



FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD  
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity  
**Annual report | 2012**  
[www.tenk.fi](http://www.tenk.fi)



# Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity

## Annual report | 2012

### 1 ADVISORY BOARD COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS

The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) is a body of specialists, as set by the Ministry of Education and Culture (OKM), which handles ethical issues concerning research. Its task especially is to promote good scientific practices and prevent research fraud (Decree on the Advisory Board on Research Integrity 1347/1991). OKM appointed the TENK members for a three-year term from 1 February 2010 to 31 January 2013.

Professor **Krista Varantola**, Chancellor of the University of Tampere, acted as Chair of the Advisory Board and Professor **Veikko Launis**, from the University of Turku, was the Vice Chair. The Advisory Board also included eight other members:

Professor **Markku Helin** (University of Turku),  
Director **Arja Kallio** (Academy of Finland),  
Professor **Riitta Keiski** (University of Oulu),  
Senior Teacher **Irma Mikkonen** (Savonia University of Applied Sciences),  
Consultative civil servant **Tuula Pehu** (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry),  
Research Professor **Jussi Simpura** (National Institute for Health and Welfare),

Chief Legal Counsel **Ari Suomela** (Tekes) and  
Professor **Pirkko Walden** (Åbo Akademi University).

During the period for this annual report, the Advisory Board convened a total of eight times. Some of the meetings were held at the House of Science and Letters (Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki). One meeting was conducted by e-mail. The October meeting was held at the University of Oulu.

Docent **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, TENK Secretary-General, acted as the Advisory Board secretary. MA **Anna Rauhala** acted as the Advisory Board assistant. Beginning 1 February, MSc **Sanna Jäppinen** undertook the fixed-term task of communications planner. BA **Iina Koskinen** worked in autumn 2012 as both the assistant's stand-in and as a part time project secretary.

The TENK secretariat works in connection with the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) in Helsinki. In 2012, the TENK office was located at Mariankatu 7 C 1. At the end of the year, preparations for a move to Snellmaninkatu 13 were being made.

## 2 EVENTS DURING THE CELEBRATORY YEAR AS WELL AS PREVENTATIVE ACTION AND EDUCATION

TENK and the Committee for Public Information (TJNK), working in connection with TSV, celebrated a milestone anniversary in 2012: TJNK began its activities in 1972, and the activities of TENK, which was established in 1991, started up in 1992.

The celebratory year began on 1 February at the House of the Estates with the TENK 20th anniversary celebration and meeting. The guests at this evening celebration were greeted by Chair **Krista Varantola**. The Ministry of Education and Culture greeting was given by Director **Anita Lehtikoinen**. The keynote speaker was the former Chair of the Advisory Board, Director of Biocenter Finland **Eero Vuorio**. The first TENK Chair, Chancellor Emeritus **Kaijo Paunio** reminisced about the events of TENK's early years. Current and former TENK members and employees were present at the celebration as well as civil servants responsible for different areas of OKM and representatives of TSV, higher education institutions, research organisations and funders, a total of 42 people.

The TENK and TJNK jubilee seminar *Supporting Solid Science* was organised on 11 and 12 September at the House of Science and Letters. The international seminar, which discussed responsible research activity and science communication, had a full auditorium on both days. The seminar was preceded by an ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices, meeting organised by TENK on 10 and 11 September whose members also participated in the seminar. On the latter date, the seminar coincided with the distribution of state awards for public information. In addition, a trip to the cultural point of Rantatie in Tuusula was organised for the foreign guests.

The speakers at the seminar included Professor Emeritus and research integrity specialist **Nicholas Steneck** from the United States, editor of the Research Policy publication **Ben Martin** from Great Britain, Pulitzer Prize winner science journalist **Deborah Blum** from the United States, Vice President for Research at the Academy of Finland **Marja Makarow** as well as the Chair of the Academy of Finland Board, Professor **Arto Mustajoki**. The chairs of the two organisers, **Krista Varantola** of TENK and **Risto Nieminen** of TJNK, acted as chairs of the seminar.



The board members at the 20th anniversary meeting on 11 February 2012 at the House of the Estates. The first row from the left: Chair Krista Varantola and Secretary-General Sanna Kaisa Spoof. The second row: Arja Kallio, Vice Chair Veikko Launis, Pirkko Walden and Irma Mikkonen. The third row: Jussi Simpura, Riitta Keiski, Ari Suomela and Markku Helin. Tuula Pehu was absent. Photo: Jari Loisa



The panelists of Supporting Solid Science -seminar Professor Ben Martin (University of Sussex), Chair Nicole Föger (ENRIO), General Director Jussi Nuorteva (The National Archives Service of Finland) and professor Nicholas Steneck (University of Michigan) at the House of Science and Letters on 11th September 2012.



Minister of Education and Science Jukka Gustafsson announced the publication of the 2012 RCR guidelines at the Ethics Day seminar on 14th November 2012.

Representatives of TENK participated in the TJNK 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary on 15 November at the Finnish science centre Heureka.

