

Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice and for dealing with scientific misconduct at Leibniz Institut für Werkstofforientierte Technologien (Leibniz-IWT)

Based on „Guidelines for Good Research Practice in the Leibniz-Community (2018, adjusted 2019)“ and under special Consideration of the current codex of the DFG „ Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice“ and „Leibniz-codex good scientific practice (2021)“ (Heinzel/Clausen, February 2022)

Preamble

The basis of valid scientific work is the honesty of the scientists towards themselves and others and the honesty in the search for truthful knowledge. The Leibniz Institut für Werkstofforientierte Technologien (Leibniz-IWT) is aware of its responsibility to ensure the norms and standards of good scientific practice and to communicate these to all scientists, especially in the qualification phase. The codex of the German Research Foundation (DFG) sets the framework for these standards. [„Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice“](#). The codex is aimed at scientists and all other actors in the science system who contribute to ensuring scientific integrity, such as publishers of specialist journals, specialist societies, whistleblowers and ombudspersons. These guidelines for good scientific practice at the Leibniz-IWT are aimed at all employees of the institution and are made known by the management in a suitable manner.

1 General Principles

The standards of good scientific practice, which are announced in these guidelines and are based on the DFG code, are mandatory for all people working at the Leibniz IWT who contribute to ensuring scientific integrity.

Guideline 1 Commitment to the general principles

Every employee is responsible for ensuring that their own behavior meets the standards of good scientific practice.

Guideline 2 professional ethics

Every person working at the Leibniz-IWT is fundamentally responsible for adhering to the standards of good scientific practice and has to inform themselves regularly about these standards. The teaching of the basics of good scientific work begins at the earliest possible point in time. Experienced employees and junior staff support each other in the continuous learning and further training process and are in regular contact.

The Leibniz-IWT offers a seminar on good scientific practice once a year, which is open to all employees working at the Leibniz-IWT. Participation in this seminar once is mandatory for all employees.

Guideline 3: Organizational responsibility of the management of the Leibniz-IWT

The organizational responsibility for creating suitable framework conditions for the implementation of and compliance with the guidelines for good scientific practice lies with the board of directors. The board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT guarantees that the employees can comply with legal and ethical standards. The responsibility for the communication, implementation and compliance with good scientific practice lies with the management of the respective scientific work units of the Leibniz-IWT, in which the tasks of management, supervision, quality assurance and conflict resolution are clearly assigned and the respective members and relatives in a suitable manner mediated. Graduate promotion was established at the Leibniz-IWT for young scientists. As part of annual talks, honest advice on careers and further career paths as well as further training opportunities and mentoring for the scientific and scientific support staff are offered.

The Leibniz-IWT is certified according to the "berufundfamilie" audit, which implements the compatibility of work and family for all employees.

Applicants for advertised positions are subject to a formalized applicant management process that is not based solely on academic achievements. In order to ensure a balanced, non-discriminatory evaluation, the women's representative and the works council are also formally involved in the application process. Gender equality and diversity are also taken into account as part of personnel selection and personnel development. The corresponding processes are transparent and avoid unconscious influences ("unconscious bias") as far as possible. Personnel development is also subject to the non-discriminatory assessment mentioned above and is supported, among other things, by the annual appraisals between employees and supervisors.

Guideline 4: Responsibility of management of work units

The leadership of each scientific work unit is responsible for the entire unit. This includes proper care of the academical [offspring](#) in the preparation and academic evaluation of qualification work.

Responsible cooperation and performance of management tasks in working groups includes looking after their members, including young scientists, so that all members are aware of their roles, rights and obligations and abuse of power and exploitation of dependency relationships are prevented.

The Leibniz Association supports its institutions with suitable joint agreements and offers ¹.

