Regulations of the University of Bremen for safeguarding good scientific practice and dealing with scientific misconduct of 27.04.2022

On May 2, 2022, the Rector of the University of Bremen approved, in accordance with Section 110 (3) of the Bremen Higher Education Act (BremHG) in the version published on May 9, 2007 (Brem.GBl. p. 339), last amended by Article 1 of the Act of February 24, 2021 (Brem.GBl. p. 216), the new version of the University of Bremen's regulations for safeguarding good scientific practice in the following version, resolved by the Academic Senate of the University of Bremen on the basis of Section 7a sentence 5 in conjunction with Section 80 (1) sentence 3 BremHG on April 27, 2022:

Preamble

Scientific work is based on fundamental principles. First and foremost is honesty towards oneself and others. It is both an ethical norm and the basis of scientific professionalism, i.e. good scientific practice. It is a core task of the self-administration of science to create the conditions to ensure its validity and application. The University of Bremen is aware of its duty to ensure unconditional compliance with good scientific practice at the University. These regulations are based on the "Code of Conduct: Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice" of the German Research Foundation from September 2019.

These regulations set out the University of Bremen's principles for safeguarding good scientific practice and regulate the handling of research misconduct. They apply to all members and affiliates of the University of Bremen who are active in teaching and research. All members and affiliates of the University are obliged to adhere to these principles of *good scientific practice* and to make them tangible by their own example. Scientists at all career levels regularly update their knowledge of the standards of good scientific practice.

Scientific work serves to gain knowledge. The basic prerequisite is the honesty of the scientist. Dishonesty in scientific work contradicts the nature of science and the scientist's responsibility to society. The University of Bremen is committed to the public and the scientific community to clarify any plausible suspicion of scientific misconduct by its members. This takes into account the fact that mistakes and errors are an inherent part of science. An open, non-repressive approach to errors is part of good science, especially since their discovery and clarification support science in finding the truth and ultimately lead to further optimization of scientific processes.

No set of rules can replace the required honesty of the scientist. Legal frameworks cannot fundamentally prevent misconduct in scientific work. However, rules can attempt to minimize misconduct.

Scientific misconduct cannot be judged solely on the basis of general rules; the circumstances of the individual case must be taken into account when imposing appropriate sanctions.

§ 1
Scope of application

(1) These regulations govern the principles of good scientific practice and the procedure in cases of suspected scientific misconduct by members and affiliates of the University of Bremen. The regulations are also to be applied if the person affected by the suspicion of academic misconduct has left the University of Bremen since the relevant date or is no longer a member of the university.

(2) The procedure according to these Rules of Procedure does not replace other procedures regulated by law or statute law.

(3) Attempt of deception and academic misconduct in the context of doctorates are subject solely to the provisions of the relevant doctoral degree regulations and their procedures. Habilitation procedures are subject to the provisions of these regulations.

(4) For students at the University of Bremen, it is the responsibility of the respective examiners and the responsible examination boards to check whether the principles of good scientific practice have been violated in a term paper or seminar paper, in a Bachelor's or Master's thesis. Violations of scientifically recognized rules are punished in accordance with the provisions of the respective examination regulations.

I. Principles of good scientific practice

§ 2
Commitment to the general principles of good scientific practice and professional ethics

(1) All academic staff at the University of Bremen are obliged to uphold the principles of good scientific practice in all work contexts, taking into account the special features of the relevant subject area, and in particular:

- to work according to the latest state of knowledge (lege artis) and with the necessary qualifications/training
- to maintain strict honesty with regard to one's own contributions and the contributions of third parties
- to document results and secure primary data
- comply with ethical standards throughout the research process
- to consistently question all results and to allow and promote critical discourse
- adhere to the recognized principles of scientific work in the individual disciplines.

(2) All scientists are responsible for implementing the fundamental values and standards of scientific work in their actions and for standing up for them. To this end, they regularly update their knowledge of the state of research and their knowledge of the standards of good scientific practice. Both form an integral part of teaching and the training and further education of early career researchers as well as the training and further education of academic staff. The aim is to impart not only theoretical knowledge and technical skills, but also an ethical attitude to scientific work.

(3) When reviewing and assessing submitted manuscripts, applications for funding or the designation of persons, as well as when working in advisory and decision-making bodies, scientists are obliged to behave honestly. They must maintain strict confidentiality, which excludes, among other things, the disclosure to third parties and their own use of third-party content. In addition, they disclose all facts that could give rise to the appearance of bias.

