INTERNATIONAL
PSYCHOANALYTIC
UNIVERSITY BERLIN

International Psychoanalytic University Berlin (IPU)

Statutes for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice

Contact us

International Psychoanalytic University Berlin
Stromstr. 1
D-10555 Berlin
Phone +49 30 300 117-500
E-mail: info@ipu-berlin.de
Internet: www.ipu-berlin.de

University management:
Prof. Dr. Jan-Hendrik Olbertz (President)
Prof. Dr. Birgit Stürmer (Vice President)
Dr. Rainer Kleinholz (Chancellor)

Berlin, 02.02.2024
Translated into English 02.06.2024

Table of Contents

On 02.02.2024, the Academic Senate of the International Psychoanalytic University Berlin (IPU) adopted the following statutes to ensure good scientific practice and thus implements the "Statutes for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice" (Codex) of the German Research Foundation. The statutes will come into effect on 15.02.2024.

1 Preamble

The IPU is committed to freedom of research and teaching in accordance with Article 5 of the German Constitution. The primary concern of these statutes is to raise awareness for the basic rules of scientific practice, to keep them alive, and to convey them to scientists as self-evident conditions starting with the beginning of their scientific work.

The rules of good scientific practice include, in particular, working lege artis, maintaining strict honesty regarding one's own contributions and those of third parties, keeping all results verifiable and consistently reflecting on them critically, and promoting a discourse in the academic community that is oriented towards scientific rigor and truth.

The purpose of these statutes is to make it clear that the IPU does not tolerate scientific misconduct, as it fundamentally undermines the process of gaining knowledge and thus also disturbs the public's trust in science and the scientists' trust among themselves.

The statutes for ensuring good scientific practice are made known to the employees of the IPU and are binding for everyone[1].

2 Institutional guidelines to ensure good scientific practice at the IPU

2.1 Organizational responsibility of the university management

(1) In addition to measures for identifying and punishing scientific misconduct, suitable measures must be taken or expanded to prevent scientific misconduct from occurring in the first place. As a place of research, teaching, and promoting academic career development, the IPU has a high degree of institutional responsibility in this regard.

(2) The university management creates the framework conditions for successful academic work. Conditions include clear and written procedures and principles for personnel selection and development as well as for the promotion of young scholars (see IPU's Concept for Promoting Young Scholars). The obligation to comply with the rules of good scientific practice is part of every new academic staff appointment. Equal opportunities regarding gender and diversity are taken into account in the context of personnel selection and development (see IPU Gender Equality

[1] The statutes are based in part on the "Statutes of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt am Main to ensure good scientific practice", adopted by the Senate of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt am Main on 25 January 2023.

Plan). The relevant processes must be transparent, and both unknowing and unconscious influences should be reflected upon and addressed in order to counteract them. The university management also takes suitable organizational measures to counteract possible abuses of power and the exploitation of dependent relationships.

(3) The university management is responsible for the parameters for complying with and communicating good scientific practice. University management creates the necessary conditions for academics to comply with legal and ethical standards.

(4) The institutional organizational structure of the IPU ensures that, depending on the size of the individual scientific task, management, supervision, quality assurance, and conflict resolution are clearly assigned and appropriately communicated to the respective members.

(5) The IPU offers all scholars appropriate career support. Suitable support structures and concepts have been established for early career scholars and are being further developed as required. Comprehensive advice is offered for academic careers and other career paths as well as further training opportunities and mentoring for academic, administrative, and service staff.

2.2 Responsibility of task management

(1) The heads of scientific projects are responsible for the entire group, in particular, for appropriate organization that ensures that the tasks and roles for management, scientific support and competence transfer, supervision, conflict resolution, and quality assurance are clearly assigned so that they can be performed appropriately. Only in this way can the group as a whole fulfill its tasks.

(2) Scholars, administrative staff, and service staff enjoy a balance of support and personal responsibility appropriate to their career level. They are accorded adequate status with corresponding rights to participation.

(3) The head of a scientific project is responsible for ensuring that supervision and support is provided for all academic staff working in this area. Abuse of power and the exploitation of dependent relationships will be counteracted by suitable organizational measures at the level of the individual group.

