



Please note:

This version of the Regulation is a translation of the official German version and is provided for informational purpose only. It has no legally binding effect.

The legally binding version is published in our Official Notices.

This regulation was translated using a neural machine translation service. We do not guarantee the quality or accuracy of the translation.

Regulations for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice and Dealing with Scientific Misconduct at the Doctoral School NRW

In the version dated 19.04.2022

Based on Section 67b (1) sentence 1 and Section 77a (2) (3) (b) of the Higher Education Act of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia (Higher Education Act - HG) as amended by the Act Amending the Higher Education Act of July 12, 2019 and Section 15 (1) and (5) of the Administrative Agreement of the Doctoral School NRW (VV), the Doctoral School NRW issues the following regulations:

Contents

Preliminary remark

Preamble

I. Standards of good scientific practice at the Doctoral School NRW

§ 1 General principles, professional ethics

§ 2 Responsibility of the Doctoral School NRW and the departments

§ 3 Supervision of junior researchers

§ 4 Criteria for recognizing achievements

§ 5 Confidentiality and neutrality in assessments and consultations

II Good scientific practice in the research process

§ 6 Responsibilities and roles

§ 7 Cross-phase quality assurance

§ 8 Scientific publications and other communication channels

§ 9 Authorship

§ 10 Legal and ethical framework conditions and rights of use

§ 11 Archiving of research results and research data

III. Non-compliance with good scientific practice at Doctoral School NRW

§ 12 Protection of whistleblowers and accused persons, presumption of innocence

§ 13 Scientific Misconduct

§ 14 Ombuds Person

§ 15 Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct

§ 16 Procedure in the event of suspected misconduct

§ 17 Work of the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct

§ 18 Sanctions

§ 19 Conclusion of the proceedings

IV Final provisions

§ 20 Transparency

§ 21 Entry into force

Preliminary remark

The Doctoral School NRW is sponsored by the 21 state and state-funded universities of applied sciences. The task of the Doctoral School NRW is to organize and carry out doctorates at a high quality level according to its own Right to confer a doctorate as well as cooperative doctorates. Research by professorial members, doctoral candidates and Affiliated Members takes place at the supporting universities. Therefore, the guidelines for ensuring good scientific practice of the respective supporting university or university generally apply and the autonomy of the universities is generally preserved.

Preamble

The basis of scientific work is the honesty of scientists towards themselves and others. In order to ensure good scientific practice and to deal with allegations of Scientific Misconduct, the Doctoral School of Applied Research in North Rhine-Westphalia (Doctoral School NRW) has adopted the following principles and procedural rules, which are based on the DFG's "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice" adopted in 2019. The Doctoral School NRW works exclusively with those supporting universities that have adopted guidelines for good scientific practice in accordance with the DFG Code.

Due to the autonomy of the university, the guidelines for good scientific practice of the respective supporting university generally apply. In matters relating to the area of responsibility of the Doctoral School NRW, the guidelines of good scientific practice of the Doctoral School NRW apply to the professorial members and Affiliated Members and the doctoral candidates appointed.

I. Standards of good scientific practice at the Doctoral School NRW

§ 1 General principles, professional ethics

(1) All members and Affiliated Members of the Doctoral School NRW undertake to comply with the guidelines of good scientific practice.

(2) The general principles of scientific work include,

- to work according to the rules that are recognized as the scientific standard in the respective discipline (*lege artis*),

- to maintain strict honesty with regard to own contributions and contributions of third parties,
- to consistently question their own results and to allow and promote a critical, scientific discourse.

(3) The Doctoral School NRW works in cooperation with the supporting universities and the universities to ensure that the following points are implemented in relation to the respective research process:

- compliance with subject-specific standards and disclosure of the methods used,
- the consideration of the current state of research and the identification of the origin of the data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process as well as correct citation,
- the complete documentation of all data collected during the research process and relevant and unaltered for publication,
- the presentation of research results in such a way that they can be verified,
- the consistency of the research results presented with the data researched and
- the secure storage of data.