§ 3
Management responsibility and cooperation

(1) The Rectorate of the University of Bremen guarantees the framework conditions for scientific work and is responsible for adhering to and communicating good scientific practice as well as providing appropriate career support for academic staff. The Rectorate, the faculties and the academic units guarantee that all academic staff can comply with legal and ethical standards. This includes, in particular, clear and written procedures and principles for personnel selection and development, taking into account equal opportunities and diversity, a range of further training opportunities, established supervising structures and concepts for early career researchers and ensuring access to the necessary infrastructure for archiving research data (primary data) and research results as well as the central materials on which they are based.

(2) Each scientist is responsible for his/her own conduct. Those who take on leadership roles are responsible for ensuring that the conditions for good scientific practice are met within the group and that the rules are adhered to. Lively communication within the research group and secure supervisory relationships are the most effective means of preventing a slide into dishonest behavior. In this communication, the disclosure of scientific sources and data as well as the communication of preliminary statements and conclusions is particularly important. Sources must be clearly identified. They serve the purpose of constant discussion within the group, independent of hierarchical controls. The mutual review of work results within the group must be ensured by the head of the group.

(3) The heads of scientific working groups are responsible for an appropriate organization that ensures that the tasks of management, supervision, conflict resolution

and quality assurance are clearly assigned and actually performed. They ensure that all members are aware of their roles, rights and duties. The size and organization of an academic work unit must be designed in such a way that the management tasks, in particular the transfer of skills, academic support and supervisory and mentoring duties, can be performed appropriately.

(4) When assessing academic performance, originality and quality should always take precedence over quantity. Quantitative indicators should only be included in the overall assessment in a reflected manner and are to be assessed on a discipline-specific basis in particular. In addition to the acquisition of knowledge and its critical reflection, other performance dimensions are also included in the assessment.

§ 4
Supervision of early career researchers

(1) The training and promotion of early career researchers is a central goal of the University of Bremen. In addition to methodological skills, the University of Bremen will teach early career scientists an ethical attitude for academic work, for the responsible handling of results and for cooperation with other scientists.

(2) The principles of good scientific practice are taught in all degree programs at the University of Bremen and as part of the supervision of early career researchers.

(3) Appropriate measures are taken to prevent the abuse of power and the exploitation of dependency relationships for early career researchers at the University of Bremen.

(4) The supervision of doctoral candidates must be designed in such a way that the supervisor supports their doctoral candidates in structuring the doctoral process, in building an academic network and in identifying career opportunities, and has an overview of the ongoing research activities and the main developmental progress of the work.

II. Good scientific practice in research and publications

§ 5
Quality assurance in the research process

(1) The roles and responsibilities of the scientific staff involved in a research project must be clear at all times. The scientists involved are in regular contact with each other. They define their roles and responsibilities in an appropriate manner and adjust them if necessary during the course of the project. This is particularly the case if the focus of work or participation in a research project changes.

(2) The scientists carry out every step of the research process in a lege artis manner. Continuous quality assurance during research relates in particular to compliance with subject-specific standards and established methods, to processes such as the calibration of equipment, the collection, processing and analysis of research data, the selection and use of research software, its development and programming, and the maintenance of laboratory notebooks.

(3) If scientists have made findings publicly available and subsequently become aware of inconsistencies or errors, they correct them immediately.

(4) Scientists use scientifically sound and reproducible methods to address research questions. Good scientific practice requires strict care in the selection and application of subject-specific methods, tools and processes as well as in the collection and analysis of data. Specific skills can also be acquired through cooperation. An essential prerequisite for the comparability and transferability of research results is the establishment of standards for methods, the use of software, the collection of research data and the documentation of research results.

(5) When planning a project, scientists take the current state of research into account and recognize it. Careful enquiry into the current state of research and established standards and applications from practice is a prerequisite for identifying relevant and suitable research questions. Methods to avoid (unconscious) bias in the interpretation of findings, for example blinding of test series, are applied as far as possible. The importance of equal opportunities and diversity is reviewed with regard to the research project.

(6) The origin of data, samples, organisms, materials and software used in the research process is identified and utilisation is documented as far as possible. The original sources are cited. The type and scope of research data generated in the research process are documented. The handling of research data is organized in accordance with the requirements of the subject concerned. The source code of publicly accessible software must be permanent, citable and documented. Results and findings must, as far as technically possible, be able to be repeated or confirmed by other researchers in a reproducible manner.