(4) The heads of a scientific project must behave in an exemplary manner in accordance with these statutes. Students and researchers should learn at an early stage of their careers to be vigilant against possible misconduct in their environment, also in the interest of planning their own futures.

2.3 Dimensions of Performance and Evaluation Criteria

(1) Originality and quality take priority over quantity as assessment criteria for examinations, earning academic degrees, appointments, recruitment, dissertations and the allocation of funds. The IPU is also guided by this principle when designing evaluation procedures.

(2) In addition to scholarly performance, other dimensions should also be taken into account in personality assessments and job references, e.g., commitment to teaching, academic self-administration, public relations, or knowledge transfer. Contributions in the interests of society

as a whole as well as openness to knowledge and willingness to take risks are also recognized.

(3) Personal, family, or health-related absence, extended periods of training or qualification, alternative career paths, or comparable circumstances are given appropriate consideration. Where voluntarily stated, individual or social characteristics in CVs are also included in the assessment, in addition to general principles of equal opportunity.

3 Basic rules of scientific work

3.1 The guiding principles of scientific work

In addition to compliance with legal regulations at domestic, European, and international levels, the following rules apply as general principles of scientific work at the IPU:

3.1.1 General rules for scientific practice:

(1) Rules specific to this field for the collection, selection, processing and documentation of data must be strictly observed;

(2) primary data, including data that does not support research results, must be reliably secured and stored for ten years; the employed procedures, methods, evaluation and analysis, citations, and all important results must be clearly and comprehensibly documented;

(3) the rule of systematic skepticism must be observed: This means openness for an epistemologically critical doubt with regard to one's own research results or the results of one's own group. Accordingly, the research process is based on the quality criteria of the relevant subject area (e.g., reliability, validity, objectivity and reflection of subjectivity);

(4) implicit axiomatic assumptions must be made explicit; personal interests or morally motivated wishful thinking must be controlled; systematic attention must be paid to possible misinterpretations due to a methodologically limited grasp of the research topic (overgeneralization).

3.1.2 General rules of collegiality and cooperation:

(1) Other scientists must not be hindered in their scientific work;

(2) the scientific qualification of scholars in the early phases of their careers must be fostered.

3.1.3 General rules for the publication of results:

(1) As a matter of principle, research results must always be published in a scientifically appropriate manner and in accordance with international disciplinary standards (according to the principle publicly available research);

(2) research results obtained with public funds should, as a rule, be made freely available, also considering options for open access publication and applicable data protection guidelines;

(3) published errors must be acknowledged and corrected in an appropriate manner;

(4) the literature used must be evaluated and named in a fair and balanced manner;

(5) contributions from employees are to be recognized in accordance with the principles of intellectual integrity.

3.1.4 General rules for proper assessments:

(1) Honest conduct is the basis for the legitimacy of any judgment process. The scientific contributions of colleagues must be reviewed carefully, dispassionately, and impartially;

(2) strict confidentiality must be maintained. The disclosure of external content, to which reviewers or committee members have access, to third parties and the use of this content for their own purposes must be precluded;

(3) assessments must be conducted within a reasonable period of time and must not be delayed;

(4) expert opinions may not be prepared as favors;

(5) all facts that could give rise to bias must be disclosed;

(6) the aforementioned obligations also apply to members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies.

3.2 Scientific professional ethics

(1) Scientists at the IPU put the fundamental values and standards of scientific work into practice through their actions and are bound by them. Teaching the fundamentals of good scientific work begins as early as possible in academic teaching and scientific training and is an integral part of teaching in all IPU degree programs and doctoral programs. Scientists at all career levels regularly update their knowledge of the standards of good scientific practice;

(2) Researchers at the IPU support each other in continuous learning and training processes at all stages of their careers and are in regular contact with each other.

3.3 Research design

(1) When planning a project, the scientists at the IPU take the current state of research into account. The identification of relevant and suitable research questions requires careful consideration of research work that has already been made publicly available.

(2) Methods to avoid biased (also unconscious) distortions in the interpretation of findings, for example blinding a series of tests or preregistration of a study, are to be applied to the greatest extent possible. The researchers examine whether and to what extent gender and diversity can be significant for the research project (regarding the methods, work program, objectives, etc.). The respective framework conditions are taken into account when interpreting findings.