The size and organization of scientific work units are designed in such a way that management tasks, in particular the transfer of skills, scientific support and supervisory and support duties, can be performed appropriately. The performance of managerial tasks goes hand in hand with the corresponding responsibility. All employees enjoy a relationship between supervision and personal responsibility appropriate to their career level. They have an adequate status with corresponding participation rights. Increasing independence puts them in a position to shape their careers.

¹ Guiding principles of our Actions in the Leibniz-Community: <https://www.leibniz-gemeinschaft.de/en/about-us/leibniz-integrity/guiding-principles-for-our-actions> and Leibniz Advice center: <https://www.leibniz-gemeinschaft.de/en/about-us/leibniz-integrity/guide-for-dealing-with-conflict/advice-centre-for-conflict-guidance-and-prevention>

Guideline 5: Performance dimensions and evaluation criteria

A multidimensional approach is used at the Leibniz-IWT to evaluate the performance of scientists. In addition to scientific performance, other aspects can also be taken into account. The evaluation of performance primarily follows qualitative standards, whereby quantitative indicators can only be included in the overall evaluation in a differentiated and reflected manner. If stated voluntarily, in addition to the categories of the General Equal Treatment Act, individual peculiarities in CVs are also included in the judgment. Personal, family or health-related downtime or the resulting extended training or qualification periods, alternative career paths or comparable circumstances are adequately taken into account.

Guideline 6: Ombudspersons

- (1) The employees of the Leibniz-IWT choose two independent ombudspersons who can represent each other as a contact point for discrepancies, suspicions and disputes regarding the standards of good scientific practice. The representation applies in particular in the case of concern of bias or impediment. Even the appearance of bias precludes the ombudsperson concerned from taking action. The bias rules of the DFG and the Leibniz Association apply.

The elected ombudspersons of the Leibniz-IWT are the first contacts for those seeking advice or reporting from the Leibniz-IWT. Employees of the university and doctoral students should contact the ombudspersons of the University of Bremen. Employees with employment contracts at the university and Leibniz-IWT decide independently to which ombudsperson their request should be addressed. If both ombudspersons of the Leibniz-IWT are biased or unable to represent each other, those seeking advice or reporting have the right to choose between the central ombudsman committee of the Leibniz Association and the committee "Ombudsman for Science" of the DFG.

Scientists who have the personal integrity, objective judgment and experience, e.g. in management positions, required to fulfill their tasks are suitable as ombudspersons. However, you may not be a member of the institute management while exercising this office. The term of office is four years. One re-election is permitted. The management is responsible for conducting the secret ballot and for ensuring that the ombudspersons are made known to the Leibniz-IWT in a suitable manner.

- (2) The ombudspersons take action when they are made aware of a suspicion. The ombudspersons check their competence and, if necessary, forward inquiries to the ombudspersons of the university. The ombudspersons are not investigative bodies, i.e. they do not actively check compliance with the standards of good scientific practice at the Leibniz-IWT on their own initiative. However, they can take action in justified cases if they are informed by a third party of a suspicion of scientific misconduct, provided the suspicion is related to their work at the Leibniz-IWT.
- (3) As neutral and qualified contact persons, the ombudspersons advise on questions of good scientific practice and suspected cases of scientific misconduct and, as far as possible, contribute to solution-oriented conflict mediation. Principles of the work of the ombudspersons are confidentiality, neutrality, fairness and transparency towards those involved.

2 Research Process – Guidelines of good scientific work

Guideline 7: Cross-phase quality assurance

One of the standards of good scientific practice is to work *lege artis*, i.e. to always use the latest knowledge. This requires knowledge and utilization of the current literature, the application of the latest methods and findings. If scientific findings are made publicly accessible (in the narrower sense in the form of publications, but also in the broader sense via other communication channels), the quality assurance mechanisms used are always explained. This is especially true when new methods are developed.