A more significant measure of the celebratory year was that the Advisory Board finalised the reform work on the national research integrity guidelines *Responsible Conduct of Research (Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2012.)* The guidelines were prepared by a working group for the Advisory Board which included Chair **Krista Varantola** and members **Markku Helin**, **Veikko Launis** and **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**. Communications planner **Sanna Jäppinen** was asked to be the secretary. A total of 51 statements were acquired from the scientific community for the draft of the guidelines.

In comparison to the 2002 RCR guidelines, the structure and groundwork of the new guidelines remained unchanged. However, an individual researcher's various roles and possible biases, the challenges of research groups and joint projects as well as the rights and responsibilities of employer bodies were taken into account in the new guidelines with more emphasis. The guidelines also list, for example, new, so-called irresponsible practices in the grey area. Specification was given to the investigation process of allegations of RCR violations.

The new RCR guidelines were approved at the TENK meeting held on 24 October 2012. TENK drew up transitional provisions to be observed in the transference of the 2002 RCR guidelines to the new ones. The original Finnish guidelines were translated into English and Swedish and the layout work was started. Minister of Education and Science **Jukka Gustafsson** announced the publication of

the 2012 RCR guidelines at the *Ethics Day* seminar organised by TENK on 14 November 2012. There were 95 attendees present.

The Advisory Board, together with Universities Finland UNIFI, Rectors' Conference of Finnish Universities of Applied Sciences Arene and the Academy of Finland, also completed a CV template intended for researchers, taking research integrity issues into account. The working group that worked on the CV template was chaired by TENK member **Riitta Keiski** and the vice chair was Secretary-General **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**. The scientific community was extensively consulted during the creation of the template. Public announcement of the template was made at the same venue as the RCR guidelines. The exaggeration of one's own merits in the CV and other application documents was entered in the RCR guidelines under irresponsible practices. The CV template for researchers can be found on the TENK webpages in Finnish, English and Swedish.

By the end of 2012, a total of 56 universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutions had committed to the proposal *Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposal for ethical review* which was drawn up by the Advisory Board in 2009. TENK embarked coherently on coordinating this ethical review of research in the so-called human sciences and the networking of regional and organisation-specific ethical committees that carry out assessments. For that purpose, it appointed the first *Ethical Review of the Human Sciences follow-up working group* for a two-year term. The working group was chaired by Professor **Risto Turunen** of the University of Eastern Finland and the vice chair was Head of Development **Arja Kuula** of the Finnish Social Science Data Archive. TENK members **Irma Mikkonen** and **Jussi Simpura** were selected as its other members. The TENK

Secretary-General and her assistant saw to secretarial tasks and other practical matters. The working group began to collect statistical data concerning review statements. For that purpose, an online questionnaire was created for ethical committees on their activities carried out in 2012.

In addition to reform work on the RCR guidelines, the activities of the Advisory Board in 2012 were stressed on different national and international specialist tasks and networking for the improvement of operational culture in terms of research integrity. There was a continuation of researcher and student counselling and other preventative work.

Together with the National Committee on Medical Research Ethics TUKIJA, TENK organised the *Seminar on Ethical Review* on 20 March, on the ethical assessment of medical and non-medical research and regional cooperation of committees. The event was intended especially for ethical committees of research organisations and higher educational institutions and specialists in research administration. The theme of *Ethics Day* in November included TENK's research integrity guidelines (seminar programmes in Appendix 4). Presentations from all the seminars have been published on the TENK webpages at [www.tenk.fi/ennakkoarviointi](http://www.tenk.fi/ennakkoarviointi).

TENK called upon the legal professionals of research organisations on 27 September to discuss publicity issues concerning the RCR process and other research integrity issues. The specialist at this occasion was Professor **Olli Mäenpää** of the University of Helsinki.

TENK and TJNK requested a collective report from Palmenia Centre for Continuing Education of the University of Helsinki on how education on research integrity and science communication has been arranged at universities and also at the universities of applied sciences. The results of this questionnaire on the needs of education were available in 2013.

TENK received education requests concerning the field of research integrity from higher educational institutions and other research organisations. The TENK Chair, certain members and the Secretary-General acted as educators in research integrity across Finland (APPENDIX 1). Furthermore, counselling was provided to various bodies

on the content of the responsible conduct of research and on the investigation mechanisms of RCR violations.

### 3 HANDLING ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT ON RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

#### RCR allegations of misconduct reported to TENK and actual violations

In 2012, the Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations that have committed to the RCR guidelines reported eight new allegations of misconduct on responsible conduct of research to TENK. The allegations were investigated in the organisations where the research under suspicion was being or had been carried out. The processing of two new RCR allegations of misconduct continued on into 2013.

According to reports that have come to TENK, a total of ten RCR investigations were finalised at research organisations during 2012, a part of which started up in 2011. Of these ten investigated cases, five were verified as showing no RCR violations. Of these, three were alleged cases of plagiarism and the others involved the requirement of permission to do research or an alleged fabrication. However, a violation of responsible conduct of research was verified in five investigated cases, namely the disregard for responsible conduct of research. The following are summaries of these cases; the names have been removed to preserve anonymity.

