CAU guidelines for safeguarding good scientific practice

in the version of 01.06.2022

The Senate at Kiel University (CAU) adopted the following directives at its meeting on 01.06.2022 to implement guidelines 1 to 19 of the codex on "Guidelines for safeguarding good scientific practice" of the German Research Foundation (DFG):
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Preamble

Scientific work is based on a series of fundamental principles. Paramount are the integrity and honesty of scientists towards themselves and others. These include the interaction of scientists with one another as well as with scientific support staff, study participants, animals, the environment and cultural assets.

The constitutionally guaranteed freedom of science, research and teaching goes hand in hand with the responsibility for communicating and maintaining scientific integrity. Honesty is both an ethical standard and the basis for the rules of scientific professionalism, in other words good scientific practice. A lack of integrity on the other hand endangers science, destroys the trust of scientists between each other and the trust of society in science. In this context, informants, ombudspersons and the DFG committee "Ombudsman for Science" play a central role in safeguarding good scientific practice.

One of the principal tasks of the university is therefore to safeguard the observance of the principles of good scientific practice and to appropriately deal with allegations of scientific misconduct. As a place of research, teaching and early career support, Kiel University undertakes to maintain high quality standards and implements measures to exclude scientific misconduct. It is of particular importance to the university to teach its students and young scientists about the fundamental principles of honesty and fairness in scientific practice and to promote an atmosphere of creativity and commitment. In this context, experienced scientists act as role models and are aware of this role within the institution and in their profession.

With these guidelines for safeguarding good scientific practice, Kiel University presents binding guidelines and a procedure for dealing with scientific misconduct on the basis of the codex "Guidelines for safeguarding good scientific practice" of 1 August 2019. As a matter of principle, Kiel University will therefore investigate every specific suspected case of scientific misconduct. If the suspicion of scientific misconduct is confirmed after clarification of the facts, appropriate measures in each individual case will be taken within the scope of the legal options.
Section I
Safeguarding good scientific practice

1 Scope of application

These guidelines are binding for everyone who is or was employed in scientific activities or those supporting such activities at Kiel University. A copy of these guidelines is to be given to members of full-time staff at Kiel University when they are appointed or recruited so that they are aware of its contents. Reference to these guidelines is to be made expressly to part-time scientific staff at the university.

2 Rules of good scientific practice

(1) These guidelines for good scientific practice are to be observed by everyone working and involved in science at Kiel University. They include:

a. the general principles of scientific work such as

i. procedures in accordance with generally applicable regulations and in accordance with the current state of knowledge (“lege artis”),

ii. usage of scientifically sound and transparently verifiable methods, in particular to avoid distortions,

iii. full documentation of the sources (proprietary and external preliminary work is to be presented correctly while refraining from using an inappropriately large number of self-citations and too short-run publications) and the results,

iv. consistent scrutiny of all the results,

v. strict honesty with regard to the contributions by collaboration partners, co-workers and rivals (exclusion of gift authorships),

vi. responsibility of all authors for every part of joint scientific publications,

vii. confidential handling of documents in the review process, in particular strict exclusion of disclosure and personal use of content to which reviewers and committee members gain access in the course of their work, as well as

vii. proactive disclosure of conflicts of interest and bias (this applies in particular to reviewers and members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies) and

b. complying with special rules for individual specialist disciplines.

(2) Scientists at Kiel University are familiar with the freedom of research and the concomitant responsibility. This refers, among other things, to rights and obligations arising from contractual regulations (for example cooperation agreements, agreements on rights of use to data and results), legal regulations (for example obtaining the necessary approvals) or
ethical framework conditions (for example a risk or impact assessment with regard to research results and their ethical aspects). In cases of doubt, all persons employed in scientific activities or those supporting such activities can resort to the ethics committee of the university or – if available – the ethics committees of individual faculties or institutions. Issues concerning research on human beings are examined by the medical ethics committee. Kiel University has laid down general principles for dealing with research risks in a statute. The handling of intellectual property is structurally regulated in guidelines (IPR policy). Furthermore, among other measures officers for specific theme areas (animal welfare, data protection, occupational safety, radiation protection, the Nagoya Protocol, open access, research data management) have been appointed and are available for consultation. Genetic engineering work is assessed with regard to the associated risks and consequences by means of a notification and approval process.

When preparing the research proposal, scientists at Kiel University also reflect, among other things, on the significance of gender-related and/or diversity-related dimensions for the research project. At Kiel University, the central and decentralised Equality Officers and the Diversity Officer offer advice in this regard.