(4) The members and Affiliated Members of Doctoral School NRW are personally responsible for implementing the fundamental values and standards of academic work in their actions, for standing up for them and for actively taking measures to comply with them in practice. They are obliged to regularly update their knowledge of the standards of good scientific practice and the state of research in their disciplines. For doctoral candidates who are doing their doctorate at the Doctoral School NRW via the Right to confer a doctorate, a mandatory course on good scientific practice is provided in the first year. Cooperative doctoral candidates are recommended to attend such a course.

§ 2 Responsibility of the Doctoral School NRW and the departments

(1) The Executive Board and the supporting universities shall create the framework conditions for academic work for the members and Affiliated Members of the Doctoral School NRW. While respecting the autonomy of the supporting universities, the Executive Board is responsible for complying with and communicating the guidelines of good scientific practice, maintaining high standards of quality assurance and establishing appropriate structures for conflict resolution. This includes

- Alignment of the qualification programs with the Framework Doctoral Degree Regulations and the Framework Doctoral Degree Program
- Established supervision structures and concepts for early career researchers (qualification programs and supervision agreements)

- Consideration of gender equality and diversity in personnel selection and development in administration, self-administration and the promotion of young academics.

(2) The Executive Board of the Doctoral School NRW shall ensure that the office of the Ombuds

Person and the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct are appropriately organized. This includes measures to reduce the workload, such as the provision of time resources in the form of reduced workloads and support services in the administrative area. The Ombuds Person and the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct generally report to the Doctoral School Senate once a year in anonymized form.

(3) The directorates of the Doctoral School NRW departments are responsible for the appropriate organization of their unit. Roles and responsibilities are to be clearly assigned, communicated and exercised. They shall ensure that the members and Affiliated Members of the department are aware of their roles, rights and duties. This responsibility includes, in particular, ensuring that junior researchers receive appropriate individual support.

(4) Both the Doctoral School NRW as an institution and at the department level shall develop suitable organizational measures to prevent the abuse of power and the exploitation of relationships of dependency.

(5) The members and Affiliated Members of the Doctoral School NRW support each other in the continuous learning and further education process and are in regular contact with each other.

§ 3 Supervision of junior researchers

(1) Special attention shall be paid to the support and training of doctoral candidates. The transfer of skills and academic support for doctoral candidates as well as supervisory and mentoring duties should be adequately performed. Doctoral candidates should be introduced to the respective subject-specific community and, through increasing independence, be enabled to shape their careers both within and outside academia.

(2) Members and Affiliated Members of Doctoral School NRW shall be appropriately informed about the applicable principles of good scientific practice and are obliged to fundamentally align their conduct with the principles of good scientific practice.

(3) A supervision agreement is concluded between Doctoral School NRW doctoral candidates and the supervision team, which is in line with the principles of good scientific practice. In the event of conflict, regulations for an ombuds procedure are established and Ombuds Persons are appointed.

(4) Cooperative doctoral candidates are subject to the University's Guidelines for Good Scientific Practice and the Regulations for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice and Dealing with Scientific Misconduct at the Doctoral School NRW.

(5) The doctoral candidates of the Doctoral School NRW have corresponding rights and obligations as members in accordance with Section 10 of the Higher Education Act and exercise participation rights accordingly.

§ 4 Criteria for recognizing achievements

(1) Academic work at Doctoral School NRW is based on quantitative and qualitative criteria. Quantitative criteria are also used to assess performance, particularly in the case of

professorial members and Affiliated Members.

(2) Quality and originality should always take precedence over quantity in the assessment of academic achievements with regard to the awarding of academic degrees and participation in the promotion of young academics. Quantitative criteria should only be reflected in the overall assessment and are to be assessed on a discipline-specific basis in particular.

(3) In addition to scientific achievements, other aspects can be taken into account when recognizing scientists and early career researchers, such as commitment to self-administration, networking in the scientific community and the transfer of ideas, knowledge and technology. Contributions in the interest of society as a whole or the scientific openness to knowledge and the willingness of individuals to take risks can also be included.

