

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Exploring best practice governance for EU-funded health research consortia: A qualitative study protocol for insight and ideation

Ana Renker-Darby^{1*}, Till Bärnighausen^{1,2,3}, Christine Neumann¹, Raman Preet^{4,5}, Marina Treskova^{1,5,6}

¹ Heidelberg Institute of Global Health (HIGH), Medical Faculty and University Hospital, Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany

² Africa Health Research Institute (AHRI), Somkhele and Durban, South Africa

³ Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, USA

⁴ Department of Epidemiology and Global Health, Umeå University, Sweden

⁵ Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Unit of Sustainable Health, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

⁶ Interdisciplinary Center for Scientific Computing (IWR), Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany

*corresponding author.

Email: ana.renker-darby@uni-heidelberg.de (AR)

23 **Abstract**

24

25 **Background**

26 International consortia have emerged as a common model to organise and fund large-scale,
27 multi-disciplinary research in contemporary health and biomedical science. The diversity of
28 participants, size and complexity of these consortia necessitates effective governance to
29 achieve their research aims and societal impact. For health research consortia funded by the
30 European Union, certain governance structures and processes have emerged out of
31 convention. However, there is limited scientific evidence to support their use, and little is
32 known about consortia participants' perspectives on how governance structures could be
33 improved to better serve the implementation of research. In this paper, we present a protocol
34 for a qualitative study to explore the perspectives of participants in European Union-funded
35 health research consortia on the value of governance structures and how they might be
36 improved.

37

38 **Methods and analysis**

39 We will conduct a qualitative study using in-depth interviews with participants in health
40 research consortia funded by the European Union. We will recruit participants following a
41 purposeful sampling approach, and recruitment will continue until saturation is reached.
42 During in-depth interviews, we will ask participants about how the governance of consortia is
43 structured and what is working well or poorly about those governance structures from their
44 perspective. We will draw on design thinking methods to help participants to ideate
45 improvements in governance structures. Data will be analysed using a thematic analysis
46 approach.

47

48 **Discussion**

49 Findings from this study will provide valuable evidence for developing and formulating
50 governance structures for health research consortia. The findings of this work may also
51 contribute to guidelines for consortium proposal submissions.

52 **Introduction**

53 International consortia have emerged as a common model to organize and fund large-scale,
54 multi-disciplinary research in contemporary health and biomedical science [1, 2]. Consortia
55 involve collaboration between several institutions, both academic and non-academic, across
56 multiple geographic locations and with a variety of disciplinary expertise. Such consortia are
57 usually funded for a specific purpose over a limited funding period with a fixed-term research
58 contract [1].

59 Funding agencies are increasingly promoting multi-disciplinary project teams due to
60 increasing scientific specialization in combination with the growing need to address complex,
61 multi-faceted societal challenges such as pandemic prevention and preparedness or climate
62 change and health research [3]. International research consortia can provide wide-ranging
63 expertise and interdisciplinary collaboration to understand these complex issues, as well as
64 bringing together stakeholders across multiple geographic locations to address global
65 problems [4].

66 The scale and complexity of research consortia means that they require effective governance
67 to achieve their research aims. Governance refers to the sustained and focused attempts to
68 direct behaviour, with the intention of producing a broadly identified outcome [3].

69 Governance comprises both the structures and processes through which decisions about
70 goals, priorities and activities are made, as well as who makes those decisions. Ultimately,
71 consortium governance should enable the project's activities to be carried out in a way that
72 balances the interests of the different partners and leads to the attainment of the consortium
73 objectives [3].

74 Effective governance is necessary for several reasons. First, increasing scientific
75 specialization and a growing need to address complex, multi-faceted challenges mean that

76 consortia often incorporate researchers from a wide range of disciplines to avoid siloed
77 approaches [3]. This diversity of backgrounds and approaches sometimes leads to challenges
78 in the collective identification of issues and solutions [4]. Research teams are also becoming
79 larger, more geographically dispersed, and include researchers from multiple institutions in
80 different countries and cities [3]. Consortia also often involve increasing numbers of public-
81 private partnerships, bringing together academic institutions with non-governmental
82 organisations and commercial companies [5]. Each of these institutions often have different
83 and sometimes competing goals from the research, which need to be addressed and managed
84 during the implementation [3, 6]. Clear rules about data access, publication and patenting are
85 also required, particularly with increasingly large datasets [3, 6]. Finally, consortia
86 governance is required to ensure compliance with external regulations around data protection
87 and ethics, such as the General Data Protection Regulation [6]. As such, the governance of
88 large research consortia facilitates the implementation of the research and ensures the
89 realisation of expected outcomes and pathways to societal impact.

