

Disclaimer: This English translation is provided for informational purposes. Only the German version of this document is legally valid and enforceable.

Statutes on Good Research Practice Europa-Universität Flensburg

Dated August 1, 2024

Announcement in NBl. HS MBWFK Schl.-H., p. 56

Date of announcement on the EUF website: August 1, 2024

Pursuant to § 6 paragraph 2 sentence 1 of the Higher Education Act (HSG) in the version of the announcement dated February 5, 2016 (GVOBl. Schl.-H., p. 39), last amended by Article 1 of the law dated February 3, 2022 (GVOBl. Schl.-H., p. 102), the following statute is enacted following a resolution by the Senate of the Europa-Universität Flensburg on July 3, 2024.

Content

Chapter 1 Good Research Practice

Section 1 Research Practice

- § 1 General principles of research practice
- § 2 Specific duties requiring action
- § 3 Data security
- § 4 Authorship
- § 5 Primacy of quality
- § 6 Special Code of Research

Section 2 Supervision

- § 7 Responsibility of senior researchers
- § 8 Supervision of early-career researchers
- § 9 Supervision of students and doctoral researchers

Chapter 2 Academic Misconduct

Section 3 Types of Academic Misconduct

- § 10 Academic misconduct
- § 11 False statements
- § 12 Violation of third-party rights
- § 13 Hindrance of third-party research activities
- § 14 Responsibility

Section 4 Procedures for Handling Academic Misconduct

- § 15 Handling academic misconduct
- § 16 Ombudsperson for upholding the rules of good research practice
- § 17 Plausibility checks (preliminary procedure)
- § 18 Committee for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct
- § 19 Confidentiality of the Committee's work

- § 20 Principles of the Committee's work
- § 21 Investigation procedure (main procedure)
- § 22 Termination of the investigation procedure
- § 23 Punitive measures against academic misconduct
- § 24 Rehabilitation
- § 25 Procedural Principles

Section 5 Academic Misconduct by Students

- § 26 Students and doctoral researchers

Chapter 3 Final Provisions

- § 27 Entry into force, Repeal

Annex 1 Special Code of Conduct

Annex 2

Chapter 1 Good Research Practice

Section 1 Research Practice

§ 1 General principles of research practice

(1) Europa-Universität Flensburg commits its employees and affiliates to full adherence to the rules of good research practice, as adopted in the resolution of the general assembly of the German Research Foundation on July 3, 2019.

(2) These principles require honesty, integrity, and responsibility in research. In academic teaching, they are conveyed in the introductory courses of the bachelor's and master's degree programs. In these courses, students are also sensitized to possible academic misconduct.

(3) Academic staff, doctoral researchers, and post-docs shall be selected solely on the basis of professional criteria at every stage of their careers. Discrimination of any kind is not permissible.

(4) The compatibility of family life and research work shall be sought.

(5) Members and affiliates of Europa-Universität Flensburg who are active in teaching and research shall independently adhere to the standards of good research practice. These include, in particular:

1. Working in accordance with the research standards of one's own discipline (*lege artis*) and within the framework of legal regulations,
2. Transparently documenting and publishing results and data,
3. Consistently questioning all results, and allowing and encouraging critical discourse within the research community, and
4. Maintaining strict honesty regarding one's own contributions and those of others.

§ 2 Specific duties requiring action

The obligation to adhere to the "Principles of Good Research Practice" particularly entails a commitment to:

1. Comprehensively considering and acknowledging the current state of research when planning a project. Identifying relevant and appropriate research questions requires careful investigation of the research that is already publicly available. Europa-Universität Flensburg ensures the necessary framework conditions for this.
2. Transparently and comprehensibly describing the methods used
3. Comprehensively documenting, in accordance with the requirements set forth in these statutes, all data collected during the research process as well as any publication-relevant data
4. Using representations and illustrations in accordance with applicable copyright law
5. Presenting research results in a verifiable manner
6. Claiming sole or co-authorship of another person only with their declared consent
7. Not hindering third parties in their research work in any way, such as through sabotage or misinformation
8. Respecting the rights of third parties, especially concerning significant research findings, hypotheses, teachings, or approaches, as well as copyrighted works

Prohibited actions include:

1. Plagiarism, i.e., the unauthorized use of the intellectual property of others by claiming authorship or feigning scientific authorship or co-authorship
2. Idea theft – that is, the exploitation of another person's research approaches and ideas without naming the author, especially as a reviewer
3. Content distortion or unauthorized publication
4. Unauthorized disclosure to third parties of another person's research work or data before the research work, underlying research approach, knowledge or insights, hypothesis, or result have been published and made generally accessible

§ 3 Data security

Primary data on which publications are based should be stored for at least ten years on durable and secure media at the Europa-Universität Flensburg facility where they were generated, in a manner that ensures their accessibility during that period. Alternatively, this data can also be stored on external repositories that meet this requirement.

