Deliverable report for

ENERI

Grant Agreement 710184

Deliverable 2.2

RIO Boot Camp Prototype

Due date of deliverable: 28 02 2018
Actual submission date: 28 02 2018

ENERI identifier	RIO Boot Camp Prototype
Editor	Erika Löfström
Authors	E. Löfström, S. Kyllönen (UH)
Work Package / Task	WP2 / Task 2.6
Document Status	Working Document – FINAL
Dissemination level	CO
	* **PU** – Public; **PP** - Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services); **RE** - Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services); **CO** - Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services).

1

Document History

Version	Date	Reason of change
0.1	23 02 2018	Draft reviewed by E. Gefenas (VU) A. Cekanauskaite (VU), V. Lukaseviciene (VU), N. Foeger (OeAWI)
1.0	28 02 2018	Final version of prototype

Table of Contents

2

HORIZON 2020

1. Description of Task at the GA

Task 2.6: boot camps activities. ENRIO and EUREC members are not only dealing with allegations of research misconduct or doing ethics reviews but also with raising awareness concerning research integrity and ethics through training activities. In the United States local research integrity officers (RIOs) have been offered specific training by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI). Since for instance collected data and material in an investigation in US are also used as legitimate evidence in court, the requirements in procedures are different compared to European standards or procedures for investigations. ENRIO wants to establish similar RIO boot camps although with a European focus thus taking into account the local circumstances. Similarly, REC boot camps are planned. For this task a strong cooperation with WP4 is necessary.

2. Objectives and needs of the deliverable

Objective as stated in the grant proposal: Developing training material including a European prototype of a RIO and REC boot camp.

In order to achieve its aim, collaboration among WPs has been vital. This collaboration includes WPs 2 (Research Ethics and Research Integrity: Shared Practice), 3 (Common ethical basis for research: Synergies between Research Ethics and Research Integrity Networks), and 4 (Training and Capacity Building).

The collaboration with WP 2 has made it possible to utilize the ENRIO Group in seeking input for relevant themes, and in the actual implementation of the Boot Camp (BC) (Rome, April 9-10, 2018) in connection to an ENRIO meeting. In the phase of informing prospective participants about the forthcoming BC, the target group also had the opportunity to express themes that they particularly felt a training need for. For instance, the inquire resulted in expressions of the need to address the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and its implications for integrity boards and committees, and creating a culture of integrity. Furthermore, as one aim of ENERI is to create synergy between research integrity and research ethics, overlapping issues and ethics topics were also included, i.e. conflict of interest, and ethics review in non-medical research involving human research participants. The latter one was also expressed as a need through ENRIO consultation.

Collaboration with WP 3 has meant that contents of the e-Manual are incorporated to the BC themes. Authors of the e-Manual, namely David Townend and David Shaw, will also be involved in doing the training at the BC on topics related to conflict of interest together with Asta Cekanauskaite and Vilma Lukaseviciene of WP 4, authorship and plagiarism, and GDPR.

Furthermore, collaboration takes place with WP 5 (Participation and Communication Portal: E-Community and E-Tools). The latest development around creating an ethics/integrity expert database will be presented and discussed as part of capacity building and strengthening cultures of integrity across Europe.

Within WP 4, there has been the opportunity to get acquainted with the U.S. BC concept and related training materials. A staff member at the Finnish Board on Research Integrity with experience of a U.S. RIO Boot Camp has reported on the experience, which provided valuable insight into this particular type of training conception.

The U.S. Boot Camp utilizes the idea of a single case, which is analysed, role played and discussed from a number of different integrity angles. This approach provides the opportunity to get to depth with a case and practice RIO competences while engaging with the mutual task.