(7) Researchers document all information relevant to the production of a research result in such a comprehensible manner as is necessary and appropriate in the subject area concerned in order to be able to review and evaluate the result. Results must not be selected in this context. Research results that do not support a research hypothesis are also documented. Any existing professional recommendations for the review and evaluation of results must be applied and, in the case of corresponding restrictions, a comprehensible justification must be documented. Documentation and research results must be protected against manipulation as far as possible.

§ 6
Communication and publication of scientific findings

(1) As a rule, research results are included in the scientific discourse. In individual cases, however, there may be reasons for not making results publicly accessible. Scientists decide on their own responsibility whether, how and where to make their results publicly accessible, taking into account the conventions of the relevant subject area. The decision must not depend on third parties.

(2) In the case of publications, the research data, samples, materials and information on which the results are based, the methods used and the software and work processes employed are presented in full, insofar as this is possible and reasonable. Own and third-party prelimiminary work must be fully and correctly documented. Independently programmed software is made publicly accessible, including the source code, insofar as this is legally possible. If self-developed research software is to be made available to third parties, it will be provided with an open source license if possible.

(3) To promote traceability, scientists deposit research data on which their publications are based in preferably recognized (specialist) repositories or archives according to the FAIR principle ("Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re- Usable"). This applies in particular to research data from publicly funded research. Restrictions may arise in the context of patent applications with regard to public accessibility.

(4) In keeping with the idea of "quality over quantity", scientists avoid inappropriately small publications. They limit the repetition of the content of their publications as co-authors to the extent necessary to understand the context.

(5) Authors select the appropriate publication medium, taking into account quality and visibility in their discipline. A key criterion here is that the publication organ has established its own guidelines for good scientific practice. Scientists working as editors should also carefully consider the publication organ for which they are taking on this task. A new or unknown publication organ is checked for its seriousness with regard to supporting good scientific practice. The scientific quality of a contribution does not depend on the publication medium in which it is made publicly accessible.

§ 7
Authors and authorship

(1) All scientists who have made a genuine, comprehensible contribution to the scientific content of the text, data or software publication are to be regarded as authors. Authors of scientific publications are always jointly responsible for their content, unless responsibility is explicitly stated otherwise. So-called " honorary authorship" is excluded.

Publications should, if they are intended as a report on new scientific findings,

- describe the results completely and comprehensibly, stating or referring to all methodological details,
- provide complete and correct evidence of the cited own and third-party preliminary work (citations),
- only repeat previously published results in a clearly identified form and only to the extent necessary for an understanding of the context.

Authors shall agree in good time on the order in which authors are to be named on the basis of comprehensible criteria, taking into account the conventions of each subject area. The necessary approval for publication of results may not be refused without a sufficient reason.

(2) The authors of an original scientific publication should be all and only those who have made a substantial contribution to the design of the study or its experiments, or to the preparation, analysis and interpretation of the data and the formulation of the manuscript, and who have agreed to its publication, i.e. who are responsible for it. Persons who have contributed substantially to the design of the study or its experiments or to the preparation, analysis and interpretation of the data must be given the opportunity to collaborate on the preparation of a manuscript for publication of the results and to become co-authors. With this definition of authorship, other - also substantial - contributions such as

- formal responsibility for the acquisition of funding,
- providing rooms, funds, personnel or other resources,
- provision of existing sample material,
- instruction of co-authors in established methods,
- participation in data compilation,
- merely reading the manuscript without helping to shape the content and
- management of an organizational unit in which the publication originated

are not in itself considered sufficient to justify authorship.

(3) Agreeing to be named as a co-author constitutes joint responsibility for ensuring that the publication meets scientific requirements. This applies in particular to the area for which the co-author has made a contribution. The co-author is responsible both for the correctness of their own contribution and for ensuring that it is included in the publication in a scientifically acceptable manner.

(4) If individual scientists are named as co-authors in a publication without their consent and they feel unable to give permission, they are expected - if they are aware of the publication - to expressly object to being named as co-authors vis-à-vis the main author and/or the editors of the journal in question or the publisher.

(5) If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, this support can be appropriately acknowledged in footnotes, in the foreword or in the acknowledgement.

