

Academic Practice Code of Conduct

[Version 2.1, September 2015.¹ Based on the IBED “Practical guidelines on Scientific Integrity version 1.0 April 20, 2014”², adapted to the kind of research done at the ILLC]

Why a Code of Conduct?

In recent years awareness of the need for a Code of Conduct that deals with issues of scientific integrity and best academic practices has been on the rise. Where issues concerning ethics have been a common concern already for a long time in the life sciences, various incidents in a wide range of disciplines, ranging from biology to social psychology, have drawn attention to the fact that in every academic discipline, irrespective of whether it deals with human subjects, animal experiments, big data collections, archival material, or other data and methods, there are many situations that could lead to acts that are at odds with proper academic conduct. Such breaches may not only have direct adverse effects on subjects participating in experiments, and other researchers, but they may also lead to a diminished confidence in science among the general public, politicians, and other relevant parties.

The range of ethical issues in academia is very wide, ranging from a minor deviation in following proper protocols to full-blown fraud, from unintended but nevertheless selective reporting to manipulation of results to please the funding organization or contractor, from being inspired by someone’s ideas to stealing, plagiarism, or scooping.

This document lists a number of “do’s and don’t’s” that should be ingrained in the work ethics, and hence the day to day practices, of everyone who is engaged in research in some way or other (as an active researcher, as a student, as a supervisor, or as an administrator). It builds on a number of more detailed and comprehensive documents that deal with these matters, such as:

1 Version 2.0 of this document is the ILLC management team’s adaptation of Version 1.0, originally designed in January 2015 by the ILLC Scientific Integrity Workgroup consisting of Prof. M. Stokhof, Dr. A. Baltag and Prof. K. Sima’an. This version 2.1 includes an appendix ‘Wetenschappelijke Integriteit aan de Uva en in Nederland’.

2 The practical guidelines on scientific integrity of IBED, the Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics at the University of Amsterdam, are available online at: <http://ibed.uva.nl/research/code-of-conduct/practical-guidelines-on-scientific-integrity.html>

- The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice, published by the Association of Universities of the Netherlands (VSNU)
- A European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, published by the European Academies of Science (ALLEA)
- On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research. published by the American Academies (NAP)

In addition there are several organizations that are involved in providing guidelines and directions for specific issues. Examples are:

- data management: DANS (Data Archiving and Network Solutions),
- privacy: College Bescherming Persoonsgegevens CBP (Authority for the Protection of Personal Data), www.cbpweb.nl

1. How to act if you suspect a problem?

Rule one, for all people involved in all cases, is this:

Address any potential ethical issue as soon as it is encountered.

As a closer inspection of known cases of misconduct shows, more often than not there were in an early stage already observations and even suspicions by relevant parties that were not communicated to, or picked up by, the responsible authorities.

As a general rule, any potential ethical issue encountered requires action: looking away is not an option.

A first step could be to check with colleagues to see if your views or observations are shared or not, but either way, the organization should know about any potential issue. This can start with talking to your own superiors, and if needed can be escalated to a complaint issued to the University Ethics Committee.

The following step-by-step approach is suggested as a guideline for actions:

1. Contact your superior (supervisor, programme leader), discuss the issue and decide which further action to take.
2. If the outcome is not satisfactory (for instance the problem is down-played), or if this step is problematic (for instance because your superior is involved), contact the director of the ILLC.
For PhD candidates there is also the possibility of getting in touch with the PVC (“Programme eValuation Committee”), through the secretary of the PVC, Tanja Kassenaar.
3. If this is not satisfactory, or problematic, or if you prefer absolute confidentiality, contact one of the university’s “Vertrouwenspersonen” (Confidential Advisors) to discuss the issue. Although they are not specifically appointed to deal with integrity issues, they can advise you on a course of action. They treat cases confidentially, and action is taken only after mutual agreement.
4. Finally, you can submit a formal complaint to the University Ethics Committee, through its chairperson, or alternatively to the Board of the University.

See also the section ‘Relevant names and addresses’ at the end of this document.

2. Ethical aspects of collaboration in research

This section deals with a number of specific issues concerning collaborative research.

2.1. *Co-authorship of papers and other academic output*

Co-authorship

Practices on (co-)authorship differ across (sub)disciplines, even within a research institute such as ILLC. The most important thing is that the rules are clear, and acknowledged by all parties involved, so as to avoid any problems at the stage of publication.