(3) As far as possible and insofar as the regulations governing data protection and the rights to the results as well as rights of use allow, research data, software and core materials that serve as the basis for publications should be stored in accordance with the practices in the specialist field in a discipline-specific repository or, if no suitable discipline-specific repositories are available, in the institutional data repository of Kiel University in accordance with the FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable) in order to ensure the verifiability, replicability, connectivity and re-usability of the research work. The storage services of Kiel University are available for archiving research data, software and materials that cannot be published. All research data (including results that do not support the research hypothesis) must be fully documented as a matter of principle. In every case, the storage duration should at least be oriented to the period customary in the field (usually 10 years). The storage period begins on the date on which the data is made publicly available. The origin of research data, software and materials should be indicated in the documentation. In cases where research data, software and core materials that serve as the basis for publications cannot be published or archived, the reasons for this are to be explained. If the retention period is shorter than is customary in the field, the reason for this is also given. In every case, a provision regarding subsequent use should be made and documented, which can also indicate that subsequent usage is restricted. Documented agreements on the rights to use research data should be made at the earliest possible opportunity. Actual usage of the data should (at least also) be permitted for those who collected the data. Regulations governing third-party access to research data should also be made.

Analogously, information about the collection of data, methodology, evaluation and analytical steps, as well as, where applicable, the non-documentation of the same together with the justification, are to be stored taking into account the usual procedures in the discipline in the sense of cross-research phase quality assurance; when developing software, the source code is to be documented. Standards for methods, the usage of software, the collection of research data, as well as the description of research results, should be formulated and established where necessary.
(4) Throughout all phases of a research project, the scientists and scientific support staff are aware of their respective roles and responsibilities. This is ensured by means of regular discussions and adapted dependent upon the requirements in the research phase sequence. Changes are communicated to everyone involved on the research project in an appropriate manner to assure the greatest possible transparency.

(5) If the results of a research project are published, a genuine, verifiable contribution to the scientific publication entitles the person concerned to be named as (co-)author. Depending upon the discipline, this is in particular justified if the person concerned either

i. was substantially involved in the conception of the research project,

ii. independently developed, collected or provided data, including software or sources, to an extent relevant to the publication,

iii. analysed and interpreted data (including sources), or

iv. co-authored the manuscript in a scientifically relevant manner.

Gift authorships are strictly excluded. A management or supervisory function does not in itself constitute an entitlement to be named as a co-author. Scientists agree on who should be the author. The sequence in which the authors’ names are stated is agreed in good time, usually no later than when the manuscript is formulated, on the basis of plausible criteria and taking into account the conventions of the specialist field. If a contribution is not sufficient to justify being named as a co-author, the assistance may be recognised elsewhere (for example in a footnote, preface or acknowledgement).

(6) Authors agree upon the final version of a work to be published and thereby share responsibility for the content of the entire publication, and not just for their contributions; exceptions to this are indicated. The required consent may not be withheld without reasonable cause. If consent is withheld, this must be justified with verifiable criticism of the data, methods or results.

If substantive errors in publications are subsequently established, these should be corrected or the publisher should be notified.

(7) The authors decide freely on their publications within the scope of the publication culture in their disciplines and in accordance with their efforts to achieve the best possible dissemination of their research results and data. Wherever possible, the aspects of open access and re-usability (without financial, technical or legal barriers) should be taken into consideration in accordance with the open access guidelines of Kiel University. The decision to make scientific results publicly available must generally not depend on third parties unless the results are subject to other rights (commissioned research, security-related research, patent applications, and where the rights of a third party are affected). The correct proof of proprietary and external preparatory work must be presented in an appropriate manner.

(8) It is the responsibility of the authors to carefully verify that the publishing body chosen for the publication is a serious organisation before commissioning it. Particular attention should be paid to determining whether (in-house) guidelines for good scientific practice are also in place there.
The assessment of the scientific quality of a contribution should not be dependent upon the publishing body in which it is made publicly available.

(9) Scientists at all career levels continually share information with one another as a process of lifelong learning. They regularly refresh their knowledge of standards of good scientific practice, in particular taking into consideration the special characteristics of the respective discipline.

(10) If the work of scientists is evaluated, this should be done in a multidimensional manner and taking the discipline into consideration. Qualitative as well as quantitative criteria are to be applied in equal measure. Quantitative criteria are to be put into context and included in the assessment in a differentiated manner. In particular, key figures taken from scientific journals should not be used as the sole assessment criteria. Other criteria can additionally be applied, such as

i. involvement in teaching, training of junior academic staff/supervision of theses and dissertations or academic self-governance,

ii. activities in the fields of public relations or knowledge and technology transfer, as well as

iii. special aspects of the professional career.