(4) Taking into account the General Equal Treatment Act, voluntarily stated individual characteristics in CVs may also be included. These include personal, family or health-related periods of absence or alternative career paths.

§ 5 Confidentiality and neutrality in assessments and consultations

(1) Researchers are obliged to behave honestly in reviews and consultations. They shall maintain strict confidentiality, which excludes, among other things, the disclosure to third parties and their own use of third-party content. In addition, they shall immediately report any facts that indicate bias or a conflict of interest to the responsible body.

(2) The obligation of confidentiality shall also apply beyond the period of office.

II Good scientific practice in the research process

§ 6 Responsibilities and roles

All members and Affiliated Members of the Doctoral School NRW must be aware of their role and responsibilities. Necessary changes, e.g. due to organizational, structural or thematic adjustments, are communicated transparently.

§ 7 Cross-phase quality assurance

(1) Researchers shall ensure that the research process is characterized by continuous quality assurance.

(2) Good scientific practice requires strict care in the selection of subject-specific methods, tools and processes as well as in the collection and analysis of data. Research questions should be answered using scientifically sound and comprehensible methods. Methodological know-how can also be acquired through cooperation. Particular attention should be paid to quality assurance and the establishment of standards in the development of new methods and applications, the collection of research data and the description of research results.

(3) As early as the research design stage, researchers conduct careful research into the current state of research and established standards and applications from practice in order to identify relevant and suitable research questions on this basis. Methods to avoid unconscious bias

should be applied when interpreting findings. The significance of gender and diversity is examined with regard to the entire research process.

(4) Researchers create clear and comprehensible documentation with all information relevant to the production of the research results. A selection of results does not take place. Negative results are also documented. Any existing professional recommendations for the review and evaluation of results must be applied and, in the case of corresponding restrictions, a comprehensible justification must be documented. Documentation and research results must be protected against manipulation as far as possible. Openness to criticism and doubts about one's own results as well as the possibility of replicability of one's own results by other scientists are essential components of quality assurance.

§ 8 Scientific publications and other communication channels

(1) In principle, research results obtained with public funds must be published and included in the scientific discourse. As far as possible, third parties should be granted access to all relevant information necessary for possible replication. The decision to publish and how to publish their research results is the responsibility of the researchers themselves; in the case of publicly funded research projects, this may not be made dependent on third parties. In individual cases, there may be reasons against publication, which must be documented. At this point, reference is made in particular to the regulations on responsibility in science.

(2) Scientific studies must be verifiable. Consequently, their publication in scientific publications must contain an exact description of the development of the hypotheses, the methods and analysis steps as well as the quality assurance applied and the results - if necessary with reference to further literature. This is particularly necessary when developing new methods. Significant findings that support the author's results and hypotheses or call them into question must also be included. The author's own and other authors' preliminary work and relevant publications by other authors on which the work is directly based must be cited as completely and correctly as possible.

(3) When communicating scientific findings via communication channels other than traditional specialist publications in books or journals, the mechanisms for quality assurance must be presented and, if necessary, prepared in a way that is appropriate for the target audience.

(4) Furthermore, the following must be observed in the event of publication:

- If the publication is to contain personal and personally identifiable data - details of the personal or factual circumstances of an identified or identifiable natural person - this is only permitted if the data subjects have expressly consented to this.
- If the scientific findings were obtained using data, organisms, materials or software from third parties, their origin must be named, stating the original sources.
- Inappropriately small-scale publications or self-referencing that goes beyond what is necessary should be avoided.
- Authors select the appropriate publication medium, taking into account quality and visibility in their discipline. The scientific quality of an individual contribution is not dependent on the publication medium chosen for publication. Even when working as an editor, careful consideration should be given to the publication medium for which

this task is undertaken.

- To promote traceability, scientists deposit research data on which their publications are based in preferably recognized (specialist) repositories or archives in accordance with the FAIR principles ("Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Useable"). This applies in particular to research data from publicly funded research.
- For publicly accessible software, the source code must be persistent, citable and documented and an appropriate license must be chosen.

