

of the remote stage of scientific training for educators, 60–66 [in Ukrainian].

**Key words:** academic integrity, artificial intelligence, educational institutions, innovative technologies, academic standards.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-397-2-48>

## **CONFLICT OF INTERESTS DETERMINATION WITHIN THE EXPERTS' ACTIVITIES OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC BODIES**

**Serhii Stepenko**

*Chernihiv Polytechnic National University*

*serhii.stepenko@stu.cn.ua*

**Introduction.** The conflict of interests (COI) can significantly reduce the quality or completely destroy the objectivity of expert assessment of educational and/or scientific achievements. The appropriate declaration and dealing with COI is a substantial background for ensuring academic and research integrity. The objective of this research is to analyze the criteria for a COI determination within the research projects evaluation (RPE) and educational programs accreditation (EPA) by the experts of appropriate Ukrainian national educational and scientific bodies.

**Materials and Methods.** In this study, the category 'Ukrainian National Educational and Scientific Bodies' comprises Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MESU), National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA) and National Research Foundation of Ukraine (NRFU).

**Results.** Within the RPE by MESU, the experts should follow the Expert Code (2022). It is determined, that a COI exists if the expert: 1.1) participated in the project preparation; 1.2) has a direct/indirect

benefit in case of financing the project; 1.3) has a close family (husband/wife; woman/man living in the same family, but not married (civil partner); child, brother/sister, father/mother, etc.) or personal relationship with the PI/responsible executor of the project; 1.4) has joint publications with the PI during the last 3 years; 1.5) was a scientific supervisor or scientific consultant of the PI/responsible executor; 1.6) has or had a scientific rivalry/professional enmity with the PI of the project. According to NAQA rules (2019), the expert group (EG) does not include experts who work (including part-time) or study at a relevant HEI, or in the presence of other circumstances indicating a real or potential COI. Within the invitation to EPA, NAQA alarms: experts who have a real or potential COI are not included in the EG, in particular in the following cases: 2.1) EG members work (worked) and study (learned) in the same HEI during the last 5 years; 2.2) the expert is a founder/member of the supervisory board, an employee/student at HEI where EPA takes place; 2.3) during the last 5 years, the expert was a founder/member of the supervisory board, an employee/student at HEI where EPA takes place; 2.4) the expert is a relative/close person or has another private interest in a person studying at/guarantor of/employee involved in the implementation or founder/head/deputy head of the HEI, where EPA takes place. The criteria for COI determined clearly by NRFU (2023) and comprise: 3.1) family relations with project team members (PTM); 3.2) employment (in the last 3 years prior to the call) in an organization that is a participant of the project; 3.3) a member of supervisory/controlling bodies in an organization that is a participant of the project (in the last 3 years prior to the call); 3.4) a scientific supervisor of at least one of the PTM; 3.5) a scientific supervisor among the PTM (in the last 3 years prior to the call); 3.6) joint scientific publications with at least one of the PTM or participated in joint scientific projects (in the last 3 years prior to the call); 3.7) personal conflict with at least one of the PTM; 3.8) other close scientific or commercial cooperation that may affect objectivity of the RPE; 3.9) other direct scientific/commercial competition that may affect objectivity of the RPE; 3.10) PI/PTM involved in expert reviewing, consideration and rating.

**Conclusion.** The considered approaches differ in their criteria. They should be further analyzed in detail taking into account completeness and appropriate time frames. The NRFU approach looks the most complete among the analyzed.

### References

1. Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy (2022) Nakaz 04.10.2022 № 885 [Order 04.10.2022 No.885] URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z1238-22#n153> [Ukrainian].
2. Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy (2019) Nakaz 11.07.2019 № 977 [Order 11.07.2019 No.977] URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0880-19#n14> [Ukrainian].
3. National Research Foundation of Ukraine (2023) NRFU Ethics Principles <https://nrfu.org.ua/en/about-us/ethical-principles/>

**Key words:** academic and research integrity; conflict of interest (COI); Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MESU); National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA); National Research Foundation of Ukraine (NRFU).

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-397-2-49>

## ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH INTEGRITY: TURKISH POINT OF VIEW

**Tetyana Tarnavska**

*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv*

*tarnavskaya@ukr.net*

**Introduction.** Artificial intelligence (AI) is entering our lives incredibly quickly, making scientists rethink the way we integrate data for analysis and use the resulting insights to make better decisions. However, no one can fully realize the vast opportunity that