§ 8
Legal and ethical framework conditions and rights of use

(1) Scientists are obliged to deal responsibly with the constitutionally granted freedom of research. They are responsible for assessing the respective ethical aspects and thoroughly evaluating the consequences of research. They pay particular attention to rights and obligations resulting from legal requirements and from agreements or contracts with third parties. They obtain approvals and, if necessary, ethics votes. Agreements on the utilization of research data or research results and funding decisions, including the ancillary provisions of the funding bodies, are also framework conditions that must be observed.

(2) Agreements or contracts regulating the rights of use should be concluded in particular when a research project is carried out with third parties. Documented agreements are particularly useful if several institutions are involved in a research project or if it is foreseeable that a researcher will leave the University of Bremen and would like to continue using the data generated by him or her for (his or her own) research purposes. In particular, the researcher who collects the data is entitled to use it. In the context of an ongoing research project, the authorized users also decide (in particular in accordance with data protection regulations) whether third parties should have access to the data. All researchers use their knowledge, experience and skills in such a way that risks can be identified, assessed and evaluated. In doing so, they take particular account of the aspects associated with security-relevant research (dual use).

§ 9
Archiving of research results and research data

(1) The research data (primary data) on which the published research results are based, central materials and any research software used must be stored in an adequate manner in accordance with the standards of the respective subjects for at least 10 years as a rule. In justified cases, shorter retention periods or the retention of only part of the data may be permitted, subject to documentation of comprehensible, possibly legally prescribed reasons. If there are comprehensible reasons for not retaining certain data, the researchers shall provide a justification for this. The University shall ensure that access to the necessary infrastructure is available to enable archiving. Archiving takes place in recognized repositories or on durable, secure media at the institution where the data was created. The retention period begins on the date on which public access is established.

(2) If co-authors leave the university before the end of the intended retention period, the responsibility for retention must be regulated by them. The equipment, test rigs and commercial software products used to obtain the research data must be named in this context.

III. Non-compliance with good scientific practice

§ 10
Scientific misconduct - definition

(1) Scientific misconduct occurs when false statements are made intentionally or through gross negligence in a scientifically relevant context, the intellectual property of others is infringed or their research activities are damaged in any other way. Scientific misconduct may occur in particular in the following cases

a) False statements, in particular the fabrication of data and/or research results as well as the falsification of data and/or research results, e.g.
   - by an undisclosed selection of results, in particular a rejection of undesired results,
   - by manipulating a representation or image,
   - incorrect information in a letter of application, in the context of a reporting obligation or an application for funding (including incorrect information on publications and publications in print), insofar as these are science-related,
   - the use of texts that have been created by other authors and are passed off as your own with their consent (so-called ghostwriting);

b) Infringement of the intellectual property rights of others, in particular with regard to a copyrighted work created by others or essential scientific findings, hypotheses, doctrines or research approaches originating from others by
   - the unmarked adoption of third-party content without the required source citation ("plagiarism"),
   - the exploitation of research approaches and ideas (theft of ideas),
   - the unauthorized disclosure of data, theories and findings to third parties,
   - the presumption or unfounded assumption of scientific authorship or co-authorship,
   - claiming the (co-)authorship of another person without their consent,
   - unauthorized publication and unauthorized making available to third parties as long as the work, finding, hypothesis, doctrine or research approach has not yet been published;

c) Damage to research activities due to
   - sabotage (including damaging, destroying or tampering with experimental setups, equipment, documents, hardware, software, chemicals, cell and microorganism cultures or other things that another person needs to carry out an experiment),
   - misappropriation of budget funds/third-party funds and private donations that is not permitted under budgetary law,

- Falsification or removal of original data, insofar as this violates legal provisions or recognized disciplinary principles of scientific work.

(2) Scientific misconduct also arises - in the case of intent or gross negligence - from:

- co-authorship of a publication that contains false information or unauthorized scientific achievements,
- gross neglect of supervisory duties, if another person has objectively fulfilled the facts of scientific misconduct and this would have been prevented or made considerably more difficult by the necessary and reasonable supervision,
- as well as from willful participation (in the sense of incitement or aiding and abetting) in the willful scientific misconduct of others.

IV. **Procedure for suspected scientific misconduct**

§ 11

Protection of whistleblowers and those affected by allegations, confidentiality

(1) All persons involved in a procedure to investigate scientific misconduct at the University of Bremen are committed to protecting both the whistleblowers and the persons affected by the allegations in an appropriate manner. The investigation of allegations of scientific misconduct is expressly carried out in compliance with confidentiality and the basic principle of the presumption of innocence.

