

**Ethical guidelines, regulations for securing and safeguarding good academic practice, and procedures for addressing academic malpractice and misconduct at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research. Member of the Leibniz Association (hereafter ‘GEI’ or ‘Institute’)**

**Preamble**

Honesty in the search for truthful findings, the fair treatment of colleagues and all staff, students, research subjects and others involved in the Institute’s work, and responsible use of resources form the basis of all academic work.

These guidelines, regulations and procedures set out the consensus at the GEI regarding these matters and are intended to raise awareness of ethical issues in the theory and practice of academic work and encourage academics and others to reflect critically upon their actions. Further, they provide appropriate procedures and measures to protect employees of the GEI from illegitimate expectations and demands or from various forms of academic misconduct or malpractice.

The Leibniz Association and its member institutions are acutely aware of their responsibility to inform academics working within them, particularly those in the early stages of their academic careers, of the ethical guidelines and regulations which should govern their actions as academics.

The GEI’s ethical guidelines and regulations for securing and safeguarding good academic practice are based on ‘The Guidelines on Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice and on Dealing with Allegations of Scientific Misconduct within the Leibniz Association’ (29 November 2018) and on principles of research ethics and guidelines on research data issued by other academic institutions.<sup>1</sup>

All employees of the GEI are required to accept the Guidelines and Regulations, and to agree to abide by them, in writing. Compliance with them is a contractual duty for all new employees.

---

<sup>1</sup> These primarily include the principles on research ethics issued by the German Educational Research Association (2015), the German Institute for Economic Research (2014), the German Sociological Association and the Professional Association of German Sociologists (*Berufsverband deutscher Soziologinnen und Soziologen*) (2014), and rules issued by the Georg-August-Universität on safeguarding good scientific practice (2016) as well as the Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice by the German Research Foundation (2016).

## **Part I: Ethical guidelines and rules of good academic practice**

### **Section 1: Key principles**

- (1) The central principles and requirements of good academic practice include, in particular:
- the principle of working *lege artis*,
  - fully documenting all stages and findings of a study including records and research data and securely storing them according to data protection regulations,
  - critically and systematically checking the validity and, where appropriate, the replicability of all research findings,
  - maintaining strict honesty in recognising the contributions made to a piece of research by collaborators, team members, competitors and predecessors, and full and honest disclosure of these contributions to funding bodies,
  - respecting, in all publications, the intellectual property of others and correctly referencing all quotations, citations or inclusions of others' work in one's own,
  - providing appropriate supervision and support to academics undertaking research for doctoral and postdoctoral qualifications and ensuring this work is appropriately assessed,
  - acting responsibly when working with and managing others in departments, forums, research teams and project groups, including providing adequate and appropriate supervision and support to members,
  - taking responsibility, as an author of an academic publication, for the content of those publications, including the presentation and discussion of research findings and explicitly identifying and explaining cases in which responsibility only extends to part of the publication,
  - consistently prioritising originality and quality over quantity as evaluation criteria for recruitment, appointments and resource allocation.
- (2) Employees of the GEI acknowledge the source/s of their research funding and do not accept financial support or research projects or enter into contracts which may compromise their academic independence or infringe any of the principles set out in this document.
- (3) Alongside implementing measures designed to identify academic misconduct or malpractice and apply appropriate sanctions, it is important for academic institutions to implement or reinforce appropriate measures to prevent such misconduct or malpractice occurring. The GEI, as an institution which engages in research and nurtures early-career academics, bears a specific institutional responsibility for the implementation of such measures.

### **Section 2: Responsibility of Institute management for upholding good academic practice**

Responsibility for organising the academic work conducted at the GEI, specifically its management and supervision, conflict resolution and quality assurance, rests with the Institute's directors, its heads of department and project leads. They must ensure that:

- early-career academics are made aware of these guidelines and rules in the course of their development as academics and in the context of supervisory relationships, and must monitor compliance with them.
- the tasks, objectives, rights and responsibilities related to the research work of individual academics at the Institute are set out, defined and assigned in accordance with the regulations in force at the GEI and in a manner considered acceptable and reliable by all involved.