3

Responsibility for the implementation

(1) The University Board ensures that the organisational framework enables scientific work to be conducted in accordance with good scientific practice and that structural conditions are put in place which enable scientists to comply with legal and ethical standards, and which prevent the abuse of power and the exploitation of dependencies. This also includes, in particular:

a. career support for scientists and scientific support staff by means of transparent, written principles and procedures for the selection and development of staff, as well as

b. support of young scientists in the form of supervisory, advanced training and advisory structures
taking into consideration the principles of equal opportunity and diversity.

To this end, Kiel University has established, among others, the following structural and regulatory measures:

i. the Graduate Centre,

ii. the Postdoc Centre,

iii. the staff position Advanced Scientific Education,

iv. the open access university publishing house (Kiel University Publishing),

v. the data centre,

vi. the central research data management,

vii. an institutional data repository,

viii. an open access publication server (MACAU),

ix. a code of conduct,
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x. a guideline for dealing with discrimination, sexual violence and harassment,

xi. a guideline on the promotion of open access,

xii. a guideline on handling research data,

xiii. a statute on the conducting of appeal proceedings,

xiv. a statute on the conducting of the (interim) assessment procedure for junior professors and university professors on tenure track prior to a permanent tenure, as well as

xv. the implementation of a Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R).

(2) Irrespective of the responsibility of the University Board, every head of a faculty and of an institution in the respective field is responsible for the management of the entire unit. This includes, in particular, that

a. the responsibilities for direction, supervision, quality assurance and conflict resolution
   i. are clearly allocated and
   ii. actually assumed,

b. the young scientists are instructed and supervised appropriately in accordance with the relevant qualifications, and

c. measures for promoting the careers of scientists and scientific support staff are implemented in an appropriate manner in line with the organisational structures anchored throughout the university.

(3) Scientists and scientific support staff bear the responsibility for implementing the fundamental values and standards of scientific work in their daily activities, irrespective of the responsibilities of the management positions and in the sense of practiced professional ethics.

(4) Principles for the supervision of young scientists

(1) Imparting the basic principles of good scientific work begins at the start of the study programme.

(2) Young scientists begin their scientific work with their bachelor’s, master’s or examination work, and in the case of medical practitioners usually with their doctorate. In addition to technical skills, the university needs to teach them basic ethical rules of conduct for scientific work and how to act responsibly when handling results and working with other scientists.

(3) Young scientists are entitled to receive regular scientific supervision, advice and support. The basic principles for doctoral regulations at Kiel University apply in every faculty and thus assure the quality of the organisation, supervision and evaluation of doctoral studies.

(4) Young scientists should regularly report on the progress of their research work in an appropriate manner.
Section II
Scientific misconduct

5 Scientific misconduct

Scientific misconduct occurs in particular when incorrect information is provided intentionally or negligently in a scientific context, or intellectual property belonging to other people is infringed or their research work is sabotaged. The following in particular constitute scientific misconduct:

1. Providing incorrect information:
   a. inventing or forging data, or withholding data, which does not confirm or refute a hypothesis,
   b. inaccurate information in an application for employment or grant application (including misrepresentations related to the publication organ and related to publications in print),
   c. non-disclosure of parallel publications.

2. Intellectual property belonging to others (a work protected by copyright created by someone else) is infringed if someone:
   a. publishes or uses such a work under the pretence of authorship (plagiarism),
   b. falsifies its content,
   c. claims (co-)authorship or has themself named as (co-)author without having made their own creative contribution in accordance with Sections 7, 8 of the German Copyright Act (UrhG),
   d. fails to disclose contributions from co-authors,
   e. names other persons as (co-)authors without their consent,
   f. names other persons – with or without their consent – as (co-)authors although they do not fulfil the requirements of Sections 7, 8 UrhG,
   g. presents or uses as their own findings, hypotheses or research approaches which were submitted confidentially owing to the person's capacity as a reviewer.

3. Sabotage of the research capacity of others: by damaging, destroying or manipulating experimental setups, equipment, documentation, hardware, software, chemicals or other items which are required to carry out an experiment.

6 Co-responsibility for misconduct

(1) Co-responsibility for misconduct within the meaning of (5) can arise, among other cases, from
   a. active involvement in the misconduct of others or
   b. knowledge of falsifications by other people.