§ 4 Authorship

An author, in the context of these regulations, is someone who has made a genuine, traceable contribution to the content of an academic text, data, or software publication. So-called "honorary authorship," meaning authorship without a personal contribution, is excluded from this definition. All authors of a research publication shall agree to the final version of the work to be published. They bear joint responsibility for the publication unless explicitly stated otherwise.

§ 5 Primacy of quality

Academic originality and quality – understood as an independent contribution to the academic development of the field – take precedence over mere quantity as evaluation criteria for examinations and the awarding of academic degrees.

§ 6 Special Code of Research

The Special Code of Research contains additional regulations and is included as Annex 1 to these statutes.

Section 2 Supervision

§ 7 Responsibility of senior researchers

Notwithstanding the responsibility of the university management, every head of a research institution and research group leader is tasked with ensuring an appropriate organizational structure their area. This organization must ensure the clear assignment and actual execution of leadership, supervision, quality assurance, and conflict resolution tasks and duties. Researchers in early career stages should be appropriately guided and supervised in accordance with their qualification levels.

§ 8 Supervision of early-career researchers

- (1) Special attention shall be given to the training and promotion of researchers in early career stages and to their instruction on adhering to the principles of good research practice.
- (2) At the start of their academic careers, researchers in early career stages must be informed about the professional image of a researcher and the opportunities and risks of a research career. They should be given opportunities to exchange ideas and reflect on their own ideas and assumptions.
- (3) During the research qualification phase, the personal and family circumstances of research staff shall be considered. This is especially the case for individuals with special needs as per § 52 Paragraph 4 Numbers 1 to 3 of the HSG.
- (4) Supervisors shall support and promote early-career researchers in an appropriate academic manner, so that the targeted research goals can be achieved within the intended timeframe.

§ 9 Supervision of students and doctoral researchers

Students, doctoral researchers, and graduates of Europa-Universität Flensburg and its institutions shall receive appropriate and continuous guidance and supervision from all full-time and part-time teaching and research staff. Intensive and repeated instruction and guidance in the principles of good research practice is an essential component of this continuous support.

Chapter 2 Academic Misconduct

Section 3 Types of Academic Misconduct

§ 10 Academic misconduct

Academic misconduct occurs when, in an academic context, false statements are intentionally or negligently made, or the rights of third parties (such as intellectual property rights) are violated or their research activities are hindered. For cases of student misconduct and misconduct by doctoral students, § 26 of these statutes additionally applies.

§ 11 False statements

False statements specifically refer to:

1. Data falsification, which includes inventing, altering, or distorting data, or
2. Incorrect information about a publication medium and forthcoming (in-press) publication, or
3. Failure to disclose parallel publications.

§ 12 Violation of third-party rights

The rights of third parties are violated when a person, for example:

1. Publishes or uses without authorization a copyrighted work created by another, while claiming authorship (plagiarism) or distorting its content,
2. Claims co-authorship of a work without having contributed to it,
3. Conceals significant contributions from staff members, colleagues, or superiors, or
4. Presents or uses as their own the insights, hypotheses, or research approaches that have been confidentially submitted by another for review

§ 13 Hindrance of third-party research activities

Hindrance of research activities particularly includes damaging, destroying, or manipulating experimental setups, equipment, documents, hardware, software, chemicals, or other materials needed by third parties to conduct an experiment, as well as manipulating or destroying data. It is also impermissible to harm researchers or their research projects through slanderous or defamatory assertions, or false statements intended to demean.

§ 14 Responsibility

The responsibility for academic misconduct arises not only from one's own actions or omissions, but also from knowingly and intentionally, i.e., deliberately or through gross negligence, participating in the misconduct of others, as well as from gross negligence in one's supervisory duties.

Section 4 Procedures for Handling Academic Misconduct

§ 15 Handling academic misconduct

- (1) Europa-Universität Flensburg investigates any specific suspicion of academic misconduct among its members and affiliates.
- (2) For this purpose, it establishes the Committee for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct (Committee for Good Research Practice, hereinafter referred to as the Investigative Committee) and appoints an Ombudsperson for compliance with the rules of good research practice (Ombudsperson).
- (3) Researchers may reach out to the Ombudsperson; if appropriate or necessary, they may also directly contact the Investigative Committee. Alternatively, those in need of guidance may contact the supra-regional Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity in Germany (Ombudsgremium für die wissenschaftliche Integrität in Deutschland).
- (4) If, after thorough clarification of the facts, the suspicion of academic misconduct is confirmed, the university management shall take appropriate measures, within the bounds of legal possibility, to penalize the misconduct and to uphold the research standards of Europa-Universität Flensburg.

