

Deliverable report for

ENERI

Grant Agreement 710184

Deliverable 2.4

REC Boot Camp Prototype

Due date of deliverable: 30 11 2018

Actual submission date: 30 11 2018

ENERI identifier	REC Boot Camp Prototype
Editor	Erika Löfström
Authors	E. Löfström, S. Kyllönen (UH)
Work Package / Task	WP2 / Task 2.4
Document Status	Working Document – FINAL
Dissemination level	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)
	* 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	13 07 2018	Draft reviewed by E. Gefenas (VU) A. Cekanauskaite (VU), V. Lukaseviciene (VU), Natalija Fiodorova (VU)
1.0	24 09 2018	Final version of prototype
2.0	29 09 2018	Amended with participant information

Table of Contents

1. Description of Task at the GA	3
2. Objectives and needs of the deliverable	3
3. Conclusions	4
4. Deviations from DoA	7
5. Next steps	7
6. References	7

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. The training curricula are designed in WP 4. These contents are fed into the boot camps. The execution of boot camps is carried through as WP 4 activities.

2. Objectives and needs of the deliverable

3

Objective as stated in the DoA: 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 REC BC is implemented in connection to a EUREC meeting (Prague, March 25-26, 2019). Needs of the target group have been collected through EUREC. A topic emerging from the field is research with minors. Furthermore, as one aim of ENERI is to create synergy between research integrity and research ethics, overlapping issues and ethics topics are also included, i.e. conflict of interest. The synergy effect is further amplified by the fact that an ENRIO meeting is planned to take place in connection to the EUREC meeting. Collaboration with WP 3 means that contents of the e-Manual are incorporated to the BC themes.

Collaboration also 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 concept. 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 REC 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 both research ethics committee/board members as well as research integrity officers working at research institutions. 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 from country to country, and therefore the training cannot be based on the idea of a specific set of regulations or a single operating 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 other than investigation procedure in order for participants to benefit. This pertains very much to the REC BC in particular.

The target group is primarily recruited through EUREC and its work groups to reach individuals for whom the topic of researching minors is of particular relevance. While a “first come first serve” basis may be applied in filling the places, it may also be relevant to consider institutional and regional spread. Based on the experiences from the RI boot camp, a suitable number of participants is approximately 20. This will allow for in-depth discussion and facilitated group work.

3. Conclusions

Based on the above, a program has been set up for the ENERI REC 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 working methods are based on introductions to themes and active work on cases/dilemmas in smaller groups. There will be one core theme, namely research with minors, running through the various sessions. Each case/dilemma is dealt with from at least two perspectives: a specific thematic perspective, and the perspective of research with minors. In the U.S. BCs, participants work on one case. However, having a few different cases, which can be analysed through different themes, will help to assure that a greater number of participants can connect with the cases 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 different 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 may serve as observers. The observer role is not a passive one as also observers are expected to report 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-centered 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 is 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; Löfström, 2016).

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 anonymized form. In line with the simulation method, it is vital that participants can get a realistic feel of the materials they work with. To accommodate the wishes of the target group, the theme running through the BC sessions connecting the sessions is research with minors. Having a transversal theme will help to create the intensity of the BC training without locking in the program too tightly onto one single procedure.

In brief, 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 REC BC (preliminary)

Day 1	Content	Working method	Transversal topics
12:00 - 13:00	Lunch		
13:00 - 13.15	Opening		
13.15 - 13.30	Introduction to the ENERI BC		
13:30 – 15:00	Impacts of GDPR on ethics review boards	Introductory lecture + Case	Implications for research on minors (e.g. informed consent)
	Coffee		
15.30 - 17:00	Bioethics: Biobanks and the GDPR	Introductory lecture + Case	Implications for research on minors
Day 2			
09:00 - 10:30	Ethics review boards in non-medical fields: Current issues (e.g. business-university collaboration; emerging technologies)	Introductory lecture + Simulation	Research on minors (e.g. minors & new technologies)
	Refreshments		
11:00 - 12:30	Implications of the CDT Regulation on children in the		Implications for research on minors

	context of medical research		
12:30 – 13:00	Ethics Expert Database	Introduction and discussion	
13:00 - 14:15	Lunch and coffee		
14:15 - 16:15	Conflict of Interest	Introductory lecture + Case	
16:15 - 17:00	Conclusion		

Alternatively, the BC can be accommodated to fit within one day, if that is more convenient for participants.

4. Deviations from DoA

NA

7

5. Next steps

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 ethical problem solving. Such understanding can be utilized in f2f and online 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 the training material to be

made available online. The experiences from the RIO BC are a valuable resource for further developing the European BC conception.

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. (2016). Role-playing institutional academic integrity policy-making: using researched perspectives to develop pedagogy. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 12:5, <http://rdcu.be/mVXE>,

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.