**Session Plan**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Session Name:** | The Ethics of Sharing Fieldwork Data and the CARE Principles | **Duration:** | 4 hours total, with one 20-minute and one 10-minute break in between |
| **Date:** | 8 May 2025, 13.00 - 17.00 | | |
| **Location:** | International Institute of Social Studies, [Kortenaerkade 12, Den Haag](https://maps.app.goo.gl/rrKq9Qawhge76ngf6) | | |
| **Audience:** | PhD candidates, Early Career Researchers | | |
| **Facilitators:** | Bora Lushaj, Tijs Gelens, Jing-Yi Magraw, Anka Mos, Rafeek-Carmelo Baloum, Beatrice Hati Gitundu | | |
| **Level:** | *Beginner* | | |
| **Language:** | English | | |
| **Topics:** | CARE Principles, Ethics in Fieldwork, Community data, Collective Benefit, Data Governance, Responsibility, Research Impact | | |
| **Summary:** | The CARE Principles are a framework for the governance of data collected in indigenous communities worldwide. These principles – Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, and Ethics – serve as high-level guidelines that can be adapted and implemented to respect the unique contexts and needs of particular indigenous communities. At the same time, these principles feed also into broader conversations about the governance and sharing of data collected in wide-ranging fieldwork contexts.  The workshop is designed to be both informative and interactive. In the first part, participants explore how the CARE principles relate to participatory research, gain insight into how the Ethics Review process addresses CARE elements, and learn about the legal frameworks Dutch research institutions use for data governance and sharing.  The second part invites participants to actively engage in working groups guided by experienced researchers from the International Institute of Social Studies. Together, they will dive into three key CARE dimensions—Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, and Responsibility—through discussion and hands-on exploration.  The session concludes with an invitation to storytelling, where participants can share their own fieldwork experiences and learn from each other.  The session is highly interactive and encourages participants to suggest viable pathways to address these elements in their own research contexts. As such, while mainly focused on the Dutch Higher Education sector, this training format is likely to benefit users in other EEA countries or further abroad. | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Learning outcomes:**  By the end of the workshop, participants will be able to: | |
| **1.** | Outline the CARE principles and discuss how these fit with participatory and engaged research methods. |
| **2.** | Describe and illustrate the inherent uncertainty of the research lifecycle, especially in relation to the Ethics Review process. |
| **3.** | Summarize the types of legal agreements on data governance that researchers themselves can consider discussing with communities, and their applicability. |
| **4.** | Discuss at depth and interpret different elements of CARE and create feasible paths for their implementation in their own contexts |
| **5.** | Share and learn from other participants’ experiences on the human side of fieldwork |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time/**  **Duration** | **Topic** | **Instructional activity** | **Learner activity** | **Resources** |
| *13.00* | Introduction | Introduction and Outline the CARE principles and discuss how these fit with participatory and engaged research methods  **Bora** | Listening to presentation  Asking questions | Slides; gauge knowledge of participants as well with green/red cards |
| *13.20* | Uncertainty in ethics review | Describe and illustrate the inherent uncertainty of the research lifecycle in their own research based on lessons from specific case studies that have successfully communicated uncertainty during the Ethics Review process.  **Tijs and Jing-Yi** | Listening to presentation  Exchange own experience | Slides |
| *13.40* | Legal agreements | 3.a. Describe different types of legal agreements needed to share data inside and outside of EEA (DSA, SCCs) with local partners and applicability to making data available to communities  3.b. Describe additional agreements within the context of the CARE principles, e.g., Memorandum of Understanding, Research Agreement with a community, etc.  3.c. Break down the key points to consider when evaluating which of these additional agreements is possible within the general research data management, privacy, and ethical guidelines in The Netherlands.  **Anka Mos and Rafeek** | Listening to presentations  Sharing experiences | Collaborative notes document; collect feedback on worries dealing with this element of the work and experiences of mitigation (or we can refer to mitigation from content) |
| 14.00 | Q&A |  | Asking questions |  |
| *(14.10)* | Break (Catering) | | | |
| *14.30* | The different elements of CARE as applicable through the ethics review process | 4.a. Integrate the concept of *Collective Benefit* into the ethics applications ahead of fieldwork, allowing for flexibility to co-create feasible paths to Collective Benefit while maintaining accountability to both communities [consent-as-process] and ethics committees **[ conversation guide; facilitator/note-taker]**  4.b. Generate scenarios on how *Authority to Control* can interact with data journeys in Dutch institutions and relevant characteristics of communities: existing governance, technological advancement, consent-as-a-process, etc. **[conversation guide; facilitator/note-taker]**  4.c. Model dimensions of *Responsibility as* different choices researchers can make to give back and for research impact, balancing community acknowledgement, community needs, as well as community evaluation of research findings (e.g., community peer review) **[conversation guide; facilitator/note-taker].** | Group work with preparatory materials and tools at hand | Preparatory materials: set of prepared questions for discussion, shared notes (written by organizers, not participants); voting on possible solutions, no screen time for participants.  Output: concrete suggestions from each group are noted down. |
|  | Evaluation (informal, anonymous notes) + 10 minute break | | | |
| 16.10 | My story: what I learned in the field that school didn’t teach me  Wrap up | Bea Gitundu [moderator]    Bora | Sharing of personal experiences, informal, trusting. Participants will be asked to bring an object to focus their stories. | Storyboard |