(2) Co-responsibility for misconduct within the meaning of (5) can arise, among other cases, from
   a. co-authorship of publications containing falsifications,
   b. gross negligence of the duty of supervision.
Section III
Ombudsteam and Standing Committee

7 Ombudsteam

(1) Kiel University appoints an ombudsteam consisting of two persons as diverse as possible which members and associates of the university may consult about issues concerning good scientific practice and suspected scientific misconduct. Students who are found guilty of misconduct are usually punished in that they fail their examination. In the event of repeated misconduct by students in the course of their examinations, the matter must be referred to the responsible examination board.

(2) Experienced scientists who are members of Kiel University are appointed as ombudspersons. They may not be a member of the Standing Commission in accordance with (9) and may not hold any other management position (e.g. membership of the University Board or the Dean's Office) at the university. The ombudspersons will undertake their activities independently of instructions from members of the university management. Reference is otherwise made to the regulations in (9) ff.

(3) The University Board will put forward suitable candidates to the University Senate within the meaning of Para. 2. The University Senate will select the ombudspersons with the majority of its members in separate ballots for an office term of five years. In addition to the majority of the University Senate, the ballot also requires the majority of the professors belonging to it. Ombudspersons can be re-elected once.

(4) The President appoints the persons elected as ombudspersons and obliges them to comply with these guidelines. Participation by ombudspersons at workshops and events will be supported.

(5) The two ombudspersons are independent of each other in their actions. However, they must work together in the strictest confidence.

(6) In the event that one of the ombudspersons is biased, the matter is referred to the other ombudsperson or to the Standing Committee. In the event that one of the ombudspersons is incapacitated (including for a longer period of time), the matter is referred to the other ombudsperson or to the Standing Committee.

(7) If one ombudsperson leaves the team prematurely, another ballot is held; Paragraphs 2 to 4 apply accordingly.
8 Responsibilities of the ombudsteam

(1) As persons of trust, the ombudspersons advise on good scientific practice in general and in particular advise those members and associates of Kiel University who inform them about suspected cases of scientific misconduct as defined in (5) and (6). Furthermore, they may, on their own initiative, follow up pertinent leads about which they become aware directly or indirectly through a third party.

(2) The ombudspersons examine whether the allegations are plausible with regard to tangibility and significance as well as possible motives, and clarify with the persons concerned whether there are any possibilities for allaying the allegations.

(3) Confidentiality must be maintained to protect the persons concerned and those who provided the information.

(4) In the event of a justified initial suspicion of scientific misconduct or specific suspicious facts, the ombudspersons will request the Standing Committee to initiate the preliminary investigative proceedings in accordance with (14) if the person to be advised has given their consent to this.

(5) After conclusion of the formal investigative proceedings, the ombudsperson will support the persons also affected and those who provided information in accordance with (19).

(6) Every member and associate of Kiel University has the right to have a personal discussion with the ombudsteam within a period of 10 days.

(7) The names and contact data of the ombudsteam are to be published in a suitable manner.

(8) At the end of each financial year, the ombudsteam submits an anonymised written report to the University Board stating the number of conducted consultations broken down by faculty and topic.

9 Appointment of the Standing Committee

(1) Kiel University will appoint a Standing Committee to investigate scientific misconduct. The Standing Committee consists of the following six members:

- Four members from the cohort of professors. Full-time professors, as well as retired or emeritus professors, who have comprehensive experience in scientific fields can be appointed. At least one member must be competent to hold judicial office.
• Two members from the cohort of research associates. Postdoctoral scientists are appointed.

(2) Two deputies are also to be appointed from the cohort of professors, one of whom must be competent to hold judicial office.

(3) The University Board will put forward suitable candidates to the University Senate within the meaning of Paragraphs 1 and 2. The University Senate will elect the Committee members with the majority of its members for a term of office of generally three years with the option of one-off re-election.

(4) The President will appoint the persons elected as members of the Standing Committee and oblige them to comply with these guidelines.

(5) The names and contact data of the members of the Standing Committee are to be published in a suitable manner.

(6) The ombudspersons belong to the Standing Committee with an advisory vote.

10 Responsibilities of the Standing Committee

(1) The Standing Committee is responsible for investigating allegations of scientific misconduct about which it is notified by a member of the ombudsteam or informed directly. It conducts the preliminary investigative proceedings (14) and the formal investigative proceedings (15). The university management is notified by the chairperson about the opening of formal investigative proceedings.