Best practices:

Authorship in collaborative work should be discussed at the start of a project, and there should be agreement on the criteria that will be used to determine if co-authorship is warranted or not, and what the procedure will be to decide on the order of the authors. Such criteria are subject to change, and in case of uncertainty, one may seek a binding judgment from a respected expert.

Necessary requirements for authorship are that one has done all of the following:

- a substantial contribution to one or more of: conception and design of the research reported; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; formulation of proofs or algorithms; critical analysis of state of the art of the research on the topic
- drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content
- final approval of the version to be published
- agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

It is advisable to specify the contribution of all authors to a published work and make this information available upon request.

Supervisors and senior research staff who co-operate with MSc- or PhD-students on a project should be reticent in claiming co-authorship of results of such collaboration, bearing in mind that young researchers are very critically judged on their list of publications, and that making contributions to the content of a student's work must be regarded as a normal part of the training process, and is principally different from the way one collaborates with one's peers.

It should also be borne in mind that substantial collaboration with a student on (parts of) his/her MSc- or PhD-project implies that

evaluation of the results also concerns the staff member and that hence, the staff member should be careful not to exert influence on the evaluation process.

2.2. *'Ownership' of ideas, originality*

Ownership

Discussion and exchange of ideas is essential for research. The variety of ways in which such discussions and exchanges take place, and often long time-span that they may cover, sometimes makes it difficult to trace back the origins of an idea, and the lines between a fruitful open exchange, scooping results, or downright stealing, is not always clear.

Best practices:

Openness and reciprocity is the ideal. But research is also a competitive affair. So, when engaging in substantial discussions and exchanges it is best to be explicit right from the start: inform your discussion partners about your plans, and ask if they foresee any overlap with their own plans, or if they wish to collaborate.

In cases where research is highly competitive, it is advisable to draw up a written agreement with everyone involved that specifies the accepted rules of conduct for disclosure of information. This may include a clause that determines what people are allowed to do with results when they leave a project.

In large collaborative projects such an agreement should also determine how intellectual property rights are dealt with and who will be the potential beneficiaries of valorisation of results.

Contact the faculty legal officer for advice on setting up an agreement among co-workers. The legal expert at the Technology Transfer Office can assist in setting up a consortium agreement for projects with (academic and non-academic) partners.

2.3. *Hierarchical relationships among researchers and peer pressure*

Hierarchical relationships

In an ideal academic world all researchers are independent and each other's peers: the quality of one's work is what counts, not rank, seniority or prestige. However, hierarchical relationships and group processes may create situations in which independence and equality come under pressure.

Best practices:

A supervisor must leave ample room for dissenting scientific opinions of people under his/her supervision. This is of special

importance in the relation between supervisor and MSc- or PhD-student.

Despite a hierarchical relationship, a junior researcher is responsible for his/her own activities at all times, and must not succumb to (perceived) pressure. In particular MSc- and PhD-students should be given enough space to develop their own ideas and be actively encouraged to pursue them. `Incorporation into the Borg' of the supervisor's research should be avoided, as this may hamper their individual development and damage their later careers.

This can be a delicate problem, and should preferably be discussed openly, for instance with an independent colleague as mediator. ILLC's Programme eValuation Committee (PVC) has an active role to play here as well.

If this is too problematic or does not solve the issue, one of the "Vertrouwenspersonen" can be contacted.

3. Ethical aspects of reporting results, fraud and plagiarism

This section deals with key aspects of publication and reporting, and of data management. The relevance of research output depends on its integrity, and that means that the entire chain, from initial data-collection to final reporting, and all the intermediate steps, needs to be transparent and accountable. This requires independence, adequate reporting, and openness.

3.1. Data³

Data-intensive research is becoming an increasingly important part of ILLC-research. This raises a number of issues concerning collection, manipulation, and storage and curation of data. There are rapid developments in this area, also concerning the issue of 'Open Data'.

