



FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity
Annual report | 2011
www.tenk.fi



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity

Annual report | 2011

1 | COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD AND MEETINGS

The Ministry of Education and Culture has appointed the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) for the three-year period 1 February 2010 – 31 January 2013. The Chair of the Board during the period under review was Chancellor of the University of Tampere, Professor **Krista Varantola** and the Vice Chair was Professor **Veikko Launis** from the University of Turku. The Advisory Board has eight other members:

- Professor **Markku Helin** (University of Turku; until 31 August 2012, a Counsellor of Legislation with the Ministry of Justice)
- Director **Arja Kallio** (Academy of Finland)
- Professor **Riitta Keiski** (University of Oulu)
- Principal Lecturer **Irma Mikkonen** (Savonia University of Applied Sciences)
- Ministerial Adviser **Tuula Pehu** (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry)
- Research Professor **Jussi Simpura** (National Institute for Health and Welfare)
- Chief Legal Counsel **Ari Suomela** (Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation)
- Professor **Pirkko Walden** (Åbo Akademi University)

Docent **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, PhD, served as the acting Secretary General of the Advisory Board. Secretary General **Salla Silvola**, who had been on a leave of absence, resigned on 1 September 2011. The position of Secretary General was declared open in the autumn and the Board of Directors of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies selected and the Ministry of Education and Culture appointed Sanna Kaisa Spoof to the post as of 1 January 2012. **Heidi Laine**, B.Soc.Sc., served as assistant to the Advisory Board up to 30 April 2011 and was replaced by **Anna Rauhala**, MA, as of 1 August.

The office of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity is attached to the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies in Helsinki. The street address is Mariankatu 7 C 1.

The Advisory Board convened seven times during the period under review. As a rule, meetings were held at the House of Sciences and Letters (Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki). The October meeting was held in Kuopio.

2 | PREVENTIVE ACTION AND EDUCATION

The Chair of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity, Krista Varantola, says that the most important aspects of the Advisory Board's work are the highlighting of preventive action, such as the inclusion of research ethics in the basic and post-graduate degree programmes of universities, and robust international activities. In 2011, the Advisory Board's efforts focused on various national and international expert duties and on the formation of networks with the aim of improving research-ethical operating culture. The Advisory Board organised seminars on research ethics and its members and the Secretary General gave lectures about research ethics at events held by universities and research institutes.

The Advisory Board launched a revision of the *Good scientific practice and procedures for handling misconduct and fraud in science* (GSP) guideline. The point of departure in this work was to refresh and bring up to date the ten-year-old guideline in a way that incorporates the so-called grey area of research-ethically irresponsible practices in addition to fraud and misconduct in science. The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity appointed some of its members to a working group to deliberate this matter; Krista Varantola was named Chair and Markku Helin, Veikko Launis and Sanna Kaisa Spoof were appointed as members. The aim is present the new *Good scientific practice and procedures for handling misconduct and fraud in science* guideline for consultation and approval to Finland's scientific community at the close of 2012, the 20th jubilee year of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity.

By the end of 2011, 89 universities, universities of applied sciences, research institutes, and other research organisations had signed the 2002 guidelines. A list of the organisations that have signed the guidelines can be found on the Advisory Board's website at www.tenk.fi/HTK/allekirjoittajat.pdf.

The proposed document *The ethical principles of research in the humanities, social sciences and behavioural sciences and a proposal regarding the arrangement of ethical pre-evaluation* drafted by the Advisory Board in 2009 had received commitments from 56 universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutes by the end of 2011. The

Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity coordinates the networking of regional and organisation-specific ethical committees that implement ethical pre-evaluations of the so-called human sciences.

The Advisory Board's 17 May spring seminar examined the separation of ethical pre-evaluation of medical and non-medical research targeting humans. The event was aimed at ethical committees, researchers and other experts representing research organisations and universities. A meeting of ethical committees was arranged at the House of Sciences and Letters the next day. The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 21 September autumn seminar focused on the theme *Preventing research fraud: ethics and legal issues*. A workshop on the revision of the GSP process aimed at, for example, lawyers employed by research organisations as well as an Advisory Board question time session were arranged in conjunction with the seminar. English-language training on good scientific practice in Finland was also arranged for foreign post-graduate students and researchers in this conjunction. (Seminar programmes in APPENDIX 1)

An initiative made by the Advisory Board launched a joint working group that aims to draft a template research-ethical resume for researchers; the working group consisted of representatives from Universities Finland UNIFI, the Rectors' Conference of Finnish Universities of Applied Sciences and the Academy of Finland. The working group was chaired by Advisory Board member Riitta Keiski, while Secretary General Sanna Kaisa Spoof served as a member.