3.4 Methods and standards

(1) To answer research questions, IPU scientists apply scientifically sound and reproducible methods. If necessary, specific competencies required for the application of a method are

covered through corresponding cooperations.

(2) When developing and applying new methods, the IPU scientists attach particular importance to quality assurance and the establishment or consideration of appropriate standards.

(3) International standards for good clinical practice are applied to patient-related clinical trials (see ICH- GCP).

3.5 Actors, responsibilities, and roles

(1) The functional and specialist roles and responsibilities of the scientists involved in a research project and of the administrative and service staff must be clear at all times during a research project.

(2) The participating researchers in a research project are in regular contact. They define their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate manner and adapt them where necessary. An adjustment is particularly appropriate if the focus of the work of those involved in the project changes.

3.6 Cross-phase quality assurance

(1) IPU scientists carry out every step of the research process lege artis and ensure continuous quality assurance throughout the research process. This applies in particular regarding

- compliance with subject-specific standards and established methods,
- the collection, documentation, processing, and analysis of research data,
- the selection and use of research software as well as its development and programming

(2) When scientific findings are made publicly available, the quality assurance mechanisms used must always be presented. This applies in particular when new methods are developed.

(3) If discrepancies or errors are discovered following a publication, these must be corrected. If the discrepancies or errors give rise to the retraction of a publication, IPU researchers will work with the relevant publisher or infrastructure provider as quickly as possible to ensure that the correction or retraction is made and marked accordingly.

(4) The origin of data, organisms, materials, and software used in the research process must be identified and subsequent use documented; the original sources are to be cited. The type and scope of research data generated in the research process are to be described. They should be handled in accordance with the requirements of the subject concerned. The source code of publicly accessible software must be persistent, citable, and documented.

(5) The fact that results and findings can be replicated or confirmed by other scientists is an essential part of quality assurance, depending on the subject areas concerned.

3.7 Scientific publications

(1) In principle, IPU researchers are to contribute all results to scientific discourse. In individual cases, there may be reasons to refrain from making the results publicly available (in the narrower sense in the form of publications, but also in the broader sense via other communication channels); the

decision must not depend on third parties. On their own responsibility and considering the practices of the subject area, researchers decide whether, how, and where they make their results publicly accessible.

(2) Publications are the most important medium for communicating research results to the scientific and general public. In this way, authors publish results for which they assume responsibility of scientific reliability. This includes a complete and comprehensible description of the results obtained and the methods used, as well as complete and correct proof of their own and others' preliminary work. This also includes, as far as possible and reasonable, making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, the methods used, and the software employed available in recognized archives and repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles ("Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable") and providing a comprehensive description of the work processes. Publications should include all findings collected for the research question; inappropriately small publications should be avoided. Self-programmed software should be made publicly available with the source code and provided with an appropriate license.

(3) As a rule, previously published results may only be repeated to the extent that it appears necessary for the understanding of a correlation. Findings that support the results presented or call them into question must be communicated equally. When publishing, the principle of "quality over quantity" is used.

3.8 Authorship

(1) If several authors are involved in research work or in the scientific text, data, or software publication based on it, only those who have made a genuine, comprehensible contribution to the conception of the studies or experiments, to the preparation, analysis, and interpretation of the data and sources (including software, if applicable), or to the formulation of the manuscript itself, and who have agreed to its publication in the final version, may be named as co-authors. The required consent to publish results may not be refused without sufficient objective justification. The refusal of consent must be justified with a verifiable criticism of data, methods, or results or the scientific quality of the publication medium. In the case of several co-authors, the decision on the publication medium requires the consent of all of them. Authorship is checked separately in each individual case and depends on the subject area concerned.

(2) Authorship of original work can only be exercised by humans. Only humans can take responsibility for the integrity, originality, and accuracy of research work. This assumption of responsibility is, in turn, the basic prerequisite for authorship. If artificial intelligence or other technologies have assisted in the preparation of a manuscript, reference must be made to this in an appropriate place.