(5) Falsified hypotheses or errors as well as mistakes or inconsistencies must be reported publicly. In the case of scientific publications, the authors shall work towards a correction or retraction.

§ 9 Authorship

(1) Authors are all scientists who have made significant, comprehensible contributions to the scientific content of the publication. These are in particular scientific contributions to

- the development and conception of the research project,
- the development, collection, procurement, provision of data, software or sources,
- the analysis, evaluation or interpretation of the data, the sources and the resulting conclusions and
- writing the manuscript.

Appropriate recognition and consideration of the contributions of predecessors, competitors and employees are a matter of course.

(2) Co-authorship is not established by:

- the acquisition of funding
- the provision of standard examination materials
- the instruction of employees in standard methods
- merely providing technical assistance with data collection
- merely providing technical support (e.g. mere provision of devices)
- the mere provision of data
- reading the manuscript alone without any substantial contribution to the content or
- a superior function or the head of the department or working group in which the publication was created.

The employment or service relationships between the parties involved are also irrelevant for the establishment of (co-)authorship. So-called "honorary authorship" is excluded.

(3) Authors of a text, data or software publication are jointly responsible for its content. All authors shall agree on the order of citation at the latest upon preparation of the manuscript and approve the final version of the work to be published. Consent may only be withheld with sufficient reason, such as verifiable criticism of data, methods, results or unclear rights of use.

(4) It is a violation of the rules of good scientific practice to terminate collaboration on a publication without sufficient reason or to obstruct or refuse publication of the results as a co-author without an urgent reason.

§ 10 Legal and ethical framework conditions and rights of use

(1) The members and Affiliated Members of the Doctoral School NRW shall treat the constitutionally granted freedom of research responsibly. They shall take into account rights and obligations, in particular those resulting from legal requirements and contracts with third parties.

(2) The members and Affiliated Members of Doctoral School NRW shall enter into documented agreements on the rights of use of the research results at the earliest possible stage in the research project. In particular, the documented agreements shall include provisions if

- several academic and/or non-academic institutions are involved,
- it is foreseeable that a member or Affiliated Member(s) will leave the Doctoral School NRW and the data generated will continue to be used for (their own) research purposes.

In particular, the researchers who collect the research results are entitled to use them. As part of an ongoing research project, the authorized users decide whether third parties should also have access to data, taking into account data protection regulations. Third parties who are granted access to data are also obliged to observe the rights and obligations arising from the handling of research data.

(3) The responsibility of the members and Affiliated Members of Doctoral School NRW is not limited to compliance with legal requirements, but also includes the obligation to use their knowledge, experience and skills in such a way that risks can be recognized, assessed and evaluated. The risk of misuse of research results must be consciously considered against the background of ethical aspects of research with and on humans as well as security-related risks to human dignity, life, health, freedom, property, the environment or the peaceful coexistence of peoples. If special approvals or ethics votes are required to carry out a research project, these must be obtained.

(4) The Doctoral School NRW shall develop regulations for the Commission on Responsibility in Science of the Doctoral School NRW, a set of ethics rules and a procedure for the ethical and safety-related assessment of research projects and establish a Commission on Responsibility in Science.

§ 11 Archiving of research results and research data

(1) Research results and research data shall be archived by the higher education institutions at which the research is based. The higher education institutions shall ensure that the necessary infrastructure is available to enable archiving.

(2) The more detailed regulations, in particular with regard to retention periods and access regulations, shall be determined by the universities.

(3) Excluded from this are all documents relating to the doctoral procedure under the Doctoral School NRW's own Right to confer a doctorate. These are archived at the Doctoral School

NRW.

