

Guidelines for Good Scientific Practice at the Klassik Stiftung Weimar

Preamble

The Klassik Stiftung Weimar pledges to uphold the following principles to ensure good scientific practice in all research activities conducted at and by the Foundation. The Klassik Stiftung Weimar shall investigate every suspected case of scientific misconduct by its employees, provided concrete reasons for such investigation exist. The following guidelines demonstrate that the Klassik Stiftung Weimar does not tolerate scientific misconduct as this inevitably erodes public trust in the scientific field and mutual trust between researchers.

§ 1: Guidelines for good scientific practice

1. Principles

Good scientific practice is rooted in the same basic principles for practically every discipline – the first and foremost is honesty to oneself and others. It is both the ethical standard and basis for virtually all rules concerning good scientific practice. Good scientific practice is also a prerequisite for efficient, distinguished research at the international level. The Klassik Stiftung Weimar recognises its institutional responsibility as an organisation publicly tasked with preserving and studying its entrusted cultural-historical heritage. It undertakes to cultivate good scientific practice, encourage its staff to engage in ethical conduct, and to investigate and address any concrete cases of misconduct in an appropriate manner.

2. Researchers who work for the Klassik Stiftung Weimar are obliged to,

- » work according to the principles and methods of their own discipline (*lege artis*),
- » reliably document any sources, aids, methods and findings they use,
- » maintain the standards of methodical scepticism with regard to one's own results and examine other's positions with integrity,
- » refrain from exploiting the achievements of others for one's personal benefit and from using their work without proper citation,
- » precisely declare and delineate authorship and responsibilities in publications.

3. Every project leader/research group leader is responsible for conducting themselves in an academically exemplary manner. Those who lead a project/research group bear responsibility for properly supervising their academic staff and ensuring efficient collaboration between all members of the project/research group.

4. When hiring researchers and deciding whether to pursue or continue research projects, originality and quality should outweigh quantity as the key criteria in the decision-making process.

5. Primary data which serve as the basis for publications must be stored centrally at the Klassik Stiftung Weimar or at the site in which they were collected on durable, secure media carriers for a duration of ten years.
6. The President of the Klassik Stiftung Weimar is responsible for ensuring that the tasks of management, supervision, conflict resolution and quality assurance are clearly assigned and carried out at all levels of management. Within the scope of their responsibility, research project leaders are especially responsible for ensuring compliance with the guidelines of good scientific practice.

§ 2: Scientific misconduct

1. The term “scientific misconduct” is used to describe cases when an individual intentionally or negligently presents false data in a scientifically relevant context, infringes upon the intellectual property rights of others or adversely affects the research activities of others in the following ways:
 - 1.1. Presentation of false data, e.g. through the
 - » contrivance of data,
 - » distortion of data, e.g. by providing incomplete data, failing to consider or disclose undesired findings or manipulating a diagram or illustration,
 - » provision of false information in an employment or grant application (including incorrect information regarding a publication medium or publications in print),
 - 1.2. Violation of intellectual property rights with respect to another’s copyright-protected work or significant research findings, hypotheses, teachings or research methods, e.g. through the
 - » unauthorised use of data under the pretence of authorship (plagiarism),
 - » exploitation of research methods and ideas of others (theft of ideas),
 - » pretence or unfounded assumption of authorship or co-authorship,
 - » falsification of content,
 - » unauthorised publication and/or provision of access to third parties insofar the work, finding, hypothesis, teaching or research method has not yet been published,
 - 1.3. assumption of (co-)authorship of another person’s work without his/her consent,
 - 1.4. sabotage of research activities, including damaging, destroying or manipulating experiments, equipment, documents, hardware, software or other items that are required for conducting a study or experiment,
 - 1.5. disposal of primary data insofar such disposal constitutes a violation of legal regulations or the recognised subject-related fundamentals of scientific practice.

2. Scientific misconduct also applies to those who bear joint responsibility for the misconduct of others, in particular through active participation in scientific misconduct, knowledge of falsification, co-authorship of falsified publications, or gross negligence in one's supervisory duties.