In order to guarantee the integrity and responsibility of data-intensive research, projects should draw up a so-called 'data management plan' at the start, which minimally contains the following:

- protocol that describes the data-collection methods and the way their execution is reported
- protocol that describes the way in which raw data are stored, secured, and made accessible
- description of the algorithms that will be employed in manipulating raw data to prepare them for further analysis
- description of way in which, and the period that, raw data, algorithms, and research data obtained will be stored and curated when the project is completed
- identification of the institution that is responsible for the storage and curation of the data

Examples of concrete data management plans for individual projects from other researchers at the ILLC can serve as a guide for designing one's own data management plan.

3.1.1. Authenticity of (primary) data

Authenticity

Some of the most extreme cases of fraud in science involved the fabrication of data. Especially data-based research is almost always teamwork, which means that responsibilities are shared that checks and balances can be implemented to guarantee accountability for data-collection.

³ In late 2015/early 2016, following UvA-regulations and in accordance with the interpretation of these regulations in the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Humanities, the ILLC will formulate a *Data Protocol* relating to management of research data.

Best practices:

In experimental and observational studies, but also in research that uses existing data collections or that collects data from other sources, an accurate logbook that details the actual data-collection should be maintained, and the raw data should be stored in a safe and un-manipulated form. The procedures should be laid down in a protocol, to ensure that reconstruction of the methods that were followed to obtain the data is possible. This protocol is part of the data-management plan that is drawn up before the research starts. The responsibility for seeing to it that the protocol is followed, is shared by all members of the project team.

3.1.2. Transparency of workflows for data mining and data processing

Workflows

Raw data often needs to be processed to prepare them for further analysis, and, ultimately, to obtain a publishable result. This may include procedures to remove outliers, transformation and aggregation of data, and combination with data from other sources. Any such action is prone to unintentional human mistakes, as well as malicious manipulation in extreme cases.

Best practices:

As with the initial data-collection, this phase should be accurately logged.

Only such algorithms and other procedures should be used that allow a full reconstruction of this phase at a later date by independent researchers. All algorithms and procedures should be identified and logged, including all details that are needed for later reconstruction (e.g. version of the programmes used for each step of a work flow, parameter settings, input/output/log files).

The procedures for logging this part of the projects are laid down in a protocol that is part of the project's data-management plan. As in the case of initial data collection, the responsibility for seeing to it that the protocol is followed is shared by all members of the project team.

3.1.3. Storage of data, statistical analyses and workflows, audits

Storage &tc

Independent inspection and verification of data, methods, and results is essential for the reliability of research output and the integrity of science. Therefore, raw data, workflows, input/output files, programmes (versions) used, as well as the

final results, need to be stored in a suitable form and curated so as to make later inspection and verification possible.

Best practices:

This part of the chain is a shared responsibility of the researchers that carry out the project and the institution.

The ILLC will develop adequate procedures and set up a suitable infrastructure to allow implementation of these requirements. This means not only taking responsibility for storage and curation of data, but also securing them against unauthorized access, and making them available for later audits. These procedures and infrastructure are to be laid down in an ILLC data plan.

In case the raw data are too unwieldy to store, appropriate procedures are to be implemented: including an exact description of the flow from raw to archived data; storage of a subset of raw data.

3.2. Reporting and publication

3.2.1. Independence of reporting from provider of funding

Independence

Most research is (still) paid by general public funding, but increasingly also contracted by private or semi-private organizations, or by specific governmental institutions (such as ministries, city councils, etc.).

In some cases, the funders may only want to hear their preferred outcome, and may exert pressure to present the results in a particular way, or to omit certain results. Clearly, research integrity requires complete independence in reporting and accountability for all results.

Best practices:

The principle of independent reporting must be clearly specified and agreed upon by all parties in any contract. While the funding organization can request clarification of the results, pressure to modify any findings is never permissible. Agreed upon conditions on the timing of publications is permissible but should be part of the contract.

Requests from a funder to modify reports, as well as other attempts to influence the way in which the research is carried out, should always be communicated and discussed with the entire research team and reported to the programme leader and/or the ILLC-management.

3.2.2. Duplicated reporting in abstracts, symposium talks, peer-reviewed papers

Re-use

Science is work-in-progress, and preliminary results might be published in a symposium abstract, or results from contract research might become available first in the form of a report, and later as a peer-reviewed publication. How often can the same materials be presented before 'self-plagiarism' applies?