All logs and primary data are stored securely and for the long term, and subject-specific standards and established methods are adhered to. The continuous, research-accompanying quality assurance also refers to processes such as the calibration of devices, the collection, processing and analysis of research data, the selection and use of research software including its development and programming, as well as the keeping of laboratory books in all laboratories of the Leibniz IWT. Validity and reproducibility of all results must be checked critically and consistently. Strict honesty must be maintained with regard to the contributions of employees and towards third-party donors. If scientists have made findings publicly available and they subsequently notice discrepancies or errors, they correct them. If the discrepancies or errors cause a publication to be withdrawn, the scientists will contact the relevant publisher or infrastructure provider as quickly as possible to ensure that the correction or withdrawal is made and that it is marked accordingly. The same applies if the scientists are informed of such discrepancies or errors by third parties.

The origin of data, organisms, materials and software used in the research process is identified and subsequent use is documented; the original sources are quoted. The type and scope of research data generated in the research process are described. How to deal with them is designed according to the specifications in the subject concerned. Publicly available software must be persistent, citable and documented. The fact that the results or findings can be replicated or confirmed by other scientists (e.g. by means of a detailed description of materials and methods) is - depending on the subject concerned - an essential part of quality assurance.

Guideline 8: Actors, responsibilities and roles

The roles and responsibilities of the scientists involved in a research project and of the staff supporting the science must be clear at all times during the research project. All those involved are in regular contact. They define their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate manner and adjust them dynamically where necessary. An adjustment is indicated in particular if the focus of work of those involved in the research project changes.

Guideline 9: Research design

When planning a project, scientists take into account the current state of publicly accessible research, research it carefully and acknowledge it. The board of directors ensures the framework conditions required for research into publicly accessible research achievements. Methods to avoid (unconscious) distortions in the interpretation of findings are used as far as possible. Scientists examine whether and, if so, to what extent gender and diversity could be significant for the research project. When interpreting findings, the respective framework conditions are taken into account.

Guideline 10: Legal and ethical framework, rights of use

The scientists deal responsibly with the freedom of research granted under constitutional law. They take into account rights and obligations, in particular from legal requirements or contracts with third parties, obtain usage rights, permits and ethics votes and thoroughly assess the research consequences and ethical aspects. The legal framework of a research project also includes documented agreements on the rights of use for research data and research results arising from it. Scientists are constantly aware of the danger of misusing research results. Their responsibility is not limited to compliance with legal requirements, but also includes the obligation to use their knowledge, experience and skills in such a way that risks can be identified, assessed and evaluated. The board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT is responsible for the conformity of the actions of the scientists and promotes them through suitable organizational structures.

The Leibniz-IWT is based on the guidelines „[Ethos im Ingenieurberuf](#)“ of VDI² and if applicable, the Leibniz Commission for Research Ethics (Leibniz-KEF). The institute has developed its own guideline for the corresponding assessment of research projects (Kernprozess Forschung). Furthermore, the national and international regulations are observed.

The scientists at the Leibniz-IWT are aware that the scientists who generated the data are entitled to use the data. Within the framework of research projects, the authorized users decide, subject to data protection regulations, whether third parties should have access to the data. The scientists correctly verify their own and third-party preliminary work.

Guideline 11: Methods und Standards

The scientists use scientifically sound and comprehensible methods. When developing and applying new methods, they pay attention to quality standards and their establishment.

Guideline 12: Documentation

The scientists at the Leibniz-IWT document all information relevant to the achievement of a research result in a comprehensible manner that is necessary and appropriate in engineering in order to be able to check and evaluate the result. Individual results are documented and not discarded from the outset if they do not support the research hypothesis. A selection of results does not take place in this context. Documentation and research results must not be manipulated and must be protected against manipulation as best as possible.

The Leibniz-IWT gives the highest priority to the extensive documentation of the research processes and results in order to be able to guarantee a high level of transparency, traceability and reusability of the results. If the documentation does not meet these requirements, the restrictions and the reasons for this are explained in a comprehensible manner. The traceability of citations is to be guaranteed and, as far as possible, third parties are to be allowed access to the information necessary for understanding the research. When developing research software, the source code is documented.

