Please note that only the German version of these regulations is legally binding. The English translation is provided for informational purposes only!

Regulations on Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice

dated September 02, 2021

On the basis of Article 5 (3)(1) of the Concordat between the Holy See and the Free State of Bavaria dated March 29, 1924 (BayRS 2220-1-K), the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt (KU) issues the following statutes:

Table of contents

I. General provisions

Section 1 Scope of application

(1) All researchers and scientists who work at the KU are bound by the provisions of these Regulations on Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice.

(2) Also bound by these Regulations are

1. former KU members,

2. persons who were not KU members but completed a doctoral project that was supervised by a KU professor,

if the accusation arises that they have violated the standards of good scientific practice during their research activity or preparation of their doctoral thesis or scientific papers at the KU, jeopardized the trust in the academic honesty of the researchers working at the KU and thereby called the scientific reputation of the KU into question.

Section 2 Principles

(1) Researchers shall bear the responsibility for realizing the fundamental values and norms of scientific work in their actions and advocating them and for ensuring that their individual behavior meets the standards of good scientific practice - taking into account the specific particularities of the relevant subject area.

(2) The principles of good scientific practice in particular include working according to the established rules (*lege artis*), maintaining strict honesty as regards own contributions and contributions of third parties, consistently doubting all results oneself and allowing and encouraging critical discourse in the scientific community.

(3) [1]The obligation to adhere to the principles of good scientific work starts during the studies at the KU and these fundamental principles are imparted at the earliest during academic teaching and scientific training. [2]All researchers shall update their knowledge on the standards of good scientific practice and the current state of research in regular intervals. [3]Experienced researchers and early-career researchers shall continuously support each other in their learning and continuing education processes and cultivate regular exchange.

(4) [1]The KU is committed to its mission and therefore bears particular responsibility for trustworthy science and the promotion of research and early-career researchers. [2]It provides for an open and creative atmosphere which is guided by honest thought and action and ensures academic integrity and compliance with the rules by introducing the respective organizational and procedural regulations. [3]It supports compliance with binding principles for research ethics by providing for processes of appropriate assessment of research projects.

(5) [1]At the KU, there are clear and transparently documented procedures and principles for staff selection and HR development and for the promotion and guidance of early-career researchers as well as for the promotion of equal opportunity. [2]In the context of staff selection and HR development, gender equality and diversity are taken into account. [3]The corresponding processes are transparent and avoid non-academic influence (“unconscious bias”) as far as possible. [4]The KU offers sincere advice for career paths and other career options as well as continuing education and personal development offers and mentoring programs for research staff and research support staff.

Section 3 Performance dimensions and assessment criteria

(1) Performance assessments and benchmarking can be used as a controlling tool within the KU and are in particular required in competition with other higher education institutions, for example in appointment or selection procedures, in evaluations, calls for application and allocation of funds.

(2) [1]Assessing the performance of researchers requires a multidimensional approach: Alongside scientific achievements, also other criteria are to be taken into account. [2]Performance assessment shall primarily follow qualitative standards; however, also quantitative indicators can also be taken into account in the overall assessment in a differentiated and reflected manner.

(3) High-quality science must be guided by discipline-specific criteria.

(4) [1]Alongside gaining knowledge and critically reflecting on it, also other performance dimensions must be taken into account in the assessment process. [2]These include: Commitment in the teaching practice, academic self-administration, public relations work, transfer of knowledge and technologies; also contributions in the interest of society as a whole can be considered. [3]Further, the scientific attitude of researchers, for example as regards openness to findings and risk-taking, will also be taken into account.

(5) [1]Insofar as provided on a voluntary basis, individual special features included in the résumé can also be considered when taking a judgment alongside categories of the General Equal Treatment Act. [2]Personal absences due to family or health reasons or prolonged training or qualification periods resulting from such absences, as well as alternative career paths or comparable circumstances shall be taken into account appropriately.

II. Guidelines in the research process

Section 4 Guidelines in the research process

(1) The KU integrates the Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice published by the German Research Foundation (DFG) into its self-conception and takes it as a benchmark for the implementation and structuring of research processes.

(2) Sections 5 to 14 reflect the ideal research process that needs to be observed for every individual project and can be adapted in accordance with the subject-specific research practice.