The inaugural *Ethics Day* was held at the House of Sciences and Letters in November. The event was staged at the initiative of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity in cooperation with the National Advisory Board on Social Welfare and Health Care Ethics and the Committee for Public Information in Finland under the theme *Using knowledge for good*. Among the event's many speakers was Finland's highest-ranking physician **Risto Pelkonen**. The event attracted plenty of interest and was filled to capacity. *Ethics Day* will from now on be administered by the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity and the intention is to make it an annual event.

Presentations made at the seminar are available on the Advisory Board's website at www.tenk.fi/ennakkoarviointi/.

The Advisory Board received requests for training on research ethics from universities and other research organisations. The Advisory Board's Chair, some members and the Secretary General provided training in research ethics at different locations around Finland (APPENDIX 2). In addition to this, the Advisory Board consulted various parties on the content of good scientific practice and the mechanisms employed to investigate alleged GSP violations.

3 | HANDLING OF SUSPECTED VIOLATIONS OF GOOD SCIENTIFIC PRACTICE

Complaints regarding alleged violations of good scientific practice

The Advisory Board was notified of 13 new cases of alleged violations to good scientific practice by Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations committed to the GSP guideline in 2011. The allegations were investigated in the organisation at which the suspect research was being conducted or had been conducted. Nine cases, which were notified to the Advisory Board and dealt with conclusively in 2011, were found to not constitute a violation of GSP. Most of these cases involved allegations of plagiarism. Misconduct was identified in three of the investigated cases, however. Two cases involved plagiarism, i.e. wrongful appropriation, and one involved the misrepresentation of research findings. Deliberation on three cases of alleged GSP violations continued into 2012.

The first investigated and verified case of **plagiarism** at a university involved a PhD thesis in medicine. An investigation team appointed by the university identified several plagiarised sections in the manuscript. The team assessed the plagiarism to be intentional, quite crude and not open to interpretation – involving text copy-pasted from the Internet, with even Wikipedia used as a source.

The second verified case of **plagiarism** occurred in the field of the humanities and it involved a PhD thesis approved by a Finnish university about ten years ago. The allegation had been made in the United States. The university in question established an investigation team, which found that the case involved extensive and intentional fraud. Substantial sections of the PhD thesis are based on text written by others without appropriate source citations, and the author had also extensively presented the writings of others as his/her own opinions. This was repeated in a scientific article written on the basis of the PhD thesis as well.

The third verified GSP violation was a **misrepresentation of findings**, which involved joint publication activities on the part of natural science professor X and post-graduate student Y, who was under the professor's supervision. Articles, which constituted part of Y's article-based PhD thesis, were published jointly by the two together with other researchers. The articles were found to be fraudulent overseas and retracted from international scientific journals. After this, Y admitted to manipulating research data, i.e. misrepresentation. The GSP violation was noted and Y lost his/her PhD degree. Even though no GSP violation was identified in the conduct of X, the university noted shortcomings in X's actions as leader of his/her research

group. Neither of these cases was put through a full GSP violation investigation process.

Statements issued by the Advisory Board in 2011

In 2011, the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity deliberated on seven cases of alleged violations of good scientific practice, which had been investigated locally, but were brought before the Advisory Board, one case for a second time. Eight requests for a statement were thus received in total. The Advisory Board issued seven statements in 2011, in addition to which the handling of two statements was still incomplete at the turn of the year.

Statement 1: Shortcomings in the procedures observed during a preliminary inquiry

One request for a statement asked whether a certain university should have conducted a full investigation in addition to the preliminary inquiry it had performed as the result of a GSP violation complaint, and if the procedures observed in relation to the case by the university in question were compliant with GSP procedures. The case involved both alleged violations of good scientific practice as well as various forms of misconduct and fraud related to a certain PhD thesis manuscript in the field of technology. The preliminary inquiry gave the university cause to take the view that, even though there were shortcomings in the citation practices of the thesis, a violation of GSP as defined by the Advisory Board had not occurred.

The Advisory Board's statement reproached the procedure observed by the research organisation. Shortcomings were identified in, among other things, the manner with which the hearings of involved parties were documented. As the reply submitted by the university to the Advisory Board was also found to be of a general nature, the Advisory Board took the view that it would be in the best interest of all parties to conduct a full investigation of the matter. The Advisory Board did not opine on whether or not the researcher had committed a violation of good scientific practice because the matter was returned for deliberation to the university in question.

