



FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity
Annual report | 2016
www.tenk.fi



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity

Annual report | 2016

1 | COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE ADVISORY BOARD

The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) is a body of specialists appointed by the Ministry of Education and Culture, which handles ethical issues concerning research. Its task is to promote responsible conduct of research and to prevent research misconduct (Decree on the Advisory Board on Research Integrity, 1347/1991). The ministry appoints the members of TENK for a three-year term based on a proposal from the scientific community.

The term of the Advisory Board ended on 31 January 2016. **Krista Varantola**, Chancellor Emerita of the University of Tampere, served as Chair and Professor **Markku Helin** of the University of Turku was Vice Chair. There were also eight other members on the Advisory Board:

- Director **Arja Kallio**, Academy of Finland
- Senior Researcher **Jyrki Kettunen**, Arcada University of Applied Sciences
- University Lecturer **Pekka Louhiala**, University of Helsinki

- Research Director **Per Mickwitz**, Finnish Environment Institute
- Professor **Kirsi Saarikangas**, University of Helsinki
- Professor **Ari Salminen**, University of Vaasa
- Chief Legal Counsel **Ari Suomela**, Finnish Funding Agency for Innovation (Tekes)
- Professor **Pirkko Walden**, Åbo Akademi University

The Ministry of Education and Culture appointed a new Advisory Board for the term from 1 February 2016 to 31 January 2019. **Krista Varantola**, Chancellor Emerita of the University of Tampere, continued as Chair. **Pekka Louhiala**, University Lecturer of the University of Helsinki, was appointed as Vice Chair. There were also eight other members on the Advisory Board:

- Principal Economist **Kari Hämäläinen**, VATT Institute for Economic Research
- Senior Researcher **Jyrki Kettunen**, Arcada University of Applied Sciences
- Academy Research Fellow, Vice-Rector **Erika Löfström**, University of Helsinki, Tallinn University



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2016 - 2019: Meri Vannas (left), Sirpa Thessler, Kari Hämäläinen, Riitta Salmelin, Rainer Oesch, Pekka Louhiala, Erika Löfström, Risto Turunen, Krista Varantola, Jyrki Kettunen.

- Professor **Rainer Oesch**, University of Helsinki
- Academy Professor **Riitta Salmelin**, Aalto University
- Programme Manager **Sirpa Thessler**, Natural Resources Institute Finland
- Professor **Risto Turunen**, University of Eastern Finland
- Legal Adviser **Meri Vannas**, Academy of Finland

During the period under review, the previous Advisory Board held one meeting, which the new Advisory Board also attended. In addition, the new Advisory Board convened seven times during the period under review. The December meeting was held in conjunction with a two-day visit to the University of Lapland.

Docent **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, Secretary General, served as the Advisory Board's secretary. **Terhi Tarkiainen**, MA, worked as part-time Coordinator in the secretariat. The position of the Coordinator is shared with the Committee for Public Information. Doctor of Arts **Iina Kohonen** was the Project Manager of the project entitled Tiedon jakaminen luo vaikuttavuutta, run jointly by TENK and the Committee for Public Information (2016–2017). Office secretary **Kaisu Reiss**, BSc (Econ), was also a member of the TENK secretariat from 2 May 2016. The position of office secretary is shared with the Council of Finnish Academies and the Committee for Public Information.

The TENK secretariat works in connection with the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) at Snellmaninkatu 13, Helsinki.

2 | PREVENTATIVE ACTION, EVENTS AND EDUCATION

TENK's preventative ethical instructions, *Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2012* had a total of 77 committed signatories by the end of 2016: all the universities in Finland, a majority of universities of applied sciences, almost all publicly funded research institutions, the Academy of Finland and Prime Minister's Office. The trilingual Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) 2012 guidelines are available free of charge from the TENK office, and the PDF file can be downloaded from www.tenk.fi.

TENK published the guidelines *Väitöskirjan ohjauksen ja tarkastusprosessin tutkimuseettiset suositukset yliopistoille* (Research integrity recommendations for universities regarding dissertation supervision and review) Formulated in collaboration with Universities Finland (UNIFI). The guidelines were translated into English, and the English version will be published in 2017.