Section 5 Cross-phase quality assurance

(1) [1]Researchers carry out each step of the research process lege artis. [2]When research findings are made publicly available (in the narrower sense of publication, but also in a broader sense through other communication channels), the quality assurance mechanisms used are always explained. [3]This applies especially when new methods are developed.

(2) Continuous quality assurance during the research process includes, in particular, compliance with subject-specific standards and established methods, processes such as equipment calibration, the collection, processing and analysis of research data, carrying out plausibility checks, the selection and use of research software, software development and programming, and the keeping of laboratory notebooks.

(3) [1]If researchers have made their findings publicly available and subsequently become aware of inconsistencies or errors in them, they make the necessary corrections. [2]If the inconsistencies or errors constitute grounds for retracting a publication, the researchers will promptly request the publisher, infrastructure provider, etc. to correct or retract the publication and make a corresponding announcement. [3]The same applies if researchers are made aware of such inconsistencies or errors by third parties.

(4) [1]The origin of the data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process is disclosed and the reuse of data is clearly indicated; original sources are cited. [2]The nature and scope of research data generated during the research process are described. [3]Research data are handled in accordance with the requirements of the relevant subject area.

(5) Depending on the particular subject area, it is an essential part of quality assurance that results or findings can be replicated or confirmed by other researchers (for example with the aid of a detailed description of materials and methods).

Section 6 Research design

(1) [1]Researchers take into account and acknowledge the current state of research when planning a project. [2]To identify relevant and suitable research questions, they familiarize themselves with existing research in the public domain.

(2) [1]Methods to avoid (unconscious) distortions in the interpretation of findings, e.g. the use of blinding in experiments, are used where possible. [2]Researchers examine whether and to what extent gender and diversity dimensions may be of significance to the research project (with regard to methods, work program, objectives, etc.). [3]The context in which the research was conducted is taken into consideration when interpreting findings.

Section 7 Legal and ethical frameworks, usage rights

(1) Researchers adopt a responsible approach to the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of research and are aware of their responsibility towards society and environment.

(2) [1]They comply with rights and obligations, particularly those arising from legal requirements and contracts with third parties, and where necessary seek approvals and ethics statements and present these when required. [2]With regard to research projects, the potential consequences of the research should be evaluated in detail and the ethical aspects should be assessed. [3]The legal framework of a research project includes documented agreements on usage rights relating to research data and results generated by the project.

(3) [1]Researchers maintain a continual awareness of the risks associated with the misuse of research results. [2]Their responsibility is not limited to compliance with legal requirements but also includes an obligation to use their knowledge, experience and skills such that risks can be recognized, assessed and evaluated. [3]They pay particular attention to the aspects associated with security-relevant research (dual use).

(4) [1]Where possible and reasonable, researchers conclude documented agreements on usage rights at the earliest possible point in a research project. [2]Documented agreements are especially useful when multiple academic and/or non-academic institutions are involved in a research project or when it is likely that a researcher will move to a different institution and continue using the data they generated for their (own) research purposes. [3]In particular, the researcher who collected the data is entitled to use them. [4]During an ongoing research project, those entitled to use the data decide whether third parties should have access to them (subject to data protection regulations).

Section 8 Methods and standards

(1) To answer research questions, researchers use scientifically substantiated and comprehensible methods.

(2) When developing and applying new methods, they attach particular importance to quality assurance and the establishment of standards.

(3) [1]As a rule, the application of a method requires specific expertise that is ensured, where necessary, by suitably close collaboration arrangements. [2]The establishment of standards for methods, the use of software, the collection of research data and the description of research results is essential for the comparability and transferability of research results.

Section 9 Documentation

(1) [1]Researchers document all information relevant to the production of a research result as clearly as is required by and is appropriate for the relevant subject area to allow the result to be reviewed and assessed. [2]In general, this also includes documenting individual results that do not support the research hypothesis. [3]The selection of results in this context must be avoided.

(2) [1]Where subject-specific recommendations exist for review and assessment, researchers create documentation in accordance with these guidelines. [2]If the documentation does not satisfy these requirements, the constraints and reasons for this are clearly explained.

(3) Documentation and research results must not be manipulated; they must be protected against manipulation as effectively as possible.