(2) The Standing Committee can discontinue the proceedings owing to suspicion of scientific misconduct or make proposals as to how the established misconduct should be punished (see Appendix 1).

(3) The Standing Committee takes action on behalf of a member of the ombudsteam or one of its own members.

(4) The Standing Committee's proceedings do not replace other statutory proceedings or those governed by the statutes (e.g. regulatory proceedings of the university, disciplinary proceedings, proceedings under employment law, criminal proceedings).
11 Chairperson and procedures of the Standing Committee

(1) The Standing Committee elects a chairperson and a deputy chairperson from among its members. The chairperson - or, if the latter is incapacitated, the deputy - issues invitations to meetings of the Standing Committee, chairs the meetings and implements its resolutions.

(2) The Standing Committee is quorate if at least three members are present, of whom two must belong to the cohort of professors. The Standing Committee will decide with a simple majority of its members. In the event of a tied vote, the chairperson has the casting vote. Minutes are to be taken on the meetings of the Standing Committee, which state the main results of the meeting.

(3) With reference to (2), Paragraph 1, members of the Standing Commission shall proactively disclose any conflicts of interest and bias in a proceeding and shall accordingly abstain from the proceeding if such conflicts of interest and/or bias exist.

(4) The Standing Committee can at its discretion involve up to two additional people with an advisory vote: experts from the field of the facts being assessed as well as experts in dealing with the relevant procedures (e.g. mediators). The Standing Commission shall also require such persons to maintain confidentiality and to disclose conflicts of interest and bias.

(5) The deadlines for statements, hearings, proceedings and decisions are to be set by the Standing Committee in such a way that the proceedings will be completed as quickly as possible.
Section IV
Procedure for suspected scientific misconduct

12 Report of suspected misconduct

(1) If individual members, former members, associates or former associates of Kiel University or scientific collaboration partners of Kiel University have tangible suspicions of scientific misconduct, they must initially notify an ombudsperson or member of the Standing Committee. If a member of the Standing Committee is informed, they must notify the ombudspersons immediately. This does not affect the possibility of directing questions and reports of suspected misconduct to the "Ombudsman for Science" committee of the German Research Foundation (DFG).

(2) Reports of suspected scientific misconduct by members or associates of Kiel University submitted by persons other than those named in (1) must be directed to the ombudspersons. They shall inform the University Board and the Dean's Office concerned without delay.

(3) The suspected misconduct should be reported in writing stating the supposedly incriminating facts and evidence; in the event of a verbal notification, a written note is to be taken about the suspicion and the facts and evidence on which it is based. The report of suspected misconduct must be made in good faith.

(4) One of the two ombudspersons examines the allegations and looks for ways to resolve the conflict. If this is successful, they will inform the persons affected and those who provided the information. If the persons who provided the information are not in agreement with the decision of the ombudsperson in the inquiry, they can call on the Standing Committee.

(5) If the ombudsperson cannot rule out the allegations, they can notify the Standing Committee about the suspected misconduct or the written note to and report on their efforts in the preliminary investigation.

(6) Confidentiality must be maintained to protect the persons concerned and those who provided the information. The presumption of innocence applies at all steps of the process until unequivocal proof of misconduct is established. The professional/scientific advancement of the informing person must not be prejudiced. This person is to be protected even in the case of unproven scientific misconduct insofar as the allegations were not verifiably made against their better judgement. The professional/scientific advancement of the person against whom allegations of scientific misconduct have been made shall not be prejudiced until such time as misconduct has been formally established.
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(7) Misconduct may also exist if the person providing the information deliberately makes false allegations against their better judgment.

13 Statement by the affected persons

(1) The Standing Committee will give the persons affected by the suspected misconduct an opportunity to submit a statement based on the named incriminating facts and evidence within a stated deadline. The deadline for submitting a statement is generally three weeks or six weeks in the lecture-free period.

(2) The names of the informants may not be disclosed without their explicit consent to the persons concerned at this stage of the proceedings unless the disclosure is essential for the further conducting of the proceedings.

14 Preliminary investigation

(1) After receipt of the statement by the affected person or after expiry of the set deadline, the Standing Committee will reach a decision within a period of four weeks or eight weeks in the lecture-free period:

   a. on whether the preliminary investigative proceedings are to be suspended with notification of the reasons to the affected persons and those who provided the information because the suspicion of scientific misconduct has been fully clarified or the scientific misconduct is not serious, or
   b. on whether formal investigative proceedings should be opened for further clarification and a decision by the preliminary investigative proceedings; the reasons for this are to be given in writing.