#### Verified RCR violations at research organisations

##### Case 1: Denigration of other researchers in a publication

Disregard for responsible conduct of research, which was investigated and verified at university X, concerned a conflict of writership. The issue concerned the actions of the director of a laboratory at university X, professor A in the field of medicine, in the publishing process of a manuscript that was written based on the findings of a research group that

RCR ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS, NO.	2012	2011	2010
official reports from research organisations to TENK on new RCR allegations of misconduct	8	13	7
finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation (fraud or disregard for responsible conduct of research) was verified*	5	3	2
finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation was not verified*	5	9	5
RCR investigation on allegations reported to TENK in progress 31 December	2	3	1

\*These figures also include cases reported before 2012, which were finalised in 2012.

worked in professor A's laboratory and especially the authorship of researcher B in the joint article in question. According to the allegation, professor A, who had transferred to university Y, had submitted the results of the research group working at university X for publication in an international journal without the members of this research group being aware of the matter. The name of researcher B was removed from the group of writers and professor A's name was put at the top of the list of authors. According to the view held by professor A, researcher B's scientific contribution was minimal and of a routine nature in relation to the published research. On the basis of the official RCR investigation carried out at university X, it was decided that professor A was guilty of the disregard for responsible conduct of research, shown as denigration of other researchers, by excluding researcher B's name from the list of authors in the article.

### Case 2: Inadequate reporting on research methods and commitments

The **disregard for responsible conduct of research** was verified in another case investigated at a university also involving the field of medicine. According to the allegation put forth, violations against research integrity were found in the activities of a research group led by a certain docent. On the basis of a preliminary investigation that was carried out, the university believed that the docent in question was guilty of the disregard for responsible conduct of research by inadequately reporting on both the testing of viruses and the selection of patients for a case report type of publication. Moreover, this docent had included an inaccurate conflict of interest report to a certain publication. However, the claims on fabrication as presented in the allegation were not verified. See also TENK statement 4.

### Cases 3 and 4: Researcher's name missing from the list of authors in an article

Researcher A, who works in research organisation X in the natural sciences, made an RCR report in 2011 on the allegation that his/her unpublished Master's thesis done for university Y had been plagiarised in scientific publications. The allegation was geared towards several researchers, whose employers or the university responsible for their postgraduate degree were two different universities, Y and Z, as well as employer X of the party who requested the

statement; however, the research project that connected them together was administered by university Z. The report was made to research organisation X and university Z. Both parties stated that no RCR violation had occurred but that researcher A's name should have, however, been entered in the publication as one of the authors. Researcher A requested a statement from TENK on the matter. According to the statement, the matter should be investigated again, either separately or between university Z and research organisation X, because the RCR investigation methods used were insufficient. After receiving the TENK statement, both research organisation X and university Z carried out new RCR investigations on the matter. It was then stated at both parties that the research group was guilty of the **disregard for responsible conduct of research** by excluding the name of researcher A from the list of authors in the article. University Z addressed its decision only on its own staff members. There was no proof of plagiarism found in either one of the RCR investigations.

### Case 5: Deficiencies in research planning and in defining the rights of research group members

This investigated and verified **disregard for responsible conduct of research** at a university concerned the allegation of plagiarism in the humanities. According to the RCR report made by docent A, the research group led by professor B included text in a manuscript submitted to a publisher which was mostly quotations from work published by docent A. This surfaced when the publisher requested docent A to be a peer reviewer of the aforementioned manuscript. Even though docent A's name was added to the later version, there was no mutual understanding to the problems involving authorship. According to the RCR investigation carried out at the university, there was negligence on the part of professor B, who acted as the leader responsible for the research project, and not the other members of the research group. According to the university, professor B was guilty of the disregard for responsible conduct of research by neglecting appropriate research planning and the sufficiently accurate defining of the rights, position and authorship of the research group members.

### RCR statements requested from and issued by TENK

RCR ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS, NO.	2012	2011	2010
official reports from research organisations to TENK on new RCR allegations of misconduct	8	13	7
finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation (fraud or disregard for responsible conduct of research) was verified*	5	3	2
finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation was not verified*	5	9	5
RCR investigation on allegations reported to TENK in progress 31 December	2	3	1

\*These figures also include cases reported before 2012, which were finalised in 2012.

In 2012, TENK received a total of eight requests for a statement concerning allegations of misconduct on responsible conduct of research. Of these, an investigation on five was completed in the RCR process on the local level the same year and there was a desire to still have these handled by the Advisory Board. No statements were issued in three cases because the official RCR investigation in the research organisation was still happening or the matter was not included within the jurisdiction of TENK. As a result, TENK issued a total of five RCR statements in 2012. Furthermore, the preparation of one statement was still underway at the turn of the year.