§ 3: Investigation of scientific misconduct

1. Ombudsperson

- 1.1. The directorate of the Klassik Stiftung Weimar appoints a member of its staff to act as an ombudsperson responsible for ensuring good scientific practice, as well as his/her deputy. The ombudsperson and his/her deputy are appointed for a three-year term. Reappointment is possible.
- 1.2. The ombudsperson serves as a contact for all employees in matters of scientific conduct. He/she is responsible for looking into accusations of scientific misconduct, consulting those who have voiced suspicion of scientific misconduct, and commencing a formal inquiry (see below). The ombudsperson performs the duties of his/her office independently. He/she is obliged to maintain confidentiality toward those who are not involved in the proceedings. He/she reports on all significant occurrences to the President of the Klassik Stiftung Weimar.
- 1.3. The ombudsperson is obliged to disclose any potential bias. In such cases, the deputy assumes the duties of the ombudsperson.

2. Commission of inquiry

- 2.1. The directorate of the Klassik Stiftung Weimar appoints a four-person commission of inquiry comprised of members of staff to investigate accusations of scientific misconduct. The ombudsperson participates in the meetings of the commission in an advisory function. The commission's members are appointed for a three-year term. Reappointment is possible.
- 2.2. The commission's members choose a chairperson and take decisions with a simple majority vote. It documents all significant procedures in writing. Statements, hearings, negotiations and decisions should be obtained and/or conducted in such a way that ensures the process proceeds in a timely fashion.
- 2.3. The commission acts independently and is not required to follow specific directives. The President may participate in the meetings without a vote and is given the floor upon request.
- 2.4. Members of the commission are obliged to disclose any potential bias. In such cases, the directorate appoints a substitute.

3. Preliminary investigation

- 3.1. Upon receiving information on scientific misconduct, the ombudsperson investigates the accusations in terms of severity, concreteness and plausibility.
- 3.2. The ombudsperson promptly notifies the individual who has been accused of scientific misconduct and offers him/her the opportunity to respond in a written statement. The

standard deadline for submitting a statement is two weeks unless pressing reasons exist for setting a different deadline. In this stage of the investigation, the whistle-blower's name may only be disclosed without his/her consent.

- 3.3. After receiving the statement or at the end of the two-week deadline, the ombudsperson determines whether to conclude the investigation or introduce a formal inquiry. The accused person and the whistle-blower must both be notified in writing with regard to the decision and the reasoning behind it. They are given the opportunity to respond. If the whistle-blower does not agree with the ombudsperson's decision to conclude the investigation, he/she has the right to take up the matter in a personal meeting with the ombudsperson. This meeting can result in a renewed examination of the case.

4. Formal inquiry

- 4.1. A formal inquiry is opened at the request of the ombudsperson. The chairperson of the commission informs the President that a formal inquiry has been introduced. Depending on the specific subject and requirements, the commission may consult with the Scientific Advisory Board (*wissenschaftlicher Beirat*) of the Klassik Stiftung Weimar. The accused party has the right to respond to the accusations, have a personal hearing and enlist the support of a person whom they trust. The members of the commission as well as any enlisted third parties are obliged to maintain confidentiality on commission-related matters.
- 4.2. At its discretion, the commission discusses the matter in closed session and upon examining the evidence provided decides whether and to what extent scientific misconduct took place.
- 4.3. The commission records its final decision in writing, documenting the result of its inquiry, its justification and concrete recommendations for action which, if applicable, takes into account the violated rights of third parties, and forwards the decision to the President, the accused party and the whistle-blower. The accused party is not permitted to seek internal recourse against the decision of the commission of inquiry.

5. Consequences

- 5.1. If the commission concludes that scientific misconduct has not been proven, the President is responsible for ensuring that the accused party is appropriately protected in his/her dignity and shielded from disadvantages. The whistle-blower must be protected in a similar fashion, provided his/her suspicions were not entirely unfounded.
- 5.2. If the commission concludes that the accused party is guilty of scientific misconduct, the President must decide on a course of action based on the recommendations of the commission in a manner commensurate with the severity of the proven misconduct. Possible courses of action may include legal recourse as provided by labour, service, civil service and criminal law.
- 5.3. Following the conclusion of the procedure, the files of the formal inquiry and its subsequent measures are transferred to the institutional archive of the Klassik Stiftung Weimar.