Statement 2: GSP allegation regarding a textbook must be investigated

The person requesting a statement had made a written notification regarding an alleged GSP violation in a textbook published jointly by a university professor and a researcher. The textbook was based on a research project in the field of business science at that university. The university in question did not launch a GSP investigation process on

the basis of this allegation because it considered the work to be of a general nature rather than an independent scientific study, in addition to which it was not included in the university's publication series.

The Advisory Board took the view that the university's grounds for not launching a preliminary inquiry were erroneous. The demands of good scientific practice apply also to textbooks, which are based on research. The Board therefore thought that a preliminary inquiry, focused on research-ethical questions, should be conducted on this matter.

Statement 3: Rights of research group members should be settled beforehand

This statement also dealt with a GSP allegation, involving the social sciences, on the basis of which a university had failed to launch a preliminary inquiry as provided for in the GSP guideline. The matter involved a dispute between a researcher, who made the allegation, and the leader of a research group. The dispute concerned the implementation of the research plan and the right to use research data, which was gathered during the researcher's term of employment, after the termination of the employment relation.

The Advisory Board's statement sided with the university's view, according to which there was no need to launch a preliminary inquiry into the matter. The Advisory Board did, however, point out that the university should, in accordance with good scientific practice, have made written agreements of the rights of each individual member of the research group before the launch of the research project and the recruitment of employees for the group. The Advisory Board's statements do not take a stance on intellectual rights issues, however.

Statement 4: Authorship of a scientific publication and inventorship of a patented invention

This request for a statement dealt with a medical researcher's rights to a research group's findings after the researcher had been dismissed from the group. The GSP violation complaint dealt with issues associated with the authorship of work performed in the research group ten years earlier and intended for use in a PhD thesis. The university's preliminary inquiry found the allegation to be groundless. A full investigation also verified as groundless the claim that the researcher in question should have, on the basis of research group membership, been named as an inventor of an invention patented by the leaders of the research group. The team appointed by the university to investigate the GSP violation claim emphasised that researchers must immediately notify their employer if they have made an

invention and that the requirements posed on a researcher for inclusion in a patented invention are more demanding than those applied to authorship of a scientific article.

The Advisory Board took the view that the implemented investigation had not revealed facts, which would have verified an occurrence of a GSP violation. The Advisory Board's statement did, however, point out that good scientific practice requires a university to make written agreements of the rights of each individual member of a research group before the launch of a research project and the recruitment of employees for the group. The Advisory Board's statements do not take a stance on issues of patent. In addition to this, the Advisory Board noted that the GSP investigation had not focused on an article published by the same research group during the course of the investigation that could have been the subject of a separate GSP investigation request.

Statements 5 and 6: Alleged plagiarism and renewal of a GSP investigation

A researcher working at natural science research organisation X made a GSP complaint alleging that an unpublished pro gradu thesis submitted by the researcher to university Y had been plagiarised in scientific publications. The allegation focused on several researchers, who were employed by or whose post-graduate work was being supervised by two different universities, Y and Z, as well as by X, the complainant's employer; the research project that linked the separate parties was administered by university Z. The complaint was lodged with research organisation X, where the GSP investigation and decision-making were the responsibility of the research director, and with university Z, where the GSP process was the responsibility of the dean.

The Advisory Board's statement notes that both investigations were implemented in a way, which contained substantial shortcomings from the perspective of GSP: the Advisory Board was not informed of the matter, a preliminary inquiry was not conducted and an investigation team was not appointed. The person who made the allegation was not heard during the investigation. Furthermore, an organisation's decisions regarding a GSP violation investigation should be made by an accountable director or the rector. As the alleged GSP violation could not be ruled out completely and because the applied plagiarism definition did not correspond with national or international interpretations, the Advisory Board took the view that new full investigations of the matter should be undertaken, either separately or jointly between university Z and research organisation X. The Advisory Board also pointed out that it was inappropriate to make a counter-allegation against the complainant in the decision.

Statement 7: Discrimination of researcher not investigated as GSP process

The complainant was unsatisfied with a university's decision to not accept for deliberation his/her GSP violation allegation in the field of the natural sciences. The complainant suggested that he/she had been subjected to scientific discrimination.

As the complaint did not specify individual GSP violations or focus allegations on the research activities of the university in question, the Advisory Board took the view that it was not necessary to undertake a preliminary inquiry on the matter.