The following are summaries of RCR statements issued by TENK in 2012; the names have been removed to preserve anonymity:

#### **Statement 1: Textbook based on background research carried out with a sufficient amount of attention**

The party who requested a statement made a written report in 2011 on the allegation of unethical investigation methods in a textbook published by a university professor and a researcher. The textbook was based on a research project concerning the field of business. The university in question, on the basis of the report, did not start up the RCR process because according to it, it was question of a popular book and not an independent scientific study, nor was it furthermore a part of the university's publication series. After receiving TENK's first statement (2011), according to which the university's grounds for not beginning a preliminary investigation were unfounded, the university started up the RCR process for the case. Since no fabrication of research results or other fraud was found in the preliminary investigation and the deficiency concerning the handling of research materials mostly indicated mild carelessness, no official investigation was begun. The party who requested the statement turned once more to TENK because he/she was not satisfied with the methods followed in the preliminary investigation nor with the outcome. According to this party, the textbook was lacking care and accuracy. In its second statement (2012), TENK recognised that the university had carried out the investigation in accordance with TENK's guidelines.

#### **Statements 2 and 3: Authorship rights to a researcher who worked in a research group and was dismissed from a company, and the failure to start a preliminary investigation**

Researcher A made a written report to a university on allegations of misconduct on responsible conduct of research in the field of natural sciences. According to the report, professor B did not take researcher A's part in the authorship into account in the editing or publishing of the research materials of the research group led by professor B. Professor B answered this by saying that researcher A had worked as an

employee of company X managed by professor B, not as an academic member of his/her research group. Furthermore, researcher A had been dismissed from business X three years prior to the year when the publications stated in the report were released.

TENK recognised in its first statement that the university made a procedural error when it did not provide an opportunity for researcher A to give a response to professor B's statement. Because of this, the matter was handed back to the university. The university made a new decision on the matter after researcher A and other parties had been heard. According to this, the case showed no need to start up a preliminary investigation in accordance with the process concerning RCR violations.

Researcher A was not satisfied with the university's aforementioned decision and requested a statement from TENK on if a preliminary investigation would have had to be done on the basis of evidence presented by researcher A and if researcher A's request for a preliminary investigation at the university was handled appropriately. After this, TENK requested an evaluation from the university on what researcher A's part was in the authorship in the publications and research activities which researcher A referred to in the request for a statement. TENK also stated in the request for a response, that the employment of the party who put forth the RCR allegation was of no significance in regard to authorship or the RCR process.

According to the university, the case indisputably recognised that the microscope images taken by researcher A were taken at least three years prior to the publication of the articles. The articles were worked on after the researcher was dismissed from the services of company X. The university also refers to the *Vancouver Protocol* which concerns authorship in biomedical publications.

In its statement, TENK states that in the allegation of misconduct put forth and in later letters, researcher A did not concretely, and on the argument of the claims made, highlight the idea of what his/her exact contribution to the disputed publications was. Because of this, and on the basis of the investigation it acquired in the case, the university had the right to not begin a preliminary investigation within the guidelines of conduct concerning the investigation of RCR violations. The party who made the report has some responsibility to sort out the matter which cannot be turned over to the university. Although the university, in making its decision on the matter, had acted in accordance with the guidelines, the opposite solution as well could have been justified. Consequently, TENK's conclusion in its second statement was that the university had acted in accordance with the RCR guidelines in deciding that a preliminary investigation would not be started.

In addition, TENK considers it important that the threshold to starting a preliminary investigation be kept low. Carrying out

a preliminary investigation is important in regard to the legal security of the parties involved and also in regard to how fair the party making out the report finds the investigation methods to be. TENK also emphasises that the kind of position, be it as an employee or student, the researcher has in a research project is of no significance when evaluating if the researcher should be noted as an author in the publication. The issue of authorship depends exclusively on what kind of intellectual contribution the researcher has made to producing new information presented in the research. So-called author's honour, the right to become recognised as an author as long as there is a sufficient amount of contribution to the research, cannot be relinquished in an employment or other contract.

#### Statement 4: Inadequate reporting of research methods was not a fabrication

**Disregard for responsible conduct of research** in the abovementioned case (Case 2) concerning the field of medicine that was investigated at a university was verified. Docent A, who put forth the allegation, worked at the university in the research group led by docent B. According to docent A, there were violations against research integrity occurring in the activities of the research group led by docent B. On the basis of a preliminary investigation that was carried out, the university recognised that docent B was guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research by, for example, inadequately reporting on the research methods used.

In the request for a statement to TENK, docent A displayed dissatisfaction in how the working group that carried out the preliminary investigation heard out the parties and especially in that the working group did not hear out the individuals named by docent A who could have verified that docent B declined to talk about the case that led to a patient's death. Furthermore, docent A suspected docent B of falsification. According to docent A, there should have been an official investigation made on the matter in accordance with the RCR process. According to TENK's evaluation, hearing out the parties had, however, fulfilled its purpose. The working group that carried out the preliminary investigation had the right to not hear out the individuals as named by docent A because of the fact that even if there was this claimed refusal, it could not be deduced that there was an intentional attempt to deceive the scientific community. Docent B's actions in the matter were justified.