(4) [1]An important basis for enabling replication is to make available the information necessary to understand the research including the research data used or generated, the methodological,

evaluation and analytical steps taken, and, if relevant, the development of the hypothesis, to ensure that citations are clear, and, as far as possible, to enable third parties to access this information. [2]Where research software is being developed, the source code is documented.

Section 10 Providing public access to research results

(1) [1]As a rule, researchers make all results available as part of scientific discourse. [2]In the individual case, however, there may be reasons not to make results publicly available (in the narrower sense of publication, but also in a broader sense through other communication channels); this decision must not depend on third parties. [3]Researchers decide in their own responsibility – with due regard for the conventions of the relevant subject area – whether, how and where to disseminate their results.

(2) [1]If it has been decided to make results available in the public domain, researchers describe them clearly and in full. [2]Where possible and reasonable, this includes making the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, as well as the methods and software used, available and fully explaining the work processes; software programmed by researchers themselves is made publicly available along with the source code.

(3) Researchers provide full and correct information about their own preliminary work and that of others.

(4) [1]In the interest of transparency and to enable research to be referred to and reused by others, whenever possible researchers make the research data and principal materials on which a publication is based available in recognized archives and repositories in accordance with the FAIR principles ("Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable"). [2]Restrictions may apply to public availability in the case of patent applications. [3]Researchers are encouraged to publish research software that they have developed themselves including the source codes and make use and, where applicable, further development by third parties possible by offering appropriate licenses. [4]The source code of publicly available software must be persistent, citable and documented.

(5) [1]In line with the principle of "quality over quantity", researchers avoid splitting research into inappropriately small publications. [2]They limit the repetition of content from publications of which they were (co-)authors to that which is necessary to enable the reader to understand the context. [3]They cite their results previously made publicly available unless, in exceptional cases, this is deemed unnecessary by the general conventions of the discipline.

Section 11 Authorship

(1) [1]An author is an individual who has made a genuine, identifiable contribution to the content of a research publication of text, data or software. [2]What constitutes a genuine and identifiable contribution must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and depends on the subject area in question. [3]An identifiable, genuine contribution is deemed to exist particularly in instances in which a researcher – in a research-relevant way – takes part in

1. the development and conceptual design of the research project,
2. the gathering, collection, acquisition or provision of data, software or sources,
3. the analysis/evaluation or interpretation of data, sources and conclusions drawn from them, or
4. the drafting of the manuscript.

(2) [1]All authors agree on the final version of the work to be published. [2]Unless explicitly stated otherwise, they share responsibility for the publication. [3]Authors seek to ensure that, as far as possible, their contributions are identified by publishers or infrastructure providers such that they can be correctly cited by users.

(3) [1]If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, the individual's support may be properly acknowledged in footnotes, a foreword or an acknowledgement. [2]Honorary authorship where no such contribution was made is not permissible. [3]A leadership or supervisory function does not itself constitute co-authorship.

(4) [1]Collaborating researchers agree on authorship of a publication of research results. [2]The decision as to the order in which authors are named is made in good time, as a rule no later than when the manuscript is drafted, and in accordance with clear criteria that reflect the practices within the relevant subject areas.

(5) [1]Researchers may not refuse to give their consent to publication of the results without sufficient reason. [2]Refusal of consent must be justified with verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.

Section 12 Publication medium

(1) [1]Authors select the publication medium carefully, with due regard for its quality and visibility in the relevant field of discourse. [2]Scientific quality of a contribution does not depend on the medium in which it is published.

(2) Researchers who assume the role of editor carefully select where they will carry out this activity.

(3) [1]In addition to publication in books and journals, authors may in particular also consider academic repositories, data and software repositories, and blogs. [2]A new or unknown publication medium is evaluated to assess its reliability. [3]A key criterion to selecting a publication medium is whether it has established guidelines on maintaining good scientific practice.

Section 13 Confidentiality and neutrality of review processes and advice

(1) Fair behavior is the basis for the legitimacy of any judgement-forming process.

(2) [1]Researchers who in particular evaluate submitted manuscripts, funding proposals or personal qualifications are obliged to maintain strict confidentiality with regard to this process. [2]They disclose all facts that could give rise to the appearance of a conflict of interest.

(3) The obligation of confidentiality and disclosure of facts that could give rise to the appearance of a conflict of interest also applies to members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies.

(4) The confidentiality of third-party material to which a reviewer or committee member gains access precludes sharing the material with third parties or making personal use of it.