§ 16 Ombudsperson for upholding the rules of good research practice

- (1) On the recommendation of the university leadership, the Senate shall appoint a faculty member of Europa-Universität Flensburg to serve as an independent Ombudsperson, along with two deputies. The deputies shall assume the duties of the Ombudsperson in case of bias, perceived bias, or the Ombudsperson's incapacity. The group consisting of the Ombudsperson and the Ombudsperson's deputies should include members representing all three faculties. They may not belong to any central managing body of Europa-Universität Flensburg while serving in this office. Persons chosen as Ombudspersons must be integrity-driven researchers with leadership experience. They shall receive the necessary substantive support and acceptance in performing their duties.
- (2) The term of office is three years; re-election is possible once. If the Ombudsperson departs prematurely, the Senate shall elect a new Ombudsperson and two new deputies to serve full terms. If one of the deputies departs prematurely, the Senate shall elect a new deputy for the remaining term.
- (3) The appointment of the Ombudsperson and their deputies, as well as their contact details, shall be announced to the university.
- (4) The Ombudsperson advises all members and affiliates of Europa-Universität Flensburg in matters of good research practice and explains the rules to be observed.
- (5) The Ombudsperson examines reports of possible violations against the rules of good research practice set forth in these statutes, based on plausibility criteria regarding the specificity and relevance of the reported information. The Ombudsperson advises those seeking counsel on options for further action and, in cases of conflict, mediates between the conflicting parties, and works toward a solution. Further details are regulated in § 17 of these Statutes.
- (6) In performing their duties, the Ombudsperson and their deputies are obligated to maintain absolute confidentiality.

§ 17 Plausibility checks (preliminary procedure)

(1) The Ombudsperson shall first carry out a confidential examination of any information submitted to them with regard to suspected academic misconduct, as per Sections 1 and 3 of these statutes, to assess its plausibility in terms of specificity and relevance and with the presumption of innocence. An anonymous report can only be examined if the informant presents the Ombudsperson with reliable and sufficiently concrete facts.

(2) In the case of a well-founded initial suspicion, the Ombudsperson shall refer the matter to the Investigative Committee, thereby initiating the main procedure. The person seeking advice also retains the right to contact the Investigative Committee directly.

(3) If the Ombudsperson decides not to initiate a main procedure, they shall notify the person who provided the information. The informant then has four weeks to appeal the decision, if they so wish, by submitting a counterstatement to the Investigative Committee, which in turn shall examine the plausibility of opening a main procedure. The decision of the Investigative Committee as to whether to initiate a main procedure is not contestable.

(4) If the Investigative Committee becomes aware of suspected academic misconduct, it shall ask the Ombudsperson to carry out a plausibility check. In addition, § 15 Paragraph 3 of these statutes applies.

(5) In examining any suspicions of academic misconduct, the Ombudsperson and the investigative committee shall strive to protect both the informant and those affected by the allegations. The reporting of the allegations must not adversely affect the academic or professional advancement of either the informant or the accused.

§ 18 Committee for the Investigation of Academic Misconduct

(1) To clarify academic misconduct in accordance with Sections 1 and 3 of these Statutes, the Senate of Europa-Universität Flensburg shall appoint an Investigative Committee on the recommendation of the university management.

(2) The committee shall consist of three members of Europa-Universität Flensburg, at least two of whom must be full-time professors. The term of office is three years. In the event of a member's premature departure, the Senate shall select a new member for the remaining term.

(3) If a member of the committee is suspected of bias as per § 81a LVwG or if there is a reason for exclusion within the meaning of § 81 LVwG, that person shall be excluded from handling the specific case. To determine bias, before handling a specific case the members of the committee shall provide a statement in accordance with Annex 2 to these statutes. This appendix is an integral part of these statutes. In case of doubt, the Executive Board [Presidium] shall decide whether there is a bias. The Senate shall elect a substitute member for the biased committee member or should a committee member be unable to attend. This substitute member shall perform the duties of the biased member only in that specific case.

(4) The Investigative Committee shall elect one of its members to act as its chairperson.

(5) When dealing with cases of academic misconduct, the Investigative Committee may seek advice from individuals who have special experience in these matters and/or may seek external legal support. No more than two individuals can be consulted per case. The chairperson shall instruct these individuals regarding, in particular, their duty of confidentiality. If any costs are incurred, these are to be discussed in advance with the university management.

(6) The Investigative Committee is independent of official directives, but is subject to legal supervision by the university management.

(7) The university management shall assign to the Investigative Committee a member of the university administration who is qualified to hold judicial office, and with whom investigation committee shall coordinate all procedural acts from a legal point of view.