(3) In recent years, conventions have been established in the scientific community, especially in many experimental disciplines, for the publication of original work, which also allow external readers to assess the contributions of co-authors based on their placement in the author line. Thus, the author line also serves the correct external perception and not only the fair recognition of the claims of co-authors acquired through collaboration. IPU scientists are to agree on who is named as author of the research results. This agreement, including the order of authors, is reached in good time, usually at the latest when the manuscript is being formulated and is

carried out on the basis of comprehensible criteria, taking into account the conventions of the respective subject area.

(4) The management of the organizational group in which the publication was created, or a function superior to this, is not in itself sufficient to establish authorship. Authors are always jointly responsible for the content unless this is explicitly stated otherwise; so-called "honorary authorship" is not permitted. Support from third parties can be recognized in an acknowledgement.

(5) Authors take care to ensure that their research contributions are marked by publishers or infrastructure providers in such a way that users can correctly cite them.

3.9 Publishing Institutions

Authors choose the publishing institution carefully, considering its quality and visibility in the respective field of discourse. Scholars who take on the role of editor should also carefully examine the publishing institution for which they take on this task. A new or unknown institution should be questioned as to its reliability. If it is an open access journal, for example, it should be checked, whether it is listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (https://doaj.org), in which only quality-checked titles from trustworthy publishers can be found. It can also be helpful to check whether the publisher is a member of the Open Access Scholarly Publishers' Association (https://oaspa.org). In the Quality Open Access Market (https://www.qoam.eu/journals), the quality of individual journals is assessed by researchers themselves. Information about publishers, the peer review process, business policies, workflows and their own experiences are entered here. If there are doubts about the reliability of a publication, blacklists such as "Beall's List of Potential Predatory Journals and Publishers" (https://beallslist.net), and websites such as Cabell's Scholarly Analytics (https://cabells.com) also offer corresponding points of reference.

A key criterion in the selection decision is whether the publishing institution has established its own guidelines for good scientific practice; however, the scientific quality of an article does not depend on the publication medium in which it was made publicly accessible. In addition to books and specialist journals, specialist repositories, data and software repositories, and blogs can also be considered as publication media.

3.10 Backup and storage of research data

(1) Research data, as the basis for publications, must be stored on durable and secure media for at least ten years in an accessible and traceable manner at the institution where they were created or in repositories across locations. The retention period begins on the date on which public access is established. It must be ensured that the data remains available in readable form for at least this period. Shortening the retention period or foregoing it altogether is possible in justified exceptional cases, but these must be documented and comprehensibly justified. Access to the data must be guaranteed for legitimately interested parties, in particular the members of the commission for handling scientific misconduct and the ombudspersons for handling scientific misconduct. This requires sufficiently complete logging and the retention of such logs for at least ten years in order to be able to refer back to the records if published results are disputed by others. In addition, documentation and research results must be protected as well as possible

against manipulation. When developing research software, the source code must be documented.

(2) All known relevant information for producing a research result must be documented as comprehensibly as is necessary and appropriate in the subject area concerned in order to be able to review and evaluate the research result. A description of the basic principles is to be provided to enable replication. In the event that the documentation of research results does not meet the relevant (technical) requirements, the limitations and reasons must be clearly explained.

(3) The IPU supports its researchers in this respect, insofar as appropriate centralized backup procedures can be provided. IPU's centralized backup procedures are to be used as far as is reasonable.

3.11 Data protection

As a rule, the anonymization of personal data must be ensured. In cases in which personal data of test subjects are part of the research project, researchers must apply the rules of the Berlin Freedom of Information Act (*Informationsfreiheitsgesetz*; IFG) and the Berlin Data Protection Act (*Berliner Datenschutzgesetz*; BlnDSG), the Federal Data Protection Act (*Bundesdatenschutzgesetz*; BDSG), and the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in their current versions.

3.12 Legal and ethical framework conditions; rights of use

(1) IPU researchers must consider all rights and obligations associated with the use of research results, particularly those resulting from legal requirements, but also from contracts with third parties. Where necessary, they obtain approvals and ethics votes and submit these to the relevant authorities. Regarding research projects, a thorough assessment of the consequences of performing the research and the evaluation of the respective ethical aspects should be carried out. The legal framework of a research project also includes documented agreements on the rights of use of the research data and research results arising from it.

(2) IPU scientists are constantly aware of the risk of misusing research results. Their responsibility 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. In doing so, they pay particular attention to the aspects associated with research relevant to safety (dual use).