(5) Researchers immediately disclose to the responsible body any potential conflicts of interest or bias relating to the research project being reviewed or the person or matter being discussed.

Section 14 Archiving

(1) Researchers back up research data and results made publicly available, as well as the central materials on which they are based and, if applicable, the research software used, by adequate means according to the standards of the relevant subject area, and retain them for an appropriate period of time.

(2) [1]When scientific findings are made publicly available, the research data (generally raw data) on which they are based are – depending on the respective subject area – generally archived in an accessible and identifiable manner for a period of ten years at the professorship or chair the staff of which has produced the data or in cross-location repositories. [2]In justified cases, shorter archiving periods may be appropriate; the reasons for this are described clearly and comprehensibly. [3]The archiving period begins on the date when the results are made publicly available.

(3) Where justifiable reasons exist for not archiving particular data, researchers explain these reasons.

III.Responsibilities and bodies of scientific self-regulation

Section 15 Responsibilities in research projects and research work units

(1) [1]Roles and responsibilities of the researchers and research support staff involved in a research project must be clear at all times during a research project. [2]They are allocated by those involved in a research project in an appropriate manner and revised where necessary. [3]A revision of such allocation of roles is in particular necessary if the focus areas of an involved person in the research project changes.

(2) [1]Working together in research work units must be designed in such a way that the group as a whole can fulfill its task, necessary collaboration and coordination can take place and all members are aware of their roles, rights and duties. [2]The size and organization of the research work unit must be designed in such a way that leadership tasks can be performed appropriately. [3]The head of a research work unit is responsible for the entire unit. [4]The leadership role in particular includes:

1. Ensuring adequate individual supervision of early career researchers, integrated in the overall institutional policy, by imparting skills, providing academic guidance and ensuring that all supervision and care obligations are met,

2. Career development for researchers and research support staff,

3. Preventing the abuse of power and exploitation of dependent relationships by introducing appropriate measures.

(3) [1]In every research project and work unit, researchers and research support staff benefit from a balance of support and personal responsibility appropriate to their career level. [2]They are given adequate status with corresponding rights of participation; whereby they are empowered to shape their career through gradually increasing autonomy.

Section 16 Responsibilities of the University Management, the faculties and academic institutions

(1) [1]The University Management provides the framework conditions for scientific work at the KU. [2]It ensures adherence to and the promotion of good scientific practice, and appropriate career support for all researchers, in particular early-career researchers.

(2) [1]The University Management is responsible for ensuring that an appropriate organizational structure is in place at the institution. [2]It provides researchers with the necessary framework conditions for being able to research and use the respective current state of research and already published research findings and using cross-location repositories. [3]The University Management ensures that the infrastructure necessary to enable archiving is in place.

(3) [1]Without prejudice to the responsibility of the University Management, every faculty and academic institution at the KU shall bear the responsibility for their own field. [2]Depending on the organizational structure, it must be ensured that leadership tasks, supervision, quality assurance and conflict management are clearly allocated and suitably communicated to the respective members. [3]The faculty management and heads of academic institutions at the KU support the researchers in such a way that they can comply with legal and ethical standards.

Section 17 KU ombudsperson

(1) [1]On the recommendation of the University Management, the Senate appoints one KU professor as ombudsperson. [2]Researchers who are persons of integrity and who have management experience are eligible to be selected as ombudspersons; professors who have already been released from their duties or retired professors may also be selected. [3]The ombudsperson is independent and must not be a member of the University Management or faculty management or head of an academic institution at the KU while exercising this office. [4]The name of the ombudsperson is published on the KU website.

(2) [1]The term of office starts with the day of appointment by the Senate. [2]The term of office is three years. [3]Re-appointment is permissible once. [4]After entering retirement, the ombudsperson may continue to hold this office until the end of the regular term of office for which he or she has been appointed. [5]For important reasons, the Senate may dismiss the ombudsperson after hearing him or her, provided that at least two thirds of its members and all of the members who are representatives of the professors vote in favor of this. [6]The ombudsperson may declare his or her withdrawal from office in writing towards the Senate at any time; he or she shall continue to hold office until appointment of a successor.

(3) [1]The regulations for the office of the ombudsperson shall apply accordingly for the office of the deputy ombudsperson. [2]The deputy ombudsperson shall be responsible in case of concerns about conflicts of interest or if the ombudsperson is unable to carry out his or her duties.