In its statement, TENK states that the parties agreed that there was no report published on the case that led to the patient's death. The difference in opinion, however, is a question of what the non-publication of the case means. In situations in which the publication has shown to be limited to the reporting of one case, it cannot be assumed that there would be reporting on other cases at the same time. The fact that possible other cases are in this way kept quiet,

shows that it is not the fabrication of discoveries but rather that the researcher has the freedom to make this kind of choice. The university working group that carried out the preliminary investigation saw several problems in its report involving the reporting of published cases and recognised that they can lead to the fact that the reader will get a misleading picture from the outcome of the treatment. Those who carried out the preliminary investigation considered this to be disregard for responsible conduct of research. This evaluation, which is justified according to TENK's view, is not, however, sufficient to show that there would have been an attempt to intentionally deceive the scientific community.

The preliminary investigation of the case implemented by the university could, in its justification, be compared to an official investigation. It could not be assumed that the continuation of an investigation would produce significant new information. Furthermore, docent B did not call for an official investigation. The university therefore had the right to make a decision on the matter on the basis of the preliminary investigation.

#### Statement 5: Wrong introductory sentence in poster layout was not plagiarism

Teacher A, who works at a university of applied sciences, requested a statement from TENK and put forth the allegation that senior teacher B and lecturer C of the same institution may be guilty of plagiarism in their poster presentation. In the RCR investigation carried out at the university of applied sciences and that preceded the request for a statement, it transpired that the posters had been worked on in cooperation using the organisation's new poster layout for the same conference. B and C had worked on their joint poster on the layout of A's poster and the text field that included the introductory sentence on A's poster was accidentally left on the joint poster. B and C immediately remedied the matter during the conference. According to TENK, it was undeniable that text from A's poster appeared on B and C's poster without any citation. TENK concurred in its statement with the evaluation



Chair Krista Varantola and professor Nicholas Steneck at the University of Michigan on January 2012.

given by the university of applied sciences on the occurrence: there were no signs of plagiarism. Since the posters dealt with different subjects, the wrong introductory sentence showed that there was no attempt to consciously deceive the scientific community.

#### 4 COOPERATION, INITIATIVES AS WELL AS PUBLICATION AND PR ACTIVITIES

Various authoritative bodies requested several specialist statements from TENK in 2012. A statement was issued to the Ministry of Finance on the proposal of a work group to update the Statistics Act. A statement was issued to both the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Education and Culture on the draft on changing the Act on the National Research Institute of Legal Policy. Moreover, TENK issued a response to the Sami Parliament of Finland on the ethics of mineral exploration activities of the Geological Survey of Finland in the home region of the Sami people. However, it was decided that no statement concerning stem cell research was issued because there are other authoritative bodies who are more focused on this issue.

TENK continued in becoming familiarised with the research integrity situation in university cities outside of Greater Helsinki. Oulu was selected as the destination of a study trip for the Advisory Board members and secretariat. The trip was taken from 23 to 24 October 2012. University of Oulu Rector **Lauri Lajunen** was the host for the visit. During the visit, there was orientation particularly on the university's research integrity education whose management was confirmed to be exemplary. TENK also had the opportunity to see, for example, ethical guidelines created for students.

TENK actively followed media discussion that was related to research integrity and publication activities of the field and also took part in them. Doctoral dissertation plagiarisms of high profile European politicians were revealed and put in the public eye was, for example. In Finland, the surprising results of research on vitamin D and the examination process of Doctoral dissertations were reported in the news, for example.

A significant part of the Advisory Board's networking and PR activities transpired through seminar presentations (APPENDIX 1) and also articles published by its members (APPENDIX 2). In addition, the TENK members actively work in both national and local ethical committees and working groups (APPENDIX 3).

As the PR measures for the celebratory year, the Advisory Board's graphic appearance and webpages were updated: [www.tenk.fi](http://www.tenk.fi).

#### 5 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

TENK has active cooperative relationships with both the other Nordic countries and the European Commission, OECD and other specialist bodies of the field. The Chair acts as the Finnish representative in the Permanent Working Group on Science and Ethics that handles research integrity in All European Academies ALLEA.

The Secretary-General acted as vice chair of ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices, and participated in its meetings. The ENRIO spring general meeting was held in Rome from 17 to 18 April and the autumn general meeting in Helsinki from 10 to 11 September. The autumn general meeting was related to the events of TENK's celebratory year. The Secretary-General also participated in the NORIA-net on Registers working group of NordForsk in Stockholm on 29 August.

The Chair and the Secretary-General went on a study trip to the United States from 22 to 29 January. The trip involved the search for information and the exchange of experiences on procedures concerning the investigation of allegations of research violations and the organisation of research integrity education. The matter was stressed both at ORI, the national Office of Research Integrity, in Washington on the federal level and at universities in Michigan. In addition to ORI, other destinations included the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. The compact programme at the universities was planned, organised and hosted by Professor Emeritus of History **Nicholas Steneck** of the University of Michigan.