III. Non-compliance with good scientific practice at Doctoral School NRW

§ 12 Protection of whistleblowers and accused persons, presumption of innocence

(1) All persons involved in a procedure to review Scientific Misconduct at Doctoral School NRW shall take appropriate measures to protect the whistleblower and the accused and maintain strict confidentiality. The principle of the presumption of innocence applies. Neither the whistleblower nor the accused, the latter at least until scientific misconduct has been established, may suffer disadvantages for their own professional and scientific advancement, e.g. due to delays during ongoing qualification procedures. §§ Sections 186 and 187 StGB (defamation, slander) remain unaffected.

(2) The following applies to whistleblowers in the proceedings:

- The name of the person will not be disclosed to third parties without his or her consent. Exceptions to this are legal obligations or the necessity of disclosure in order to give the accused the opportunity for a proper defense related to the identity.
- Before the name of the person must be disclosed to the accused or to persons not involved in the investigation, the whistleblower will be informed of this. He or she can then decide whether the report should be withdrawn.
- The identity of the whistleblower is public if the whistleblower chooses the route of reporting via the public itself. In this case, the following procedure will decide how to deal with this breach of confidentiality.

(3) Whistleblowers shall also be protected in cases of unproven Scientific Misconduct, provided that the allegations made are not obviously unfounded.

(4) In principle, a report can also be made anonymously. The review of an anonymous complaint requires the presentation of sufficiently concrete and reliable facts by the person making the complaint to enable a review. If this is not the case, the review can be rejected.

§ 13 Scientific Misconduct

(1) According to the DFG's Code of Good Scientific Practice (2020), Scientific Misconduct is deemed to have occurred "if false statements are made deliberately or through gross negligence in a scientifically relevant context, if the intellectual property of others is infringed or if their research activities are otherwise impaired. The circumstances of the individual case are decisive in each case". Violations of the rules of good scientific practice include, in particular

- Incorrect information
- the invention of data,
- falsifying data, for example by selecting and rejecting undesirable results without disclosing this, by manipulating a representation or illustration,
- incorrect information in a letter of application or an application for funding (including

incorrect information on the publication organ and on publications in print).

- Infringement of intellectual property

- in relation to a copyrighted work created by one or another, or to substantial scientific findings, hypotheses, doctrines or research approaches originating from others:
 - unauthorized use under presumption of authorship (plagiarism),
 - the exploitation of research approaches and ideas, especially as a reviewer (theft of ideas),
 - the presumption or unfounded Acceptance of scientific authorship or co-authorship,
 - the falsification of the content,
 - unauthorized publication and unauthorized making available to third parties as long as the work, finding, hypothesis, doctrine or research approach has not yet been published.
- Claiming the (co-)authorship of another person without his or her consent
- Sabotage of research activity (including damaging, destroying or tampering with experimental equipment, devices, records, hardware, software, chemicals or other items needed by another or others to conduct an experiment).
- Removal of primary data, insofar as this violates legal provisions or discipline-related recognized principles of scientific work.

(2) Shared responsibility for misconduct may result from, among other things:

- active participation in the misconduct of others,
- Knowledge of counterfeiting by others,
- Co-authorship of falsified publications,
- gross neglect of supervisory duties in research projects ,
- Lack of instruction of those involved in Research regarding the rules of good scientific practice
- other gross violation of the duty of supervision in the case of doctoral candidates.

(3) In order to deal with cases of Scientific Misconduct, the Doctoral School NRW provides for the appointment of an Ombuds Person and establishes a Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct.

§14 Ombuds Person

(1) In agreement with the Chair of the Doctoral School Senate, the Chair of the Executive Board shall propose to the Doctoral School Senate academics who are members of the Doctoral School NRW for election as Ombuds Person and deputy. The Doctoral School Senate elects the Ombuds Person and the deputy by simple majority. After election by the Doctoral School Senate, those elected receive a letter of appointment from the Chair of the Executive Board.

(2) The Ombuds Person and their deputy may not be members of a governing body of Doctoral School NRW during their term of office. Their term of office is limited to three years; further terms of office are possible.

(3) The Ombuds Person's tasks are to advise, support and mediate. Questions of labor, disciplinary and financial law are not the responsibility of the ombudsperson. In cases relating

to the area of responsibility of the participating supporting universities or the cooperative universities, the ombudsperson shall refer the matter to the competent authorities.