### **Section 3: Academic publications and authorship**

- (1) The purpose of academic publications is to describe the findings of academic research and the manner of their attainment comprehensively and in a way which makes the findings and their process clear and transparent to others. Text and findings previously published elsewhere may only be included in later publications if this is clearly indicated (duplicate publication).
- (2) Employees of the GEI make the findings of their research publicly available in an appropriate form. An exception to this rule shall be granted in cases where to publish such research would be morally irresponsible or indefensible or infringe confidentiality. In instances where confidentiality clauses relating to the holders of specific offices or agreements with the commissioners of the research interfere with the authors' right to publication of the findings, employees of the GEI shall attempt to uphold their right to publish as fully as possible.
- (3) Employees of the GEI respect the intellectual property and the authorship of academic ideas, theories, findings and data. Where they cite such material, they attribute authorship or intellectual property correctly, completely and within the relevant context.
- (4) Authorship of an original academic publication may only be claimed by those who have themselves made a substantive contribution to the conceptualisation of a study, the creation, analysis and interpretation of data, and the production of the manuscript and who have agreed to its publication, i.e. those who hold or share responsibility for the publication. So-called honorary authorship is not permitted. In instances such as major research projects involving multiple institutions, these rules should be incorporated into cooperation agreements.
- (5) Where multiple authors have produced a publication, all authors involved always share responsibility for the content published. Each individual author identifies with the findings published, vouches for the publication's content, and may be called upon to defend the work or answer for irregularities if necessary.
- (6) External reviewers of manuscripts submitted for publication must observe confidentiality and declare any interests which may compromise their objectivity.

### **Section 4: References, assessments, expertise, reviews and consultancy services**

- (1) Employees of the GEI asked to provide references for individuals, reviews of manuscripts or assessments of grant applications or other work or matters must refuse the request if acceding to it would lead to a conflict of interest.
- (2) Research submitted for assessment or review must be assessed in its entirety, with due care, in accordance with confidentiality, fairly, and within an appropriate period of time.
- (3) When drawing up performance and assessment criteria for academic examinations, for the conferment of academic degrees, or for academic appointments, quality and originality are to be given precedence over quantity.
- (4) Employees of the GEI requested to review books or manuscripts they have previously reviewed elsewhere should inform the person making the request of this. They must decline to review publications in which they were directly or indirectly involved.

### **Section 5: Treatment of research subjects**

- (1) It is imperative to respect both the individual rights of persons taking part in academic research as subjects and their right to freely choose whether or not to participate.
- (2) The consent of research subjects to participation, and inclusion of data relating to them, in empirical research is a fundamental prerequisite of this participation and inclusion. Consent must be given on the basis of prior information on the theoretical basis, objectives and methodology of the research, made available in a manner coherent with the research design and in as much detail as possible. Researchers must take particular care to ensure research subjects are

informed appropriately when there are reasonable grounds for the assumption that they may be unable, due to their level of education, socio-economic disadvantage or lack of language skills, to sufficiently understand the study's intent, process and organisational arrangements without being provided with specific information on these. If informed consent cannot be obtained due to the researcher's well-founded belief that doing so would falsify the findings or produce erroneous data, other acceptable ways of obtaining consent should be used. This may mean that consent to the use of data or material obtained during the study must be sought after data collection. Research subjects may withdraw their consent at any time during the research process.

- (3) Persons participating in a study as subjects of observation or as survey respondents or in any other way, in relation, for example, to the analysis of personal information, must not be exposed to any dangers or disadvantage through the research. Participants must be fully informed of all risks of involvement in the study which exceed those encountered in normal everyday life.
- (4) Researchers must respect the personal and individual integrity of the persons they survey or observe in the course of their work. They must, as a general principle, use methods and processes which exclude the possibility of the subject being identified and guarantee their anonymity. Where data is processed electronically, researchers must take care to ensure it cannot be accessed by those not entitled to do so.
- (5) All information collected from research subjects must be treated confidentially by all involved in the research process that have access to it, including interviewers, coders, transcribers and typists. Project leads are responsible for ensuring that all involved in the research are aware of this obligation and for monitoring access to confidential material.
- (6) Researchers and project team members shall be voluntarily subject to confidentiality obligations analogous to those in force for members of other professions and shall exercise the right to refuse to make statements or give evidence if they have reason to believe that making such statements would be to the detriment of those to whom the information at stake relates or who were involved in its collection.