(2) If the persons who provided the information are not in agreement with the initial suspension of the preliminary investigative proceedings, they can present their objections within four weeks (or eight weeks in the lecture-free period) in writing or verbally to the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee will consult and decide on the objections through the corresponding application of Paragraph 1 if applicable in accordance with (13) Paragraph 1 after hearing the affected person again. The affected persons and those who provided the information are to be informed about the decision.

15 Formal investigative proceedings

(1) The chairperson of the Standing Committee will initiate formal investigative proceedings by notifying the affected persons about the result of the preliminary investigation. The notification of the result of the preliminary examination to the person concerned shall also be made in the event of a suspension in accordance with (14), Paragraph 1 a. The President
and the Dean of the faculty concerned shall be informed about the initiation of formal investigative proceedings.

(2) The Standing Committee will provide advice in a closed verbal hearing. It must determine not only the incriminating but also the exonerating circumstances. It will verify in open consideration of the evidence whether any scientific misconduct has taken place.

(3) The person(s), working group or institute affected by possible misconduct shall be given the opportunity to make statements. The informing person shall likewise be given the opportunity to make a statement. The affected persons are to be heard verbally on request and they can each have someone they trust in attendance to support them. This also applies to other people who are to be heard.

(4) The names of the persons providing the information are to be disclosed to the affected persons on application if there is otherwise no appropriate defence possible for them or if the credibility and motives of the persons providing the information are of major significance in clarifying the allegations. The persons providing the information are to be notified about the disclosure.

(5) All those involved must work towards a rapid conclusion of the proceedings.

16 Decisions of the formal investigative proceedings

(1) If the Standing Committee believes that there is no proof of scientific misconduct, it will discontinue the proceedings. Sentence 1 will also apply if the Standing Committee considers that the scientific misconduct is not serious. The President is to be notified about the suspension of the proceedings.

(2) If the Standing Committee believes that there is proof of scientific misconduct, it will report on the result of its investigations in writing to the President and propose how the proceedings - also with regard to maintaining the rights of others - are to be continued.

(3) The main reasons which have led to the proceedings being suspended or for passing the matter on to the President are to be notified in writing to the affected persons and those providing the information.

(4) It is not possible to appeal against the decisions of the Standing Committee.

(5) The files on formal investigative proceedings will be kept for 30 years.
Section V

Possible decisions and penalties in the event of scientific misconduct

17  
Decision by the President

(1) If scientific misconduct has been established, the President will examine what measures should be taken on the basis of the final report and the recommendation of the Standing Committee, both to maintain the scientific standard of the university as well as the rights of all those affected directly and indirectly.

(2) Scientific misconduct cannot be assessed in accordance with established rules; the appropriate penalties depend upon the circumstances of the individual case.

(3) The respectively responsible bodies initiate the university's internal service, employment, civil, criminal or regulatory measures with the corresponding procedures (see Appendix 1) depending on the circumstances of the individual case.

(4) The ombudsteam and the Standing Committee are informed in writing by the University Board about the completion of the formal investigation and the measures that have been taken.

(5) The President examines in agreement with the Standing Committee whether and to what extent other scientists (former or possible collaboration partners, co-authors), scientific institutions, scientific journals or publishing houses (in the case of publications), funding institutions and scientific organisations, professional associations, ministries and the general public should or need to be notified.

18  
Procedure in the event of a change of institution

(1) The provisions in (14) and (15) apply accordingly in cases in which the person affected by a suspicion of scientific misconduct has left the university, and the institution to which the affected person now belongs asks the university to conduct the proceedings. The University Board will be replaced by the management of the institution of which the affected person is now a member.

(2) If the affected person was also a member of another institution at the time of the suspected infringement of the rules of good scientific practice, the university will usually request this institution to conduct a preliminary investigation and, if necessary, a formal investigation.
19
Support for persons also affected and those providing information

After the conclusion of formal investigative proceedings, the persons who were innocently involved in procedures of scientific misconduct are to be protected against adverse effects with regard to their personal dignity and scientific integrity. The following can serve to protect personal and scientific integrity:

a. advice from the ombudsteam;

b. a written explanation by the chairperson of the Standing Committee that the person also affected is not accused of any scientific misconduct (5) or has any joint responsibility for this (6).

20
Entry into force

This directive will enter into force on the day after it is approved in the University Senate. At the same time, the directive which was adopted by the University Senate on 11 May 2017 will cease to apply.

Kiel, 14 June 2022

Prof. Dr. med. Simone Fulda
President of Kiel University