Best practices:

Results submitted to peer-reviewed journals, conferences, and other venues should be original and new. Any previously published part that is included, e.g., for reasons of exposition, should be identified as such and appropriately referenced. If it concerns work done with others their permission should be obtained and explicitly mentioned.

If the submission is already published as a report, this should be mentioned and the report should be made available to the editor(s). Publication of preliminary results and 'work in progress' (e.g., as a symposium abstract, poster or talk) requires permission of all authors working on the project that are planning to publish the results later on.

3.2.3. Proper references and citations

References

Proper references are part of a rigorous academic method: they show how new results relate to older findings, and are a crucial tool for the reader to critically investigate the results presented.

Although it may not always be possible to reconstruct the origins of an idea, one should always attempt to make sure that the proper persons receive appropriate credits.

Deliberately not referencing relevant work of others, or including irrelevant references, is a breach of confidence with the reader and should be avoided at all times.

Best practices:

Since different (sub)disciplines, and even different journals, have different policies, it is not possible to lay down strict guidelines. But the following are sound 'rules of thumb':

- avoid too many references (i.e. over-citing) to authors who have shaped a discipline and whose work can be assumed to be familiar to all your readers ('Don't show off')
- avoid selective referencing, do not leave out relevant references because the authors are from a competing school of thought ('Be fair')
- avoid irrelevant references, do not include a reference only because the author happens to belong to your school of

thought (or your institution, research programme, ...) ('Be independent')

- avoid indiscriminate self-referencing: only reference your own work if it is important for the reader to understand the paper
- if a reference contains a citation, use the appropriate tools to make sure the reader is aware that your quoting from another source; double-check wording; and make sure you are not quoting out of context

3.2.4. Public media and popularising science venues

Public outreach

Public outreach, by means of publication in popularising science venues or appearance in public media, is an important aspect of academic practice, and where relevant and possible it is a duty that comes with being a researcher who is funded by public means. It does carry a number of risks.

Best practices:

The pitfalls that may be encountered when engaged in public outreach are many. The following rules of thumb apply:

- be clear about the proper interpretation of the results reported
- outline the limitations and inherent revisability of results
- avoid anything that could lead to a wrong or disproportional interpretation of the importance of the results themselves, or of their academic and/or societal impact
- make proper reference to the institutions that are involved in funding the research you report on
-

4. Ethical aspects of research topics or its methodologies

This section deals with a number of issues that relate to what is being researched and how research results are used.

4.1. The way results are used

Although much of the research at ILLC is of a theoretical nature, all ILLC-researchers need to be aware of the fact that research results, once published or shared by other means, can be used by others in ways that are not intended and that may be harmful.

Potential unintended use or misuse of results

Research can sometimes deliver knowledge that can be used for unintended purposes, illegal activities (e.g., privacy violations, identity theft), or societal/ethically disputable applications.

Best practices:

At the level of individual researchers the topic is addressed explicitly in appointment procedures, and subsequently, whenever relevant, in the annual ‘functionerings- en beoordelingsgesprekken’.

Periodically, an open discussion at the level of research teams and that of the research programmes should be held to maintain awareness of these issues, to identify potential problems and to discuss ways of preventing them.

More specific issues regarding research topics and methodologies include the following three broad categories: observation and observational data involving humans; experiments and experimental data involving humans; experiments and experimental data involving non-human animals.

4.2. Observation and observational data involving humans

Observation of humans and human behaviours concern a relevant part of research done at ILLC, either directly, when it is part of a project carried out by an ILLC-researcher, or indirectly, when ILLC-researchers are members of larger projects in which such research is being done by others.

Direct and indirect observation of humans and their behaviours

Research in human behaviour can be direct (observations, experiments) or indirect (data logs, corpora, and other data sets). It may concern individuals or aggregations of individuals. This raises issues on anonymity and privacy that must be properly addressed.

Best practices:

The VSNU has published a Code of Conduct for dealing with data (in Dutch, see www.vsnu.nl/gedragcodes) that can be traced back to individuals.

The following three elements need attention.

Direct observation

One should obtain written permission of the subject before the data are used or disclosed. The permission must state:

- the scope of the research
- the purpose of the use of the data
- the way in which, and the length of time that, the data will be stored and maintained
- the responsible authority for curating the data

Any data on individuals that are stored in a database must adhere to relevant legislation (“Wet Bescherming Persoonsgegevens”).

