Topic Report n. 2: "Incentives"

- **Based on:**
  - Discussions and shared experiences at the MLE Kick-off Meeting in Brussels, Belgium, 15 November 2018 and the First MLE Country Visit in Olso, Norway, 30 January 2019
  - Articulation of the problem, review of the literature: in the Challenge paper
  - Feedback and discussions at the third MLE Country Visit, in Paris, France, 14 May 2019

Challenges - MLE objectives

- Share knowledge, experiences and opinions on:
  - Which **course objectives** have been, will be, or should be prioritized in a given country/institution/target audience: knowledge, skills or affective?
  - What **approaches, materials and incentives** were implemented to pursue such objectives, and with what results?
  - What **modes of assessment** were implemented, if any, and what were the advantages and disadvantages?

Overarching challenges

- **How should RI instruction be most effectively coordinated within countries and across the EU, given the diversity of national and institutional cultures and priorities?**
  - What specific elements of RI instruction should remain (or be made more) **uniform**: At the national level? Across the EU?
  - Which specific elements of RI instruction should remain (or be made more) **diverse**: Across the EU? Within each country (at the institutional level)?
  - Elements to consider could be any aspect of the design of a course: Objectives, Topics, Forms of incentives, Methods of assessment.
- **How can information and data about RI instruction be most effectively shared across Europe?**
  - What components of course materials would it be most useful to share?
  - What course materials can be shared? And in what form?
  - Could existing organizations and/or platforms facilitate the exchange of know-how and/or the sharing of data online? If so, how?

Policy recommendation n.1

- **RI training programs in the EU need to strike an optimal <u>balance</u> between <u>coordination</u> and <u>diversity</u>, both across EU countries and within.**
  - There appears to be a distinctly European approach to RI, which training material developed in the United States does not reflect.
  - A plurality of approaches to RI training is also, and more importantly, expressed across EU countries, and within each of them, across institutions.
  - Not all sources and levels of pluralism are beneficial, however. Many participants reported how different and conflicting purposes of different institutions within a country were a source of considerable difficulties and obstacles in advancing a RI training agenda

Policy recommendation n.2

- **<u>Coordination</u> across the EU and within countries is to be improved by sharing course materials, experiences and data on RI training.**

  - Materials need to be collected in a curated and easily accessible form. An online platform should be identified for the scope, and its continuing existence should be ensured.

An exemplary, and non-exhaustive, list of material to share includes:

- **Description of cases of RM:** these may be real cases in which RM was proven by an investigation or may be fictional but realistic cases.

- **Exemplary cases of RI:** these could include cases of authors who faced difficult decisions and made the ethically correct decision.

- **Controversial and disputed issues**: disputes concerning authorship, for example, are extremely common and highly relevant to all researchers.

- **Description of "grey-area" cases:** for example, cases in which RM was investigated but ultimately not proven.

- **RI training course syllabi**, to document what is taught and where, and inspire the design of new courses.

- **Tools to collect course feedback**. This could provide valuable information on how to best design and teach RI.

- **A "question bank" for research integrity**, containing lists of questions and tests designed to stimulate and to assess the acquisition of RI knowledge, skills and awareness.

- **Links to published research on EU courses, or unpublished data** about courses. Ideally, this data would include data on participants, their characteristics, and results of tests or other behavioural outcomes and it should be in a format that permits the conduction of statistical analyses.

Policy recommendation n.3

- **<u>Diversity</u> across the EU and within countries must be preserved by encouraging institutional autonomy in the design and delivery of RI training and by discouraging an uncritical re-use of material from other institutions or countries**.
  - Materials for a course, even when obtained from the sharing platform discussed above, should be adapted as necessary to the objectives of the course and the culture and requirements of the institution or discipline for which the course is being designed.

Policy recommendation n.4

- **National-level RI Officers (or other equivalent figures) are crucial <u>mediators</u> between the need to coordinate and that to maintain diversity within their own countries and across the EU. In particular:**
  - They should ensure the collection and sharing of material and information on RI training in their country.
  - They should indicate the overall objectives and themes of RI training within the country. Institutions should then be allowed to develop their own training programs in autonomy.
  - They should facilitate dialogue and communication among stakeholders within the country, to ensure some level of coordination.
  - They should facilitate the conduction of research on RI training.

Policy recommendation n.5

- **Research on RI training should be supported.**

  - Research funds should be devoted by the EU and by individual member states, to sustain the collection, sharing or publishing of qualitative and quantitative data on RI training, in order to allow all RI programs to make continuing improvements.