The Secretary-General participated in the *Quest for Research Excellence* conference in Washington from 12 to 18 March, which was organised by the Office of Research Integrity, ORI. She gave a joint presentation there on her own and **Krista Varantola's** behalf on the theme of *Demarcating boundaries in research ethics and investigation thresholds in relation to fraud*. At the Palmenia Centre for Continuing Education at the University of Helsinki, preparations for a project application began, on the initiative of the TENK Secretary-General, for the 7th Framework Programme under the title *Toolkit for Advancing Responsible Research and Innovation in Europe*. Both universities and other scientific and research integrity organisations all around Europe were taken in as partners. TENK worked as a partner in the application through TSV. The deadline for application was 16 January 2013.

#### 6 PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

In 2012, TENK had one full-time employee, a Secretary-General, as well as an assistant, a communications planner and a fixed term project secretary with TJNK for the celebratory year. TSV offered TENK financial and personnel administration as well as IT services. The spaces of the House of Science and Letters were available for meetings



and seminars. The TENK Secretary-General was selected to represent the entire TSV staff for the TSV board.

OKM granted TENK a total of €126,000 in operating appropriations in 2012. Of this amount, €15,000 was allocated for operational expenses and €25,000 went to publication, seminar and travel costs. TENK and TJNK together received a grant of €55,000 from OKM to use for the expenses for the celebratory year.

This annual report was presented at the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity meeting held on 23 April 2013.

**Krista Varantola**  
Chair

**Sanna Kaisa Spoof**  
Secretary-General

## APPENDIX 1

List of seminars and educational events where the chair of the advisory board, members or the secretary-general have given papers in 2012, other than the advisory board's own seminars and educational events concerning research ethics.

### Chair Krista Varantola:

- Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan toiminnan esittely, Office of Research Integrity, Washington D.C., USA, 24.1.2012
- Tutkimusetiikka yliopiston arjessa. Esitelmä Tieteellisten Seurain Valtuuskunnan vuosikokouksessa 22.3.2012
- Onko kansainvälistyminen sitä, että englantia aletaan käyttää yliopiston kotikielenä? Esitelmä Edistyskeskeisen tiedeliiton 40-vuotisjuhlaseminaarissa 26.9.2012.

### Member Arja Kallio:

- Tutkimusetiikka. Esitelmä VTT:n tutkijapäivillä 1.11.2012.

### Member Riitta Keiski:

- Research Ethics. Membrane School in Ilawa, Puola, 17.4.2012.
- Eettiset kysymykset eri tieteenalojen näkökulmasta - Tekniset tieteet. Tieteen etiikan kurssi, Oulun yliopisto, University of Oulu Graduate School, UniOGS Oulu 23.4.2012.
- Multidisciplinary Dialogue – Wellbeing, Technology and Environment. Research Ethics in Finland. First Joint Summer School by Finnish Russian Cross Boarder Universities, Rovaniemi 31.8.2012.
- Technology and Environmental Ethics. - Research Ethics course, University of Oulu Graduate School, UniOGS Oulu 8.10.2012.
- Research Ethics -kurssi maisterivaiheen opiskelijoille. Prosessi- ja ympäristötekniikan osasto, Oulun yliopisto (3 op).

### Secretary-General Sanna Kaisa Spoof:

- Sanna Kaisa Spoof & Krista Varantola: *Fighting against irresponsible research practices – the Finnish context*. Quest for Research Excellence – ORI konferenssi, Washington D.C., USA 16.3.2012.
- Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan toiminta. Esitys ja panelistina toimiminen, Helsingin yliopiston oikeustieteellinen tiedekunta 24.9.2012.
- Tutkijan ansioluettelomalli. Esitelmä Aalto-yliopiston taiteiden ja suunnittelun korkeakoulussa 6.10.2012.
- Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan puheenvuoro. Esitys tutkimusetiikkakoulutusta käsittelevässä seminaarissa, Oulun yliopisto 23.10.2012.

## APPENDIX 2

### Articles, other publications and interviews by members of the advisory board in 2012.

#### **Chair Krista Varantola:**

- Krista Varantola: Tutkimusetiikka yliopiston arjessa. - Tieteessä tapahtuu Vol. 30, 4/2012.

#### **Secretary-General Sanna Kaisa Spoof:**

- Sanna Kaisa Spoof: Plagioimalla tohtorikoulutukseen? – Acatiimi 5/2012.
- Haastattelu opiskelijavilpistä. Svenska YLE, 1.6.2012.
- Haastattelut koskien dosentti Johan Bäckmaniin julkisuudessa kohdistettua epäilyä hänen väitöskirjansa aineistosta ja yleisesti väitöskirjan tarkastusprosessista. Helsingin Sanomat, HBL, Ylioppilaslehti 8.11.2012.

#### **Member Jussi Simpura:**

- Haastattelu tutkimusetiikasta. – Ikaros 2/2012.