The ENERI RIO BC utilizes a similar idea of intensive work with cases. However, there are challenges, which require modifications into the approach in the European context. First, the target group in the ENERI BC is broader including research integrity officers working at research institutions, but also, and mostly so, officers serving on national or institutional integrity boards and committees. Therefore, the tasks of participants in the ENERI BC are more varied, whereas in the U.S. context, participants are research integrity officers with similar task profiles. Second, the integrity infrastructures, regulations and guidelines vary greatly from country to country, and therefore the training cannot be based on the idea of a specific set of regulations or a single proper procedure. By default, the discussion around the dilemmas will be more diverse, explorative and comparative in nature, which will, on the one hand, challenge the coherent discussion of topics, but on the other hand, also enrich discussions. Third, in the U.S. research integrity officers are involved in investigations and their work has legal implications unlike in many European

countries. Thus, in the European context, the scope must be broader than investigation procedure in order for participants to benefit.

3. Conclusions

Based on the above, a program has been set up for the ENERI RIO BC to accommodate objectives and needs of the target group, and to pilot-test related training modules later available online. For the program, please see Table below.

The venue for the ENERI RIO BC is the National Research Council (CNR) at Piazzale Aldo Moro 7, 00187 Rome.

The working methods are based on introductions to themes and active work on cases/dilemmas in smaller groups. We will use a few core cases /dilemmas running through the themes. This is illustrated by the arrows in the table. The idea is that each case is dealt with from at least two perspectives to create continuity. In the U.S. BCs, participants work on just one case. However, having a few different cases, which can be analysed through different topics, will help to assure that a greater number of participants can find at least one case that they can easily connect with in terms of content, field and methodology. The BC serves the purpose of pilot-testing materials, and thus, it is relevant to test at least a couple case materials. At the same time, we wish to maintain the idea of a BC with intensive work into the chosen case(s).

The work with cases take different forms:

- small-group sessions around cases where groups deal with their assigned case, but report the outcomes to the whole group
- small-group sessions around a mutual case where outcomes are compared and group solutions complement each other
- Simulation of case in which volunteers act roles, and others are observers. The observer role is not a passive one as also observers will be reporting on their perceptions
- Simulation case is carried on to small-group work in which groups should continue to solve/discuss the simulation case from an assigned perspective.

Thus, the BC will include activating working methods (group work, simulation) to engage participants. Learner-centred methods facilitate higher-quality learning, i.e. deeper level learning and conceptual change (Martin et al., 2000; Kember & Kwan, 2000). Role-play and simulation are teaching/learning activities which engages participants into taking an active role in their learning, and which mimic real/realistic situations. This a feature highly relevant for adult learners who often have the goal of being able to transfer their learning to a real-life context, such as work. Simulation and role play are relevant methods for dealing with ethics and integrity-related content as these encourage participants to recognize different perspectives and to understand the dynamics of systems or processes (Wheeler, 2006; Wright-Maley, 2015).

Creating cases with continuity covering at least two themes is a demanding task, and for this purpose the case studies will draw on multifaceted real-life cases in modified and, where relevant, anonymized form. There are some high-profile cases, the use of which does not require anonymization as the case will draw upon publicly available information and reports. In line with the simulation method, it is vital that participants can get a realistic feel of the materials they work with.

6

One of the cases providing the opportunity for multi-perspective exploration is the so called Macchiarini case (cf. https://ki.se/en/news/the-macchiarini-case-timeline). It is used to explore conflict of interest and creating a culture of integrity. The simulation related to ethics review and the subsequent session on General Data Protection Regulation draw on a case on deviation from the norm of informed consent or on data management and fidelity. Either one of these cases will be used in the BC, but both will be available in the final training resource. Cases for the introductory session drawing on the ALLEA Code of Conduct is illuminated with cases that can be followed up in the session on authorship, plagiarism and peer review. For this purpose we will use 1-2 cases drawing on ideas from UKRIO, the Finnish ethics advisors' training, and based on extensive qualitative research (e.g. Löfström & Pyhältö 2012; 2014; 2015) While information on the Macchiarini case has been publicly available, the other cases draw to some extent on other real cases, which are not public. Therefore, anonymization and modification are necessary measures for protecting identities of individuals involved.