(4) [1]KU researchers can turn to the KU ombudsperson with questions regarding good scientific practice and matters of suspected cases of scientific misconduct, as the KU ombudsperson acts as a neutral and qualified contact person and, where possible, contribute to solution-oriented conflict mediation. [2]The KU ombudsperson is obliged to strict confidentiality, unless otherwise stipulated in these regulations.

(5) [1]The ombudsperson applies the same standards to his or her independence and impartiality that are applied to the impartiality of a judge where an objection is made due to concerns about conflicts of interest. [2]The ombudsperson shall leave the handling of a case to the deputy ombudsperson in cases where he or she becomes aware of his or her own bias.

(6) [1]The KU ombudsperson is an organ of scientific self-regulation and receives the necessary support and acceptance from all KU members needed to carry out his or her duties. [2]In order to increase the functionality of the ombudsperson system, other relief for the ombudsperson should be made possible.

(7) [1]The DFG body “Research Ombudsman” is an independent body for advice and support in matters relating to good scientific practice and its violation due to scientific dishonesty. [2]KU researchers can choose whether they prefer to contact the KU ombudsperson or the supra-regional body “Research Ombudsman”.

Section 18 Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation

(1) A standing Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation has been established at the KU as a body of scientific self-regulation responsible for the formal investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct.

(2) [1]The Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation consists of five voting members, at least one of whom is not a KU member, and the ombudsperson as an advisory member. [2]All members of the Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation must be professors. [3]One voting member of the Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation must be qualified to hold the office of a judge. [4]The voting members of the Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation as well as their deputies are appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the University Management. [5]If a member leaves the Commission, the University Management must ensure that a replacement is appointed.

(3) [1]As regards the concern about conflicts of interest, Articles 20 and 21 of the *Bayerisches Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz* (Bavarian Administrative Procedure Act) in the currently valid version shall apply for the members of the Commission. [2]If a member is unable to participate due to concerns of bias, a deputy member of the Commission shall participate instead.

(4) [1]The Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation elects a chairperson from among its members. [2]The Commission's meetings are not public; its members are obliged to maintain confidentiality. [3]The commission is quorate when all members have been properly invited to the meeting and the majority of the members are present and eligible to vote. [4]A transfer of votes may be granted in a letter or by e-mail and transferred votes are counted when determining whether a sufficient number of members are present and eligible to vote. [5]Decisions are passed according to the simple majority of the votes cast. [6]The commission must endeavor to reach unanimous decisions. [7]The commission creates minutes for each meeting that document the significant steps in the procedure and the results of the meeting.

IV.Dealing with suspicions of scientific misconduct

Section 19 Scientific misconduct

(1) [1]Not every breach of good research practice constitutes scientific misconduct. [2]Scientific misconduct is defined as intentional or grossly negligent behavior in a scientific context that violates the standards of good scientific practice, infringes the intellectual property rights of others, or otherwise compromises their research. [3]The deciding factor is the specific circumstances of the individual case.

(2) The following, in particular, may be considered scientific misconduct:

1. Making false declarations, such as by fabricating or falsifying data, omitting or dismissing undesirable results without disclosing this fact, or manipulating graphs or images

2. Omitting required information, for example concealing work that was already performed and submitted for publication or results in the context of a funding application

3. Infringing intellectual property rights related to another person's copyrighted work or another person's significant research findings, hypotheses, teachings, or research approaches

4. Wrongfully appropriating another person's work and representing it as one's own work (plagiarism)

5. Stealing another person's research approaches and ideas (theft of ideas), such as in a role as a reviewer or in the context of a management function or as superior

6. Falsifying the content of another person's work or publishing another person's work and making it available to third parties without authorization in cases where the work, result, hypothesis, theory or research approach has not yet been published

7. Presuming authorship or co-authorship or allowing oneself to be named as an author or co-author where this is not justified

8. Naming another person as the author or a co-author without his or her permission

9. Compromising another person's research, such as by damaging, destroying, stealing, or manipulating his or her experimental arrangement, equipment, documents, hardware, software, or chemicals, or other items that he or she requires in order to conduct an attempt.