(3) As far as is possible and reasonable, IPU researchers shall produce documented agreements on the rights of use of research results and data at the earliest possible stage in the project. The researchers who collected the data are primarily entitled to use it. As part of an ongoing research project, the authorized users decide (in particular in accordance with data protection regulations) whether third parties should have access to the data.

(4) Against the background of its responsibility for ensuring its members conform with regulations, the IPU promotes this through suitable organizational structures such as the Ethics Committee. The IPU Ethics Committee has developed binding principles for research ethics and procedures for the corresponding normative assessment of research projects, which are applied in the ethical evaluation of research projects.

3.13 Conflicts of interest between scientific work and external clients of a private and public nature

(1) In the context of cooperation with commercial enterprises, there are many areas of conflict that can often be traced back to the collision of scientific standards with political, economic, or financial interests. For example, conflicts can arise over the confidentiality of unpublished data. Secondary activities as an expert or consultant can also lead to conflicts, especially if a certain result is desired by the client but cannot be achieved based on the objectively available data. Membership on supervisory boards or shareholdings in companies that are active in one's own field of research can also lead to significant conflicts of interest.

(2) Economic considerations must not take precedence over scientific rigor and scientific freedom. If the acquisition of scientific knowledge comes into conflict with economic priorities, the IPU gives priority to the acquisition of scientific knowledge, even if economic advantages may be lost in the process. For economic reasons alone and without the prospect of gaining new scientific knowledge, no organizational group of the IPU involved in research will enter into a commitment with external clients of a private or public nature.

(3) To prevent conflicts of interest, all persons involved in a research project must disclose their financial and other interests and ties to their superiors or responsible bodies if they could conflict with their research activities. In addition, strict personnel separation of management responsibilities in the given organizational group of the IPU and management activities in commercially active companies (e.g., in the case of outsourcing) must be ensured.

4 Scientific misconduct

The following understanding of scientific misconduct results from these basic rules of scientific work (3.1.-3.13.):

Scientific misconduct occurs when, in a scientifically relevant context, false statements are made deliberately or through gross negligence, the intellectual property of others is infringed upon, or their research activities are impaired in any other way. Even if the circumstances of the individual case are decisive, scientific misconduct must always be refrained from, avoided, and punished where it occurs. All members of the IPU are committed to this.

Potentially serious personal misconduct includes in particular:

4.1 Incorrect information

- the invention of data,
- falsifying data, for example by selecting and rejecting undesirable results without disclosing this, by manipulating a representation or image,
- incorrect information in a letter of application or an application for funding (including incorrect information on publishing institutions and publications in print).

4.2 Infringement upon intellectual property

in relation to a copyrighted work created by another or to essential scientific findings,

hypotheses, doctrines, or research approaches created by others:

- unauthorized use under presumption of authorship (plagiarism),
- the presumption or unfounded acceptance of scientific authorship or co-authorship (e.g., so-called "Honorary authorship"),
- exploiting the research approaches and ideas of others, especially as expert witnesses (idea theft),
- the falsification of content,
- unauthorized publication and unauthorized provision to third parties as long as the work, finding, hypothesis, doctrine, or research approach has not yet been published.

4.3 Claiming (co-)authorship without the consent of the parties involved

4.4 Sabotaging research activities

including damaging, destroying, or tampering with experimental set-ups, equipment, documents, hardware, software, chemicals, or other objects that others require to conduct an experiment.

4.5 Elimination of primary data

insofar as this violates statutory provisions or recognized disciplinary principles of scientific work (3.10.).

Shared responsibility for the misconduct of others may result from, among other things:

- active participation in the misconduct of others,
- knowledge of falsification by others,
- co-authorship of falsified publications,
- gross neglect of the duty of supervision.

5 The persons and bodies appointed to monitor compliance with the rules of good scientific practice at the IPU

5.1 General procedural principles

All members of the IPU are required to inform the relevant offices of the university immediately of any suspicions of scientific misconduct, stating the reasons/suspicions. For this purpose, the IPU has an ombudsperson (ombudsperson.gwp@ipu-berlin.de) for handling scientific misconduct and their proxy as well as the Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct (kommission.gwp@ipu-berlin.de) are available.

