



FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK



Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK

Annual report | 2017

www.tenk.fi



Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK

Annual report | 2017

1 | COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE BOARD

The Finnish National 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 current TENK is from 1 February 2016 to 31 January 2019. **Krista Varantola**, Chancellor Emerita of the University of Tampere, serves as Chair and University Lecturer **Pekka Louhiala** of the University of Helsinki as Vice Chair. There are also eight other members on the 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
- 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

The secretary of TENK is Secretary General, docent **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**.

During the year, TENK convened seven times.

On 1 February 2017, it was the 25th anniversary of TENK's establishment. In honour of this, a dinner with invited guests was arranged at Katajanokan Kasino. The main speech was held by TENK's former chair, professor **Gustav Björkstrand**.

2 | PREVENTATIVE ACTION, EVENTS AND EDUCATION

The Research Integrity Adviser system was launched at the beginning of 2017 on TENK's initiative. More than 60 organisations, including universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations nominated a total of 120 research integrity advisers. The starting point for the system was the need to raise the increasingly international research community's awareness of the responsible conduct of research and procedures in Finland and to increase personal guidance on research integrity in situations where scientific misconduct is being suspected. The support person activities are also expected to lower the threshold for making an RCR notification in serious cases of alleged misconduct.

TENK organised a discussion on the activities of Research Integrity Advisers on 17 January 2017. TENK also offered expert training on responsible conduct of research and procedures to all Advisers nominated by the organisations. The training was carried out in the Moodle learning environment and complemented by contact teaching on 14 March and 8 to 9 May 2017 and by a networking session on 16 November 2017. The steering group for the research integrity adviser training was chaired by Erika Löfström. To support the work of the Advisers, TENK drafted recommendations for Research Integrity Advisers and related background organisations.

All the universities in Finland, the majority of universities of applied sciences, almost all publicly funded research institutions, the Academy of Finland, Business Finland and the Prime Minister's Office are committed to following TENK's preventative ethical instructions *Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland*. The Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2012, which had a total of 79 committed signatories by the end of 2017. The trilingual *Responsible Conduct of Research* (RCR) guidelines are available free of charge from TENK's office, and the PDF file can be downloaded from www.tenk.fi.

A working group was established to develop the RCR process. It is chaired by Krista Varantola, and the members are Pekka Louhiala, Riitta Salmelin, Meri Vannas and Chancellor's Secretary **Sakari Melander** from the University of Helsinki. The term of the working group will continue to the end of 2018.

In recent years, disputes related to the authorship and RCR violations of articles have increased. As a result of the project *Tiedon jakaminen luo vaikuttavuutta (Information Sharing Creates Impact)*, run jointly by TENK and the Committee for Public Information, a TENK recommendation *Agreeing on authorship. Recommendation for research*

publications was drawn up. The working group which drew up the recommendation was chaired by Pekka Louhiala. As part of the project, a researcher-oriented website www.vastuullinentiede.fi was also created.

In addition to drafting these guidelines, TENK's activities focused on various national and international specialist tasks and networking, with a view to improving the culture of research integrity. Additionally, the Board advised various parties on the mechanisms employed to resolve allegations of RCR misconduct. On 18 May 2017, TENK sent the parties committed to the RCR guidelines a letter reminding them about the binding nature of the guidelines in the handling of alleged RCR violations. The purpose of the letter was to present TENK's concern that if the RCR guidelines are not followed, the legal protection of both the party presenting the alleged RCR violation and the person suspected of misconduct could be jeopardised.

In 2017, TENK organised two seminars on the field of research integrity. The theme of the *Ethics Day* seminar held on 15 March 2017 was the ethical issues of research done through joint ventures. *The European guidelines for research integrity were updated: The importance for the scientific community* seminar was held on 4 May 2017 in cooperation with the Council of Finnish Academies. The seminar dealt with the updated version of *The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity* published by ALLEA (All European Academies), which is a cooperating body between European academies.



The TENK Chair Krista Varantola served in the editing team that updated the European Code of Conduct on Research Integrity.



The first Research Integrity Advisers being trained by TENK at the House of Science and Letters on 16 November 2017.

Presentations and videos from the above-mentioned seminars can be found on the TENK website.

3 | HANDLING OF ALLEGATIONS OF RCR MISCONDUCT

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

In 2017, 21 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 six of these cases, there was no need to initiate a preliminary inquiry.

According to notifications received by TENK, a total of 24 RCR investigations were finalised at research organisations during 2017, some of which had been started earlier. A violation of responsible conduct of research was found in five investigated cases: one case of misconduct (*plagiarism*) and four cases of disregard for responsible conduct of research, (*denigrating the role of other researchers and referring to earlier research results inadequately or inappropriately, self-plagiarism*).