90 Health research consortia that are funded by the European Union (EU) have varying
91 governance structures depending on their aims, but at a high level there are certain
92 commonalities. Governance structures are partially determined by the funding body, both in
93 the requirements for submitting grant proposals and through the contractual agreement
94 between the consortium and the funder. For example, EU-funded research requires that
95 consortia are structured in work packages, each with their own milestones and deliverables.
96 Each grant agreement confirms the timelines for deliverables as well as reporting periods and
97 mechanisms [3]. Governance structures must also conform to EU policies, such as those of
98 gender equality and inclusiveness [7]. Other aspects of consortia governance structures are
99 determined by the external regulations that the consortium is bound by, including data
100 protection laws, ethics, and regulations of the various participating institutions [1, 3].

101 Other key elements of governance structures have emerged through convention. Consortia
102 typically employ modular components to coordinate the activities of partner institutions and
103 align them with the funding agency priorities [3]. These often include a management team or
104 steering committee responsible for the internal governance of the research consortia.
105 Consortia usually also have varying external advisory bodies that provide high-level
106 governance for the consortium's direction. Consortia use different external advisory bodies
107 depending on their aims, but this often includes an ethics advisory board and scientific
108 committee of external experts. These explicitly defined governance structures are
109 complemented by a range of informal governance processes that are used in practice and vary
110 between consortia.

111 Participation in the governance structures of consortia often demands significant time from
112 the consortia participants. Previous qualitative interviews with consortia participants found
113 that consortium governance structures can create additional bureaucratic workload that can
114 delay scientific work [5]. As such, it is crucial that both the governance structures and
115 processes of consortia support participants to implement the consortium's research activities
116 and meet research objectives outlined in the grant agreement without creating unnecessary
117 work that can tie up participants' expertise and resources [1, 8].

118 While there is some previous empirical research on the governance of health research
119 consortia, this has tended to focus on the power dynamics between institutions from high-
120 income countries and low- or middle-income countries [9-13] or the development of data
121 governance policies within health research consortia [6, 8, 14]. Further literature draws on
122 authors' experience within consortia to explore the way that conventional governance
123 structures can undermine scientists' ability to implement responsible research and innovation
124 [3], or to propose principles or guidance for consortia governance [1, 4]. To our knowledge,

125 there is currently no empirical research that explores the value of governance structures from
126 the perspective of consortia participants across a range of health research consortia.

127 Further, literature on how governance structures could be improved is usually limited to
128 abstract principles or guidelines. At present, we lack research that draws on the perspectives
129 of consortia participants to ideate improvements in governance structures. Design thinking, a
130 human-centred approach for innovating solutions, offers methods for ideating concrete
131 solutions to complex problems in health research [15, 16]. Design thinking has been
132 previously employed in healthcare research, but has rarely been used in other areas of health
133 research [15]. Design thinking methods offer an innovative approach for ideating
134 improvements in consortia governance from the perspective of participants.

135 In this study, we aim to understand the perspectives of consortia participants on how the
136 governance of EU-funded health research consortia is structured, the value of governance
137 structures and processes, and how governance structures and processes could be improved.

138

139

140 **Materials and methods**

141

142 **Study design**

143 This is a qualitative research study addressing four research questions:

- 144 1. How are the internal steering functions and external advisory functions of EU-funded
145 health research consortia commonly structured?
- 146 2. What is the value of the internal steering functions and external advisory functions in
147 EU-funded health research consortia from the perspective of consortia participants?

148 3. What is the value of ethics advisory boards for research in EU-funded health research
149 consortia from the perspective of consortia participants?

150 4. According to consortia participants, how can the governance of EU-funded health
151 research consortia be improved?

152

153 This study will take place between October 2023 and July 2024. The data collection method
154 for this research is in-depth interviews with participants in EU-funded health research
155 consortia. In the interviews, we will explore the perspectives of participants on the value of
156 consortia governance structures for the implementation of research. We will also employ
157 design thinking methods to ideate improvements in consortia governance structures.

158

159 **Population**

160 The study population includes participants in active EU-funded health research consortia.

161 Criteria for inclusion in the study are as follows:

162 - 18 years or older

163 - English speaking

164 - Participation in an EU-funded health research consortium that has been active for at
165 least six months

166 - Member of at least one of four participant groups: i) lead scientists/researchers
167 (overall lead, work package lead or co-lead); ii) non-lead scientists/researchers; iii)
168 non-scientists (e.g. non-governmental organisation participants); iv) project co-
169 ordinators or administrators.

170 - Agree to participate and sign the consent form

171

172 Participants who do not meet the inclusion criteria will be excluded.

173

174 **Sample size**

175 A minimum of 20 participants will be interviewed, with at least five participants in each of
176 the four participant groups described above and a balance of genders across participants.