Guideline 13: Creation of public access to research results

In principle, scientists bring all the results into the scientific discourse. They decide on their own responsibility - taking into account the customs of engineering sciences - to what extent there are reasons to deviate from this principle in individual cases and refrain from making it publicly available. This decision must not be made dependent on third parties.

² https://www.vdi.de/fileadmin/pages/mein_vdi/redakteure/publikationen/VDI_Ethische_Grundsaeetze.pdf von März 2002

"Quality before quantity" applies to publications, i.e. inappropriately small-scale publications should be avoided and results previously made public should be cited. The scientists limit the repetition of the content of their publications and self-citations to the extent necessary for understanding the context. The intellectual authorship of others must be respected in all publications and all quotations and acquisitions must be duly identified.

For reasons of traceability, connectivity of research and reusability, the scientists store the research data and central materials on which the publication is based in a specified file structure in a comprehensible manner on the institute's data servers. In order to comply with the FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-Usable), this data is currently stored in publicly accessible repositories such as e.g. zenodo copied. The software programmed as part of the publication is made publicly accessible on an institute's Github server, stating the object or source code.

Guideline 14: Authorship

Authors of an original scientific publication are those who have made a genuine contribution to the content of a scientific text, data or software publication and have approved the final version. The authors bear joint responsibility for the publication, unless explicitly stated otherwise. In particular applies:

- (a) A comprehensible genuine contribution exists in particular if a scientist contributes to the
 - Development and conception of the research project or
 - the development, collection, procurement, provision of data, software sources or
 - the analysis/evaluation or interpretation of the data, sources and the conclusions drawn from them or
 - participated in writing the manuscript.
- (b) If a contribution is insufficient to justify authorship, that support may be acknowledged in footnotes, the foreword, or the acknowledgment.
- (c) A so-called honorary authorship is excluded. The mere provision of infrastructure and/or financial resources or a mere management or superior function does not entitle authorship.
- (d) The order of the authors will be agreed in good time, at the latest when the manuscript is being drafted, based on comprehensible criteria.
- (e) Consent to the publication of results may not be refused without sufficient reason. The refusal of consent must be justified with a verifiable criticism of data, methods or results.

Guideline 15: Publication organ

The authors decide where and how the research results are made publicly available and strive for free access (open access). You choose the publication organ carefully. New publication organs are checked with regard to their seriousness. The scientific quality of a contribution does not depend on the publication in which it is made publicly available. In addition to publications in books and specialist journals, specialist repositories, data and software repositories and blogs can also be considered. Researchers who assume the function of editors also carefully check for which publication organ they assume this task. A key criterion in the selection decision is whether the publication organ has established its own guidelines for good scientific practice.

Guideline 16: Confidentiality and neutrality in assessments and consultations

Scientists who assess submitted manuscripts, funding applications or the identification of persons or are members of scientific advisory and decision-making bodies undertake to act honestly and to maintain strict confidentiality. This excludes the transfer of content to third parties and your own use of this content. They disclose all facts that could give rise to concerns about bias.

Guideline 17: Archiving / long-term storage

Primary data and research data or research results that have been made publicly available are stored at the Leibniz-IWT for at least ten years in an accessible and traceable manner (this period expires after the data is published) or stored in cross-site repositories. In the case of shortened retention periods, this will be justified in a comprehensible manner. If, in exceptional cases, there are comprehensible reasons for not storing certain data, the scientists will explain this.

With the institute's own file server and cooperation with external partner institutions and service providers, the Leibniz-IWT ensures that the necessary infrastructure is in place to enable this long-term storage. State-of-the-art long-term archiving is pursued at all times.