4 | COOPERATION, INITIATIVES AS WELL AS PUBLICATION AND COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES

The Advisory Board gave an expert submission to the Academy of Finland regarding the development of researcher training. The Advisory Board's view is that the prevention of research-related dishonesty and scientific fraud is an essential aspect of a university's quality control. Therefore a period of study dealing with research-ethical questions should be made a permanent part of training in all fields of science. Foreign post-graduate students must also be informed of Finland's national GSP guideline. The rights and responsibilities of individual post-graduate students as well as their share in a research group's findings, materials and authorship must be agreed to before post-graduate students are accepted as members of the group. The Advisory Board also offered to coordinate supplementary training and networking in the field of research ethics.

The Advisory Board was in contact with the Council of Finnish Foundations; the aim was to encourage research-funding associations and foundations to promote good scientific practice by requiring the projects that they fund to commit to observing the GSP guideline. The Council of Finnish Foundations promised to inform its member organisations of this matter and include it, where applicable, to the fresh edition of its *Good governance in foundation* document.

The Advisory Board wanted to examine the research-ethical situation at one of the university towns outside the greater Helsinki region. The Kuopio campus of the new unified University of Eastern Finland was selected as the destination of a study trip, which took place on 20-21 October 2011. Participants also studied the activities of the Savonia University of Applied Sciences during the trip.

The Advisory Board actively monitored and participated in media debate on research ethics and related publishing activity. Examples of issues that gained publicity in 2011

were the resignation of the German defence minister because his PhD thesis was found to include plagiarism and cases of so-called fake doctors in Finland.

A significant portion of the Advisory Board's networking and communications activities was performed through seminar presentations (APPENDIX 2) and articles published by members (APPENDIX 3). In addition to this, Advisory Board members participated actively in both national and local ethical committees and working groups (APPENDIX 4). The Advisory Board collaborated with the Committee for Public Information in Finland and the third Finnish Publication Forum Project, an expert venture that operates in conjunction with the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies, to organise an open afternoon for cooperation partners at our joint premises on 8 November.

The Advisory Board's website was developed and the Board continues its active effort to increase awareness of the GSP guideline. A brochure, which details the activities and goals of the Advisory Board, was circulated to boost recognition of our efforts. GSP guideline booklets can be ordered free of charge from the Advisory Board's office. These booklets have also been handed out at events organised by the Advisory Board. A process to redesign and harmonise the visual appearance of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity as well as to produce a graphic guideline was launched towards the end of the year.

5 | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity has active cooperation relations with other Nordic actors as well as with the European Commission, the OECD, the European Science Foundation and other research ethics expert organisations. The Chair represents Finland at the *Science and Ethics* standing committee of All European Academies ALLEA. The Secretary General participates in meetings of the European Network of Research Integrity Offices ENRIO. The spring meeting of ENRIO was held in Copenhagen on 1-2 February and the autumn meeting in Vienna on 27-28 September.

The Chair and Secretary General made a study trip to Oslo on 2-3 March. They visited the joint offices of the Norwegian national research ethics advisory boards and attended a lecture by University of Michigan Professor Emeritus **Nicholas Steneck** on training in research ethics.

Global networking continued with the Chair and Secretary General preparing to participate in the *Quest for Research Excellence* conference, which was to be held by the United States Office of Research Integrity ORI in Washington. The intention was for Krista Varantola to deliver a presentation on the topic *Fighting against irresponsible research practices – the Finnish context* and Sanna Kaisa Spoof about

Demarcating boundaries in research ethics and investigation thresholds in relation to fraud. The conference was called off at the last minute because of Hurricane Irene and a new date was set for spring 2012.

6 | PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

In 2011, the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity had one full-time employee, the Secretary General. There was also a paid assistant, whom the Advisory Board shared with the Committee for Public Information. The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity and the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies cooperated in the recruitment of a new Secretary General in autumn 2011. The Advisory Board could avail of services provided by the Federation; these included financial administration, office management and IT services. The facilities of the House of Sciences and Letters were available for meetings and seminars. A consultation paper drafted by the development committee of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies charted the status quo and goals in the relationship and division of labour between the two organisations.

In 2011, the Ministry of Education and Culture granted the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity an operating grant of €120,000. €15,000 of this was allocated for running costs and €25,000 for the Advisory Board's expenditure on publications, seminars and travel. At the end of the year, the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity and the Committee for Public Information received a €55,000 grant from the Ministry of Education and Culture for events to be arranged to mark their joint jubilee year in 2012.