(2) The report must be made in good faith. Deliberately false or willful accusations may themselves constitute scientific misconduct. The person making the report should not suffer any disadvantages for their own academic or professional advancement as a result of the report. This applies to the person affected by the allegations as long as scientific misconduct has not been formally established.

(3) The name of the whistleblower will be treated confidentially and may only be disclosed to third parties without consent if there is a legal obligation to do so or if the person affected by the allegations would otherwise not be able to defend themselves properly. The Commission will decide on a case-by-case basis. Before the name of the whistleblower is disclosed, he or she will be informed immediately and can decide whether he or she wishes to withdraw the report if the name is likely to be disclosed.The identity is public if it chooses the route of reporting via the public itself.

(4) The regulations for personnel files regarding access by third parties and storage apply accordingly to the files of the formal investigation.

§ 12
Ombudspersons

(1) The Rector appoints two experienced members of the University as ombudspersons to clarify academic misconduct in connection with members and affiliates of the University of Bremen for a period of up to five years. A further term of office is possible. One of the ombudspersons should belong to the humanities and social sciences, the other to the natural sciences and engineering. Academics with management experience are appointed as ombudspersons. The ombudspersons may not hold leading positions in the department or university management. A deputy ombudsperson is appointed for each ombudsperson, who performs the ombudsperson's duties if the ombudsperson is unable to attend or is biased. § Section 21 VwVfG applies. The ombudspersons are to be announced in an appropriate manner.

(2) Ombudspersons are neutral persons of trust who provide general advice on issues of good scientific practice. They are not bound by instructions and are obliged to maintain confidentiality and impartiality. The ombudspersons are the contact persons in connection with allegations of scientific misconduct against members and affiliates of the University of Bremen. In particular, they must receive information about such scientific misconduct and contribute to the solution-oriented resolution of conflicts. In accordance with § 16, they conduct discussions with persons who make such allegations. They examine whether there are indications of scientific misconduct in individual cases.

(3) Members and affiliates of the University of Bremen can also contact the "The German Research Ombudsman " of the German Research Foundation (DFG) independently of this. This also applies if a person is unsure whether an observed behavior constitutes scientific misconduct or if they are unable to check the facts themselves.

(4) The ombudspersons receive the necessary support and acceptance in the performance of their duties. Measures are planned to relieve the burden elsewhere.

§ 13
Commission

(1) The Academic Senate appoints a commission to investigate allegations of scientific misconduct.

(2) The commission consists of:

1. four university professors, one of whom is qualified to hold judicial office,
2. an academic member of staff,
3. one employee from the Technology and Administration group, and
4. one student.

The members of the commission are elected by the Academic Senate. Only persons who are members of the University of Bremen are eligible for election. The students are elected for one year, the other members for three years. Re-election is possible.

(3) At least one deputy shall be appointed for each member to act in the event that the member is unable to attend or is biased. § Section 21 VwVfG applies.

(4) The commission elects a chairperson and a deputy chairperson from the group in accordance with paragraph 2 no. 1. The chairperson opens and chairs the meetings of the commission.

(5) The committee does not meet in public. It may invite members and affiliates of the University, in particular the ombudspersons, as well as other experts to participate in its deliberations.

(6) The members of the commission must be informed of the duty of confidentiality by the chairperson. The same applies to reviewers, experts and other persons called upon to assist the Commission.

§ 14
Reporting suspected scientific misconduct

(1) In accordance with the following regulations, the University of Bremen will investigate any well-founded suspicion of scientific misconduct at the University of Bremen that is brought to the attention of the ombudsperson responsible for good scientific practice. There is no obligation to follow up on anonymous reports.

(2) If a person becomes aware of circumstances that give rise to a concrete suspicion of scientific misconduct that needs to be clarified, they must explain this to the ombudsperson. As a rule, the circumstances on which the suspicion is based must be explained in writing.

(3) If other persons or offices of the University are informed, they must immediately refer the informant to the ombudsperson. Written statements must be forwarded to the ombudsperson.

§ 15
Preliminary review by the ombudsperson

(1) If an ombudsperson becomes aware of circumstances that may give rise to indications of scientific misconduct, he or she shall examine the information from a plausibility point of view for concreteness and significance, for possible motives and with regard to possibilities of clearing up the allegations. To this end, it advises the person providing the information and also informs them about the course of the procedure in accordance with these regulations. The person providing the information must indicate to which other body they have provided information on the behavior described.