3 Non-compliance with good scientific practice, procedures

Guideline 18: Whistleblowers and those affected by allegations

The ombudspersons of the Leibniz-IWT and investigative commissions that investigate suspected scientific misconduct are committed to protecting both the whistleblower and those affected by the allegations. The investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct is expressly carried out with due regard to confidentiality - both for those providing the information and for those affected by the allegations - and the basic idea of the presumption of innocence. The reporting of the whistle-blower must be made in good faith and based on objective indications of a violation of good scientific practice. Allegations made intentionally incorrectly or willfully can themselves constitute scientific misconduct. The notification should - especially in the case of young scientists - not lead to delays in the qualification of the person providing the information, and the preparation of theses and doctorates should not be disadvantaged. This also applies to working conditions and possible contract extensions. The whistleblowers are also to be protected in the event of scientific misconduct that has not been proven, unless the allegations were reported against their better knowledge.

The investigating body takes the basic idea of the presumption of innocence towards the person concerned into account at every stage of the procedure within the framework of a case-by-case assessment. In principle, the person affected by the allegations should not suffer any disadvantages from the investigation of the suspicion until scientific misconduct has been formally established. The person providing the information must have objective evidence that standards of good scientific practice may have been violated.

If the whistleblower cannot check the facts themselves or if there is uncertainty in interpreting the applicable rules of good scientific practice with regard to an observed process, the whistleblower should contact the responsible ombudsperson to clarify the suspicion.

An anonymous report can only be checked in a procedure if the person reporting the crime presents reliable and sufficiently concrete facts to the body investigating the suspicion. If the whistleblower is known by name, the investigating body treats the name confidentially and does not pass it on to third parties without the appropriate consent.

Else only applies if there is a legal obligation to do so or if the person affected by the allegations is otherwise unable to defend himself/herself properly because, exceptionally, the identity of the person providing the information is important. Before the name of the whistleblower is disclosed, she/he will be informed immediately; the whistleblower can decide whether he/she will withdraw the report if the name is to be disclosed.

The confidentiality of a procedure is restricted if the whistleblower goes public with the suspicion. The investigating body decides on a case-by-case basis how to deal with the breach of confidentiality by the informant. The whistleblower is also to be protected in the event of scientific misconduct that has not been proven, unless the allegations were demonstrably reported against better knowledge.

Guideline 19: Procedures in suspected cases of scientific misconduct

At the Leibniz-IWT, the facts of scientific misconduct, procedural regulations and measures when scientific misconduct is determined are defined in corresponding sets of rules (see section 4. Facts of scientific misconduct, section 5. Procedures for resolving conflicts and investigating allegations of scientific misconduct and section 6. Completion of the procedure).

4 Facts of scientific misconduct

Scientific misconduct occurs if (in a scientific context) false information is provided intentionally or through gross negligence, third-party scientific achievements are adopted as one's own without justification, or the research activities of others are impaired. These facts are specified below:

- (1) In particular, the following deemed to be incorrect:
 - a) fabricating data and/or research results,
 - b) the falsification of data and/or research results, in particular
 - i. by suppressing and/or eliminating data and/or results obtained in the research process without disclosing this,
 - ii. by manipulating a representation or illustration,
 - c) through the incongruent representation of the image and the associated statement,
 - d) through incorrect information in publication lists, in funding applications or as part of the reporting obligation (including incorrect information on the publication organ and on publications in print),
 - e) by claiming the (co-)authorship of another without their consent;
- (2) Unauthorized appropriation of third-party scientific achievements occurs in particular through:
 - a) the unauthorized adoption or other use of passages from third parties without proper appropriate proof of authorship (plagiarism),
 - b) the exploitation of research approaches and ideas without consent (in particular as an expert) ("theft of ideas"),
 - c) the unauthorized disclosure of data, theories and findings to third parties or their unauthorized use for one's own scientific purposes,
 - d) the presumption or unfounded assumption of authorship or co-authorship, especially if no genuine, comprehensible contribution to the scientific content of the publication was made, as well as the denial of legitimate co-authorship,
 - e) the falsification of the content,
 - f) unauthorized publication or unauthorized disclosure to third parties as long as the work, knowledge, hypothesis or research approach has not yet been legally published;