## APPENDIX 3

### Advisory Board members' membership of national and local research ethics bodies in 2012.

#### **Member Riitta Keiski:**

- Oulun yliopiston etiikka-työryhmän puheenjohtaja

#### **Vice Chair Veikko Launis:**

- Valtioneuvoston asettaman eläinlääketieteellisen tutkimuskeskuksen jäsen
- Varsinais-Suomen sairaanhoitopiirin eettisen toimikunnan jäsen
- Turun yliopiston eettisen toimikunnan varsinainen jäsen

#### **Member Irma Mikkonen:**

- Savonia-ammattikorkeakoulun tutkimuseettisen toimikunnan jäsen

#### **Member Jussi Simpura:**

- Terveyden ja hyvinvoinnin laitoksen tutkimuseettisen työryhmän puheenjohtaja

#### **Secretary-General Sanna Kaisa Spoof:**

- Sukuseurojen Keskusliiton oikeudellisen toimikunnan jäsen

## APPENDIX 4



TUKIJA

Valtakunnallinen lääketieteellinen  
tutkimuseettinen toimikunta



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN  
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA

### EETTISEN ENNAKKOARVIOINNIN TEEMASEMINAARI

TENKIn ja TUKIJAn yhteisseminaari lääketieteeseen ja ns. ihmistieteiden tutkimuksen eettisestä arvioinnista

**Aika** Tiistai 20.3.2012, klo 9.00 – 16.00

**Paikka** Tieteiden talo, sali 104, Helsinki

**Järjestäjä** Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta (TENK) ja Valtakunnallinen lääketieteellinen tutkimuseettinen toimikunta (TUKIJA)

**Kohderyhmä** Kansalliset ja alueelliset tutkimuksia arvioivat eettiset toimikunnat ja työryhmät sekä muut tutkimushallinnosta kiinnostuneet

**Puheenjohtajat** ap. kansleri Krista Varantola, Tampereen yliopisto / TENK  
ip. professori Heikki Ruskoaho, Oulun yliopisto / TUKIJA

09.00 **Ilmoittautuminen ja kahvi**

09.30 **Seminaarin avaus**

Puheenjohtaja Krista Varantola, Tampereen yliopisto / TENK

09.45 **Eettinen ennakoarviointi Helsingin yliopistossa**

Puheenjohtaja, yliopistonlehtori Laura Hokkanen, Helsingin yliopiston ihmistieteiden eettisen ennakoarvioinnin toimikunta

10.15 **Kommenttipuheenvuoro: tutkijan näkökulma**

Yliopistotutkija Pia Olsson, Helsingin yliopisto, kansatiede

10.30 **Keskustelua**

10.45 **Lakisääteisen eettisen toimikunnan tehtävät – alueellinen yhteistyö**

Professori Tapani Keränen, Pohjois-Savon sairaanhoitopiirin alueellinen eettinen toimikunta / TUKIJA

11.15 **Yliopiston eettisen toimikunnan tehtävät – alueellinen yhteistyö**

Puheenjohtaja, professori Risto Turunen, Itä-Suomen yliopiston tutkimuseettinen toimikunta

11.45 **Keskustelua**

12.00 **Lounastauko (lounas omakustanteinen)**

13.00 **Terveystieteiden ja hyvinvoinnin laitoksen eettinen työryhmä**

Tutkimusprofessori Jussi Simpura, THL / TENK

13.30 **Säteilyturvakokeskuksen tutkimuseettinen työryhmä**

Tutkimusprofessori, eettisen työryhmän puheenjohtaja Eeva Salminen, STUK

13.45 **Keskustelua**

14.00 **Kahvitauko**

## Rinnakkaiset ohjelmat

### Sali 405

14.30 -15.30 **Ihmistieteiden eettisen ennakkoarvioinnin toimijoiden verkostoituminen**  
Yhteyshenkilönä pääsihteeri Sanna Kaisa Spoof, TENK

### Sali 104

14.30 **Perusterveydenhuollossa toteutettavan tutkimustoiminnan ennakkoarviointi- ja lupakäytänteet**  
Erytysuunnittelija Hanna-Leena Nuutinen, Helsingin terveystieteiden keskus

15.00 **Ravitsemustieteen tutkimuseettiset kysymykset**  
Professori Christel Lamberg-Allardt, Helsingin yliopisto

### Yhteinen loppukeskustelu

15.30 ***Keskustelua, seminaarin päätös***  
Puheenjohtaja Heikki Ruskoaho, Oulun yliopisto / TUKIJA

Tilaisuuteen on vapaa pääsy, mutta osallistuminen edellyttää ilmoittautumista.

Ilmoittautumiset 13.3.2012 mennessä verkkolomakkeella: [www.tenk.fi/seminaari\\_ilmo/](http://www.tenk.fi/seminaari_ilmo/)

Lisätietoja:

TENK: [tenk@tsv.fi](mailto:tenk@tsv.fi) tai puh. (09) 228 69235

TUKIJA: [tukija@valvira.fi](mailto:tukija@valvira.fi) tai puh. 0295 209 111 (vaihde)



TIEDONJULKISTAMISEN NEUVOTTELUKUNTA  
DELEGATIONEN FÖR INFORMATIONSSPRIDNING  
COMMITTEE FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN  
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA  
FORSKNINGSETISKA  
DELEGATIONEN  
FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD  
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY

## SUPPORTING SOLID SCIENCE 11.-12.9.2012

The House of Science and Letters / Tieteiden talo  
Jubilee Seminar of The Committee for Public Information in Finland and The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity  
Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunnan (TJNK) ja Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan (TENK) kansainvälinen juhlaseminaari

### PROGRAMME

*Tuesday, September 11th*

13:00 – 13:15 Welcome!