## **Section 6: Management of research data**

- (1) The GEI supports and promotes free access to research data, subject to the stipulations in Section 5 being met.
- (2) Research data includes all data accrued through academic working processes and processed in digital form.
- (3) Rules and procedures for the management of research data generated in research projects at the GEI are set out in the 'Guidelines on the Handling of Research Data within the Leibniz Association' adopted on 29.11.2018.
- (4) Research data management encompasses the planning, collection, processing and storage of such data. Its purpose is to ensure that all data on which research findings are based is accessible, available to be used for appropriate subsequent purposes, reproducible and of adequate quality. Project leads and independent researchers are, as a rule, responsible for data management within their research projects. In particular, they must ensure that their data management meets the standards of good academic practice and the standards typical of their academic discipline.
- (5) Research data must be collected, processed and analysed in accordance with ethical, legal and data protection stipulations. It must be stored on durable and secured media at the institution by which it was collected for a period of ten years, unless doing so would conflict with mandatory legal stipulations, contractual provisions, or data protection regulations.

## **Section 7: Treatment of colleagues, junior employees, students, early-career academics and cooperation partners**

- (1) Employees of the GEI who supervise students and early-career academics commit to providing supervision of consistently high quality and ensuring that those under their supervision receive an optimal academic grounding in their field. These ethical guidelines and principles of good academic practice should be an integral component of the teaching or academic training received. Heads of department and project leads bear responsibility for ensuring that students, including graduate and doctoral students, receive appropriate supervision, including in instances where supervision needs to be provided by an academic from outside the Institute.
- (2) The GEI's management shall strive to ensure that it acts fairly, objectively, and in accordance with all relevant legal stipulations in relation to appointments, redundancies and dismissals, performance assessments, promotions, salary determinations, other issues relating to an individual's employment at the Institute or the commissioning of work, and appointment to professorships or the co-opting of persons to Institute bodies. Employees of the GEI do not discriminate against others on the basis of their age, gender identity, physical disability, social status, country or region of origin, ethnicity, religion or political affiliation.
- (3) Employees of the GEI must not exploit the work or achievements of others for their own ends or use others' work without attribution.
- (4) Employees of the GEI must not force, compel or pressure others, in particular research subjects, commissioners of research, junior employees and students, to grant them personal favours or career advantages of any kind.

## **Section 8: Decentral ombudsperson**

- (1) The GEI's academic staff shall elect by general secret ballot an ombudsperson and a deputy ombudsperson as points of contact to whom disagreements, suspicions and disputes in relation to good academic practice may be reported (decentral ombudsperson). The ombudsperson may not be a member of Institute management and should be in a position to act with independence by virtue of, for instance, having a permanent contract of employment at the Institute. The term of office of the ombudsperson and his or her deputy shall be three years, and re-election for two further terms of office shall be permitted. Institute management is responsible for organising and conducting the secret ballot. The ombudsperson can be deselected if it is no longer possible for them to fulfil their duties reliably in the long term, or if there is no longer any trust that they will fulfil their duties properly. Before a deselection decision is taken, the ombudsperson must be given a hearing. At least two thirds of the Institute's academic employees must agree to the deselection.
- (2) The ombudsperson may confer on a matter with his or her deputy.
- (3) The decentral ombudsperson has the power to launch an investigation into allegations of academic malpractice or misconduct (decentral investigation).
- (4) If, in the course of the decentral investigation, it emerges that it is not possible to fully resolve the allegations at the level of the member institution, or if the process is hindered by exceptional circumstances, the matter is passed to the central ombudsperson.

## **Section 9: Central ombudsperson**

- (1) The Senate of the Leibniz Association elects an ombudsperson for the Leibniz Association (central ombudsperson) and a deputy. The ombudsperson and deputy are proposed for election by the Leibniz Association's executive board and generally elected for a term of office lasting three years. They may be re-elected twice.
- (2) The central ombudsperson advises ombudspersons and academics in the member institutions when requested to do so. In addition he/she investigates, on the basis of the Leibniz Association

guidelines, allegations of academic misconduct or malpractice directed at employees and former employees of member institutions of the Leibniz Association. The work of the central ombudsperson is supported and closely followed by Leibniz headquarters.