(4) As a neutral and qualified person of trust, the Ombuds Person advises both generally on questions of good scientific practice and specifically in cases in which he or she becomes aware of suspected Scientific Misconduct. The Ombudsperson also advises members and Affiliated Members of Doctoral School NRW, in particular early career researchers, who have been involved in a case of Scientific Misconduct through no fault of their own, on how they can maintain or restore their academic and personal reputation.

(5) The principles of the Ombuds Person's work are confidentiality and fairness. The Ombuds Person is not bound by instructions and is obliged to maintain confidentiality and impartiality.

(6) The Doctoral School NRW will publish the contact details of the Ombuds Person on its homepage and endeavor to achieve similar visibility for the Ombuds Persons at the supporting universities and the universities.

§ 15 Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct

(1) The Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct shall be established as a permanent commission. It shall consist of one professorial member from each of three different departments, with one representative each from the social sciences, humanities or cultural sciences, natural sciences and engineering sciences. A deputy is appointed for each member. The representative is called in if a member is absent in order to keep delays to a minimum. Any biases must be taken into account when appointing the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct.

(2) In consultation with the Chair of the Doctoral School Senate, the Chair of the Executive Board shall propose the members and representatives of the standing committee to the Doctoral School Senate. The Doctoral School Senate elects the members and representatives of the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct in separate ballots by simple majority. After election by the Doctoral School Senate, the members and representatives of the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct receive a letter of appointment from the Chair of the Executive Board.

(3) The members of the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct and their deputies may not be members of a governing body of the Doctoral School NRW during their term of office. Their term of office is limited to three years; further terms of office are possible.

(4) The Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct shall appoint one of its members as Chairperson for a period of three years. When appointing the members of the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct, attention should be paid to a balanced gender ratio. The Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct may consult other experts as required.

§ 16 Procedure in the event of suspected misconduct

(1) The Doctoral School NRW Ombuds Person shall become active if there is a report of

Scientific Misconduct. Reports can also be submitted anonymously. If there is no complaint, it is at the discretion of the Ombuds Person to investigate 'rumors' or 'heard accusations' in order to protect the person concerned and to enter into a conversation with the person concerned.

(2) If a report is withdrawn by a whistleblower, it is up to the Ombuds Person to decide whether to continue the proceedings in the event of a well-founded or substantiated suspicion of Scientific Misconduct.

(3) The Doctoral School NRW Ombuds Person works on the basis of the principles of confidentiality, fairness and transparency for the parties involved.

(4) Members and Affiliated Members of the Doctoral School NRW may contact the Ombuds Person of the Doctoral School NRW if there are objective indications of Scientific Misconduct relating to the area of responsibility of the Doctoral School NRW. In cases of Scientific Misconduct that do not relate to the area of responsibility of the Doctoral School NRW and the conduct of the doctorate, the Ombuds Person of the supporting university or university at which the Scientific Misconduct is suspected is responsible.

(5) The Doctoral School NRW Ombuds Person shall cooperate with the Ombuds Persons of the supporting universities and the universities while observing confidentiality.

(6) Members and Affiliated Members of the Doctoral School NRW have the option of contacting the "Ombudsman for Science" Body or Board or Committee. As an independent body, the "Ombudsman for Science" is available to all scientists in Germany for questions and conflicts in the area of good scientific practice and scientific integrity.

(7) Ombuds Persons of the supporting universities, universities and the Doctoral School NRW as well as the Body or Board or Committee "Ombudsman for Science" can be contacted in cases where there is uncertainty as to whether an observed behavior constitutes Scientific Misconduct or if the facts cannot be verified themselves.

(8) The tasks of the Doctoral School NRW Ombuds Person are to clarify and resolve conflicts in matters of good scientific practice. The Doctoral School NRW Ombuds Person is not responsible for determining Scientific Misconduct. The decision on the facts of scientific misconduct is made exclusively by the Standing Committee for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct.