The Annual Report was presented at a meeting of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity on 25 April 2012.

Krista Varantola
Chair

Sanna Kaisa Spoof
Secretary General



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA
FORSKNINGSETISKA
DELEGATIONEN

Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan kevätseminaari 17.5.2011 ja eettisten toimikuntien tapaaminen 18.5.2011

Kevätseminaari – Eettisen ennakoarvioinnin rajanvetoa

Tapahtumapaikka ja -aika: Tieteiden talo, sali 104, Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki, tiistai 17.5.2011 klo 9.30–16.00.

Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan (TENK) kevätseminaari tutkimuksen eettisestä ennakoarvioinnista on suunnattu yliopistojen, ammattikorkeakoulujen ja tutkimuslaitosten eettisille toimikunnille, tutkijoille ja muille kiinnostuneille. Tilaisuuteen on vapaa pääsy. Tervetuloa!

Seminaariin ilmoittaudutaan verkkolomakkeella osoitteessa <http://www.tenk.fi/ilmoittautuminen> 10.5.2011 mennessä.

OHJELMA

9.30–10.00 Aamukahvi

10.00–10.15 Avaus

Ajankohtaista tutkimuseetiikasta

- Puheenjohtaja, kansleri **Krista Varantola**, TENK

10.15–12.00 Ihmistieteiden tutkimuksen eettisiä kysymyksiä kansainvälisestä näkökulmasta

Ihmistieteiden eettisen ennakkosäätelyn pulmakysymyksiä kansainvälisten kokemusten valossa

- Professori **Klaus Mäkelä**

Haastattelututkimukseen liittyvät eettiset kysymykset ja eettinen ennakoarviointi. Esimerkit Suomesta, Ruotsista ja Kanadasta

- Etnologian professori **Hanna Snellman**, Jyväskylän yliopisto

12.00–13.00 Lounastauko (lounas omakustanteinen)

13.00–16.00 Eettisen ennakkoarvioinnin järjestäminen

TENKin ehdotus ihmistieteiden eettisen ennakkoarvioinnin järjestämiseksi pähkinäkuoressa

- Pääsihteeri, dosentti **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, TENK

Ihmistiede, hoitotiede, lääketiede; rajanvetoa tutkimusasetelmien välillä lääketieteellistä tutkimusta koskeneen lainsäädäntöuudistuksen valossa

- Ylitarkastaja **Outi Konttinen**, valtakunnallinen lääketieteellinen tutkimuseettinen toimikunta TUKIJA

Sitovatko TENKin eettisen ennakkoarvioinnin ohjeet korkeakoulujen ulkopuolista tutkimuslaitosta?

- Terveyden ja hyvinvoinnin laitoksen eettisen toimikunnan puheenjohtaja, tutkimusprofessori **Jussi Simpura**, Terveyden ja hyvinvoinnin laitos

14.30–14.45 Kahvitauko

Ihmistieteiden alan eettisen toimikunnan ensimmäinen toimintavuosi Tampereella. Miten on lähtenyt käyntiin yliopistojen, ammattikorkeakoulujen ja muiden tutkimusorganisaatioiden yhteispeli?

- Tampereen alueen ihmistieteiden eettisen toimikunnan sihteeri, tutkimuksen kehittämisspäällikkö **Jarmo Wahlfors**, Tampereen yliopisto.

Loppukeskustelu

16.00 Tilaisuus päättyy

Eettisten toimikuntien tapaaminen 18.5.2011

Tapahtumapaikka ja -aika: Tieteiden talo, sali 404, Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki, keskiviikko 18.5.2011 klo 9.30–11.30

TENK järjestää kevätseminaarin jatkoksi keskiviikkona 18.5. *Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja sen loukkausten käsitteleminen* -ohjeeseen sitoutuneiden korkeakoulujen ja tutkimuslaitosten eettisten toimikuntien edustajien tapaamisen. Tapaamisen tarkoituksena on verkostoituminen ja tulevasta yhteistoiminnasta keskusteleminen. Kahvitarjoilu.

Ilmoittautumiset eettisten toimikuntien tapaamiseen sähköpostiosoitteeseen tenk@tsv.fi 13.5.2011 mennessä.