## Part II: Procedures for addressing academic malpractice and misconduct

### Section 10: Academic malpractice and misconduct

- (1) Academic malpractice or misconduct is deemed to have been committed when a researcher, in an academic context, deliberately, negligently or grossly negligently, makes false statements or falsifies research, infringes intellectual property rights, or impedes or negatively affects others' research activities.
- (2) Along with violations of academic ethics, particularly through deceptive actions or those that disrespect human dignity, academic malpractice and misconduct includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the following:
  - a. False statements or falsification of research, in particular:
    - inventing data,
    - falsifying data (for instance by selecting desirable findings, dismissing undesirable findings or selecting methods of analysis that provide desired results without disclosing such actions, or by manipulating diagrams or illustrations),
    - giving incorrect information in lists of publications or grant applications (including incorrect information on names or forms of publications, third party funds or on forthcoming publications),
    - not disclosing duplicate publications of data or text.
  - b. Infringement of intellectual property rights, in particular:
    - in relation to a legally protected work created by others or to substantive academic or scientific knowledge, findings, hypotheses, teachings or approaches to research generated or formulated by others:
      - the incorporation into a text or other use, without permission, of passages of text without appropriately attributing authorship to the correct author/s (plagiarism),
      - the exploitation of ideas and approaches to research without permission, particularly if awareness of the idea or approach has been gained in the course of acting as a reviewer or examiner of academic work or author of an expertise,
      - claiming or accepting academic authorship or co-authorship without rightful claim thereto, or refusing to be named as co-author where co-authorship exists,
      - misrepresenting the content of a piece of academic work or a passage of text,
      - publishing or making available to third parties a piece of academic work, a research finding, a hypothesis, a teaching or a research approach which has not yet been officially and lawfully published;
    - naming another as (co-)author of a publication without his or her consent.
  - c. Impeding the research activities of others.
  - d. Destroying, deleting or disposing of research data in a manner contrary to legal stipulations or recognised principles of good academic practice. This includes unlawful failure to destroy, delete or safely dispose of data, particularly personal information.
- (3) Shared responsibility for misconduct or malpractice may arise, *inter alia*, from involvement in malpractice or misconduct committed by others, gross negligence in relation to supervision duties, or co-authorship of publications contaminated by malpractice or misconduct.

**Section 11: Procedures for investigations into allegations of academic malpractice and misconduct carried out by the decentral ombudsperson (decentral procedure)**

- (1) Upon learning of an allegation of academic malpractice or misconduct, the ombudsperson launches an internal investigation within the GEI (decentral procedure).
- (2) The internal investigation proceeds as follows: The ombudsperson hears the individual accounts of those involved, and is permitted to consult the chair of the Institute's Academic Advisory Board if he or she feels it necessary. At this stage in the proceedings, the ombudsperson shall treat all information given to him or her, the name of the person against whom the allegation has been made, and that of the informant confidentially and maintain the anonymity of those involved.
- (3) If the allegation cannot be disproved at this stage, the ombudsperson informs Institute management and the relevant head of department. It may be necessary at this stage to maintain the anonymity of the person subject to the allegation and the informant. If the allegation is against a member of Institute management, the ombudsperson shall inform the chair of the Academic Advisory Board.
- (4) The ombudsperson provides mediation in order to support those involved in tackling the conflict constructively. He or she shall prepare meetings between those involved, structure and facilitate them, mediating between the parties' differing perspectives in order to help them come to a mutually acceptable resolution. Further, the ombudsperson shall minute such meetings and document the action agreed upon for the solution's implementation, and subsequently provide supervision and support during this implementation. Once agreement or conciliation has been reached, the ombudsperson shall conclude the decentral procedure with a report and inform Institute management, the relevant head of department and, where required, the chair of the Academic Advisory Board of the procedure's conclusion. The information given by the ombudsperson shall relate to the fundamental facts of the matter and give a clear idea of how the ombudsperson's decision or the resolution of the conflict came about.
- (5) If the decentral process fails to provide a resolution, the ombudsperson shall pass the matter to Institute management, which shall decide on further steps and, where relevant, on the application of sanctions in accordance with Section 15 of these guidelines. Alternatively, the ombudsperson may pass the matter to the central ombudsperson of the Leibniz Association, who may initiate a central procedure for the investigation of academic malpractice or misconduct (see Sections 12-14).

**Section 12: Procedures for investigations into allegations of academic malpractice and misconduct carried out by the central ombudsperson (central procedure)**

- (1) Information relevant to investigations into allegations of academic misconduct or malpractice shall be submitted in writing to the central ombudsperson of the Leibniz Association.
- (2) The central ombudsperson investigates allegations of academic misconduct or malpractice submitted by decentralised ombudspersons (see section 8 para. 4), or if he/she is notified by affected persons, third parties or even anonymously, of a suspicion of academic misconduct or malpractice at a member institution of the Leibniz Association. In each case the allegations must be specific enough to give rise to reasonable grounds for an initial suspicion of misconduct or malpractice.
- (3) The ombudsperson shall confirm receipt of the notification within one month.
- (4) The name of a person making an allegation of misconduct or malpractice is to be treated confidentially. The central ombudsperson has a duty to prevent, as far as possible, any disadvantage being incurred by the informant in terms of their academic or professional advancement. This duty also applies to any additional individuals or bodies involved in the



investigation at a later stage. As a rule, disclosing the name of the accused person should only occur in cases where the accused is unable to properly defend him/herself against the allegations in any other way.