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

3.2. Verified RCR Violations at Research Organisations

Case 1: Information security leak suspected by the media turned out to be plagiarism

An allegation was presented in the media that A and B, researchers in humanities, had used in two of their joint articles sensitive material which they, in the name of national security, should not have had access to. After this, another two separate RCR notifications of the matter were submitted to the university in which A acted as a docent. The university considered itself to be competent to investigate the matter with respect to A only, since B was working abroad. In the RCR investigation it turned out that A had never had the original material in use, but rather the data in the tables in article 1 had been copied from a Master's thesis which had been approved some years earlier in another Finnish university. Even though B took all responsibility for what had happened, the university still found A guilty of misconduct. The investigation group could not verify the

origin of the material in article 2, and the matter remained unresolved in that respect. A notification of the final report of the investigation was submitted to both the publisher of article 1 and the employer of B.

Case 2: Unauthorised borrowing over many years by a teacher of a university of applied sciences lead to a serious warning

The articles of a teacher of technology at a university of applied sciences were suspected of containing text passages and pictures copied from elsewhere without appropriate references. In the final report of the investigation group established for the purpose, the teacher was found to have been borrowing materials of others without permission for years and was therefore found guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research. The teacher was given a written warning stating that employment would be terminated, if the behaviour continued.

Case 3: RCR violation in the grant application of a postgraduate university student

The grant application of a doctoral student in natural sciences was suspected to contain passages copied from elsewhere, which were lacking the appropriate references. On the basis of the preliminary investigation made by the university, the doctoral student was found guilty of disregard, which was manifested as inadequate and inappropriate references to the work of other researchers. As the doctoral student accepted the results of the preliminary investigation, there was no need to carry out a proper investigation.

Case 4: Self-plagiarism identified in an article-based doctoral dissertation shortly before the public examination

The day before the public defence of the doctoral dissertation, one of the members of the assessment committee observed a lot of overlapping in the articles of the dissertation in humanities and that one of them was the English translation of the doctoral candidate's former article published in Finnish. The member of the assessment committee did not want to make an RCR notification. The doctoral candidate was notified of the observations, and in the public defence of the dissertation, the candidate explained that an amendment concerning the matter would be made in the electronic version of the dissertation. After the public examination, however, the university initiated a preliminary inquiry on the matter in accordance with the RCR process, on the basis of which the doctoral candidate was found guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research, which manifested itself as self-plagiarism, i.e. publishing the same research results multiple times ostensibly as new and novel results.

Case 5: Plagiarism and self-plagiarism suspected in a doctoral dissertation suspended the doctoral examination process

Before the public defence of the doctoral dissertation, the assessment committee had noticed inadequacies in the references of the article-based doctoral dissertation and passages that could be interpreted as self-plagiarism. The university decided to cancel the public examination of the doctoral dissertation and to initiate a preliminary inquiry. The person carrying out the preliminary inquiry found the postgraduate student guilty of both misconduct and disregard (self-plagiarism). However, since the act was not considered serious or intentional misleading of the scientific community, the university considered that the case did not represent misconduct but rather that the postgraduate student was guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research.

3.3. RCR Statements Requested from and Issued by TENK

In 2017, TENK received a total of nine new requests for a statement concerning allegations of misconduct in the responsible conduct of research. In two of the cases, TENK issued no statement as the time limit for requesting a statement matter had expired. In one of the cases, TENK issued no statement as the matter was outside TENK's competence. In one of the cases, the processing of the matter was moved to the following year. In five of the cases, the request for a statement had already been received during the previous year. Consequently, TENK issued a total of ten RCR statements in 2017.

Below are summaries of the RCR statements issued by TENK in 2017:

Statement 1: Pointed online postings damaged the reputation of another researcher (TENK 2017:1)

Researcher A had made an RCR notification to the rector of university of applied sciences X. A alleged that B, a lecturer in technology at university of applied sciences X, had inappropriately hindered A's work by publishing disparaging and derogatory writings about A. The rector of X did not make an RCR decision on the matter, since B did not participate in scientific research at the university of applied sciences. In its first statement, TENK returned the matter to X for the RCR process (see summary TENK 2016:4). According to the RCR decision made because of the statement, an RCR process was not initiated, because the matter did not fall within the scope of research integrity, and the RCR guidelines do not cover writing on the Internet that an employee does during free time. In addition, the rector of X concluded in his decision that the writing of B did not represent the official standing of X on the matter.