In addition to drafting these guidelines, the Advisory Board's activities focused on various national and international specialist tasks and networking, with a view to improving the culture of research integrity. Counselling of researchers and postgraduate students continued, as did other preventative work. Higher education institutions and research organisations asked TENK to give lectures

on the field of research integrity. The TENK Chair, certain members, the Secretary General and the Project Manager provided training in research integrity around Finland (for more information, see appendix 1 in the Finnish version of the annual report). Additionally, the Board advised various parties on the mechanisms employed to resolve allegations of RCR misconduct.

In 2016, TENK organised two seminars on the field of research integrity. The Ethics Day seminar, which has now become an annual event, was held on 9 March at the House of Science and Letters in Helsinki. TENK is the main organiser of this annual event. This year the theme was the ownership of research material.

Together with Akava Special Branches, the Finnish Union of Experts in Science LAL, the Finnish Union of University Professors, Academic Engineers and Architects in Finland TEK and the Finnish Union of University Researchers and Teachers, TENK organised a seminar on the topic of "Vilppiä vai ei" (Fraud or not) at the House of Science and Letters in Helsinki on 9 May.

Presentations and videos from these seminars can be found on the TENK website.

In December 2015, TENK and the Committee for Public Information initiated a joint two-year project entitled *Tiedon jakaminen luo vaikuttavuutta* (Information Sharing Creates Impact), focusing on issues related to responsible scientific communication and definition of authorship. The project is funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture. A recommendation for the agreement of authorship of scientific publications will be published as a result of the project. The creation of a new researcher-oriented website

vastuullinentiede.fi was started in order to raise awareness about the RCR process. The website will serve as a databank for Finnish RCR with a selection of case studies and teaching material, also in English.

In spring 2016, the Finnish media wrote about scientific misconduct and TENK's role and authority in the control of scientific misconduct. Scientific misconduct is still rare in Finland, but cases of alleged misconduct have increased. Some of the cases are not investigated when people fail to report them officially because of ignorance or fear. In order to ensure comprehensive prevention and timely control of scientific misconduct, the Ministry of Education and Culture commissioned a report of actions reinforcing responsible conduct of research from TENK. Based on TENK's practical experience, international comparison and the answers to a questionnaire sent to research organisations, the report suggested the following actions:

- a. Researchers, research organisations and TENK will establish an RCR support person system.
- b. Awareness about the Finnish RCR process and TENK will be increased by creating a researcher-oriented "Etiikkakirjasto" (Ethics Library) website with guidelines and teaching materials in different languages.
- c. TENK will create ways to make it easier to report scientific misconduct and protect whistle-blowers.
- d. TENK will be reinforced by creating a second expert position in the secretariat in order to secure the current level of the prevention and control of scientific misconduct and implement the suggested actions.

Drawn up by Secretary General Sanna Kaisa Spoof, the report was submitted to Minister of Education and Culture **Sanni Grahn-Laasonen** on 20 June.



Submitting the report on 20 June 2016: Minister of Education and Culture Sanni Grahn-Laasonen (left), TENK Secretary General Sanna Kaisa Spoof and TENK member, Professor Rainer Oesch.

3 | HANDLING OF ALLEGATIONS OF RCR MISCONDUCT

3.1. Allegations of RCR Misconduct Reported to TENK and Verified Violations

In 2016, 20 new allegations of misconduct in the responsible conduct of research (RCR) were reported to TENK by Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations that are committed to the RCR guidelines. Each allegation was investigated in the organisation where the research under suspicion was carried out. In ten of these cases, there was no need to initiate a preliminary inquiry.

According to notifications received by TENK, a total of 19 RCR investigations were finalised at research organisations during 2016, some of which had started earlier. A violation of responsible conduct of research was found in three investigated cases: one case of *plagiarism*, one case of *misappropriation* and one case of disregard for responsible conduct of research, namely *denigrating the role of other researchers* and *referring to earlier research results inadequately or inappropriately*.

Summaries of the verified cases are given in section 3.2 below.

3.2. Verified RCR Violations at Research Organisations

Case 1: Plagiarism led to the rewriting of a thesis

Plagiarism was discovered in a Master's thesis in technology accepted by a university. This had been detected with a plagiarism detection tool a year after the thesis had been accepted, when the student had used parts of the said

thesis in another piece of coursework and the teacher had realised they had been taken directly from other sources. In the preliminary inquiry, the student admitted the insufficient references but pleaded ignorance and language difficulties. The rector of the university concluded that the student was guilty of fraud but the act was not considered intentional. The student was obliged to rewrite the thesis under supervision.