- (5) If sufficiently specific allegations have been made and there are grounds for initial suspicion of academic misconduct or malpractice, the central ombudsperson will conduct a preliminary investigation. To carry out this preliminary investigation he/she will, as a rule, give a hearing to the accused individual and the informant. The ombudsperson may call in additional people and ask for expert opinions. Following the preliminary investigation, the central ombudsperson determines whether it is necessary to convene an enquiry committee.
- (6) The accused and the informant are informed by the central ombudsperson of the results of the preliminary investigation. The results of the preliminary investigation will, as a rule, be presented to the executive board of the Leibniz Association when it next sits.
- (7) An enquiry committee to investigate allegations of academic misconduct or malpractice is convened as a result of a resolution made by the executive board. If the executive board deviates from the result of the preliminary investigation by the central ombudsperson it must have good reasons for doing so, such as consideration of circumstances that were not taken into account during the preliminary investigation, and it must disclose this justification to those involved.

### **Section 13: Procedures for an enquiry committee to investigate allegations of academic malpractice or misconduct**

- (1) A committee of enquiry formed to investigate allegations of academic misconduct or malpractice has the duty to investigate in full any allegations of academic misconduct or malpractice that fall within the scope of these guidelines. The committee is bound by the standards of good academic practice and definitions of academic misconduct or malpractice set out in these guidelines. It also takes into account established professional standards beyond the scope of these guidelines and its work is guided by common principles of establishing the truth.
- (2) The ombudsperson selects the members of the committee in consultation with the executive board. A designated member may decline to take part if they have good cause. The enquiry committee must include at least three members who are entitled to vote, including
  - a. the chairperson of the Academic Advisory Board of the member institution in question and/or the spokesperson of the respective section,
  - b. another member with the expertise necessary to fully understand the specific facts of the case and who is not an employee of the member institution in question,
  - c. a fully qualified lawyer.

The central ombudsperson is a non-voting member of the committee of enquiry.

- (3) All voting members of the committee have equal voting rights. The Leibniz Competition's rules on impartiality shall apply.
- (4) The committee of enquiry shall conduct its discussions orally and in private. The members shall agree on a procedure during the first meeting. A chairperson shall be appointed by the committee from among its members, who is then responsible for leading the meetings. The enquiry committee also instructs one of its members with suitable expertise to search for exonerating arguments, in the sense of a lawyer for the accused, and to present these arguments for discussion by the committee.
- (5) The members of the committee of enquiry, the employees of the Leibniz Association's headquarters who are involved in supporting its work, and all individuals involved in, or informed of, the proceedings shall maintain strictest confidentiality in all matters pertaining to them.

- (6) An enquiry committee must be given access to all data and documents it requests from the member institutions and Leibniz headquarters.
- (7) The enquiry committee will hear the accused person and the informant and will establish the context of the conduct forming the basis of the complaint. The committee may, if required, interview further persons, commission expert opinions and bring in assessors in an advisory capacity.
- (8) As a rule, the committee of enquiry shall conclude its work within a maximum of six months of the committee's constitutive meeting.
- (9) The committee of enquiry shall produce a report for the executive board of the Leibniz Association in which it adjudges whether a case of academic misconduct or malpractice exists. If the committee of enquiry concludes that academic malpractice or misconduct has been committed, i.e. should a majority of its members consider such malpractice or misconduct to be sufficiently proven, the report shall, in particular:
  - present and evaluate the extent of the academic misconduct or malpractice and
  - determine and justify whether the misconduct or malpractice was a result of negligence or gross negligence, or whether it was wilful.
- (10) The report may also record what further steps or measures the committee of enquiry recommends.