(9) In the event of a non-anonymous complaint, the Ombuds Person of the Doctoral School NRW shall examine the allegations made separately with the accused and the whistleblower.

(10) The procedure is terminated when the Ombuds Person of the Doctoral School NRW is able to resolve the reported conflict or a reconciliation of interests is achieved and the suspected case of a violation of good scientific practice no longer exists.

(11) If the suspicion of Scientific Misconduct is not completely dispelled, the Ombuds Person of the Doctoral School NRW shall hand over the proceedings to the Executive Board while maintaining confidentiality. The Executive Board shall hand over the proceedings to the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct.

§ 17 Work of the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct

(1) In its proceedings, the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct shall observe the principles of hearing the parties involved, confidentiality, the presumption of innocence and the principles of impartiality.

(2) In the event of an investigation, the following procedural rules shall be observed by the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct:

- The Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct does not meet in public. The meeting can be held in person, as a video conference or hybrid.
- The Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct is only quorate if three nominated professors or their deputies attend the meeting
- Resolutions are passed by a simple majority.
- The Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct is entitled to take all steps necessary to clarify the facts of the case. It may obtain all necessary information and opinions for this purpose and, in individual cases, also consult reviewers from the relevant scientific field. Care should be taken to ensure that the procedure is concluded within a reasonable period of time.

(3) The accused shall be informed of the incriminating facts and any available evidence.

(4) Both the accused and the informant shall be given the opportunity to make an oral statement. The person concerned shall have the right to inspect the files.

(5) Upon conclusion of the procedure, the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct shall submit a report to the Executive Board with the results of the investigation and a recommendation on how to proceed.

(6) In the event that the suspicion of Scientific Misconduct has not been confirmed, the proceedings shall be terminated.

(7) If the suspicion of a violation of good scientific practice cannot be dispelled, the Executive Board shall decide on further action on the basis of the report and the recommendation of the Commission for the Investigation of Scientific Misconduct.

(8) The accused and the whistleblower shall be informed in writing of the Executive Board's decision. The main reasons that led to the decision must be communicated.

§ 18 Sanctions

(1) In cases of proven Scientific Misconduct, the Doctoral School NRW reserves the right to apply sanctions depending on the degree of severity. These may include, but are not limited to

- Admonition or written reprimand of the person concerned by the Chairperson of the Executive Board
- Withdrawal of membership
- Ineligibility to submit a new application to Doctoral School NRW

- Reclaiming funding granted by the Doctoral School NRW
- Withdrawal or correction of publications that are erroneous due to Scientific Misconduct, provided they have not yet been published
- Withdrawal of the doctoral degree

(2) If Scientific Misconduct is proven, the Doctoral School NRW will inform the sending supporting university or the university involved, regardless of the degree of severity.

§ 19 Conclusion of the proceedings

(1) The Doctoral School NRW may be obliged to inform affected third parties and the public in order to protect third parties, to maintain confidence in academic honesty, to restore the academic reputation, to prevent consequential damage and in the general public interest.

(2) The Executive Board shall decide on the form of information to be provided to third parties and the public in consultation with the Board of Supporters.

IV Final provisions

§ 20 Transparency

The Doctoral School NRW will communicate these principles and rules to all members and Affiliated Members in an appropriate manner and ensure compliance with the guidelines of good scientific practice, taking into account the autonomy of the universities.

§ 21 Entry into force

The Regulations for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice and Dealing with Scientific Misconduct at the Doctoral School NRW enter into force on the day following their publication in the Doctoral School NRW Gazette.

Issued on the basis of the decision of the Doctoral School Senate of the Doctoral School NRW of 19.04.2022.

Sankt Augustin, 19.04.2022

The Chairman of the Doctoral School Senate
signed. *Jung*

(Prof. Dr. Norbert Jung)

Bochum, 10.06.2022

The Chairman of the Executive Board
signed. *Sternberg*

(Prof. Dr. Martin Sternberg)