*Lisätietoja tapahtumista antaa tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan pääsihteeri **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, [sanna-kaisa.spoof\(a\)tsv.fi](mailto:sanna-kaisa.spoof(a)tsv.fi), puh. 09-228 69 234 / 050-594 19 09.*

Tarkempia tietoja Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö -ohjeistuksesta sekä ihmistieteiden eettisistä periaatteista ja eettisestä ennakkoarviointista saa neuvottelukunnan kotisivulta, osoitteesta www.tenk.fi.



www.tenk.fi

TUTKIMUSEETTINEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA
Mariankatu 7 C 1
00170 Helsinki
Puh (09) 2286 9234

FORSKNINGSETISKA
DELEGATIONEN
Mariegatan 7 C 1
00170 Helsingford
Tfn (09)2286 9234

NATIONAL
ADVISORY BOARD ON
RESEARCH ETHICS
Mariankatu 7 C 1
FIN-00170 Helsinki
Tel + 358 9 2286 9234

Tutkimusvilpin torjunta: Etiikkaa ja juridiikkaa. Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan syysseminaari

Paikka: Tieteiden talo, sali 104, Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki

Aika: keskiviikko 21.9.2011, klo 9:30 – 15:30

Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan (TENK) ajankohtaisseminaari Suomen tutkimuseettisestä ohjeistuksesta. Päivän ohjelma on suunnattu tutkijoille, tutkimusryhmän johtajille sekä korkeakoulujen tutkimushallinnosta vastaaville henkilöille; aamupäivän ohjelma erityisesti ulkomaisille tutkijoille ja jatko-opiskelijoille. Hyvän tieteellisen käytännön (HTK) loukkaustutkintaa käsittelevä työpaja on tarkoitettu tutkimusorganisaatioiden edustajille kuten lakimiehille.

Seminaarin uutuutena on TENKin kyselytunti!

Ohjelma: http://www.tenk.fi/tapahtumat/syysseminaari_2011/index.html

Tilaisuuteen on vapaa pääsy. Kahvitarjoilu. Tervetuloa!

Ilmoittaudu verkkolomakkeella seminaariin <http://www.tenk.fi/ilmoittautuminen/form.php?fi> ja

HTK -työpajaan http://www.tenk.fi/tyopaja_ilmo/form.php

9.9.2011 mennessä.

Lisätietoja seminaarista: tenk@tsv.fi tai puh 09 - 2286 9235

Good scientific practice in Finland. Autumn seminar of National Advisory Board on Research Ethics

Venue: House of Science and Letters, Seminar Room 104, Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki

Date and time: 21. Sept (Wednesday) 2011, 9:30 am – 15:30 pm

Morning lectures of this current seminar of the National Advisory Board on Research Ethics are aimed at foreign researchers and postgraduate students in Finland.

Program: http://www.tenk.fi/tapahtumat/syysseminaari_2011/index.html

The seminar is free of charge. Coffee service. We look forward to seeing you at this seminar!

Registration by 9. Sept 2011: <http://www.tenk.fi/ilmoittautuminen/form.php?en>

Further information on the seminar: tenk@tsv.fi

Guidelines on Good scientific practice and procedures for handling misconduct and fraud in science:

http://www.tenk.fi/en/good_scientific_practice/Hyva_Tieteellinen_ENG.pdf

Tutkimusvilpin torjunta: Etiikkaa ja juridiikkaa.

Good scientific practice in Finland.

OHJELMA / PROGRAM

Coffee starts at 9:30 am

Research Ethics / Research Integrity in Finland and world-wide,

10:00 am – 11:45 am, seminar room 104

- Good scientific practice and code of conduct in Finland. Procedures for handling misconduct and alleged fraud in science. *Chair of National Advisory Board on Research Ethics, Chancellor **Krista Varantola**, University of Tampere.*
- Discussion
- Research integrity from the point of view of research funding nationally and internationally. *Member of National Advisory Board on Research Ethics, Director **Arja Kallio**, Academy of Finland.*
- Discussion

Lounastauko

Rinnakkaiset ohjelmat klo 13.00 – 15.00 / Afternoon program only in Finnish.

1. Ajankohtaista tutkimusetiikasta ja TENKin kyselytunti, sali 104

- Kokemuksia tutkimusetiikan koulutuksesta tekniikan alalla. *TENKin jäsen, prof. **Riitta Keiski**, Oulun yliopisto.*
- HTK -ohjeistusta uusitaan; palaute on tervetullutta. *Pääsihteeri **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, TENK.*
- Kysykää tutkimusetiikasta ja tutkimusvilpin torjunnasta! TENKin kyselytunti jatko-opiskelijoille, tutkijoille ja tutkimusryhmän johtajille. Paikalla TENKin jäseniä vastaamassa yleisökysymyksiin.