- (3) The impairment of research activities of others occurs in particular through
 - a) Sabotage of research activities (e.g. by damaging or manipulating experimental setups),
 - b) Tampering or unauthorized disposal of research data or research documents,
 - c) Falsification or unauthorized disposal of research data documentation,
 - d) Inadequate supervision of qualification work (cf. e.g. guidelines for the qualification phase for a doctorate from the Leibniz-IWT).
- (4) The removal of primary data is considered scientific misconduct if it violates legal regulations or recognized principles of scientific work (see above). This also applies to the unlawful non-removal of (in particular personal) data.
- (5) Violation of confidentiality in the review process through unauthorized disclosure of data, theories or findings to third parties also constitutes scientific misconduct.
Shared responsibility for misconduct can result, among other things, from participation in the misconduct of others, gross neglect of the duty of supervision or co-authorship of forged publications.

5 Procedures for resolving conflicts and investigating allegations of scientific misconduct

- (1) An ombudsperson usually acts upon request (s. a.).
- (2) The ombudspersons should weigh up the review of anonymous reports. In principle, an expedient investigation requires the confidential naming of the whistleblower to the ombudsperson. The valid violations of good scientific practice for the Leibniz-IWT are defined in section 3 (non-compliance with good scientific practice) and serve as a guide.
- (3) The ombudspersons work in an appropriate manner to protect both the whistleblower and those affected by the allegations. The name of a whistleblower is to be treated confidentially. Disclosing the name to the accused person may be necessary in individual cases if the person otherwise unable to defend themselves properly, but should only be done if the whistleblower does not suffer any disadvantages for their own scientific and professional advancement.
- (4) The reporting of the whistleblower must be made in good faith. Allegations made intentionally incorrectly or willfully can themselves constitute scientific misconduct.
- (5) The ombudspersons will confirm receipt of the report to the whistleblower within one week of receipt.
- (6) If it is not a case of scientific misconduct that has already occurred (e.g. publication of falsified data), but rather advice on how to avoid misconduct or mediation between people (e.g. supervisors and those being looked after), the discussions can be canceled by all those involved at any time without specifying reasons to be terminate. In the event of mediation, the parties to the conflict are responsible for implementing and implementing the proposed solutions. The ombudspersons have no authority to take any measures to enforce or monitor the agreements made.
- (7) If scientific misconduct is suspected, the ombudspersons carry out a preliminary examination. In order to carry out this preliminary examination, at least the accused and the informants should be hear. Persons who are asked for an interview by ombudspersons for the purpose of this preliminary examination are obliged to comply with this request promptly (within a maximum of 2 weeks after the request).