§ 19 Confidentiality of the Committee's work

(1) The members of the Investigative Committee are bound by absolute confidentiality. This also applies to former committee members.

(2) The sharing of documents and committee reports to third parties is prohibited.

(3) The term "third parties" does not include the Ombudsperson for compliance with the rules of good research practice, newly elected members of the Investigative Committee, the Executive Board of Europa-Universität Flensburg, the legal department of Europa-Universität Flensburg, and state law enforcement agencies.

§ 20 Principles of the Committee's work

(1) The Investigative Committee shall meet in closed sessions. The Ombudsperson and the assigned member from the university administration shall be allowed to attend without voting rights.

(2) All participants in oral or written proceedings of the Investigative Committee are bound by absolute confidentiality.

(3) Investigations into allegations of academic misconduct shall be conducted in strict compliance with the basic principle of the presumption of innocence.

(4) Decisions of the Investigative Committee are passed by a simple majority. There is no internal appeals process against decisions of the Investigative Committee.

(5) The Investigation Committee is authorized to take all legally possible steps to clarify the facts of the case. To this end, it may obtain all necessary information and opinions. In individual cases, it may also seek advice and counsel from external experts from the academic field concerned.

(6) The Investigative Committee can assign one of its members to act as a reporter to investigate the facts of the case. The reporter shall coordinate their investigations with the Investigative Committee and report back to the Investigative Committee on the facts established. After this presentation, the Investigative Committee shall decide whether further investigations are needed, or whether it will accept the results of the investigation.

(7) The person concerned must be informed of the incriminating facts and, if applicable, the evidence of the Investigative Committee.

(8) The person concerned must be heard on the matter. They can make statements to the Commission both orally and in writing.

(9) Both the affected individual and the informant shall be given the opportunity to comment during each stage of the process.

(10) The informant's report must be made in good faith. Deliberately false or willful allegations may themselves constitute academic misconduct.

(11) The name of the informant, if known, is to be treated confidentially and not disclosed to third parties without appropriate consent. Exceptions only apply if there is a legal obligation or because the person affected by the allegations cannot defend themselves appropriately, because this (exceptionally) depends on the identity of the informant. Before the informant's name is disclosed, the informant shall be immediately told; the informant can decide whether to withdraw the report if

their name is likely to be disclosed. If the informant goes public with their suspicions, the confidentiality of the procedure is compromised. The investigating body shall decide on a case-by-case basis how to deal with the informant's breach of confidentiality. The informant must also be protected in cases where the academic misconduct remains unproven, unless it can be shown that the allegations were made despite the informant's knowledge to the contrary.

(12) If Committee is investigating allegations of academic misconduct against a member of the Executive Board (Präsidium), all of the Executive Board's decisions relating to this procedure shall be made in the absence of the person concerned. This particularly applies to decisions concerning any potential bias of Committee members in accordance with § 18 paragraph 3, as well as decisions related to the assessment of investigation results, any resulting measures that may be taken against the individual concerned, and the information of third parties pursuant to § 23 paragraphs 1, 2 and 6.

§ 21 Investigation procedure (main procedure)

(1) If, after the plausibility check, the Ombudsperson refers a suspected case of research misconduct to the Investigative Committee, the latter shall initiate a full investigation of the facts and promptly inform the university management.

(2) In accordance with the standard legal rules for the free assessment of evidence, the Investigative Committee shall determine whether it is convinced that academic misconduct has been proven.

(3) The Investigative Committee shall inform the accused person of the allegations, citing the incriminating facts and evidence, and ask them for a position statement.

§ 22 Termination of the investigation procedure

(1) If the Investigative Committee believes that the alleged academic misconduct has been clarified to the fullest extent possible, it shall conclude the investigation procedure with this determination.

(2) The Committee shall report its findings to the university management and submit its decision recommendation for a decision, including, where applicable, any specific proposals regarding measures to be taken, pursuant to 23 Paragraph 2 Sentence 4 Numbers 1 to 11.

(3) The decision to terminate or discontinue the investigation procedure, or to forward it to the university management, must be justified in writing and promptly communicated in writing to the affected person and the informant, with reference to the fact that the final decision rests with the university management.

(4) At the end of the main procedure, the Ombudsperson shall inform all persons who are or were involved in the case of its outcome. The Ombudsperson shall also advise those individuals, especially early-career researchers or students, who were involved in academic misconduct incidents through no fault of their own, in matters concerning the safeguarding of their personal and academic integrity.

§ 23 Punitive measures against academic misconduct

(1) The university management shall decide, based on the final report and the recommendation of the Investigative Committee, whether to discontinue the main procedure or whether academic misconduct has been sufficiently proven.