(3) [1]A person who is jointly responsible for another person's violations of the standards of good scientific practice is also considered to have committed misconduct. [2]Joint responsibility may, amongst others, result from:

1. Active participation in another person's misconduct

2. Knowledge of falsifications made by others

3. Being a co-author of a publication that included falsifications

4. Gross neglect of the duty of care or supervision.

Section 20 People reporting misconduct and persons affected by the suspicion

(1) [1]The investigation of a suspected case of scientific misconduct shall be expressly carried out in compliance with confidentiality and the fundamental principle of the presumption of innocence. [2]Until scientific misconduct has been proven, the information about the parties involved in the proceedings and the findings to date shall be treated confidentially in accordance with these regulations and both the person reporting the alleged misconduct and the person affected by the suspicion shall be protected in an appropriate manner. [3]Both the persons affected by the allegations and the persons reporting the alleged misconduct shall be given the opportunity to comment at each stage of the investigation process.

(2) [1]The report of the alleged misconduct must be made in good faith. [2]Providing incorrect accusations deliberately may itself constitute scientific misconduct. [3]The person reporting the alleged misconduct must be able to present objective indications for a possible violation of the standards of good scientific practice. [4]If persons reporting the alleged misconduct are unable to check the facts themselves or if there are insecurities regarding the interpretation of the guidelines for good scientific practice in connection with a witnessed process, the person reporting the alleged misconduct should turn to the KU ombudsperson or the statutory body “Research Ombudsman”.

(3) [1]Neither the person making the report nor the person affected by the suspicion should suffer any disadvantages for his or her own scientific or professional advancement as a result of the report. [2]The report should – especially in the case of early-career researchers – not lead to delays during the qualification of the person making the report, if possible; the preparation of final theses and dissertations should not be disadvantaged; this also applies to working conditions as well as possible contract extensions.

(4) [1]If the person making the report in known by name, the name shall be treated confidentially and not be disclosed to third parties without corresponding consent. [2]The only exception is if there is a legal obligation to do so or if the person affected by the suspicion cannot otherwise defend himself or herself properly because, in exceptional cases, the identity of the person making the report is relevant. [3]The person reporting the alleged misconduct shall also be protected in the event of unproven scientific misconduct, provided that the report of the suspicion is not demonstrably made against better knowledge.

(5) [1]Confidentiality of the procedure is restricted if the person reporting the alleged misconduct makes the suspicion public. [2]The investigating body shall decide in the individual case how to deal with the breach of confidentiality by the person making the report.

(6) [1]The KU decides in its own responsibility and in the individual case if also reports that were made without the person making the report stating his or her name (anonymous report) shall be reviewed. [2]An anonymous report can only be reviewed in an investigation process if the person making the report presents reliable and sufficiently specific facts.

Section 21 Procedure in cases of suspected scientific misconduct

(1) [1]The KU applies a multi-stage procedure to investigate suspected cases of scientific misconduct:

1. Inquiry into allegations
2. Preliminary investigation
3. Formal investigation, where applicable.

[2]The multi-stage procedure specified in these regulations does not replace any other procedures regulated by law, in particular any prosecutorial or judicial function or the binding clarification of copyright issues. [3]The procedure is intended to prepare the decision-making

process of the competent bodies of the KU. [4]Each required procedural step shall be completed within a reasonable period of time in order to conclude the entire procedure as promptly as possible.

(2) The ombudsperson and the Commission carry out their tasks in the procedure independently and are not bound by any instructions; no disadvantages may arise for the ombudsperson and the Commission members as a result of their work during or after the end of their terms of office.

(3) [1]Both the person who is suspected to have committed scientific misconduct and the person who reported the alleged scientific misconduct may contact the chairperson of the Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation if they have concerns that ombudsperson is biased. [2]In this case, after obtaining a statement from the ombudsperson and assessing the circumstances of the individual case, the chairperson of the Commission has the right to pass the case to the deputy ombudsperson for further consideration.

(4) The collection, processing and use of personal data shall be governed by the provisions on the protection of personal data, in particular by the Law on Data Protection in the Catholic Church in Germany (KDG) in the version of the unanimous resolution of the plenary assembly of the Association of German Dioceses (VDD) of November 20, 2017, as amended from time to time, unless these regulations provide otherwise.

(5) Scientific misconduct by students who are not doctoral candidates is dealt with by the responsible board of examiners according to the examination regulations.