Case 2: Supervisors used students' material as their own in an article

In their article, a university lecturer and emeritus professor in social sciences used material that two of their students under their supervision had collected for their Master's thesis. The students had not been asked for a permission to use the material, they had not been offered joint authorship and their thesis had not been referred to in the article. Based on an investigation proper, the university rector concluded that the suspected violators were guilty of misappropriation. They were obliged to report to their publisher about their RCR violation. Moreover, they had to add a reference to the Master's thesis in question to their article.

Case 3: One of the authors of an original article was omitted from the translation of the article

A, a postgraduate student in social sciences, co-authored an article in Finnish with B, the leader of a research project. The article was based on material collected and analysed by A. C, another postgraduate student, was also cited as a co-author of the article. Later, A noticed that B and C had published an identical article in English. The English article cited the Finnish article as a reference, as if it were a standalone article.

However, a preliminary inquiry conducted at the university concluded that the English article differed from the Finnish one to the extent that A should not be cited as a co-author.

RCR ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS, NO.		2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
Official reports from research organisations to TENK on new RCR allegations of misconduct		20	24	23	19	8	13
Finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation (research misconduct or disregard for responsible conduct of research) was verified*	<i>Misconduct</i>	2	4	5	2	0	3
	<i>Disregard</i>	1	3	1	2	5	0
Finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation was not verified*		16	17	15	10	5	9

*These figures also include cases reported before 2016, which were finalised in 2016.

Unsatisfied with the decision, A requested a statement from TENK in which TENK concluded that the matter had not been settled yet and that the university should initiate an investigation proper.

On the basis of the final report of the investigation team the university concluded that B and C were, after all, guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research in the form of denigrating the role of another researcher and referring to earlier research results inadequately or inappropriately.

B and C had also made an RCR notification in which they claimed that A was guilty of misconduct by presenting fabricated observations and distorting his/her interview material. The university concluded, however, that A was not guilty of RCR violation.

3.3. RCR Statements Requested from and Issued by TENK

In 2016, TENK received a total of nine new requests for a statement concerning allegations of misconduct in the responsible conduct of research. In one of the cases, TENK issued no statement as the matter was outside TENK's competence. The processing of four allegations continued into 2017, which means that TENK issued a total of eight RCR statements in 2016.

Below are summaries of the RCR statements issued by TENK in 2016, with the names removed to preserve anonymity:

Statement 1: The author of a publication drawn up in corporate cooperation was not governed by RCR guidelines

A researcher in pedagogics discovered text from his/her doctoral dissertation in a publication drawn up in cooperation between a university and a commercial business. The researcher made an RCR notification. The university concluded, however, that it was not competent

to process the case as the author of the publication in question was not a member of university personnel. The researcher then requested a statement from TENK. TENK concluded that the university had acted in accordance with RCR guidelines when dismissing the case.

Statement 2: A press release led to a preliminary inquiry

According to the RCR notification, the participants of a technology project in a university were alleged to be guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research by publicising misleading and distorting information about the research results as well as the scientific significance and applicability of these results. A press release about the project results had aroused suspicion. In spite of his/her request, the person who made the notification was not shown the research behind the press release. The person made an RCR notification to the university, but the university did not initiate an RCR process. When a serious allegation is made against a research team, TENK considers that it is beneficial to all parties concerned to investigate the matter in an RCR process. After having received TENK's statement, the university initiated a preliminary investigation in accordance with the RCR process.

Statement 3: A long dispute over authorship required a more extensive investigation

A, a former doctoral student of a university presented the allegation that B, a researcher who had worked with him/her on a research project in the natural sciences, had plagiarised the former doctoral student's Master's thesis in his/her licentiate and doctoral theses. In the RCR process it turned out that B had plagiarised the thesis both directly and indirectly on several occasions. During the process, the university's publication practices were investigated more extensively, but even though they were found to be unclear in many ways, no concrete proof of a RCR violation could be presented after the preliminary investigation.