Indirect observation

If data are obtained by indirect means and the individuals that provided the data cannot be directly identified, a protocol must be drawn up to guarantee the anonymity of the data sources. Such a protocol minimally describes:

- the way in which the data are anonymized; this should include any known or suspected vulnerability of the techniques used for anonymization
- the way in which the data are stored and protected from unauthorized access
- the conditions under which (with whom, for what purposes) the data will be shared
- the way in which, and the length of time that, the data will be stored and maintained
- the responsible authority for curating the data

The protocol must be freely available.

Accidental discoveries

It is conceivable that observations lead to discoveries about individuals that are completely outside the specified scope of the actual research question. Any such findings should be ignored and the relevant results should not be kept in any way (in writing, electronically, or otherwise) or communicated to others. When possible, an attempt should be made to prevent that the same accidental discoveries be made by others that have access to the data. This may include informing the subjects (in the case of direct observation), or deleting relevant data. Only if the discovery points at potential criminal activities this must be reported to the relevant authorities. In such a case the first step is to contact the relevant faculty legal expert.

4.3. *Experiments and experimental data involving humans*

There is some experimental research done at the ILLC with human and/or medical subjects. Additionally, ILLC-researchers may collaborate in larger projects in which such research is carried out by other project members. Although they will not be directly responsible, they need to be aware of the issues involved.

If ILLC-researchers become aware of potential cases of misconduct they should report this to the person(s) in charge of overseeing the relevant part of the project, and they should inform their supervisor(s) at the ILLC.

The following are the relevant points to note.

Use of individuals as subjects in medical experiments.

(Bio-)medical research often necessitates the use of individual subjects, for instance in clinical trials. This is strictly regulated (Wet medisch-wetenschappelijk onderzoek met mensen, WMO).

Best practices:

Permission is needed from the relevant authorities at all times, see www.ccmo.nl for details. There is special contact person of the AMC ethical committee for dealing with this for research done the University of Amsterdam, who can advise on proper procedures needed to get the required permissions from the authorized ethical committee.

Researchers must strictly adhere to the approved protocols and log all performed experiments.

4.4. *Experiments and experimental data involving non-human animals*

Use of non-human animals

Biological and (bio)medical research often involves working with animals and (especially for vertebrates) there are strict regulations (“Wet op Dierproeven”) on who is allowed to handle animals and what a treatment may and may not involve, the number of animals used, etc.

Best practices:

The VSNU has published a Code of Conduct for dealing with animals (in Dutch, see <http://www.vsnu.nl/gedragscodes>). Permission is needed from the relevant authorities. There is a certified employee at the Faculty of Science (“dierproefdeskundige”, animal testing expert) for dealing with this

who should be informed at all times, and needs to be involved to adhere to proper procedures and get permission. Researchers must strictly adhere to the approved protocols and log all performed experiments.

4.5. General data policies

Since the use of data in ILLC-research can be expected to grow, and also in view of the rapid developments concerning 'Open Data', which will be subject to requirements and regulations by funding organizations and other relevant institutions, the ILLC will discuss developments on this front regularly, at the level of projects and programmes, as well as in the management team, and update its policies accordingly (see also footnote 3).

5. Ethical aspects and conflicts of interest in research evaluations

This section deals with some issues that concern another aspect of academic work, viz., judging the work of others.

5.1. Reviewing papers

Reviewing papers

Independent peer review of papers before publication is considered to be one of the cornerstones of rigorous academic practice. In many cases this is done anonymously. This enables the reviewer to judge freely, but also it contains some ethical pitfalls. For example, unfounded or overly harsh criticisms can be voiced without the reviewer being held accountable. And a reviewer might reject a good paper and use the information or ideas for his own benefit. Obviously, this is highly unethical behaviour.