5.2 Persons affected by the allegations

Investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct are carried out in specific cases of suspicion and expressly comply with confidentiality and the basic principle of the presumption of innocence. The investigating body shall presume innocence towards the person in question at every stage of the procedure as part of a case-by-case assessment. The person(s) affected by the allegations will not

suffer any disadvantages because of the investigation until scientific misconduct has been formally established.

5.3 Whistleblowers

(1) Scientists are sometimes reluctant to disclose their suspicions of scientific misconduct for fear of reprisals, hostility, or isolation. The whistleblower must not suffer any disadvantages as a result of their actions.

(2) Scientists who provide a specifiable and comprehensible indication of possible scientific misconduct within the scope of these statutes are to be regarded as whistleblowers within these regulations.

(3) The whistleblower must make the report in good faith. The whistleblower must have objective evidence that standards of good scientific practice may have been violated. Deliberately false or willful allegations may themselves constitute scientific misconduct. If the whistleblower is unable to verify the facts themselves or if there are uncertainties regarding the interpretation of the guidelines for good scientific practice regarding an observed process, the whistleblower can and should contact the ombudsperson for handling scientific misconduct at the IPU or the commission set up by the DFG to clarify the suspicion. As far as possible, the report must not lead to delays in the whistleblower's career, especially in the case of early career scholars. The preparation of theses and doctorates must not be disadvantaged; this also applies to working conditions and possible contract extensions.

(4) In the event of proceedings brought before the Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct, the name of the whistleblower(s) must be treated confidentially and only be disclosed if the person in question cannot otherwise defend themselves properly during the opportunity to comment or if the credibility or motives of the whistleblower(s) need to be examined. This is intended to ensure that whistleblowers are heard without reprisals and that proceedings remain fair.

(5) Reports must be investigated regardless of the person and/or motivation of the whistleblower if reliable and sufficiently concrete facts are presented. Reports in which the whistleblower does not provide their name (anonymous report) must also be investigated.

(6) If the whistleblower is known by name, the investigating body must treat the name confidentially and may not disclose it to third parties without corresponding consent. Exceptions only apply if there is a legal obligation to do so or if the person affected by the allegations would otherwise not be able to defend themselves properly, because the identity of the whistleblower is essential to do so. Before the name of this person is disclosed, they will be informed immediately; the whistleblower can decide whether to withdraw the report if it is likely that their name will be disclosed. The confidentiality of the proceedings is restricted if the whistleblower goes public with their suspicion. The investigating body decides on such a restriction on a case-by-case basis. The Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct must be consulted in the decision by the university management as to whether, when, and in what form the public should be informed.

(7) The whistleblower must also be protected in the event of unfounded scientific misconduct,

provided that the allegations were not demonstrably made against better knowledge.

5.4 Ombudsperson for dealing with scientific misconduct

A neutral, qualified ombudsperson with personal integrity and management experience as well as a proxy (in the event of concerns of bias or incapacity) must be appointed at the IPU to advise in conflicts in matters of good scientific practice. Neither may be an active member of a central management body of the IPU at the same time. They will receive the necessary support in their work and may be relieved of other tasks.

5.4.1 Tasks and position of the ombudsperson

Anyone who is confronted with concrete circumstances that could constitute a violation of the rules of good scientific practice or a suspicion of scientific misconduct is given the opportunity at the IPU to discuss the matter with a neutral and qualified person – usually the ombudsperson – who can provide solution-oriented conflict mediation, if necessary, without having to fear disadvantages for themselves or their own working group, while maintaining strict confidentiality.

The ombudsperson is therefore directly available as a trusted person in all matters of good scientific practice and in cases of suspected scientific misconduct (ombudsperson.gwp@ipu-berlin.de). The position of the ombudsperson also serves to resolve possible conflict situations that can arise, especially among junior researchers, from the conflict between loyalty to their superiors or research group and the obligation to behave in a scientifically correct manner. Ombudspersons therefore elucidate to members that justified whistleblowing (5.3.(2)) is not denunciation or behavior detrimental to the group, but rather a necessary step in the face of suspected violations of the principles of ethical research. It is not the whistleblower expressing a justified suspicion who harms colleagues or the research institution, but the scientist who commits the misconduct.