STATEMENTS RECEIVED AND ISSUED BY TENK, NO.	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
New requests for a statement received by TENK that concerned the RCR process	9	11	11	5	8	8
Statements issued by TENK that concerned the RCR process (also including different requests for a statement other than those found in the previous section)	8	8	4	5	5	7
Preparation of RCR statement in progress 31 December	5	3	2	-	1	2
Other specialist statements for TENK than those that concerned the RCR process	1	-	-	1	4	1

A alleged, however, that the RCR process differentiating the two matters had not been completely impartial. The university did not initiate an investigation proper to conclude whether A should have been cited as a co-author in the conference papers. A also complained about the long duration of the investigation. In total, the process including two RCR investigations had lasted about 13 months.

TENK concluded that it was justified to process the two cases separately owing to the scope and quality of the matter. The processes were targeted at different research projects and concerned different people. Moreover, TENK concluded that considering the circumstances, the preliminary investigation had been conducted in a reasonable time scale.

However, as the parties had very differing views concerning the course of events, it would be beneficial to all parties to include in the investigation impartial experts from outside the investigating organisation. Therefore, TENK concluded that an RCR investigation proper was necessary.

Statement 4: A university of applied sciences was unable to ignore an allegation against a member of staff

A, a researcher, had made an RCR notification to the rector of a university of applied sciences. A alleged that B, a lecturer in technology in this university of applied sciences, had inappropriately hindered A's work by publishing disparaging and derogatory writings about A. The rector concluded, however, that the matter was not in the scope of RCR guidelines, since B did not participate in scientific research at the university of applied sciences.

In its statement, TENK concluded that the university had committed a procedural error in its decision that the RCR guidelines did not concern B. TENK concluded that universities of applied sciences are research organisations whose teaching staffs are part of the scientific community. Therefore, they should also comply with responsible conduct of research in interactive situations outside the scientific community, such as social media, when operating in the context of their teaching or research field. TENK furthermore concluded that the university of applied sciences should make a decision on the initiation or non-initiation of a preliminary investigation and explain this decision.

TENK did not take a stand on whether an RCR violation had occurred as the matter had not yet been investigated in the RCR process of the university of applied sciences.

Statement 5: A university investigated a dispute over authorship and material but left the matter undecided

A, a medical researcher, had presented to his/her former university employer an allegation that B, a professor in the same field, and C, a junior researcher, were guilty of misappropriation, falsification and photo manipulation as well as disparagement of A's merits. A had worked at the university as the lead researcher of a research project behind the article in question and as the supervisor of C's doctoral dissertation. Yet A's scientific contribution was not mentioned in the article. Instead, according to A, B's merits in the research project were presented in the article in a misleading manner and B should not have been cited as one of the authors of the article at all. During the project, C had been working for some of the time at a university abroad. According to the article, most of the animal tests for the research had been conducted at that university, while A alleged that they had been done in Finland under his/her supervision.

In the RCR investigation it was concluded that A was partly right about the location of the tests but that a dispute over the user rights of the research material between the parties also had an impact on the matter. The investigation had been further complicated by the fact that the university abroad was unwilling to cooperate. According to the RCR process, as the lead author of the article, C was responsible for the collection and contents of the material, but B had also been guilty of disparaging A's authorship. Moreover, the investigation group found inadequacies in the procedures of the unit that administered the disputed project. As a result of the RCR process, however, the university did not conclude whether an RCR violation had occurred or not. A was unsatisfied with the decision.

TENK concluded in its decision, that the university should have specified for each allegation made in the original RCR notification whether they were RCR violations or not. TENK asked the university to amend its decision in accordance with RCR violation criteria.

Statement 6: Inadequacies in the reference practices of a Master's thesis were not plagiarism

A university was notified of an alleged plagiarism concerning a Master's thesis in social sciences accepted at the university. In the preliminary investigation, it was concluded that the literature review in the thesis contained a few faults in the reference practices but no actual plagiarism.

The person who made the notification asked TENK to issue a statement on whether the university had acted correctly when limiting its investigation to the disputed

parts only and whether the author of the thesis was guilty of plagiarism. In its statement, however, TENK concluded that the preliminary investigation had been conducted correctly and the university had justifiably limited the preliminary investigation to the object of the original RCR notification alone. This was also justifiable as the preliminary investigation showed no signs of more extensive fraud than had been notified. According to TENK, the inadequacies in the reference practices of the literature review were not enough to constitute plagiarism, and the inadequacies should have been taken into account in the assessment of the thesis.