In its second statement TENK concluded that the matter fell within the scope of the RCR process. The disputed writing put the limits of responsible conduct of research to the test. Through writing in the public, B showed irresponsible behaviour by inappropriately hampering the work of another researcher. As a whole, however, the act was not that serious that it would necessarily have to be deemed an RCR violation. Therefore, X was allowed to drop the preliminary RCR inquiry on the matter. In addition, returning the matter to preliminary inquiry would have further prolonged the handling of the matter. Generally, however, TENK believes it important to keep the threshold for initiating a preliminary inquiry low.

RCR ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS, NO.		2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
Official reports from research organisations to TENK on new RCR allegations of misconduct		21	20	24	23	19
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>	1	2	4	5	2
	<i>Disregard</i>	4	1	3	1	2
Finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation was not verified*		17	16	17	15	10

*These figures also include cases reported before 2017, which were finalised in 2017.

Statement 2: The alleged disqualification related to an appointments procedure was not adequately investigated (TENK 2017:2)

Docent A suspected that professors B and C, experts of a certain university who took part in the appointments process of a university lecturer, as well as professor D who made the appointment proposal, had a conflict of interest. A had applied for the position but was not chosen. The university did not initiate a preliminary inquiry on the matter, as it considered the notification to be unfounded.

A felt that B favoured the person chosen for the position, because B had been in a cooperation relationship with the selected researcher through joint publications, for example. According to TENK, working at the same university department does not lead into disqualification as such. In the opinion of A, the disqualification of C resulted from C having copied the works of A. As regards C, TENK concluded, however, that since A had not taken the alleged plagiarism into the official RCR process, the alleged conflict of interest could be ignored in this context.

According to A, the disqualification of D resulted from A having made a complaint of the activities of D due to a former dispute. According to university X, in conjunction with the said complaint process it had been investigated that D was not disqualified at that time. TENK concluded, however, that it was possible that due to the said complaint, a polemic relationship had evolved between A and D. In addition, during the now disputable appointments process of the university lecturer, A had made a remark to D about D's potential disqualification, but D did not take any action on the remark.

According to TENK, D's action had been ethically reprehensible. Even though the disqualification of D had not been adequately investigated from the RCR point of view, the university may have decided not to initiate the RCR process, because there was no reason in this case to suspect an RCR violation. At the same time TENK pointed out to the university that the any engagements of the

persons participating in appointments procedures must be clarified in advance.

Statements 3 and 4: Serious accusation of negligence of ethical principles in human sciences was to be investigated in the RCR process (TENK 2017:3 and TENK 2017:4)

A, a private person suspected that B, a lecturer at the university of applied sciences X, and C, a person belonging to the management of the university of applied sciences Y, would as editors of a symposium in social sciences be guilty of disregard for both responsible conduct of research and ethical research principles in the field of human sciences. According to A, in an article of a publication series representing the research and development activities of X, also published online, delicate information related to the personal history of A is told in such a way that it is easy to work out the true identity of A. A submitted an allegation of RCR misconduct to both the rectors of X and Y.

The rector of X notified A that the allegation was unfounded because the persons presented in the publication had been anonymised and so were not identifiable by any conventional means. Therefore, a decision on the RCR process was not made on the matter. Y took the view of the rector and the ethical committee of X in the matter. In their joint response to TENK, X and Y announced that the matter did not fall within the scope of RCR guidelines, because B is a teacher with a contractual employment relationship who does not participate in the research of X. As a further reasoning for their view, X and Y announced that X is not a research organisation referred to in the RCR guidelines and that the said publication is not a scientific one.

In its statement TENK refuted all of the reasoning presented above. Researchers B and C and the university of applied sciences X were responsible for the content of the publication. According to TENK, both X and Y were to initiate an investigation proper into the matter in accordance with the RCR process, either jointly or separately, because the

STATEMENTS RECEIVED AND ISSUED BY TENK, NO.	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
New requests for a statement received by TENK that concerned the RCR process	9	9	11	11	5
Statements issued by TENK that concerned the RCR process (also including different requests for a statement other than those found in the previous section)	10	8	8	4	5
Preparation of RCR statement in progress 31 December	1	5	3	2	-
Other specialist statements for TENK than those that concerned the RCR process	1	1	-	-	1

allegation was serious, and A had solid grounds for the validity of the allegation. In the statement TENK also stated that the ethical committee of an organisation or a joint one of several universities of applied sciences is not a body that belongs to the RCR process.