Best practices:

The rules to follow here are the following:

First, as a reviewer:

- be objective: if you think a submission conflicts too much with your own work or ideas, you might not want to take the assignment
- never review a submission by someone to whom you bear a personal relationship, such as a close colleague, a student, a friend, or a family member
- be fair: it is easy to focus on what is wrong, try to come to a balanced judgment
- respect the confidentiality of the process: don't share (parts of the) information about the reviewing process with others; don't reveal your identity to the authors; don't communicate the outcomes of a review process to other parties
- avoid creating a bias by reviewing the work of the same author or work on the same topic too often

Second, as an editor:

- make sure you are ok with the journal's policies regarding reviewing before you accept the position, in particular with regard to suggestions from authors to exclude reviewers
- select reviewers carefully, be aware of heated debates and potential mud-throwing. As an editor you are responsible for the professional conduct of the reviewers you have selected, hence you are expected to intervene in case your reviewers do not conform to the expected professional standards.

As stated, the above rules are pretty obvious and simple, it is applying them in concrete contexts that may be very hard. Rely on your judgment, also 'outside' the rules, and when in doubt consult an experienced and trusted colleague. Usually it is possible to give enough information without breaching confidentiality to get useful advice.

5.2. *Reviewing research proposals*

Reviewing proposals

Peer review of proposals is a key step to obtain funding for research, and can make or break careers. Given the extreme competition, it is very easy for a reviewer to kill a proposal, by giving it a low mark (anything below 'excellent' in fact). Also, panel members can have conflicting interests, leading to unfair outcomes.

Best practices:

Many of the same principles of independence and objectivity as for reviewing papers apply to reviewing research proposals. As reviewer, decline to review if you are in doubt and suspect that conflicts of interests may arise. Make sure that your comments correspond to your final mark.

Only accept membership of a panel in which a common opinion has to be reached if you feel the panel as a whole has the expertise, independence and reputation to do this well.

If you have your own interests in a particular proposal (or for instance a close colleague) make this explicitly clear and do not partake in the discussion of this proposal (e.g., leave the room).

5.3. *Quality assessments of institutes / programmes*

Other peer review

In the constant quest for excellence of all research institutions, peer review of research is a big responsibility (as well as a huge task), as the future of people and entire research groups may depend on the outcome of the review.

Best practices:

Many of the same principles of independence and objectivity as in the previous sections apply here. Again, this is a group process, which helps to reach a balanced judgment.

In addition, some principles for reviewing:

If you are in a panel, ensure that you are aware of how your judgment will be used by the organization; ask for the terms of reference.

If you feel that some panel members have too much influence and too big an impact on the outcome, address the issue openly in the group.

Likewise, listen to others and attempt to reach consensus, but claim a dissenting opinion if you have sufficient grounds not to accept a certain conclusion.

Relevant names, addresses, websites

University of Amsterdam Ethics Committee (AIEC):

Mw. prof. dr. J.C.J.M. (Hanneke) de Haes (Chair AIEC)
E: J.C.J.M.deHaes@uva.nl

University of Amsterdam Academic Affairs:

Ms drs. B.J. van den Bergh (Head Academic Affairs)
E: B.J.vandenBergh@uva.nl

University of Amsterdam
Spui 21
1012 WX Amsterdam
T: 020 525 4888

Programme eValuation Committee (PVC):

Mw. T. Kassenaar
ILLC Office
Universiteit van Amsterdam
mail:
P.O. Box 94242
1090 GE Amsterdam
office:
Room F1.46
Building F
Science Park 107
1098 XG Amsterdam
T: 020 525 8849
E: T.Kassenaar@uva.nl

Information about the PVC, including the list of members, is available online at: <https://www.illc.uva.nl/PhDProgramme/current-candidates/support/pvc.html>

Vertrouwenspersonen:

For students, please consult:

<http://student.uva.nl/az/content/vertrouwenspersoon/vertrouwenspersone-n-binnen-de-uva/vertrouwenspersonen-binnen-de-uva.html>
<https://www.illc.uva.nl/PhDProgramme/current-candidates/support/gethelp.html>

For employees, please consult:

<https://medewerker.uva.nl/az/content/vertrouwenspersoon/contact/contact.html>

Experts that may be consulted for advice on specific issues:

Faculty of Science legal expert
Mw. mr. E. (Eveline) Hollink

Academic Affairs
Faculty of Science
T: 020 525 7826
E: E.Hollink@uva.nl

Faculty of Humanities Academic Affairs:
Ethics:
Drs. G. (Gea) Lindeboom
T: 020 525 3054
Head of unit:
Dr. E.O. (Elske) Gerritsen
T: 020 525 3662