Statement 7: The acquisition of funding had to be specified more clearly on a CV

A, a professor working as the lead researcher in a research project in technology in a university, made an RCR notification about the CV of B, a professor who became the lead researcher of the project after him/her. According to A, B was credited with the acquisition of funding for the project on his/her CV, while A felt that the merit was his/hers. A furthermore accused B of having added his/her name to the list of authors in two articles to which he/she had not contributed. According to the preliminary investigation, no RCR violation had occurred.

Unsatisfied with the decision, A requested a statement from TENK. TENK concluded that as regards the CV, B's conduct had been somewhat irresponsible and reprehensible and he/she should amend his/her CV so that it would no longer be misleading. As regards the issue about authorship, TENK agreed with the university that no RCR violation had occurred. In line with the practice prevalent in the branch of science in question, the author first listed as an author of a joint publication may decide who will be cited as co-authors.

Statement 8: Scientific editorship and the responsibility of the editor-in-chief

A, a doctor in humanities, suspected that B, a professor in the same field, was guilty of misappropriation as well as inappropriate hampering and delaying of research work as A's name had not been cited as an editor of a scientific symposium of which B was the editor-in-chief. The symposium had not been published yet when A made an RCR notification to the university, but B had told A that he/she was no longer one of the editors of the publication. A felt that he/she should be cited as an editor as he/she had participated in the editing work throughout the project and the original idea had been his/hers. B felt that A had not followed the schedule agreed with the other editors. No written agreements had been made on the work, and the parties had differing views of what had been agreed

otherwise. According to the preliminary RCR investigation conducted by the university, B was not guilty of an RCR violation.

TENK concluded that editorship does not depend on whether a person actually participates in the revision and editing of the texts, but editorship is also associated with the scientific / mental contribution. In its statement, however, TENK did not assess the adequacy of A's scientific contribution for the editorship of the book since A had waived his/her rights during the process, albeit he/she later unilaterally cancelled the waiver. TENK concluded that editor-in-chief B should have been responsible for trying to settle the matter before publication. Since it was not a question of gross negligence, however, it was not necessary that the case be investigated as a disregard for RCR. Furthermore, it was not a question of misappropriation as A's contribution to the project was mentioned in the foreword and B's name was not cited as a co-author. TENK found it reprehensible, however, that the book was published in the university's own publication series before the final result of the RCR process was available.

TENK concluded that the university had acted in accordance with RCR guidelines with its decision that B was not guilty of an RCR violation. When the RCR process was still under way, B made an RCR notification about A's conduct. However, TENK issued its statement solely on the basis of the material in the original RCR notification.

4 | ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES

At the end of 2016, a total of 58 organisations were committed to TENK's guidelines *Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review*. TENK coordinates the ethical review of research in the field of human sciences, and promotes cooperation between regional and organisation-specific ethical committees that carry out assessments.

TENK annually monitors the state of ethical reviews in universities and research institutions by gathering information on the cases handled by ethical committees. The TENK office also maintains a list of related committees' contact details.

The number of requests for a statement handled by ethical committees has grown steadily over recent years, which has put the ethical committees under pressure. Some of the committees have renewed and amended their guidelines, and statement request systems have also been tested.

NO. OF CASES HANDLED BY ETHICAL COMMITTEES IN HUMAN SCIENCES	2016	2015	2014	2013
Requests for statement related to ethical reviews	392	341	303	265
Statements given by ethical committees	324	295	287	243
Returned requests for statement (no statement given or negative statement with demand for amendment)	65	49	52	42

Many incomplete requests for a statement are still submitted to the committees. Problems include the accuracy of research plans, material management plans and the clarity of notices and consent forms.

Universities of applied sciences have less need for ethical reviews compared to universities and research institutes.

Ethical committees expect that the use of social media material will increase in the research in human sciences, which will raise the number of data protection and person register issues. As international and multidisciplinary research projects become more common, the roles and competencies of various committees will become all the more important.