Statement 5: The threshold of disregard was not exceeded in an authorship dispute (TENK 2017:5)

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. No written agreements had been made on the work at any stage, and the parties had differing views of what had been agreed otherwise. According to both the preliminary RCR inquiry conducted by the university and the statement issued by TENK (see summary TENK 2016:8), 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. B considered A to be guilty of disregard which manifests itself as misleading of the scientific community and several irresponsible measures, such as manipulation of authorship. According to the preliminary inquiry conducted by the university, there was no reason to suspect an RCR violation. TENK agreed with the assessment made by the university. As the acts were not serious or gross, the university did not need to initiate an investigation proper into the matter.

Statement 6: The investigation of an alleged RCR violation concerning a doctoral dissertation was not permitted on faculty level (TENK 2017:6)

An association operating in the field of medical and health sciences suspected plagiarism in a doctoral dissertation related to its field. The association had reported the matter to the doctoral candidate, the tutor, and the faculty in question. The university handled the matter on the faculty level mainly from the point of view of copyright.

TENK reported in its statement that any allegations concerning research integrity of doctoral dissertation manuscripts should be subjected to the RCR process, if a permit for the public examination has already been granted. By failing to initiate an RCR process, the university committed a procedural error. Therefore, the university was to initiate a new investigation on the matter in accordance with the RCR process. In addition, the university was required to revise its guidelines to state that the rector must be immediately notified of any allegations concerning research integrity.

Statement 7: The RCR process was invalidated, since the person conducting the preliminary inquiry was disqualified (TENK 2017:7)

Doctor A presented an allegation that exaggeration of one's own scientific and scholarly achievements occurred in the application documents of B, a doctor appointed in the position of a professor in the arts. According to the preliminary RCR inquiry, however, this was a case of negligence, not an RCR violation. A was not satisfied with the outcome of the preliminary inquiry or with its impartiality. The person who conducted the preliminary inquiry was dean C, who had made the disputed appointment. TENK concluded in its statement that C had been disqualified when conducting the preliminary inquiry, which is why the RCR process that had been carried out was invalidated. Consequently, the university was to initiate a new RCR process on the matter.

Statement 8: Negligent reporting and storage of interview material was considered to be disregard of responsible conduct of research (TENK 2017:8)

A university lecturer presented the university an allegation of an RCR violation concerning a postgraduate student in agriculture and forestry who, at the time of the occurrence, was working for the research project led by the lecturer. According to the university lecturer, the postgraduate student had added results from fabricated interviews to the manuscript jointly authored by them. In the RCR process conducted it remained unclear what kind of interviews had been made and how the material collected on the basis of the interview had been stored. According to the investigation group, the case involved disregard for responsible conduct of research. In the decision made by the university they stated, however, that this disregard could not clearly be limited to the postgraduate student alone and so concluded in its decision that no RCR violation had occurred. The university lecturer was dissatisfied with the decision and asked TENK to issue a statement on the matter.

According to TENK, in the course of handling the case it became quite apparent that the interviews used as the material of the article had not been reported or stored in the manner required by scientific data. The postgraduate student was given the opportunity to explain the shortcomings in the storing and reporting of the interview material but failed to do so in the actual RCR investigation or in TENK's statement process. Negligent storing of results is problematic from the point of view of the scientific community in the sense that without the material the scientific community has no chance to verify the research results obtained through the interviews. Therefore, TENK concluded that the postgraduate student had been guilty of

disregard for responsible conduct of research. This disregard manifested itself especially as inadequate recording and storage of research material.

Statements 9 and 10: No falsification but rather a difference in scientific views (TENK 2017:9 and TENK 2017:10)

An association acting in the field of social sciences suspected that falsification had occurred in two doctoral dissertations of the field. According to the society, this manifested itself through selection and concealment of sources. One of the doctoral dissertations was reviewed at university X and the other at university Y. Both universities concluded that the allegation was unfounded, and no preliminary RCR inquiry was initiated on the matter.

TENK concluded in its statement that the universities had acted in accordance with the RCR guidelines, since this was not a research integrity issue or RCR violation but rather a difference in scientific views in question.

4 | ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES

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 review in universities and research institutions by gathering information on the cases handled by ethical committees. TENK also maintains a list of related committees' contact details. At the end of 2017, a total of 60 organisations were committed to TENK's guidelines *Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review* (IEEA).

Generally, the requests for a statement processed by the committees have remained at the level of the previous year. In some of the committees, however, the number of requests for a statement has significantly increased. The committees also receive requests for a statement for research which according to TENK's guidelines would not

require a review. A so-called lighter procedure for receiving a statement has been planned for requests for a statement that have solely been made at the request of the financier/publishers.

