# Ton Hol

- Head of School of Law UU
- Member of (drafting) commission of New Dutch code of Research Integrity
- Chair Committee's of Research Integrity Utrecht University / Tilburg University
- Chair Research Integrity Group LERU (League of European Research Universities
- Member of NRIN Working Group

- (Thanks to Lex Bouter)

# Research Integrity

- Codes of Conduct explain what the right thing is
- Aspirational codes focus on virtues and values
- Normative codes contain do's and don'ts

# New Dutch Code

- VSNU (Association of Dutch universities)
- KNAW (Dutch Royal Academy of Sciences)
- NWO (National research organisation)
- Counsel of Universities for Applied Science (Hogescholen)
- TO2 (Federation of  Institutes of Applied Science (e.g. TNO))

- Coherent with ALLEA-code (European Code)
- Inspired by other national codes

# Reach

- Scientific research
- Applied research

- Not education/teaching
- Not other issues of integrity (harasment)

- Not only individual researcher (or group of researchers)
- Also admistration of institutions
  - Duties of care

# Ideas behind the new Dutch code of conduct

- Focus on fostering RCR and prevention of Research Misconduct
- Standards specify good science and Responsible Conduct of Research
- Standards are methodological, ethical, or both
- Laws, regulations, disciplinary and institutional codes are also relevant
- Judgements are essential - principles may conflict and standards can be unclear

# Principles

- Honesty
- Scrupulousness
- Transparency
- Independence
- Responsibility

# Standards for good research practices

- Do's (and don'ts) (61)
  - Further elaboration of principles
  - Applicabel to all disciplines
    - Further differention in disciplines
- Phases of research process
  - Design
  - Conduct
  - Reporting results
  - Assesment and peer review
  - Communication

# Function of code

- Fostering good research practices
  - Training and education

- Normative framework for investigating allegations and handling cases

# Possible conclusions of an investigation

- Research Misconduct
- Questionable Research Practice
- Minor Shortcoming
- None of the above

# Research misconduct

- Fabrication – standard 19
- Falsification - standard 21 □
- Plagiarism – standards 34 + 40 (not when plagiarism is limited and ‘selfplagiarism’ (standard 41) is excluded)
- Serious other violations – standards 7, 8, 14, 18, 22, 23, 30, 36, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47, 49, 53, 55, 57, 58, 60
- Exceptional cases of violations of other standards

# Investigations of alleged breaches of research integrity

- Only plausible allegations of non-compliance to a core set of 23 out of 61 standards are eligible
- Assessment criteria for failure to comply with the standards:
  - Impact (validity, trust) and consequences (society, nature)
  - Intentionality and benefits for perpetrator □
  - Experience of and earlier offences by perpetrator
  - Views within the discipline

# Examples of other violations

- Be open about the role of external stakeholders and pos sible conflicts of interest (8)
- Accept only research assignments that can be undertaken in accordance with the standards in this Code (14)
- Describe the data collected for and/or used in your research honestly,scrupulously and as transparently as possible (23)
  - Sensitive issue: open data? (See standard11,12)
  - Principle: as open as possible, as closed as necessary

# Examples of other violations

- Ensure a fair allocation and ordering of authorship, in line with the standards applicable within the discipline(s) concerned (30)
- As a supervisor, principal investigator, research director or manager, refrain from any action which might encourage a researcher to disregard any of the standards in this chapter (57)

# Duties of care
# What institutions should provide?

- clear codes, guidelines and SOPs (what is expected behaviour in operational terms)
- fair procedures for handling allegations protect both the whistleblowers and the scientists they accuse
- adequate mentoring and training in RCR likely to be important, not only for PhD students
- adequate methodological and statistical support
  - many QRPs have to do with poor methods

# What institutions should provide?

- system of internal audits this is so often ignored in academia
- good facilities for data-management and – storage web-based solutions for being transparant and accountable
- promote an open research climate
  open discussion of dilemmas and learning from mistakes

# Implementation

- Making RI part of strategic plan of institution
- Education
  - Mandatory for master / phd students
  - Partly integrated in eduction on methodology
- Conferences (institutional, national, international level)
- Communication on cases of research misconduct / QRP

- Financial consequences!