(2) In cases of academic misconduct, the university management shall take into account the

specific circumstances of the case at hand and determine appropriate disciplinary action to uphold the academic standards of Europa-Universität Flensburg. Possible measures include oral or written reprimands, as well as (in particular) employment and disciplinary measures. If the revocation of an academic degree is considered, the responsible bodies shall be involved. In accordance with the principle of proportionality, the university administration may impose the following sanctions and take the following measures, either individually or cumulatively:

1. A written reprimand
2. A request to the accused to retract or correct incriminated publications or refrain from publishing incriminated manuscripts
3. Withdrawal of funding decisions or termination of funding agreements, where the decision was made by the university or the contract was entered into by the university, potentially including a reclamation of funds.
4. Temporary exclusion from serving as a reviewer or committee member of the university
5. For university employees: employment-related warnings, termination of the employment contract, or extraordinary dismissal
6. For civil servants of the university: initiation of disciplinary proceedings under civil service law, including interim measures as applicable
7. Filing a criminal complaint with the police or public prosecutor
8. Filing a notice of regulatory offenses with the relevant authority
9. Assertion of civil claims, including through interim legal protection, particularly for damages restitution, or removal/injunction
10. Assertion of any public law claims, including through interim legal protection
11. Initiation of proceedings for the revocation of an academic degree or recommendation to initiate such proceedings according to the applicable doctoral or habilitation regulations valid at the time of the conclusion of the investigation

(3) The person concerned must be immediately informed in writing of the university management's decision. The main reasons leading to the decision must also be communicated

(4) In the event of a confirmed breach of duty, the decision will also be communicated to affected academic organizations. It will also be shared with third parties that have a legitimate interest in the decision. The university management will decide, at its discretion, whether and how this applies. It will also determine whether and how the information will be made public. Communications under this paragraph may include a justification.

§ 24 Rehabilitation

If the suspicion of academic misconduct has been unjustly raised, the university management shall initiate all necessary measures for the complete rehabilitation of the accused person.

§ 25 Procedural principles

(1) The investigation and decision-making procedures under these regulations must be carried out without culpable delay. The entire main procedure should be completed within six months at the latest, unless specific circumstances of the individual case prevent this.

(2) The records of the main procedure shall be kept for 30 years by the university management of Europa-Universität Flensburg. After this period, they shall be destroyed.

Section 5 Academic Misconduct by Students

§ 26 Students and doctoral researchers

(1) In cases of academic misconduct by students during examinations taken during the course of their studies, the designated Examination Committee is responsible (in deviation from these regulations), as set forth in the supplementary regulations of the relevant Examination Regulations. In cases of academic misconduct by doctoral researchers within the scope of their doctoral project, the designated Doctoral Committee is responsible (in deviation from these regulations), as set forth in the regulations of the relevant doctoral regulations.

(2) The responsibility of the Ombudsperson and the Investigative Committee for all other cases of academic misconduct by the groups of persons noted in Paragraph 1 remains unaffected.

(3) In cases of academic misconduct by students or doctoral researchers not covered by paragraph 1, the Ombudsperson shall issue a statement as to whether and under what conditions the opportunity to complete a degree can be granted, and whether any conditions must be met.

(4) The university management shall decide whether to exclude the student from further studies or doctoral candidacy upon the request of the Examination Committee, the Doctoral Committee, or the Investigative Committee, unless the Examination and Doctoral Regulations set forth different regulations. Paragraph 1 remains unaffected.

Chapter 3 Final Provisions

§ 27 Entry into force, Repeal

These statutes come into effect the day after its announcement. The Europa-Universität Flensburg Statutes on Good Research Practice dated June 12, 2023 ((NBl. HS MBWFK Schl.-H., p. 43) is thereby repealed.

Flensburg, August 1, 2024

Europa-Universität Flensburg

Prof. Dr. Werner Reinhart, President

Annex 1

Special Code of Research

1. Preamble

Researchers are responsible for actively upholding and advocating for the fundamental values and norms of academic work. These are outlined both in this code and in the Statutes on Good Research Practice of Europa-Universität Flensburg.

Education in the foundations of good research practice begins at the earliest possible stage in academic teaching and scholarly training. Researchers of all career levels continually refresh their understanding of the standards of sound research practice and the evolving state of research. This process is further enriched by the constant exchange of knowledge and ideas between seasoned researchers and those in the early stages of their careers. The Special Code of Research is mandatory for all members and affiliates of Europa-Universität Flensburg.

2. Responsibilities

2.1. The *Präsidium* [hereafter referred to as the “Executive Board”], faculty leadership, and directors of the university's flagship research centers create the conditions for research endeavors. They are tasked with promoting and ensuring adherence to sound research practices and providing appropriate career support for all researchers. The heads of the faculties and flagship research centers ensure that researchers can comply with legal and ethical standards.