The ombudsperson or their proxy must treat information about possible misconduct that is brought to their attention as confidential. They are not obliged to disclose this information to the management of the organizational group concerned (e.g., the professorship or group). In conflict situations, however, the ombudsperson or their proxy may request a meeting with the suspected person or with the management of the organizational group concerned.

Alternatively, members of the IPU are free to contact the DFG's nationally active, independent "Ombudsperson for Science" committee instead of the ombudsperson.

5.4.2 Appointment and term of the position as ombudsperson

The ombudsperson and their proxy are appointed for a period of five years by the Academic Senate from among the professors of the IPU on the recommendation of the President. A one-time reappointment is possible, whereby both a term as ombudsperson and a term as proxy are to be considered. The ombudsperson should inform university management about their work once a year, in anonymized form if necessary. In the event that the ombudsperson is unavailable or unable to act, a proxy will represent them. The name of the ombudsperson will be made known at the IPU in a suitable form.

5.5 Commission for handling scientific misconduct

To investigate suspected cases of scientific misconduct at the IPU, a commission for handling scientific misconduct is to be appointed. The commission has a managing member who can be contacted at kommission.gwp@ipu-berlin.de.

5.5.1 Tasks and position of the Commission for Handling Academic Misconduct

The commission is responsible for investigating any circumstances that suggest specific scientific misconduct by a member of the IPU. The commission is also responsible if the member has left the IPU in the meantime, but the possible misconduct occurred during their time at the IPU.

The Commission for Handling Academic Misconduct can be called upon by the ombudspersons as well as by any member of the university in the event of concrete, objective suspicions of scientific misconduct. The appeal must be made in written form to the managing member of the Commission (kommission.gwp@ipu-berlin.de).

In some cases, the chairperson of the Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct may suggest that the whistleblower first contact the IPU Ombudsperson (5. 1. and 4.). In the event of suspicion of particularly serious scientific misconduct (3.), the ombudsperson should report this case to the commission without delay.

The commission shall meet in closed session. In some cases, the chairperson of the commission may also arrange for resolutions to be passed by way of electronic circulation. Until scientific misconduct is proven, the information on those involved in the procedure and the findings to date will be treated confidentially. The person affected by the allegations and the whistleblower must be given the opportunity to comment at every stage of the procedure. Commission members who appear to be biased shall not take part in the consultation and voting on a specific individual case. The commission shall decide on the question of bias after pointing out the circumstances that may give rise to bias, and excuse the concerned member of the commission. The commission's procedure does not replace other procedures regulated by law or the Articles of Association (e.g., regulatory procedures of the university, disciplinary proceedings, labor court proceedings, criminal proceedings).

5.5.2 Appointment and term of the members of the Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct

The Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct consists of five members (including three professors). The composition of the committee should cover the breadth of the subject spectrum at the IPU. In cases of bias or incapacity, each member group appoints a representative from the same member group to replace the relevant commission member.

Commission members and their deputies are appointed for a term of three years by the Academic Senate on the recommendation of the President; reappointment for a second term is possible.

If necessary, the commission may involve another member from the particular area related to the suspected misconduct for individual cases, provided that this area is not already represented by the members of the commission. The additional member has no voting rights and only participates in the commission meetings in an advisory capacity.

The commission has a quorum if at least three members with voting rights are present. Decisions by the commission require a simple majority of the members present. The commission elects a chairperson from among its members. Minutes shall be taken of the commission meetings, which shall record the overall outcome of the meetings.

6 Procedure in the event of suspected scientific misconduct

6.1 Commission decision on the initiation and further progress of proceedings

After an appeal referencing an initial suspicion of scientific misconduct (5.5.(1)), the Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct shall immediately examine whether proceedings should be initiated.

Once the case has been submitted, the commission first examines the basis of the documents submitted and the other known facts and assesses whether there may actually be sufficient suspicion of scientific misconduct if the alleged facts provided can be proven with the means of clarification available to the commission (6.3.). As a rule, it decides in an oral meeting (5.5.(1)); in some cases (e.g., also in cases of particular urgency), the chairperson may initiate a written circulation procedure.