2. Työpaja tutkimusorganisaatioille HTK -loukkaustutinnan kehittämisestä, sali 505

- Työpaja ja käytännön kokemuksia HTK-loukkausten tutkintaprosessista ja menettelyohjeiden täsmentämisestä. *Vetäjänä TENKin jäsen, prof. **Markku Helin**, Turun yliopisto.*

Kahvitauko klo 14.00 – 14.15

Päivän yhteenveto: Parempi tieteellinen käytäntö 2012,

klo 15.00 – 15.30, sali 104

- Päivän yhteenveto ja loppukeskustelu. *Puheenjohtajana pj. **Krista Varantola**, TENK.*

Suomen yliopistoissa, ammattikorkeakouluissa ja muissa tutkimusorganisaatioissa noudatettava Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja sen loukkausten käsitteleminen (HTK) -ohjeisto:

http://www.tenk.fi/hyva_tieteellinen_kaytanto/Hyva_Tieteellinen_FIN.pdf



TIEDONJULKISTAMISEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA



Valtakunnallinen sosiaali- ja
terveysalan eettinen
neuvottelukunta, ETENE

Etiikan päivä 2011 – TIEDON HYVÄ KÄYTTÖ

Keskiviikkona 16.11.2011 klo 9.30 - 16.00

Tieteiden talo, Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki

Seminaari tarkastelee tiedon käyttöä eri yhteyksissä. Tiedon käyttöä lähestytään tieteellisen tiedon luotettavuuden ja uskottavuuden sekä hyvien käytäntöjen ja yhteiskunnallisen käytön näkökulmista.

Seminaariin ovat tervetulleita eettisten neuvottelu- ja toimikuntien jäsenet, tutkijat, tiedottajat ja toimittajat ja muut tiedepolitiikasta kiinnostuneet henkilöt.

Tilaisuuteen on vapaa pääsy mutta osallistuminen edellyttää ennakkoilmoittautumista. Tilaisuuteen mahtuu 135 henkilöä.

Linkki ilmoittautumiseen: <http://www.tenk.fi/etpailmo/form.php>

Seminaarin järjestävät:

Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunta (TJNK)

Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta (TENK)

Valtakunnallinen sosiaali- ja terveysalan eettinen neuvottelukunta ETENE

TERVETULOA!

puheenjohtaja *Risto Nieminen*, TJNK

puheenjohtaja *Krista Varantola*, TENK

puheenjohtaja *Markku Lehto*, ETENE

Lisätietoja:

pääsihteeri *Reetta Kettunen*, p. (09) 228 69236, reetta.kettunen(at)tjnk.fi

pääsihteeri *Sanna Kaisa Spoof*, p. (09) 228 69234, sanna-kaisa.spoof(at)tsv.fi

pääsihteeri *Päivi Topo*, p. (09) 1607 3834, 050 370 6521, etene(at)stm.fi



TIEDONJULKISTAMISEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA



Valtakunnallinen sosiaali- ja
terveysalan eettinen
neuvottelukunta, ETENE

TIEDON HYVÄ KÄYTTÖ

OHJELMA

Aika Keskiviikkona 16.11.2011 klo 9.30-16.00

Paikka Tieteiden talo Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki

Ohjelma 9.30–10.00 Kahvitarjoilu

10.00–12.00 MITEN TIETOA KÄYTETÄÄN? (Erillissessiot)

sali 104	sali 505	sali 309
<p>Ammattitiedon hyvä käyttö</p> <p>Tilaisuuden avaus pj. Markku Lehto</p> <p>Käypähoito-suositusten soveltaminen arkkiatri Risto Pelkonen</p> <p>Professionaalisen tiedon käytön vaarat pj. Markku Lehto</p> <p>Keskustelu</p>	<p>Tiedeviestinnän triple-helix. Tutkijan viesti tutkimuksen, asiantuntijuuden ja elinkeinoelämän kehyksissä</p> <p>Tutkiva työpaja</p> <p>pj. Erkki Karvonen, professori, Oulun yliopisto</p>	<p>Tutkimusvilpin torjunnan uudet haasteet. Harmaan alueen tutkimuseettisten laiminlyöntien tunnistaminen ja torjunta</p> <p>Tutkiva työpaja</p> <p>pj. Veikko Launis, professori, Turun yliopisto</p>

12.00–13.00 Lounas

13.00–16.00 TIETO JA ETIIKKA ERI YHTEYKSISSÄ (Yhteissessio, sali 104)

13.00–13.05 Tervetuloa,
kansleri Krista Varantola, Tampereen yliopisto, TENK pj.