Section 22 Inquiry into allegations

[1]The ombudsperson advises persons who inform him or her of suspected cases of scientific misconduct and persons who are alleged to have committed scientific misconduct. [2]He or she investigates specific indications of scientific misconduct that he or she becomes aware of through any other means at his or her own initiative. The ombudsperson examines every suspicion of scientific misconduct under plausibility aspects in free evaluation of evidence within a reasonable period of time for concreteness and significance and documents his or her examination and the result.

Section 23 Preliminary investigation

(1) [1]In case of concrete suspicions of scientific misconduct within the meaning of the catalog of conduct, the ombudsperson shall, without undue delay, give the person affected by the suspicion of misconduct the opportunity to make a statement, providing comprehensive information on the incriminating facts and evidence. [2]The affected person must be allowed two weeks to submit a statement and must be informed (electronically or in writing) of the deadline by which he or she must submit the statement. [3]The deadline may be extended. [4]At this stage, the name of the person reporting the alleged misconduct is not disclosed to the affected person without the his or her consent.

(2) [1]After the affected person’s statement has been received or after the deadline has passed, the ombudsperson shall decide within two weeks whether the preliminary investigation is to be terminated because the suspicion has not been sufficiently confirmed, or whether the procedure should progress to a formal investigation; the affected person is informed of the decision and the reasons for it. [2]If a formal investigation is initiated, this fact and the name of the person affected by such formal investigation will be reported to the University Management; no further information is involved.

Section 24 Formal investigation

(1) [1]The standing Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation is responsible for carrying out the formal investigation. [2]The Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation conducts an unbiased assessment of all evidence in its investigation of the allegation and clarifies the situation of which it has been informed at its own initiative. [3]In order to do so, it may take all steps necessary for clarification of the situation, request all necessary information and statements and, on a case-by-case basis, may appoint expert evaluators in the academic matters that are to be assessed and experts for dealing with such cases as advisory members. [4]The faculties support the Commission in determining the relevant discipline-specific standards of good scientific practice on request.

(2) [1]The affected person must be informed of the incriminating facts and any evidence against him or her. [2]The Commission gives the affected person an appropriate opportunity to make a statement. [3]Both the affected person and the person reporting the alleged misconduct must be given the opportunity to make an oral statement if they wish to do so; a person of their choice may be present as support. [4]The Commission may decide that persons who are also affected by the allegation of scientific misconduct may not be allowed to attend as support.

(3) [1]If the person affected does not know the identity of the person reporting the alleged misconduct, the reporting person's identity must be disclosed to the affected person at this stage if this information is necessary in order for the affected person to defend himself or herself properly, in particular if the credibility of the reporting person is of significance in the determination of whether scientific misconduct has occurred. [2]The person reporting the alleged misconduct is informed immediately before his or her name is disclosed; in view of imminent disclosure of his or her name, the reporting person can decide whether he or she wants to withdraw the report.

Section 25 Conclusion of the formal investigation

(1) [1]If the Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation decides that scientific misconduct has not been proven, the procedure is terminated. [2]If it decides that scientific misconduct has been sufficiently proven, it discusses possible ways in which to proceed, in particular the possible consequences, and presents the responsible dean and the University Management with a final report and a recommendation on how to proceed.

(2) [1]The chairperson of the Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation must immediately inform the affected person in writing of the academic reasons that formed the basis for the decision to terminate the procedure or to pass the case on to the dean and the University Management. [2]There is no internal procedure for appealing against the Commission's decision.

(3) [1]If it has been determined that scientific misconduct has occurred, the responsible faculty considers which measures should be implemented on the basis of the Commission's final report and recommendation in order to safeguard both the academic standards of the University and the rights of all persons who are directly or indirectly involved. [2]The faculties must work with the University Management to check whether and to what extent other researchers (former or potential research partners or co-authors), academic institutions, academic journals or publishers (in the case of publications), funding institutions and scientific organizations, professional associations, ministries, and the public should or must be informed.

(4) [1]The responsible organs initiate legal measures according to the relevant procedures under consideration of the circumstances of the individual case and the results of the investigation. [2]Academic consequences that have been decided on by the responsible faculty are implemented by the University Management. [3]The University Management informs the ombudsperson about the measures taken in writing or electronically.

(5) The documents of the ombudsperson and the Commission for Scientific Self-Regulation must be kept for thirty years after the end of the procedure.