If the commission concludes that there is sufficient suspicion of scientific misconduct, the commission decides to initiate proceedings (6.3.). The decision must go on the record.

Pending the conclusion of proceedings before the Commission for Handling Scientific Misconduct, parallel pending proceedings at institute or department level in the same matter must be suspended. If proceedings are pending with the German Research Foundation (DFG) or other non-university institutions in the same matter, the proceedings before the commission must be suspended in case of doubt after consultation with the DFG or the other non-university institutions.

The university shall ensure that the entire procedure is carried out as promptly as possible and that confidentiality is maintained until its conclusion. It shall take the necessary steps to complete each stage of the procedure within a reasonable period of time.

6.2 Proceedings before the commission to clarify a reasonable suspicion of scientific misconduct

After the proceedings before the commission have been opened, the commission shall give the person accused of misconduct the opportunity to comment after stating the incriminating facts and evidence. The person in question shall be given a period of up to one month to respond.

After receiving the statement from the person(s) concerned or after the deadline has expired, the commission shall immediately decide as to whether and which further clarification measures are required. The person accused of misconduct may testify orally to the commission at their request; the person in question may call in a trusted person to assist them. This also applies to other testifying persons, such as the whistleblower, witnesses, or other persons concerned.

When further clarification measures have been completed or are not required, the commission shall decide, in free assessment of the evidence it has gathered, whether scientific misconduct has occurred or whether the proceedings can be discontinued because of the commission’s opinion that

no scientific misconduct has occurred, or it is to be regarded as a minor infraction. The main reasons for the decision must be communicated to the person in question and to the whistleblower.

Discontinuation on the grounds of insignificance may be considered if only minor scientific misconduct is established and the person concerned has contributed to the clarification of the matter, has taken measures to make amends, or has already taken measures to remedy any damage that has occurred.

If discontinuation of the procedure is not an option, the commission is to establish the existence of (if applicable, according to the criteria mentioned in 4. “serious”) scientific misconduct in a written, substantiated decision. Prior to the final decision on the measures to be taken (6.4.), the person concerned shall be informed. They should again be given the opportunity to comment within a period of no more than one month.

At the request of the person concerned, their authorized representative, they shall be granted access to their case files insofar as knowledge of the files is necessary to assert or defend the legal interests of the person concerned. This right does not extend to information about the whistleblower if this would impair the proper performance of the IPU's duties or if this must be kept confidential by law or by its nature. In all other respects, the regulations contained in 5.3. apply regarding the disclosure of the name of whistleblowers.

6.3 Measures to sanction scientific misconduct at the IPU

Depending on the nature and severity of the misconduct found, the commission may decide on one or more of the following measures:

(1) A written reprimand of the accused person by the commission, which as a rule must also be brought to the attention of the organizational group to which the person belongs.

(2) The recommendation of measures to the university management or to third parties.

These include in particular

- the written request to the accused person to withdraw a publication or to correct incorrect data (i.e., by publishing an erratum) or to include a reference to the omitted naming of co-authors in an appropriate manner, the withdrawal of internal university funding decisions (such as the withdrawal of funds approved by university bodies),
- informing the university management with the suggestion to assess the need to revoke or withdraw academic titles and degrees, and
- informing any third-party funders.
- The final result of the commission shall be communicated to the accused person, the responsible organizational group, the university management and, upon request, the whistleblower and other persons or institutions (particularly scientific publishers or scientific institutions) who may have a justified interest in the decision, including the main reasons.

6.4 Final provisions for handling scientific misconduct

The commission's decision is final for the IPU regarding the determination of the existence or

absence of scientific misconduct.

Regarding the consequent measures, the commission makes recommendations – apart from the complaint (6.4.(1)). The university management or the organizational group concerned shall implement the commission's recommendation without delay within the scope of their discretion regarding the type of measures to be taken. They shall also inform the commission without delay, to the extent permitted by law, of the type of measure taken and the date of its implementation.

In the event that a measure is recommended for which a separate legal procedure is required, such as in the case of a withdrawal of title, the necessary documents from the proceedings will be made available by the commission (6.1. - 4.) in order to carry out the case.

After consulting the commission, the President will decide on an individualized basis whether to make a decision regarding scientific misconduct public where there is a legitimate public interest.