13.05–13.40 Paneeli aamupäivän teemoista

13.40–14.10 Tutkimustiedon hyvä käyttö osana poliittista päätöksentekoa
johtava tietoasiantuntija Timo Turja, Eduskunnan kirjasto, Eduskunta

14.10 -14.30 Kahvitarjoilu

14.30–15.30 Kansainvälisiä esimerkkejä eettisestä yhteistyöstä
Etiikan toimijoiden organisointi Pohjoismaissa
tutkija Aaro Tupasela, Helsingin yliopisto
Etiikan toimijoiden organisointi Kanadassa
ylilääkäri Päivi Rautava, Varsinais-Suomen sairaanhoitopiiri

15.30–16.00 Eettisten toimijoiden kirjava kenttä Suomessa: keskustelu eettisten
toimijoiden yhteistyöstä
kansleri Krista Varantola, Tampereen yliopisto, TENK pj.

APPENDIX 2

List of seminars and educational events where the Chair of the Advisory Board, members or the Secretary General have given papers in 2011, other than the Advisory Board's own seminars and educational events concerning research ethics.

Krista Varantola:

- Etiikka ihmisten arjessa. Tieteen päivät 2011. Helsinki 14.1.2011.
- Responsible research and innovation. Sis.net Forum, Science in Society -seminaari. Helsinki 27.9.2011.

Veikko Launis:

- Voivatko käsitteet vahingoittaa? Esimerkkinä eutanasia. Tieteen päivät 2011. Helsinki 14.1.2011.

Riitta Keiski:

- Research Ethics - Tutkimusetiikka -opintojakso (3 op.) Prosessi- ja ympäristötekniikan osasto, Oulun yliopisto 10.1.-11.2.2011.
- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö – eettiset ulottuvuudet. Tutkimusetiikka ja hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö -seminaari. Kuopio 4.10.2011.
- Research Ethics - How to get a PhD: Methods and practical hints, University of Oulu 6.10. 2011.

Irma Mikkonen:

- Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan tehtävät ja toiminta. Tutkimusetiikka ja hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö -seminaari. Kuopio 4.10.2011.

Sanna Kaisa Spoof:

- Tutkijan eettinen vastuu. Sulle salaisuuden kertoa mä voisin? Julkisuus ja tietosuojasta muistiorganisaatioille – seminaari. Suomen Tieteellinen Kirjastoseura. Helsinki 28.1.2011.
- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö. Eettisesti ja kansainvälisesti -seminaari. Viestintätieteiden tohtoriohjelma CORE. Helsinki 10.2.2011.
- Eettiset kysymykset sukututkimuksessa. Lahden seudun sukututkijat ry:n kuukausikokous. Lahti 21.2.2011.
- Tieteen etiikka. 1 op. National Doctoral Programme of Psychology. Turun yliopisto 23.2. 2011.
- Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan puheenvuoro. Itä-Suomen yliopiston tutkimusetiikan seminaari. Kuopio 21.3.2011.
- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja sen loukkausten käsitteleminen. Säteilyturvakeskus. Helsinki 12.5.2011.
- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja sen loukkausten käsitteleminen. Bioetiikka -kurssi, bioteknologian koulutusohjelma, Tampereen yliopisto 5.10.2011.
- Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan puheenvuoro. Avoin data, avain uuteen -seminaari. Helsinki 1.11.2011.
- Tutkijan etiikka – kurssi jatko-opiskelijoille (1 op), humanistinen tiedekunta, Helsingin yliopisto, syksy 2011.

APPENDIX 3

Articles, other publications and interviews by members of the Advisory Board in 2011.

Arja Kallio:

- Rahoittajan näkökulma tutkimuseetiikkaan. – Suomen Lääkärilehti 46/2011.

APPENDIX 4

Advisory Board members' membership of national and local research ethics bodies in 2011.

Veikko Launis:

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

Riitta Keiski:

- Oulun yliopiston etiikka-työryhmän puheenjohtaja

Irma Mikkonen:

- Savonia-ammattikorkeakoulun tutkimuseettisen toimikunnan jäsen

Jussi Simpura:

- Terveystieteiden ja hyvinvoinnin laitoksen tutkimuseettisen työryhmän puheenjohtaja