- (8) Those affected and those providing information must be given the opportunity to comment at every stage of the procedure.
- (9) The investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct is expressly carried out in compliance with confidentiality and the basic idea of the presumption of innocence.
- (10) The ombudspersons can hear other people and commission external reports. All statements and consultations with an ombudsperson are confidential. Access to files is not granted in the course of a preliminary examination, not even to the Executive Board (unless all parties agree to this).
- (11) As a result of the preliminary examination, the ombudsperson responsible for the specific case decides whether to discontinue the proceedings, whether it is necessary to set up a committee of inquiry or whether further investigations can be carried out by the extended board of directors. If the Leibniz-IWT ombudspersons decide during the course of the preliminary examination that an external examination of the allegations is necessary, the process can be referred to an external body, e.g. the central ombudsman committee of the Leibniz Association or the ombudsman, in consultation with the extended board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT the DFG. All parties involved are informed before an external opinion is sought.
- (12) If the procedure is discontinued by ombudspersons, those involved can raise an objection. The procedure is then forwarded directly to the extended board of directors or, in the event of bias, to the central ombudsman committee of the Leibniz Association.
- (13) If it is necessary to set up a committee of inquiry, the ombudspersons will inform the whistleblower, the accused and the extended board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT in writing about the result of the preliminary examination and the reason for setting up a committee of inquiry.
- (14) In the event that they consider the existence of serious scientific misconduct to be sufficiently probable, ombudspersons will set up a committee of inquiry to examine the allegations of scientific misconduct, or if the extended board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT decides to do so.
- (15) The investigative committee consists of at least four members, including a member of the Leibniz-IWT Scientific Advisory Board and two members of the Leibniz-IWT Extended Board of Directors. Two deputies are appointed. The bias rules of the DFG and the Leibniz Association apply. In addition, a fully qualified lawyer is to be appointed to the committee of inquiry. The committee of inquiry appoints a chairperson and a deputy chairperson from among its members.
- (16) One of the ombudspersons is a member of the committee of inquiry, but without voting rights. All voting members have equal voting rights.
- (17) The committee of inquiry advises in non-public and oral hearings. In its first meeting, it agrees on rules for the procedure. The members of the investigative committee and the employees of the Leibniz-IWT involved, as well as all persons involved in the procedure or who have been informed about the procedure, are obliged to maintain confidentiality.
- (18) The Leibniz-IWT supports the work of the investigative committee in organizational terms; in particular, all requested data and documents must be made available to an investigative committee.
- (19) The investigative committee examines in free evaluation of evidence whether scientific misconduct has occurred. He hears the accused and those who provide information and can also question other people and commission expert opinions.

- (20) As a rule, the review by the committee of inquiry should be completed within a period of no more than six months from the constitutive meeting of the committee of inquiry.
- (21) The committee of inquiry may decide to discontinue the proceedings.
- (22) The committee of inquiry draws up a report that either justifies the discontinuation of the procedure or establishes the existence of scientific misconduct.
If the committee of inquiry comes to the conclusion that scientific misconduct has occurred, i.e. if the majority of the committee of inquiry considers the scientific misconduct to be sufficiently proven, the report should in particular:
- determine whether such behavior was grossly negligent or intentional and
 - assess the seriousness of scientific misconduct
 - also state what further action the committee of inquiry recommends (referring to other institutions and bodies, the initiation of appropriate measures, etc.).
- (23) The report is presented to the participants and the extended board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT. The extended board of directors deals with the report promptly and decides on further measures if necessary.

6 Completion of the procedure

- (1) Based on the report of the investigative committee on the existence of scientific misconduct, the extended board of directors decides on the necessary measures or on the discontinuation of the procedure. The following measures can be taken against the person concerned:
- Written complaint, warning or other labor law measures,
 - Exclusion from the Leibniz-IWT internal competition for funds from the Leibniz-IWT innovation fund and the Leibniz competition for one to five years (depending on the severity of the scientific misconduct),
 - Request to withdraw (a) incriminating publication(s) in whole or in part and to correct inaccurate data,
 - Depending on the severity of the case: disciplinary, labour, civil or criminal consequences.
- (2) If the extended board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT determines on the basis of the report of the investigative committee that scientific misconduct could make it necessary to withdraw academic degrees, it forwards the case to the awarding university.
- (3) The report submitted by the committee of inquiry and the decisions made by the extended board of directors are final for the procedure within the Leibniz-IWT.
- (4) The main reasons that led to the discontinuation of the procedure or to the decision of the extended board of directors on measures to be implemented must be communicated to those affected and any whistleblowers.
- (5) After the conclusion of the investigation, the result will be communicated to the scientific organizations concerned and, if necessary, to third parties who have a justified interest in the decision.
- (6) The extended board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT decides on the publication of the resolutions and the reports of the investigative committee on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the existence of a legitimate public interest.