To sum, the BC includes concrete cases that are followed up from different perspectives in the spirit of "Boot camp", and it will include a selection of cases to

allow the European diversity to be taken into account. In order to honor the goal of ENERI to bring together research ethics and research integrity, there are cases that are carried over from themes in one domain to themes in the other domain.

Table 1: Programme for RIO BC

Monday, 9 April	Content	Working method	Presnter/ Facilitator
12:00 - 13:00	Lunch		
13:00 - 13.15	Opening		Dorian Karatzas, EC
13.15 - 13.30	Introduction to the ENERI BC		Erika Löfström, Nicole Föger
13:30 - 14:45	ALLEA code and research misconduct	Work on cases 1-2	Simo Kyllönen
	Coffee		
15.15 - 16:15	Ethics review boards in social sciences and humanities	Simulation with case 3	Erika Löfström
16.15 - 17:30	Impacts of the General Data Protection Regulation	Work with case 3 (simulation case) continues as group work case study	David Townend
Tuesday, 10 April			
09:00 - 10:45	Challenges for responsible publication: authorship, peer review and plagiarism	Work with cases 1-2	David Shaw
	Refreshments		
11:15 - 12:30	Creating a Culture of Integrity through Supervision and Mentoring	Work with case 4	Erika Löfström
12:30 - 13:00	Ethics Expert Database		Panagiotis Kavouras
13:00 - 14:15	Lunch and coffee		
14:15 - 16:00	Conflict of Interest	Work with case 4	Vilma Lukaseviciene, Asta Cekanauskaite, David Shaw
16:15 - 17:00	Conclusion		

7

4. Deviations from DoA

NA

5. Next steps

Preparations for the implementation of the BC are currently undertaken.

During the BC, organisers intend to collect evidence of how the chosen cases work with expert target groups, and what kind of discussions they trigger. This is an important step in assessing training resources created within the ENERI project. An evidence-based approach is applied in order to understand the processes by which integrity experts engage with the selected training material. This will help WP 4 to develop the materials into their final format, later made available online. Moreover, the evidence-based approach increases understanding about how experts analyse ethical dilemmas, including what kind of strategies they use, and what they emphasise in problem solving. Such understanding can be used in future training to help participants develop effective and expert-like strategies for identifying, analysing, and solving ethical dilemmas.

In addition to the evidence-based approach, participants of the BC will be asked to provide feedback on the training. The program concludes with an opportunity to evaluate the training. In addition, participants are also asked to provide written feedback. This material is analysed and fed forward into a) the training material to be made available online at a later stage, and b) the following BC with a focus on research ethics committees (RECs) to be held in early 2019. The preparations for the REC BC have already started, and the experiences from the RIO BC will be a valuable resource for further developing the European BC conception.

8

6. References

Kember D, Kwan KP (2000) Lecturers' approaches to teaching and their relationship to conceptions of good teaching. Instr Sci 28(5):469–490.

Löfström E, Pyhältö K (2015) "I don't even have time to be their friend!" Ethical dilemmas in PhD supervision in hard sciences. Intl J Sci Ed 37(16): 2721-2739.

Löfström E, Pyhältö K (2014) Ethical Issues in Doctoral Supervision - The perspectives of PhD students in the Natural and Behavioural Sciences. Ethics & Behavior, 24(3): 195-214.

Löfström E, Pyhältö K (2012) The supervisory relationship as an arena for ethical problem-solving. Educ Res Intl, article ID 961505, 1-12.

Martin E, Prosser M, Trigwell K, Ramsden P, Benjamin J (2000) What university teachers teach and how they teach it. Instr Sci 28:387–412.

Wheeler SM (2006) Role-playing games and simulations for international issues courses. J Polit Sci Educ 2(3):331–347.

Wright-Maley C (2015) Beyond the "Babel problem": defining simulations for the social studies. JSSR 39(2):63–77.

9