The Executive Board bears the responsibility for establishing an appropriate institutional organizational structure. The size and organization of research work units are designed to ensure that leadership tasks—particularly in the areas of skills training, research guidance, supervision, and mentorship—can be appropriately carried out.

This organizational structure ensures that the tasks of leadership, supervision, quality assurance, and conflict management are clearly allocated in accordance with the size of each individual research work unit and appropriately communicated to the members, employees and affiliates. In the statutes of its Central Ethics Committee and Ethics Commission, Europa-Universität Flensburg has set forth binding principles for research ethics and defined the procedures for assessing ethical issues related to research projects.

The relevant regulations are also contained in the Doctoral Regulations, the Habilitation Regulations, the Appointment Statutes, the Statutes for the Interim and Final Evaluation of Junior Professors, the Tenure-Track Professorship Statutes (TTP Statutes), the Senior Professorship Statutes, the Statutes on Performance-Related Bonuses, the Gender Equality Plan for Parity, and the Personnel Development Concept. These documents outline the established policies and procedures for staff selection and development, as well as for the promotion of early career researchers and equal opportunity.

2.2 The head an academic unit is responsible for the entirety of that unit. If seminars or departments exist within an institute, the leadership bears full responsibility for that area. The assumption of leadership tasks is associated with a corresponding responsibility. Basic provisions regarding roles, rights, and duties for each employee status group are outlined in the

Orientierungsrahmen.¹ Individual regulations concerning roles, rights, and duties are determined with each staff member based on their specific job description. Annual staff performance reviews are conducted to support the reflection on and ongoing development of role understanding.

Researchers and research support staff benefit from a balance between support and autonomy appropriate to their career level. They are granted adequate status with corresponding participatory rights. Through gradually increasing autonomy, they are empowered to shape their careers.

2.3 Abuse of power and the exploitation of dependent relationships are countered through appropriate organizational measures, both at the level of individual work units and at the level of university management.

2.4 The roles and responsibilities of the researchers and research support staff who participate in a research project must be clear at each stage of the project. Regular communication ensures this clarity by appropriately defining roles and responsibilities. Adjustments should be made as needed—especially if the research focus of an individual participating researcher changes.

2.5 The university leadership ensures that researchers who seek to identify suitable research questions have appropriate access to published research findings.

3. Dimensions of performance and assessment criteria

When assessing the performance of researchers, a multi-dimensional approach is adopted. Alongside academic and scientific achievements, other factors are also considered. Performance is mainly assessed on the basis of qualitative standards; quantitative indicators may only be incorporated into the overall evaluation in a thoughtful and nuanced manner. In addition to generation of and critical reflection on knowledge and findings, the evaluation considers other aspects of performance. These may include, for example, engagement in teaching, academic self-governance, public relations, and knowledge and technology transfer; contributions of broader societal interest can also be acknowledged. Professional integrity, openness to new knowledge and findings, and willingness to take risks are also considered. Appropriate allowance for individual circumstances, such as absence periods due to personal, family or health-related reasons, or the prolongation of training or qualification periods resulting from such absences, and for alternative career paths or similar circumstances, is made in accordance with legal provisions.

Details on the procedure are set forth in the Human Resources Development Concept, JunProfEvalS, TTP Statutes, the Senior Professorship Statutes, and the Statutes on Performance-Related Bonuses.

4. Research process

4.1. Researchers carry out each phase of the research process *lege artis*. In particular, this includes: adherence to subject-specific standards and established quality assurance methods;

¹ Guiding Framework for Advancing Early-Stage Researchers Before and After Doctoral Completion and for Supporting Alternative Non-Professorial Academic Career Paths [*Orientierungsrahmen zur Förderung des wissenschaftlichen Nachwuchses vor und nach der Promotion und für akademische Karrierewege neben der Professur*], passed by resolution of the Senate on November 25, 2015.

processes such as device calibration, data collection, processing and analysis; the selection and use of research software and its development and programming; and the keeping of lab notebooks.

4.1.a When planning a project, researchers comprehensively consider and acknowledge the current state of research. Identifying relevant and suitable research questions requires diligent research into existing published research studies.

4.2. Researchers use academically and scientifically sound and appropriate methods to answer research questions. In developing and applying new methods, they give special importance to quality assurance and the setting of standards. Setting and documenting standards for methods, software application, data collection, and the description of research findings are essential for the comparability and transferability of research findings.

4.3. Whenever possible, methods are used to avoid potential biases, including unconscious ones, in the interpretation of findings. Researchers evaluate if and to what extent gender and diversity may be significant to the research project in terms of methods, the work program, objectives, etcetera. When interpreting findings, contextual conditions associated with each specific research outcome are considered.