Faculty of Science Technology Transfer Office
Mw. mr. M. (Marion) Leenen
T: 020 525 2759
E: M.C.L.Leenen@uva.nl

Medical ethical issues:
Mw dr. Y.E. Donselaar
AMC
T: 020 566 7389
E: mecamc@amc.nl

Animal testing expert:
Mw. dr. M. (Miriam) van der Meer
SILS
E: M.vanderMeer@uva.nl

Additional references

The University has a page with its rules and regulations in English:
www.uva.nl/en/about-the-uva/uva-profile/rules-and-regulations/research/research.html and
<http://www.uva.nl/en/research/research-at-the-uva/academic-integrity/academic-integrity.html>

And in Dutch:

<http://www.uva.nl/over-de-uva/uva-profiel/regelingen-en-reglementen/onderzoek/onderzoek.html>

This also includes links to the information of the federation of universities (VSNU) on the general code of conduct on integrity issues, as well as specific codes for animal testing and the use of personal data.

A Dutch document: Wetenschappelijke integriteit aan de UvA en in Nederland (unfortunately not available in English), with references and links to websites, is attached to this document

Legislation

See www.overheid.nl for all Dutch laws and bylaws. In general it is better to seek assistance from (university) legal experts than attempt to study the regulations yourself.

Wetenschappelijke integriteit aan de UvA en in Nederland

De UvA beschikt over een **Klachtenregeling Wetenschappelijke Integriteit** die gebaseerd is op de Nederlandse Gedragscode Wetenschapsbeoefening van de VSNU.

De **Vertrouwenspersoon Wetenschappelijke Integriteit** (VWI) behandelt zaken die vertrouwelijk behandeld dienen te worden. Iedereen kan de vertrouwenspersoon benaderen voor consultatie of advies bij vragen over vermoedens van schending van de wetenschappelijke integriteit of de daarbij te volgen procedure.

Voor mogelijk dubieus gedrag van wetenschappers dat een openbaar oordeel vergt – bijvoorbeeld manipulatie van data, plagiaat van eerdere publicaties en ongeoorloofd citatiegedrag – beschikt de UvA over een (driehoofdige) **commissie Wetenschappelijke Integriteit (cWI)**. De commissie behandelt dus klachten, een klager kan al dan niet via het CvB een formele (schriftelijke) klacht indienen.

Voor ethische vraagstukken in brede zin beschikt de UvA over een **Algemene Instellingsgebonden Ethische Commissie** (AIEC). De AIEC adviseert het College van Bestuur over richtlijnen met betrekking tot ethische aspecten verbonden aan werkzaamheden van de instelling. Voorbeelden daarvan zijn het antiplagiat beleid en het vraagstuk van openbaarheid van docentevaluaties. De AIEC adviseert primair het CvB en geen individuele medewerkers. De AIEC heeft 13 leden. Naast de voorzitter en secretaris zijn dat vertegenwoordigers van de 7 faculteiten – namens de FNWI is dat prof. Kareljan Schoutens – twee vertegenwoordigers van de COR en twee vertegenwoordigers van de CSR.

Voor algemene beleidsadvisering heeft het College van Bestuur in 2016 een ad hoc **werkgroep Wetenschappelijke Integriteit** ingesteld voor advies over het instellingsplan.¹

Voor hulp bij (seksuele) intimidatie, agressie en discriminatie beschikt de faculteit over meerdere **vertrouwenspersonen**. De namen van deze functionarissen staan vermeld op het intranet. De vertrouwenspersonen hebben in principe geen rol bij integriteitsschendingen.

Het **Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit** (LOWI) is een onafhankelijk (advies)orgaan ingesteld in 2003 door de KNAW, NWO en de VSNU. Het orgaan adviseert de Colleges van Bestuur van de Nederlandse universiteiten, de Raden van Bestuur van de universitair medische centra en de besturen van NWO en KNAW inzake klachten over schendingen van wetenschappelijke integriteit. Het LOWI neemt uitsluitend klachten in behandeling waarover de instelling waar de schending zou hebben plaatsgevonden een beslissing heeft genomen.

¹ De werkgroep is ingesteld om het College te adviseren over het beleid omtrent wetenschappelijke integriteit binnen de UvA en hoe dit te bestendigen gedurende het lopende Instellingsplan. De werkgroep zal voor de zomer van 2016 een advies uitbrengen aan het College. De werkgroep bestaat uit negen leden en staat onder voorzitterschap van Frans Oort, hoogleraar Methoden en technieken bij de FMG.