177 Recruitment and data collection will continue alongside data analysis until data saturation has
178 been reached. We will use the concept of saturation as defined by Morse to determine when
179 data collection will end [17, 18]. Morse describes saturation as when data from several
180 participants have essential characteristics in common, enabling abstraction from individual
181 participants' data and theoretical development.

182

183 **Participant recruitment and sampling**

184 For recruitment, we will use a purposeful sampling approach that aims to select information-
185 rich cases for in-depth study [19]. Sampling will occur on the basis of maximum variation to
186 collect a diverse range of perspectives and ensure transferability of findings across EU-
187 funded health research consortia [19]. To ensure diversity of participants we will apply four
188 criteria: participant role within the consortium (lead scientists/researchers; non-lead
189 scientists/researchers; non-scientists; project co-ordinators or administrators), gender, country
190 of institution, and consortium.

191

192 The research team will initially invite at least one potential participant from each group from
193 their own networks to participate in the study. We will provide participants with a participant
194 information sheet and consent form via email. Participants will have the chance to read the
195 participant information sheet and ask the research team any questions before signing the
196 consent form and emailing it to the research team. We will then schedule an interview time
197 with the participant.

198

199 Further, we will ask the participants whether they can recommend other potential participants
200 from their own networks in any of the four groups and to prioritise participants of a different
201 gender to their own, who work at an institution in a different country, and who participate in
202 a consortium that the primary institution of the study investigators is not involved in. This
203 recruitment approach will continue until saturation is reached [18].

204

205 **Data collection**

206 In-depth interviews will be conducted by one researcher (AR) using a semi-structured
207 interview schedule to guide the conversation. We chose this method of data collection to
208 collect rich, qualitative data on the subjective perspectives of participants based on their
209 experiences in health research consortia [20]. The interview schedule was developed based
210 on the research questions and was piloted with two of the study co-investigators. The data
211 generated from the pilot interviews will not be incorporated into the findings of this study.

212

213 During the interview, participants will first be asked for some demographic information
214 (gender, country, institution/organisation, position at institution, discipline) and for
215 information about the consortium that they are part of (name, start and end date, number of
216 partners, location of partners, the participant's role in the consortium). If the participant is a
217 member of more than one consortium, they will be asked to choose one to focus on in the
218 interview. Participants will then be asked to describe how the internal steering functions and
219 external advisory functions of their consortium are structured.

220

221 We will use two design thinking methods to explore the value of governance structures and
222 ideate improvements. The 'rose, bud, thorn' tool will be used to help participants identify

223 what is working about governance structures, what currently is not working, and what has
224 potential [21]. ‘How might we’ ideation questions will be used to shift participants from
225 insight to early-stage ideation, prompting participants to suggest ways that consortia
226 governance structures could be improved [22].

227

228 We will conduct interviews using Zoom videoconferencing software, as participants are
229 based in a range of locations. Interviews will be audio-recorded. Recordings will be
230 transcribed and audio-recordings will be deleted as soon as transcription is complete. We will
231 return transcripts to participants for any edits they may wish to make.

232

233 **Data analysis**

234 Data will be analysed by one researcher (AR) using NVivo software. Data will be analysed
235 using the thematic analysis approach described by Braun and Clarke [20, 23]. We chose
236 thematic analysis due to its methodological flexibility and its inductive approach, enabling
237 the development of analytical themes that respond to the research questions [23].

238

239 Data will be inductively coded, building a bank of codes. We will then arrange these codes
240 into descriptive themes. Descriptive themes will be organised into analytical themes that
241 respond to the research questions. Data analysis will be an iterative process, with codes being
242 renamed and reorganised as analysis continues and new data are collected. We will use peer
243 debriefing between co-investigators to ensure the rigour of data analysis.

244

245 **Ethics**

246 This study received ethics approval from the Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty of
247 Heidelberg University on 13.09.2023 [reference number S-516/2023]. The study is conducted

248 under the General Data Protection Regulation. All participants will be provided with a
249 participant information sheet explaining the study and what their participation would involve.
250 Participants will sign an informed consent form before participating.

251

252 **Registration**

253 This study was registered with OSF Registries on 1.11.2023

254 [<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/TD6QX>].

255

256 **Discussion**

257 The purpose of this study is to explore the perspectives of consortia participants on the
258 governance structures of EU-funded health research consortia and ideate ways that
259 governance structures can be improved. At present, there is limited evidence that supports the
260 conventionally used governance structures in health research consortia. Participation in these
261 governance structures is often bureaucratic and time-consuming for consortia participants.

262 This study will provide evidence on how the governance structures of health research
263 consortia can be improved to better serve the objectives of the consortium and the needs of
264 consortium participants.