4.4. Researchers exercise their constitutionally granted freedom of research in a responsible manner. They maintain an awareness of the potential to misuse research findings. Their responsibility extends beyond legal compliance to include the obligation to use their knowledge, experience, and skills so that risks can be recognized, estimated, and evaluated. In this, they pay special attention to the factors associated with security-relevant research, for example in terms of dual use.

Researchers comply with rights and obligations, particularly those arising from legal provisions and third-party contracts, and obtain and provide any necessary approvals and ethics statements. With regard to research projects, the potential research outcomes and their ethical implications should be thoroughly evaluated and assessed. The legal parameters of a research project also encompass documented agreements on the usage rights of the data and outcomes generated by that project.

5. Usage rights

Whenever possible and practicable, researchers make documented agreements on the usage rights of any potential research findings as early as possible in the research project. Documented agreements are especially useful when a research project involves multiple academic or non-academic institutions, or when it is likely that individual researchers will change their institutional affiliation and, for their own research purposes, wish to continue using the data that they themselves generated. Usage rights primarily belong to the researchers who collected the data. In ongoing research projects, the authorized users also decide, in accordance with data protection regulations, whether third parties should be granted access to the data.

6. Documentation

Researchers document all the information relevant to the generation of a specific research outcome as comprehensibly and transparently as is necessary and appropriate in that field in order to verify and evaluate that outcome. Consequently, they also document individual results

that do not support the research hypothesis. The selection of results in this context is prohibited. If the subject area has existing guidelines for verification and evaluation, researchers adhere to these guidelines in their documentation. If the documentation fails to meet these requirements, the constraints as well as the reasons for them must be clearly and comprehensibly explained. Manipulating research documents and results is strictly forbidden; they must be safeguarded as well as possible against any potential manipulation.

7. Public access to research findings

In principle, researchers present their research findings within the realm of academic and scientific discourse. In certain cases, however, there may be reasons not to publicize the findings (both in the narrower sense, as publications, and in the broader sense of making them available via other communication channels). This decision must not depend on third parties. Researchers themselves decide independently whether, how, and where to make their findings publicly accessible, taking into consideration the norms and conventions of the relevant subject area. If a decision is made to publicize the findings, researchers describe them clearly and thoroughly. This includes thoroughly detailing all workflows and making available the underlying research data, materials, information, methods applied, and software used, to the extent that this is possible and reasonable. When research findings are publicized – for example, in the narrower sense as publications, as well as in the broader sense through other communication channels – the quality control mechanisms used must always be presented. This especially applies when new methods are developed.

In accordance with the principle of "quality over quantity," researchers avoid the fragmentation of their work into inappropriately small publications. As authors or co-authors, they limit the content repetitions in their publications to that which is necessary for the reader to grasp the context. In addition, they should cite their previously published results in the manner standard within the relevant discipline.

8. Authorship

Anyone named as an author of an academic contribution has made a genuine and identifiable contribution to the research publication. Authorship must be determined on a case-by-case basis and depends on the subject area involved. An identifiable, genuine contribution is particularly evident when a researcher has significantly and in an academically relevant manner collaborated in

- the development and conceptual design of the research project, or
- the drafting, collection, acquisition, or provision of data, software, or sources, or
- the analysis/evaluation or interpretation of data, sources, and the conclusions derived from them, or
- the writing of the manuscript.

If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, the support provided can be appropriately acknowledged in footnotes, the preface, or the acknowledgments. "Honorary authorships" granted in the absence of such a contribution are not permissible. Holding a leadership or supervisory role does not, in itself, constitute co-authorship. Researchers determine which individuals are the author(s) of a research finding. The order in which author names are listed is decided upon in a timely manner, and normally no later than when the manuscript is being drafted, based on clear criteria that reflect the standards and conventions of each subject area. Researchers may not withhold their required consent to publish a research finding without a sufficient reason. Refusal of consent must be justified with verifiable criticisms of the data, methods, or results.

Authors strive to ensure that, to the extent possible, publishers or infrastructure providers identify their contributions in such a way that users can correctly cite them.

In addition, scholars must fully and correctly cite their own and others' prior work.

9. **Corrections; enabling replication**

If researchers identify inconsistencies or errors after having publicly released their findings, they correct them. If these inconsistencies or errors warrant the retraction of that publication, the researchers act as quickly as possible by working with the relevant publisher, infrastructure provider, etcetera to ensure that that it is corrected or retracted and properly indicated as such. The same applies if researchers are alerted to such inconsistencies or errors by third parties.

The origin of data, organisms, materials, and software used in the research process is clearly identified, and their subsequent use documented. Original sources are cited. The nature and scope of the research data generated during the research process are described, and the data is handled in accordance with the requirements of the relevant subject area.