Functionarissen op het gebied van wetenschappelijke integriteit aan de UvA

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Vertrouwenspersoon WI: | prof. Hanneke de Haes |
| Voorzitter cWI: | prof. Ernst Hirsch Ballin |
| Voorzitter AIEC: | prof. Hanneke de Haes |
| Voorzitter werkgroep WI: | prof. Frans Oort |

Links naar websites

http://www.vsnu.nl/wetenschappelijke_integriteit.html

<http://www.uva.nl/onderzoek/onderzoek-aan-de-uva/wetenschappelijke-integriteit/wetenschappelijke-integriteit-uva.html>

<https://medewerker.uva.nl/a-z/content/ethische-commissie/ethische-commissie.html>

<https://medewerker.uva.nl/a-z/content/vertrouwenspersoon/contact/contact.html>

<https://www.knaw.nl/nl/thematisch/ethiek/landelijk-orgaan-wetenschappelijke-integriteit-lowi/overzicht>

Academic integrity at the University of Amsterdam and in the Netherlands

The UvA has an **Academic Integrity Complaints Regulations** which is based on the Dutch Academic Integrity VSNU.

The **Confidant for Scientific Integrity** (CSI) deals with cases that should be treated as confidential. Anyone can approach the counselor for consultation or advice with regard to suspected violation of academic integrity and procedures connected to this issue.

Possible dubious behavior of scientists that requires public judgment – for example, manipulation of data, plagiarism of earlier publications and unauthorized citation behavior – the UvA has a **Committee on Scientific Integrity** (cWI). The committee handles complaints, and a complainant may, whether or not via the Executive Board of the University, submit a formal (written) complaint.

For ethical issues in a broad sense, the UvA has a **General Institution-bound Ethics Commission** (AIEC). The AIEC advises the Executive Board on guidelines that involve ethical aspects which are related to scientific activities of the institution. Examples include anti-plagiarism policy and public access to teacher evaluations. The AIEC primarily advises the Executive Board and not individual employees. The AIEC has 13 members. In addition to the chairman and secretary are representatives of the seven faculties – prof. Kareljan Schouten acts on behalf of the Faculty of Science – two representatives of the UvA Works Council and two representatives of the UvA Students Council.

For general policy advice, the University Board has installed an ad hoc **Working Group on Scientific Integrity** for advice on integrity in relation to the strategic plan of the university.²

For assistance in situations of (sexual) harassment, aggression and discrimination, the faculty has appointed **confidants**. Their names are listed on the intranet. The confidants have no role in integrity violations.

The **National Board for Scientific Integrity** (LOWI) is an independent (advisory) body established in 2003 by the Royal Academy, NWO and VSNU. This body advises the Executive Boards of the Dutch universities, the Boards of Directors of the university medical centers and the boards of NWO and the Royal Academy regarding complaints about violations of academic integrity. LOWI will only accept complaints on integrity that are already settled by the institution where the violation has taken place.

Officials in the area of academic integrity at the University of Amsterdam

Confident SI: prof. Hanneke de Haes
Chair cWI: prof. Ernst Hirsch Ballin
Chair AIEC: prof. Hanneke de Haes
Chair Working Group SI: prof. Frans Oort

Links to websites

http://www.vsnu.nl/wetenschappelijke_integriteit.html

<http://www.uva.nl/onderzoek/onderzoek-aan-de-uva/wetenschappelijke-integriteit/wetenschappelijke-integriteit-uva.html>

<https://medewerker.uva.nl/a-z/content/ethische-commissie/ethische-commissie.html>

<https://medewerker.uva.nl/a-z/content/vertrouwenspersoon/contact/contact.html>

<https://www.knaw.nl/nl/thematisch/ethiek/landelijk-orgaan-wetenschappelijke-integriteit-lowi/overzicht>

² The working group was established to advise the Board on policies regarding scientific integrity within the UvA and how to maintain it during the current Strategic Plan. The working group will draft an advisory report to the Board in the summer of 2016. The working group consists of nine members and is chaired by Frans Oort, Professor of Methodology at the Faculty of Social Science.