7. Mode of choice for the IWT ombudspersons

- (1) If possible, the election should be held on the occasion of the election of the works council and after four years at the latest. If possible, the ombudspersons should come from two different main departments of the IWT. The ombudspersons may not be members of the institute's management, i.e. they may not be heads of departments or directors.
The term of office of the ombudspersons is usually four years. Two re-elections are possible. As long as no new election has taken place, the previous ombudspersons remain in office. All scientists of the IWT and the three university departments, which are headed by the heads of departments at the University of Bremen, have active voting rights. Only scientists with a doctorate have the right to stand as a candidate.
- (2) Formation of an election committee
The election is prepared and carried out by an election committee, which consists of three employees who are entitled to vote.
The management of the institute draws up a list of those entitled to vote no later than two months before the election is due and calls them to a meeting at which the members of the election committee and three substitutes are elected. If a member of the electoral committee is a candidate, the elected substitute with the highest number of votes takes his place.
- (3) The election committee has the following tasks:
He announces the election no later than 21 days before the election date. The place and time of the election must be specified in the election notice. The election notice, together with a list showing the employees who are eligible to vote and who can be elected, and these election regulations must be posted at the institute and forwarded to the eligible voters. The election committee decides on objections to the correctness of the list.
He calls on all eligible employees who do not want to stand as candidates to have themselves removed from the list of eligible candidates within a specified period of time. The election committee should work towards ensuring that as many candidates as possible stand for election. He then publishes the final list of candidates. The list also serves as a ballot paper and will be sent to every employee entitled to vote together with an unwritten ballot paper envelope no later than eight days before the day the vote is cast.
Upon request, he/she shall send the eligible voters who are prevented from voting in person on election day the documents required for conducting the election together with an election letter addressed to the election committee and bearing the address of the eligible voter.
He monitors the correct casting of votes and counts the votes.
A short record of the results must be prepared for each meeting of the election committee and signed by all members.
- (4) When casting their vote, the voter ticks one or two of the names listed on the ballot paper. Ballots with more than two names marked with a cross or with additions are invalid. The ballot paper is to be handed in by the voter in a sealed ballot paper envelope.
In the case of postal voting, the voter must send his or her ballot paper in a sealed ballot paper envelope with the postal ballot envelope in good time to the electoral committee so that it is received by 3:00 p.m. on election day at the latest. After the end of the ballot, the election committee opens the ballot envelopes and places the ballot paper envelopes with the unopened ballot paper envelopes handed in at the polling place.
The two candidates with the most votes are elected as equal ombudspersons of the IWT. In the

event of a tie in the second position, a runoff election will be held for the candidates with the same number of votes. The candidate with the highest number of votes is then elected. In the event of a tie again, the lot decides.

The course of the election is to be recorded in writing. In particular, this must be stated:

- the number of eligible voters
- the number of votes cast,
- the number of invalid votes,
- the names of the two elected employees and the two candidates with the next lowest number of votes and the number of votes cast for them,
- notification of acceptance of the election.

The election committee announces the election result immediately by posting it in the institute.

- (5) Electronic election procedure: The election of the members of the election committee (2) as well as the preparation and implementation of the election (3 and 4) can also be carried out electronically while maintaining the confidentiality of the specified deadlines.
- (6) Contesting the election: The election committee decides on contesting an election. It must be submitted in writing to a member of the election committee by a person entitled to vote, with reasons, no later than on the tenth working day after the election or the run-off election.

8. Formal

Come into operation:

The "Rules for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice and Procedures for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct at the IWT" come into force immediately with the institute's internal announcement. (Status: February 2022)

Issued on February 25th, 2022 by the board of directors of the Leibniz-IWT

Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Rainer Fechte-Heinen
Direktor Hauptabteilung Werkstofftechnik

Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Lutz Mädler
Direktor Hauptabteilung Verfahrenstechnik

Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Bernhard Karpuschewski
Direktor Hauptabteilung Fertigungstechnik

M.A. Philip Voelcker
Kaufmännischer Direktor