Ensuring that results or findings can be replicated or reproduced by other researchers, for instance by providing detailed descriptions of materials and methods, is an essential aspect of quality assurance, depending on the subject area. One key requirement needed to enable this reproduction is to provide the information needed to understand the research. Such information includes the data used or generated, the steps related to methodology, evaluation, and analysis, and – when relevant – how the hypothesis came about. These are properly documented. Whenever possible, access to this information should be granted to third parties. The traceability of citations must be ensured.

10. **Development of research software:**

The source code is documented when developing research software. Even self-coded software (including its source code) is to be made publicly available, to the extent that this is possible and reasonable.

If self-developed research software is to be shared with third parties, it should be licensed appropriately.

The source code for publicly available software should be persistent, citable, and documented.

11. **Archiving of research data**

The processing of research data should, whenever possible, follow the requirements set forth in the EUF Research Data Policy. For the sake of transparency and to ensure both the continuity and future usability of research, researchers store research data and key materials related to their publications in recognized archives and repositories whenever possible, in accordance with the FAIR principles (**F**indable, **A**ccessible, **I**nteroperable, **R**e-Usable). If there are legitimate reasons for not retaining or granting access to certain data, researchers must explain them. Restrictions may arise due to legal, ethical, or economic factors, such as patent applications, or from other factors related to public access. At EUF, the use of such archives and repositories is supported by appropriate structural conditions. These conditions ensure that the required archiving of the research data or research findings that are to be made publicly available, along with their underlying core materials and any research software used, can be done in a manner that meets the standards of the research area affected. In general, when research findings are made publicly available, the underlying research data (typically raw data) is retained and made traceable for ten years at the institution where the data was generated or in cross-venue repositories, depending on the specific subject area. In certain justified cases,

shorter retention periods might be deemed appropriate; the corresponding reasons must be clearly laid out. The retention period commences from the date when public access begins.

12. Publication medium

Authors choose their publication medium with care, taking into account its quality and visibility within that field of discourse. Researchers who take on editorial roles carefully consider for which publications they choose to serve in that capacity. The academic quality of an article does not depend on the medium in which it is published. In addition to publications in books and journals, researchers may also consider specialized repositories, data and software repositories, and blogs. A new or unfamiliar publishing medium should be checked for its integrity and credibility. A crucial criterion in selecting a publishing medium is whether it has established its own guidelines for good research practice.

13. Reviewing and advising/discussion

Ethical behavior is the foundation of the legitimacy of any judgement-forming process. Researchers, especially those who assess submitted manuscripts, grant proposals, or the qualifications of individuals, are bound to strict confidentiality. They disclose all facts that could give rise to concerns about bias or conflict of interest. This obligation to maintain confidentiality and to disclose any potentially biasing facts also applies to members of academic or scientific advisory boards and to decision-making bodies. The confidentiality of third-party content to which reviewers or committee members gain access precludes its sharing with third parties or personal use. Researchers immediately report to the responsible body or unit any potential or apparent conflicts of interest or biases that could be related to the research project reviewed, or to the person or matter under discussion.

Annex 2

Declaration of committee member _____

in the procedure: _____

1. I am related to a someone involved in the procedure * Yes No

2. I have a personal close relationship with someone involved in the procedure**
 Yes No

3. I have close academic relationships to the following people involved in the procedure:

1. Participant in the procedure	Number/Types	Times
Employment contract ***		
Dissertation/habilitation supervision		
Joint courses/research projects		
Joint publications		
Current/former institute or department colleagues		

2. Participant in the procedure	Number/Types	Times
Employment contract		
Dissertation/habilitation supervision		
Joint courses/research projects		
Joint publications		
Current/former institute or department colleagues		

Signature

Notes

* Relatives are excluded from the procedure, in accordance with § 20 VwVfG. Relatives include: 1. the fiancé(e), 2. the spouse, 3. relatives and immediate in-laws, 4. siblings, 5. children of siblings, 6. spouses of siblings and siblings of spouses, 7. siblings of parents, 8. persons connected within a household community through a long-term care relationship, like parents and children (foster parents and foster children). Relatives include the persons listed in sentence 1, even if: 1. (in the cases of numbers 2, 3, and 6) the marriage that established the relationship no longer exists; 2. in the cases of numbers 3 to 7, the relationship or affinity has ceased due to adoption as a child; 3. in the case of number 8, the domestic community no longer exists, provided the persons continue to be connected like parents and children.

**This includes, among other things, friendly ties, neighborly relations, and shared leisure activities e.g., in clubs.

***This includes not only direct employment contracts between committee members and procedure participants, but also university-issued employment contracts, such as those between professors and their own research staff.