Professor Risto Nieminen, Committee for Public Information, chair  
Chancellor Krista Varantola, Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity, chair

13:15 - 13:30 Greeting from The Ministry of Education and Culture  
Director Annu Jylhä-Pyykönen

13:30 - 14:00 Ethical issues when a researcher meets the media  
Professor Arto Mustajoki, University of Helsinki

14:00 - 14:30 Global Efforts to Promote Integrity in Research: Past Accomplishments and Future Challenges  
Director of Research Ethics Program, Professor Nicholas Steneck, University of Michigan

14:30 - 14:45 Science in the Finnish society - past and present  
Director General Jussi Nuorteva, National Archives of Finland  
Coffee break

15:30 – 17:00 Panel discussion: It´s all about Ethics!

- Chair: Director General Jussi Nuorteva, National Archives of Finland
- Director, Professor Nicholas Steneck, University of Michigan
- Professor Ben Martin, University of Sussex
- Dr. Nicole Föger, European Network of Research Integrity Offices ENRIO, chair

*Wednesday, September 12th*

13:30 - 14:00 State Award Winners

14:00 - 14:30 Whither research integrity? Plagiarism, self-plagiarism and coercive citation in an age of research assessment  
Professor Ben Martin, University of Sussex

Comfort break

14:45 - 15:15 Shared principles of responsible research and innovation - the foundation for international collaboration  
Vice President for Research, Professor Marja Makarow, Academy of Finland

15:15 - 15:45 Science Writing in the Age of Denial  
Science journalist, Professor Deborah Blum, University of Wisconsin-Madison

#### SPEAKERS

- Deborah Blum, Pulitzer-prize winning science journalist for writing about primate research; Helen Firstbrook Franklin Professor in the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Nicole Föger, Head of Administrative Office, Austrian Agency for Research Integrity; Chair of European Network of Research Integrity Offices ENRIO
- Marja Makarow, Vice President for Research, Academy of Finland; Professor of applied biochemistry and molecular biology, University of Helsinki; Member of the Governing Board, European Institution of Innovation & Technology EIT
- Ben Martin, Professor of Science and Technology Policy Studies at SPRU (Science and Technology Policy Research, Business and Management), Editor - Research Policy, The Freeman Centre, University of Sussex; Associate Fellow of the Centre for Science and Policy
- Arto Mustajoki, Head of The Department of Modern Languages, University of Helsinki; Chair of the Academy of Finland's Board
- Jussi Nuorteva, Director General, National Archives of Finland
- Nicholas H. Steneck, Director of the Research Ethics and Integrity Program of the Michigan Institute for Clinical and Health Research; Professor Emeritus of History, University of Michigan; Consultant to the US Federal Office of Research Integrity

#### ORGANIZERS

The Committee for Public Information in Finland (TJNK) and Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) are expert bodies attached to the Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland.

The Committee for Public Information follows progress in research, arts and technology and the development of knowledge in Finland and abroad. It was founded in 1972.

Advisory Board on Research Integrity was founded in 1992 to deal with ethical questions relating to scientific research.

The Committee for Public Information in Finland (TJNK) and Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) are expert bodies attached to the Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland.



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN  
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA  
FORSKNINGSETISKA  
DELEGATIONEN  
FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD  
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY

## ETIIKAN PÄIVÄ

Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö  
14.11.2012, Tieteiden talo

10.00 Ohjeita ja malleja tarvitaan

Kansleri Krista Varantola, TENK, puheenjohtaja

10.15 Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja sen loukkausten käsitteleminen 2012 -ohjeen (HTK-ohje) ja Tutkijan ansioluettelomallin julkistaminen

Opetusministeri Jukka Gustafsson

10.30 Uudistettu HTK-loukkausten tutkintamenettely

Professori Markku Helin, TENK, jäsen

10.50 Kommenttipuheenvuoro

Rehtori Perttu Vartiainen, Itä-Suomen yliopisto

11.00 Keskustelua

11.30–12.30 Lounas, 2. kerroksen kabinetti

12.30 HTK-ohjeistuksen tutkimuseettiset kysymykset 1990-luvulta 2010-luvulle

Professori Veikko Launis, TENK, varapuheenjohtaja

13.00 Keskustelua

13.15–13.45 Kahvitauko

13.45 Tutkijan ansioluettelomallin esittely ja käyttötarkoitus

Pääsihteeri Sanna Kaisa Spoof, TENK

14.15 Kommenttipuheenvuorot

Toiminnanjohtaja Timo Luopajarvi, ammattikorkeakoulujen rehtorineuvosto Arene ry

Kansleri Ilkka Niiniluoto (Helsingin yliopisto), Suomen yliopistot UNIFI ry

Johtaja Arja Kallio, Suomen Akatemia

15.00 Keskustelua

15.30 Tilaisuuden päätös