

**SUMMARY OF
RECOMMENDATIONS**
FOR RCRC



ABOUT

This Tool is extracted from the Toolkit for RCRC produced as part of the research project *Responsible Conduct in Research-Creation: Providing Creative Tools to Meet the Challenges of an Emerging Field*. It was funded by the Fonds de recherche du Québec (FRQ) as part of the Concerted Action *La conduite responsable en recherche : mieux comprendre pour mieux agir* (2016-2018) [Responsible Conduct of Research: A Better Understanding for More Effective Action — 2016–2018]. A co-design workshop held in November 2017 was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and several institutional partners.

The Toolkit for RCRC provides an overview of the issues of responsible conduct in research-creation identified through this initiative. It is complemented by four detachable, practical reflective tools aimed mainly at the responsible conduct of research and research-creation communities.

Toolkit French version

<http://hdl.handle.net/1866/20923>

Toolkit English version

<http://hdl.handle.net/1866/20924>





PRESENTATION OF THE TOOL

This tool gathers together the institutional recommendations identified in the Accompanying Guide (see *Section 2*) to promote responsible conduct in research-creation (RCRC). It proposes paths for reflection and action to better take into account the characteristics of research-creation (RC) identified within the context of our project, with regard to the main themes in responsible conduct of research (RCR).

Although this tool can be used independently, we invite readers to also consult the Guide, which provides the context for RCR and the specific issues relating to RC.

ACRONYMS

CC

Conflict of commitment

COI

Conflict of interest

FRQ

Fonds de recherche du Québec

RC

Research-Creation

RCR

Responsible Conduct of Research

RCRC

Responsible Conduct in Research-Creation

REB

Research Ethics Board

RRC

Researcher-Creator

SRCR

Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research

TO CITE THIS TOOL

Noury, C., Roy, M.-C. and Cloutier, M. (2018). Summary of Recommendations for RCRC (Tool 2). In *Toolkit for RCRC: Summary of Issues in Responsible Conduct in Research-Creation and Proposed Tools for Reflection* (p.70-77). Montréal, Québec: Research Project on Responsible Conduct in Research-Creation: Providing Creative Tools to Meet the Challenges of an Emerging Field. <http://hdl.handle.net/1866/20924>

RECOMMENDATIONS

BY THEME

RCRC — CHALLENGES WHEN RCR AND RC MEET (2.1)

DIALOGUE BETWEEN RCR AND RC

- › Promote more opportunities for dialogue between the RCR and RC communities to strengthen mutual understanding.

CONSOLIDATION OF RCRC

- › Facilitate dialogue and discussions that jointly address research integrity and research ethics within RCR, rather than separately.
- › Train and equip RCR and REB officials on RC and its specific issues, in collaboration with RRCs.
- › Focus more effectively on supporting RRCs in taking into account RCR policies, particularly through a more positive approach that is focused on dialogue, collaboration and the clarification of the issues specific to each RC practice and project. This also implies that more resources be devoted towards this kind of support.

ADAPTATION OF POLICIES AND ACCESSIBILITY

- › Reinforce the consideration of creative practices in RCR policies and clarify the specificities of RC in this context, where relevant.
- › Systematically include RRCs or RC specialists on evaluation committees when allegations of breaches of RCR involve RC practices.
- › When this is not the case, make RCR policies more easily accessible on the websites of institutions and universities, and develop training tools on RCR and RCRC for researchers and students.



SPECIFIC ISSUES IN RC — DEFINITION, POSTURE AND QUALITY (2.2)

UNDERSTANDING RC

- > Prioritize a pluralistic, evolving and holistic view of RC focused on specific practices, projects and contexts, rather than a general definitional approach.
- > Establish means to document projects in RC to increase understanding of this set of practices.
- > More clearly define the connection between the various approaches within RC and the variations that may not belong.

LOOKING AT RCRC

- > Look at RCRC from the perspective of specific practices in RC and see the dialogue between RCR and RC as being specific to each project and taking into account its characteristics and challenges.
- > Highlight the relationship between the various practices in RC and the issues in RCR that are more closely related to them.