Challenges in the international research projects were discussed in an event organised by TENK for ethical committees on 15 November. The committees were also informed about topical matters in the field of research integrity. The speakers at the event were **Erika Löfström**, Chair of the Ethical Review Board of the University of Helsinki, **Hannakaisa Isomäki**, Chair of the University of Jyväskylä Ethical Committee, and **Ritva Halila**, General Secretary of the National Advisory Board on Social Welfare and Health Care Ethics ETENE.

5 | COOPERATION, INITIATIVES, AND PUBLICATION AND PR ACTIVITIES

TENK continued familiarising itself with the research integrity situation in university cities outside of Greater Helsinki. Rovaniemi was selected as the destination of a study trip for the Advisory Board members and secretariat. The visit to the University of Lapland on 7–8 December 2016 was hosted by Rector **Mauri Ylä-Kotola** and Professor **Markku Vieru**, Chair of the Ethics Committee. During the visit, TENK met representatives of the Ethics Committee of the University of Lapland, Vice-Rector **Reijo Tolppi** of the Lapland University of Applied Sciences and researchers from the Arctic Centre. TENK also visited the Arktikum science centre and museum.

TENK's secretariat worked with national ethical committees (the Council of Finnish Academies and the Committee for Public Information) on the arrangements for the Ethics Day, among others. TENK was also an active part of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV).

The Advisory Board's members and the Secretary General carry out networking and distribute information on TENK's activities by giving seminar presentations, publishing articles and giving interviews (see appendix 1 and 2 in the Finnish version of the annual report). TENK also published a new trilingual brochure about its activities that can be downloaded from the TENK website.

TENK's members worked actively in both national and local ethical committees and working groups (see appendix 3 in the Finnish version of the annual report).

TENK followed and took part in publication activities and media discussions concerning research integrity. Furthermore, TENK followed national and international developments in open science and research.

6 | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The TENK Chair serves as the Finnish representative in the Permanent Working Group on Science and Ethics, which handles research integrity as part of All European Academies (ALLEA), as well as in the internal editing team of the ethical committee whose task it was to update the European Code of Conduct on Research Integrity from 2011.

The Secretary General serves as a member of the strategy team in ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices. ENRIO held general meetings Ljubljana (spring) and Bratislava and Vienna (autumn). Additionally, TENK has active cooperation relationships with other Nordic operators, such as NordForsk, and other specialist bodies in the field.

A three-year project sponsored by Horizon 2020, the European Network of Research Ethics and Research



ENRIO general meeting in Bratislava on 20 October 2016.

Integrity (ENERI), was initiated on 1 September. The goal of the project is to create a European network of research ethics and research integrity, develop training and other resources, establish a database of research ethics experts and support countries where the infrastructure for research integrity is still developing. TENK and the University of Helsinki participated in the planning of the project. The project partners include ALLEA, ENRIO and the University of Helsinki, where TENK's member Erika Löffström works as the work package leader of the project. The aim of this work package is to implement the curricula for experts in research integrity.

In November, TENK's secretariat had guests from Norway: Director **Torkild Vinther** and HR Director **Torun Ellefsen** from the National Commission for the Investigation of Research Misconduct. They shared their experiences of their Research Ethics Library (www.etikkom.no/en/library) that has been available online since 2009.

December 2015, having received total funding of €200,000. Towards the end of the year, the Ministry of Education and Culture granted TENK a separate support of €20,000 for the implementation of an RCR support person system and the training of the support persons.

In 2016, TENK had one full-time employee (the Secretary General) and a Coordinator shared with the Committee for Public Information. TSV offered TENK financial and personnel administration services, network connections, IT services as well as the services of the office secretary shared with the Council of Finnish Academies and the Committee for Public Information. The House of Science and Letters was used free of charge for meetings and seminars.

This annual report was presented at the meeting of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity held on 6 April 2017.

7 | PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

TENK draws up an action plan for each three-year term of the Advisory Board. Separate areas of focus are then defined for each calendar year in conjunction with budgeting.

The Ministry of Education and Culture granted TENK a total budgetary allocation of €132,400 for 2016. Of this, €37,000 was spent on actual operational expenses such as publication, seminar and travel costs. The two-year project entitled *Tiedon jakaminen luo vaikuttavuutta*, run jointly by TENK and the Committee for Public Information, started in

Krista Varantola
Chair

Sanna Kaisa Spoof
Secretary General