#### **Section 14: Conclusion of the procedure**

- (1) The executive board of the Leibniz Association will address the committee's report in its first meeting following receipt of the report. It establishes the existence of academic misconduct or malpractice or takes the decision to close the case. If its decision deviates from the verdict presented in the report by the enquiry committee, this must be sufficiently justified.
- (2) If the misconduct or malpractice is deemed to be the result of negligence, the executive board may decide on the following measures against the individual in question:
  - a. A written reprimand.
  - b. A demand to withdraw incriminating publications or, in less severe cases, to correct incorrect information by publishing an erratum.
- (3) If the misconduct or malpractice is deemed to be premeditated or the result of gross negligence, the executive board may decide on the following measures against the individual in question:
  - a. A written reprimand.
  - b. A demand to withdraw incriminating publications or, in less severe cases, to correct incorrect information by publishing an erratum.
  - c. Loss of passive voting rights for Leibniz Association bodies for one to five years (depending on the severity of the academic misconduct or malpractice).
  - d. Exclusion of the individual in question from leading roles in projects for which funding applications have been submitted through the internal Leibniz competition process for one to five years (depending on the severity of the academic misconduct or malpractice).
- (4) If the executive board determines, on the basis of the committee of enquiry's report, that the academic misconduct or malpractice may result in the individual being stripped of an academic title, degree or qualification, it shall forward the case to the relevant awarding institution. The management of the member institution to which the academic concerned belongs is responsible for instigating any disciplinary measures or action under employment, civil or criminal law.

- (5) The central ombudsperson is responsible for informing those involved, including informants, of the key reasons that led to the case being closed or of decisions by the executive board regarding further measures to be taken.
- (6) The executive board of the Leibniz Association shall decide on a case-by-case basis whether to pass on or publish its resolutions and the reports of the committee of enquiry, taking into account whether there is legitimate public interest.
- (7) As far as proceedings with the Leibniz Association are concerned, the decisions taken by the executive board of the Leibniz Association on the basis of the report submitted by the enquiry committee are final.

#### **Section 15: Disciplinary and legal action in cases of proven malpractice or misconduct**

- (1) In accordance with the circumstances of the case in hand, and particularly with regard to the seriousness of the malpractice or misconduct deemed to have been proven, disciplinary or legal action may be taken, in some cases cumulatively. Such action may include:
  - a. Action under employment law:
    - 1. issuance of a written warning;
    - 2. dismissal without notice;
    - 3. termination of the employee's contract of employment by mutual agreement.
  - b. Consequences for the academic standing of the person concerned:
    - 1. revocation of the academic's doctoral degree;
    - 2. revocation of *venia legendi*.
  - c. Action under civil law:
    - 1. denial of entry to the premises of the institution concerned;
    - 2. civil claims for the return of (for instance) research materials illegitimately removed from the premises;
    - 3. the pursuit of removal or cease-and-desist orders in relation to copyright, rights pertaining to the person, patent or competition legislation;
    - 4. claims for repayment of monies, such as grants, fellowships, third-party funding or similar;
    - 5. claims for damages brought by the Institute or by third parties.
  - d. Criminal prosecution.
- (2) Academic publications contaminated by proven academic malpractice or misconduct shall be withdrawn from the review and publication process if yet to be published, or, if they have already been published, retracted (post-publication retraction) or made the subject of an erratum or correction. Where necessary, any cooperation partners involved in the original research shall be informed in an appropriate manner. Authors and book series or journal editors involved in the publication have a fundamental duty to carry out this action. If they fail to act within a reasonable time frame, the director of the GEI or the chair of the Academic Advisory Board shall undertake the appropriate action.
- (3) In cases of serious academic malpractice or misconduct, the director of the GEI or the chair of the Academic Advisory Board shall inform other research institutions or organisations affected by the issue and, where relevant, professional associations.
- (4) In certain instances, the director of the GEI or the chair of the Academic Advisory Board may have a duty to inform third parties affected by the malpractice or misconduct, and/or the public at large, of the malpractice or misconduct found proven. Such a duty may arise where it is necessary to protect third parties' interests, to maintain individuals' or the public's trust in academic integrity, to restore the academic reputation of the Georg Eckert Institute or to prevent

further damage arising from the incident, or where publicising the matter is in the general public interest.

### **Section 16: Entry into force**

These 'Ethical guidelines, regulations for securing and safeguarding good academic practice, and procedures for addressing academic malpractice and misconduct at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research. Member of the Leibniz Association' enter into force upon being passed by the Board of Trustees of the Georg Eckert Institute.

The Board of Trustees of the Georg Eckert Institute passed the German version of these guidelines and regulations in its meeting of 7 June 2019.

Braunschweig, 7 June 2019