merits (e.g. spin-off companies and trademarks)
- merits in science communication and expert assignments in the media
Principle 3: open science ...
Principle 5: other contributions to responsible research

Begun in 2016 - volunteers who advise members of the research community on proper handling of research data. In this, they promote good research data management (RDM) and support Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Re-usable (FAIR) research principles.

Based on Cambridge program. Soon includable in CV for promotion.
Next Steps

1. Work up of examples
   (other examples? Please email David Moher, dmoher@ohri.ca)

2. Revised wording of Principles, text and examples
   2a. Plan on completing this task within the next few weeks

3. Re-post of WCRI website (for a couple of weeks)

4. Final revision

5. Accompanying explanatory document

Chair  David Moher, University of Ottawa; and Ottawa Hospital Research Institute

Click here to view the updated draft “Hong Kong Manifesto for Assessing Researchers: Fostering Research Integrity”.