EVALUATION AND RECOGNITION OF RC

- > Increase the recognition and appreciation of the various statuses and postures of RRCs (e.g., artist, researcher, professor).
- > Promote openness to the different forms of dissemination and valorization of RC and take into account the specific aims of RC projects during their evaluation (e.g., by giving more weight to qualitative aspects).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND OF COMMITMENT IN RC (2.3)

PREVENTION AND TRAINING

- › Encourage a more positive perception and culture regarding COI and CC to foster dialogue on these issues.
- › Encourage the idea that COI and CC prevention and management are the shared responsibility of researchers and institutions hosting research and research-creation activities, and provide the support needed to manage them beyond their purely bureaucratic aspects.
- › Provide more training on COI and CC for researchers, particularly to facilitate their upstream prevention, and their identification and management.

CLARIFICATION OF EXPECTATIONS

- › Clarify expectations towards RRCs, their roles and responsibilities, as well as the planned valorisation modalities for their contributions and their research and creation activities, to reduce the potential for COIs and CCs.



DISSEMINATION OF RC (2.4)

CHARACTERISTICS OF RC

> Take greater account of the different possible objectives of RC dissemination—in keeping with the practices and intentions of RRCs—and the characteristics of these alternative modes of dissemination (e.g., going beyond the pursuit of “objectivity”).

AUTHORSHIP

> Take into account the progressive forms of dissemination and authorship in creation and in the arts (e.g., co-creation, pseudonym, anonymity, artist collective), especially in order to adapt the definition of plagiarism in institutional RCR policies and to facilitate the prevention and evaluation of alleged breaches of RCR.

> Promote different levels of reflection and moments for discussing the attribution of author status and credit associated with RC projects (e.g., in advance, via REBs).

> Publicize decision-making tools regarding authorship attribution (e.g., Smith and Master [17]) among the academic and creative communities, to encourage dialogue on this subject in the various fields of research and, thus, facilitate collaboration.

DATA MANAGEMENT

> Adapt protocols and expectations regarding data management to the specific reality of RC practices and assist RRCs in implementing them.

EVALUATION OF RC (2.5)

CHARACTERISTICS OF RC

› Take into greater account the characteristics of RC and its specific practices (e.g., its artistic, creative, collaborative or experimental value) in the evaluation and validation of this type of research. For example, this could include adding a qualitative component (e.g., interviews, a statement of intent, or a portfolio) to the evaluation process of RC projects, while maintaining common evaluation criteria.

EVALUATION COMMITTEES

- › Establish evaluation committees adapted to the characteristics of RC, both in terms of processes and evaluation criteria, and include RRCs on these committees.
- › Sensitize evaluators to the variety of RC approaches and practices in order to encourage the coexistence of multiple visions and a dialogue about them.

RC PRACTICES AND RESEARCH ETHICS (2.6.1)

RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW

- › Clearly identify the scope of research ethics review processes with regards to RC to facilitate communication between RRCs and officials in RCR and REBs.
- › Adopt a more flexible and processual approach to ethics review that is better aligned with the reality of specific RC practices (e.g., by recognizing the fieldwork required to develop a preliminary problem statement), and adapt procedures and tools (e.g., consent forms) accordingly.

SPECIFICITIES OF RC

- › Promote a joint reflection on the ethical considerations related to research arising from specific RC practices (rather than the other way around), and take into account the unique characteristics (e.g., methodological, epistemological, creative) associated with these projects.
- › Conceive of the process of ethical review and approval of research more as an accompaniment to the success of RC projects, and allocate more resources to this support.



TRAINING AND STUDENT SUPERVISION IN RC (2.6.2)

GUIDANCE

- > Pay particular attention to the specificities of RC so as to provide support that is adapted to the reality of students and to each practice and project.
- > Question the type of training, skills and support expected by professors supervising RC projects or taking part in their evaluation (e.g., as a member of a jury).

RCRC TRAINING

- > Reinforce the need for institutions and professors to accompany student training in RCR.
- > Offer RCR training—including research integrity and research ethics—from the very beginning of the student's RC journey. This training could be based on a framework provided by the institutions and should favour an approach that accompanies students and that also takes into account the specificities of each RC practice and project.

REFERENCES FOR THIS TOOL

17. Smith E, Master Z. Best Practice to Order Authors in Multi/Interdisciplinary Health Sciences Research Publications. *Accountability in research*. 2017; 24 (4):243-67.

TO CITE THE ENTIRE TOOLKIT

Noury, C., Cloutier, M. and Roy, M.-C. (2018). *Toolkit for RCRC: Summary of Issues in Responsible Conduct in Research-Creation and Proposed Tools for Reflection*. Montréal, Québec: Research Project on Responsible Conduct in Research-Creation: Providing Creative Tools to Meet the Challenges of an Emerging Field. <http://hdl.handle.net/1866/20924>