

## Evaluation of ENERI Research Integrity Boot camp, April 9-10, 2018

### 1. Objectives

The BC aimed to provide:

- New perspectives on definitions around responsible conduct/misconduct (ALLEA code)
- Insights into the work of ethics review boards in non-medical research involving human participants
- Understanding of the impacts of the General Data Protection Regulation
- New perspectives on the challenges for responsible publication: authorship, peer review and plagiarism
- Insight on creating a culture of integrity through supervision/mentoring
- A broadened view on conflict of interest

The **objectives** were met, on a scale from 1-5 (1=very poorly, 3=neither well nor poorly, 5=very well) with average ratings between 3.5 - 4.4. These ratings appear overall relatively high.

It appears that participants perceived the sessions on “New perspectives on the challenges for responsible publication: authorship, peer review and plagiarism”, and “Insights into the work of ethics review boards in non-medical research involving human participants” as the most useful (> 4).

### 2. Learning and engagement

When asked what the participants **learned about research integrity**, the following were mentioned (number of times this aspect has been mentioned within parentheses):

- Understanding differences (and similarities) among contexts/fields (5)
- Exchange of views with other experts (4)
- Seeing cases from research ethics perspective; RI/RE overlaps (2)
- Content matter (e.g. conflict of interest, authorship, GDPR)
- Understanding the complexity of issues
- International aspects and insights
- Difficulty of reaching consensus
- Importance of networks and training of own group

Participants evaluated their **own engagement with the topic and the activities** as a 4.2 on average (scale 1-5; 1=I was not actively engaged at all, 3=I was actively engaged some of the time, 5=I was very actively engaged all the time) indicating a high level of engagement with the tasks and activities. They evaluated their **own input in the activities** as a 3.8 on an average (scale 1-5; 1= I feel that I did not contribute to discussions and/or group work, 3=I feel that I contributed some to discussions and/or group work, 5= I feel that I contributed a lot to discussions and/or group work).

When asked **what facilitated the learning experience**, the participants highlighted the following:

- Group work (5)
- Cases / Short introductions followed with work on case (4)
- Discussions with colleagues (3)
- Wrap-up of conclusions on flip chart (2)
- Cases with RE/RI overlapping perspectives
- Heterogeneity of the group
- Good and engaging facilitators
- Lecture parts

### 3. Expectations and overall experience

The **Boot Camp met expectations** with an average of 4.0 corresponding to the response alternative “It filled many of my expectations” on a scale from 1-5. The participants’ **overall experience of the BC was rated at 4.2 on average** (1=very unsatisfied, 3=neutral, 5=very satisfied). This rating appears relatively high and suggests that participants were satisfied and some very satisfied with their BC experience.

The participants commented their experience as follows:

- “Very good experience from different points of view.”
- “Very good working atmosphere. I felt comfortable with the other participants.”
- “I liked the case used for the BC. It gave insight in the different aspects of the case.”
- “I thought there would be more interaction regarding cases. Satisfied as I am more “taught” on the field of research ethics after X case.”
- “Better have real “camp” in a peaceful surrounding. 3 days would be nice.”
- “Competence, collaborative attitude, engagement.”
- “Facilitators should give enough time to read and observe complete (and enforce) silence. Facilitators should require silence when someone speaks plenary.”
- In my opinion this experience is very important. What we need is more time to discuss these issues.

### 4. Improvement suggestions

Suggestions on **what to do differently** included the following:

- Presentations/materials available in advance (8)
- Better readable power points (3)
- More time for focused discussion (3)
- More examples from social sciences and natural sciences to engage non-medical participants (2)
- Good practice: use made-up cases (2)
- More real cases and less made-up ones
- Address acoustics of the room
- GDPR tailored to RIO
- Push participants to stick to programme so as to not go into lengthy debate, and more focus on questions asked

- More participant action to allow going deeper in some areas
- Organise sessions around questions, not topics
- Add legal expertise session
- More days
- More topics

How can **we address the suggestions**? A significant number of the participants would have liked to receive materials in advance. This can most certainly be addressed for the REC BC. Some participants preferred made-up cases whereas other preferred real ones. In line with the U.S. BC it may be more appropriate to use imaginary cases, which are, nevertheless, very realistic. The time needed for discussions could be increased and at the same time, the discussion tasks must be very focused.