(6) [1]In order to protect third parties, to maintain confidence in academic honesty, to restore its scientific reputation, and to prevent consequential damage, the KU may be obliged to inform affected third parties and the public, insofar as a special or justified interest exists or third parties have a legitimate interest in the decision. [2]In cases of serious scientific misconduct, the KU informs other affected research institutions and scientific organizations of the scientific misconduct. [3]In justified cases, it may also be necessary to inform professional associations of the scientific misconduct.

Section 26 Possible consequences in cases of scientific misconduct

(1) In cases of scientific misconduct, the consequences are based on the circumstances of the individual case and the severity of the misconduct that has been identified.

(2) [1]The KU can only draw academic consequences in the form of revocation of degrees if the KU awarded the degree in question to the affected person itself. [2]The following, in particular, may be considered:

1. Revoking the doctoral degree
2. Revoking the right to teach
3. Evaluating junior professors as unsuitable for an academic career.

[3]If the degree was awarded by another institution, it must be informed in cases in which severe scientific misconduct was committed in conjunction with the process of acquiring the academic qualification.

(3) [1]For employees of the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt Foundation, consequences may take the form of disciplinary action. [2]For regular employees, disciplinary action includes, in particular, a written warning, exceptional notice of dismissal, regular notice of dismissal, and dissolution of the employment contract. [3]For public servants (*Beamte)*, disciplinary action (reprimand, fine, salary reduction, removal from post) may be taken after a disciplinary procedure has been carried out according to the current version of the disciplinary regulations of the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt Foundation (*Disziplinarordnung der Stiftung Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt* – StDiszO) dated June 16, 2012.

(4) The following consequences under civil law may be considered:

1. Issuing a ban on entering University premises
2. Asserting claims for the affected person to surrender material, such as stolen scientific material
3. Asserting claims for the affected person to cease and desist on the basis of copyright, personality rights, patent law, or competition law
4. Asserting claims for scholarships, third-party funding, or similar to be returned
5. The KU or third parties asserting claims to damages in the case of personal injury or property damage.

(5) [1]Consequences under criminal law may be considered if it is suspected that the scientific misconduct is also a criminal offense under the German Criminal Code (*Strafgesetzbuch)* or other penal provisions, or an administrative offense. [2]The decision to contact law enforcement agencies must generally be implemented by the University Management.

(6) [1]Academic publications that include errors due to scientific misconduct must be recalled if they have not yet been published and must be corrected if they have been published (retraction); where necessary, research partners must be informed in a suitable manner. [2]Generally the author and the editor(s) involved are obliged to do this; if they do not act, the KU initiates suitable measures that are within its powers.

Section 27 Revocation of academic degrees if a person is deemed unworthy of holding a degree

(1) If, following the discovery of scientific misconduct, the revocation of an academic degree is considered as a measure, the bodies responsible for this will be involved.

(2) Academic degrees may be revoked if, in the context of research and teaching, the holder fabricates or falsifies data, infringes on another person's intellectual property rights, compromises another person's research, conducts or instructs others to conduct human experiments that are prohibited by law or conducted without the consent of those affected, conducts or instructs others to conduct prohibited animal experiments, or degrades individual persons or groups of persons in a manner that violates their human dignity or promotes or incites hatred, violence, or arbitrary actions against them.

(3) [1]The effects of the revocation of the degree on the affected person's ability to practice his or her profession must be taken into sufficient consideration by all internal organs of the University when making a decision. [2]Degrees may also be revoked post mortem.

(4) The procedure and the persons responsible are governed by the applicable legal regulations; the present regulations may be applied accordingly.

V. Final provisions

Section 28 Entry into force

(1) The Regulations on Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice enters into force on the day following their publication.

(2) The Regulations on Safeguarding Standards of Good Scientific Practice and Dealing with Allegations of Scientific Misconduct dated July 16, 2014 in the version dated June 18, 2018 ceases to be in force.

Issued on the basis of the resolution of the Senate of the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt dated July 21, 2021, and the approval of the president dated August 26, 2021.

Eichstätt/Ingolstadt September 02, 2021

Prof. Dr. Gabriele Gien
President

These regulations were set down in writing at the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt on September 2, 2021. This fact was made known to members of the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt on the same day. The date of publication is therefore September 2, 2021.