265

266 Findings from this study can be used by researchers when setting up future health research
267 consortia, to develop evidence-based governance structures for their consortia. Findings may
268 also be used by the consortium that this study is part of to improve its own governance
269 structures. Future research could build on the study findings to develop and test best practice
270 guidelines for the governance of EU-funded health research consortia.

271

272 **Study status**

273 Participant recruitment is underway and data collection is expected to end in February 2024.

274 **References**

- 275 1. Kaye J, Muddyman D, Smee C, Kennedy K, Bell J, UK10K. 'Pop-up' governance:
276 developing internal governance frameworks for consortia: the example of UK10K. *Life Sci*
277 *Soc Policy*. 2015;11(10):1-17.
- 278 2. Burgio MR, Ioannidis JPA, Kaminski BM, DeRycke E, Rogers S, Khury MJ, et al.
279 Collaborative cancer epidemiology in the 21st century: the model of cancer consortia. *Cancer*
280 *Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2013;22(12):2148-60.
- 281 3. Morrison M, Mourby M, Gowans H, Coy S, Kaye J. Governance of research consortia:
282 challenges of implementing Responsible Research and Innovation within Europe. *Life Sci*
283 *Soc Policy*. 2020;16(13):1-19.
- 284 4. Koelle B, Scodanibbio L, Vincent K, Harvey B, van Aalst M, Rigg S, et al. A guide to
285 effective collaboration and learning in consortia: building resilience to rising climate risks.
286 London, UK: Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre; 2019.
- 287 5. Morrison M. "A good collaboration is based on unique contributions from each side":
288 assessing the dynamics of collaboration in stem cell science. *Life Sci Soc Policy*.
289 2017;13(7):1-20.
- 290 6. Teare HJA, de Masi F, Banasik K, Barnett A, Herrgard S, Jablonka B, et al. The
291 governance structure for data access in the DIRECT consortium: an innovative medicines
292 initiative (IMI) project. *Life Sci Soc Policy*. 2018;14(20):1-17.
- 293 7. European Commission. European research area policy agenda - overview of actions for the
294 period 2022-2024. Brussels; 2021.
- 295 8. Morrison M, Klein C, Clemann N, Collier DA, Hardy J, Heißerer B, et al. StemBANCC:
296 governing access to material and data in a large stem cell research consortium. *Stem Cell Rev*
297 *Rep*. 2015;11:681-7.

- 298 9. Pratt B, Hyder AA. Governance of transnational global health research consortia and
299 health equity. *Am J Bioeth.* 2016;16(10):29-45.
- 300 10. Tagoe N MS, Pulford S, Murunga VI, Kinyanjui S. Managing health research capacity
301 strengthening consortia: a systematised review of the published literature. *BMJ Global*
302 *Health.* 2019;4:1-12.
- 303 11. Tagoe N, Pulford J, Kinyanjui S, Molyneux S. A framework for managing health research
304 capacity strengthening consortia: addressing tensions and enhancing capacity outcomes. *BMJ*
305 *Glob Health.* 2022;7(e009472):1-28.
- 306 12. Pratt B, Hyder AA. Governance of global health research consortia: sharing sovereignty
307 and resources within Future Health Systems. *Soc Sci Med.* 2017;174:113-21.
- 308 13. Parker M, Bull S. Ethics in collaborative global health research networks. *Clin Ethics.*
309 2009;4:165-8.
- 310 14. Muenzen KD, Amendola LM, Kauffman TL, Mittendorf KF, Bensen JT, Chen F, et al.
311 Lessons learned and recommendations for data coordination in collaborative research: The
312 CSER consortium experience. *HGG Adv.* 2022;3(100120):1-15.
- 313 15. Oliveira M, Zancul E, Fleury AL. Design thinking as an approach for innovation in
314 healthcare: systematic review and research avenues. *BMJ Innov.* 2020;7:491-8.
- 315 16. Brown T. Design thinking. *Harv Bus Rev.* 2008;Jun.
- 316 17. Morse JM. Editorial: The significant of saturation. *Qual Health Res.* 1995;5(2):147-9.
- 317 18. Morse JM. "Data were saturated...". *Qual Health Res.* 2015;25(5):587-8.
- 318 19. Patton M. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage; 1990.
- 319 20. Braun V, Clarke V. *Successful Qualitative Research.* London: Sage; 2013.
- 320 21. The Luma Institute [Internet]. A taxonomy of innovation. *Harv Bus Rev* [Internet]. 2014
321 [cited 2023 October 10]. Available from: <https://hbr.org/2014/01/a-taxonomy-of-innovation>.
- 322 22. IDEO.org. *The field guide to human-centred design.* Canada: IDEO.org; 2015.

- 323 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qual Res in Psychol.
324 2006;3(2):77-101.