Incomplete requests for a statement are a typical problem, but only a few of these still need to be forwarded to the ethical committees of hospital districts. The requests for a statement concern an increasingly versatile group of fields of science, and multidisciplinary research has also become more popular. Shortcomings in research plans are often related to the notifications to be given to the research subjects, consent forms, data protection and material management. More training is needed in order to improve people's knowledge of ethical review and to increase its coverage.

TENK established a working group to update the guidelines for the ethical review of research in the field of human sciences to meet the requirements of the new General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) of the EU. **Arja Kuula-Luumi**, Development Manager of the Finnish Social Science Data Archive was invited to chair the working group, and Erika Löfström, Kari Hämäläinen, Jyrki Kettunen, Riitta Salmelin, Sanna Kaisa Spoof and Risto Turunen were invited to be members. To build the foundation for the working group's work, an online questionnaire was targeted to the ethical committees to collect feedback concerning the current guidelines. The updating and the GDPR were also handled in a discussion arranged for the ethical committees on 7 November 2017.

5 | COOPERATION, INITIATIVES, AND PUBLICATION AND PR ACTIVITIES

TENK paid a visit to the University of Vaasa on 13 to 14 December 2017. The visit was hosted by rector **Jari Kuusisto** and vice-rector **Jukka Vesalainen**. In conjunction with the visit, a seminar on research integrity was arranged for the personnel and doctoral students of the higher education institutions in Vaasa. TENK also familiarised itself with the research project on hidden corruption and cronyism in management lead by professor emeritus **Ari Salminen**.

NO. OF CASES HANDLED BY ETHICAL COMMITTEES IN HUMAN SCIENCES	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
Requests for statement related to ethical reviews	412	392	341	303	265
Statements given by ethical committees	385	324	295	287	243



Secretary General Sanna Kaisa Spoof thanking professor emeritus Ari Salminen for his presentation during TENK's visit to the University of Vaasa on 14 December 2017.

TENK's members and Secretary General carried out networking and shared information about 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'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).

During the course of the year, TENK's own website www.tenk.fi was renewed, and the new website www.vastuullinentiede.fi to be launched in spring 2018 was under development.

6 | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The TENK Chair serves as an expert in several international projects and working groups and, for example, 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.

The Secretary General served as a member of the strategy team in ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices and the head of the whistleblowing working group. ENRIO members **Torkild Vinther** (Norway), **Nicole Föger** (Austria) and **Grace van Arkel** (The Netherlands) visited TENK on 30 November to 1 December 2017. ENRIO held general meetings Amsterdam (spring) and Lisbon (autumn).

Additionally, TENK has active cooperation relationships with other Nordic operators, such as NordForsk, and other specialist bodies in the field.

TENK's secretariat and chair participated in the *5th World Conference on Research Integrity* in Amsterdam on 28 to 31 May 2017. The main themes of the conference were transparency and accountability. At the conference, TENK's expert **Iina Kohonen** gave a presentation entitled '*Public science communication as part of the responsible conduct of research – an example from Finland*'.

To clarify its position in international contexts as the Finnish national ethical player, TENK decided in its meeting held on 14 December 2017 to change its current English name 'Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity' to 'Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK'.

7 | PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

In addition to Sanna Kaisa Spoof, Secretary General, Coordinator **Terhi Tarkiainen**, MA, and Office Secretary **Kaisu Reiss**, B.Sc. Econ., worked part-time at TENK's secretariat. **Simo Kyllönen**, MA, worked as a part-time training coordinator for the activities of Research Integrity Advisers in the spring of 2017.

The secretariat received a significant addition to the resources on 1 May 2017 when another full-time position was established. Iina Kohonen, Doctor of Arts, was selected for the position of Senior Advisor.

Iina Kohonen worked as a Project Manager in a project entitled *Tiedon jakaminen luo vaikuttavuutta*, jointly run by TENK and the Committee for Public Information until 30 April 2017. **Maija Lähteenmäki**, MA, worked as the project's part-time online editor starting from 26 September 2017.



The Chair of the 5th World Conference on Research Integrity Professor Lex Bouter (Vrije Universiteit) opening the conference in Amsterdam on 28 May 2017.

TENK's secretariat works at the location of The Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) at Snellmaninkatu 13, Helsinki. TSV offers TENK financial and personnel administration services, network connections, IT services as well as the office premises. The facilities of the House of Science and Letters are in TENK's use free of charge for meetings and seminars.

This annual report was presented at the meeting of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK held on 17 April 2018.

Krista Varantola
Chair

Sanna Kaisa Spoof
Secretary General



Permanent Secretary Anita Lehikoinen spoke on behalf of the Ministry of Education and Culture at TENK's 25th anniversary celebration dinner.



TENK member Erika Löfström giving a presentation in the Ethics Day seminar on 15 March 2017.