(2) If the ombudsperson deems it necessary, he or she may involve the person concerned in an interview in accordance with paragraph 1 with the consent of the whistleblower.

(3) If the ombudsperson comes to the conclusion that there are no indications of scientific misconduct from the documents available to him/her, he/she shall inform the informant and close the case. For their protection, the ombudsperson guarantees, in accordance with the principle of confidentiality pursuant to Section 11 (3), not to disclose the allegations to anyone.

§ 16
Initiation of proceedings

(1) If the ombudsperson comes to the conclusion that there is a suspicion of scientific misconduct, he or she shall forward the case to the Chairperson of the Commission together with the documents available to him or her at the time.

(2) If the informant does not agree with the ombudsperson's decision pursuant to Section 15 (3), he or she may notify the ombudsperson in writing within two weeks, who shall then review his or her decision. If the ombudsperson upholds his or her decision, he or she shall inform the Chairperson of the Commission, stating the relevant reasons. The ombudsperson shall submit the opinion of the informant to the Commission. The Commission shall decide on the initiation of proceedings. Care should be taken to ensure that the proceedings are conducted within a reasonable period of time.

§ 17
Commission investigation

(1) The person suspected of scientific misconduct shall be given the opportunity by the Commission to comment without delay, stating the incriminating facts and evidence. The statement must be submitted in writing to the chairperson of the committee. The deadline for submitting the statement is generally two weeks.

(2) After receipt of the statement or after expiry of the deadline, the Commission shall examine whether scientific misconduct has occurred. It may obtain a supplementary statement from the informant.

(3) The Commission deliberates in closed hearings. It is entitled to take all steps necessary to clarify the facts of the case and examines them in a free consideration of evidence. To this end, it may obtain all necessary information and opinions and, in individual cases, also consult experts in the scientific field to be assessed as well as other experts. The person to whom

is accused of scientific misconduct must be heard orally. They may call in a person they trust to assist them.

§ 18
Commission decision

(1) The proceedings will be discontinued if the Commission does not consider scientific misconduct to have been proven.

(2) The proceedings may also be discontinued on the grounds of insignificance if less serious scientific misconduct has been established. The decision must take into account whether the person concerned has made a significant contribution to the clarification, has offered a measure such as the publication of an erratum or whether measures have already been taken to remedy any damage that has occurred. The person concerned, the ombudsperson and the informing person must be informed of the discontinuation of proceedings.

(3) At the request of the person concerned, the Commission may recommend to the Rector that the discontinuation decision be published.

(4) If the Commission considers scientific misconduct to be proven, it shall determine the existence of scientific misconduct and submit the result of its investigation to the Rector with a proposal for further proceedings.

(5) The main reasons that led to the termination of the procedure in accordance with paragraphs 1 and 2 or to the determination of scientific misconduct in accordance with paragraph 4 and to the submission of the results of the investigation to the Rector must be communicated to the person concerned and the informing person in writing without delay.

(6) Decisions of the Commission require a majority of the votes of its members.

(7) Resolutions may be passed by way of circulation, provided that this does not conflict with legal provisions and no member objects.

(8) There is no internal appeal procedure against the Commission's decision.

§ 19
Decision of the rector

(1) Taking into account the report and recommendation of the commission, the Rector decides on the further procedure. Depending on the facts of the case, the responsible bodies or institutions initiate legal or regulatory measures with the corresponding procedures.

(2) The Rector decides on the publication of the committee's decision in accordance with Section 18 (3) and (4).

of scientific misconduct of the third-party funder. Third parties who have a justified interest in the decision are also informed of the outcome of the procedure.

§ 20
Sanctions

Irrespective of the legal consequences, the University of Bremen reserves the right to impose sanctions in the event of scientific misconduct, depending on the severity of the academic misconduct. These may include, among other things

1. written reprimand of the respondent by the rector,
2. official instruction to correct or retract not correctly written publications
3. exclusion from internal university research funding procedures on a temporary or permanent basis,
4. initiation of measures under labor law or employment law

V. Final provisions

§ 21
Entry into force

These regulations enter into force upon approval by the Rector. At the same time, the Regulations for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice dated 05.07.2017 shall cease to apply.

Bremen, 02.05.2022 The Rector of the University of Bremen