Globethics Repository



Rules for good scientific practice

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Preprint
Authors	University of Copenhagen
Publisher	University of Copenhagen
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-11-19 20:02:35
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/209913

The University of Copenhagen's rules for good scientific practice

Part 1 General provisions

Purpose

Section 1. The purpose of these rules is to promote good scientific practice at the University of Copenhagen and to provide a basis for the activities of the Committee for Good Scientific Practice (the Practice Committee).

(2) The rules apply to research conducted by or at the University of Copenhagen, or that forms the basis for a degree bestowed by the University of Copenhagen.

(3) Cases in which a question is raised relating to dishonesty are not included, as these are brought before one of the national committees, see section 9.

Basis

Section 2. The evaluation of whether a particular practice is in accordance with the requirements for good scientific practice is based in particular on the applicable laws and other public-sector regulations, rulings by research councils or other funding institutions and foundations, and ethical codes set by national or international scientific societies or other professional groups, such as the Vancouver Rules or "Uniform Requirements", the "European Science Foundation" and the "Singapore Statement on Research Integrity".

Considerations

Section 3. Good scientific practice is based on a series of principles that have been formulated and are regularly adjusted by relevant international associations of researchers and research organisations. These principles include:

1. that the research is conducted in a reliable manner
2. that primary data is kept secure and, as far as possible, is made publicly available
3. that the research results are presented openly and honestly
4. that there is openness in relation to possible conflicts of interest
5. that everybody who takes part in the research process is credited in a fair manner.

(2) Good scientific practice should be promoted in such a way that the interests of academic freedom are not jeopardised.

Part 2 Committee for Good Scientific Practice (the Practice Committee)

The Committee

Section 4. The Rector appoints a committee to address questions of good scientific practice, known as "the Committee for Good Scientific Practice (the Practice Committee)".

(2) Professors or associate professors at the University of Copenhagen are eligible to be members of the Committee. HEALTH and SCIENCE each appoint two members, while HUM, LAW, SOC SCI and THEOL appoint one each. They also nominate alternates for each member. Members and alternates are appointed for a period of three years. Reappointment is permitted.

(3) Committee members and alternates are appointed by the faculties' academic councils.

(4) The Committee elects a chairperson and deputy chairperson from among its members.

(5) The Committee adopts rules of procedure.

(6) Where necessary, the Committee is permitted to seek expert assistance from individuals with special insight into a particular subject, see also part 3.

Section 5. The Committee acts as an independent body.

(2) In its work, including the assessment of specific cases, the Committee is independent of the Rector and is therefore, in these contexts, not under his or her authority.

(3) The Rector provides secretarial services to the Committee.

(4) The Secretariat assists the chairperson and the Committee in their work, as agreed with the chairperson.

Tasks

Section 6. The Committee is responsible for

1. helping to clarify the existing norms for good scientific practice
2. taking steps to ensure that the norms for good scientific practice are discussed
3. ruling on specific cases, cf. part 3.

(2) The Committee may also – on a mandate from the Rector or of its own volition – propose rules and guidance on good practice.

(3) The Committee decides how its own work is organised.

(4) The Committee publishes an annual report on its activities.

Part 3. Casework

Initiative and deadlines

(7) Any case can be brought before the committee by

- a named physical or legal person submitting a written complaint
- the Rector submitting a case to the Committee
- the Committee taking up a case of special significance on its own initiative
- a person who wishes to be cleared of rumours or accusations.

(2) A case must be brought before the Committee within a reasonable time after the person who initiates proceedings has received, or should have received, the necessary information to raise the matter. A case brought under (1) nos. 1–3 must not relate to matters that are more than five years old when the case is taken up by the Committee. A case raised under (1) no. 4 must not relate to rumours or accusations that the person concerned has known about for more than six months when the Committee is requested to consider the case. In special cases, the Committee may disregard these deadlines.

Rejection

Section 8. The Committee can reject a case if the complaint is manifestly unfounded or if the case is found to be outside the remit of the Committee, see section 1.

Section 9. If the case raises a question of dishonesty, it must be rejected. Cases of this nature must be brought before one of the national committees on scientific dishonesty. If the case is dealt with by another authority or body, it may be suspended until a decision is reached there. The Committee advises whoever referred the matter accordingly.

(2) If a case is rejected, cf. (1), the Committee must ask the complainant within a deadline of seven days whether he or she will refer the matter to a committee on scientific dishonesty. If at the end of this period the Committee has not received confirmation of this from the complainant, the Committee informs the Rector and the relevant dean about the case. At the same time, the Committee requests information from the dean about referral to a committee on scientific dishonesty.

(3) In exceptional circumstances, the Committee itself may, cf. (2) item 2, bring a case before a committee on scientific dishonesty.

Information

Section 10. The Committee makes sure that sufficient information is available about the case. The Committee may ask for comments from experts.

(2) For a particular case, the Committee can establish an ad hoc committee made up of experts representing the relevant subject area in particular. Individuals who are not members of the Committee are allowed to be part of ad hoc committees. An ad hoc committee makes recommendations to the Committee. For ad hoc committees, the provisions in section 11 (1) items 1 and 3apply.

Report

Section 11. The Committee terminates its proceedings with a reasoned decision as to whether the matter submitted is contrary to good scientific practice. The procedure should generally be completed within six months of the case being brought before the Committee.

(2) The Committee sends its ruling to the defendant, the complainant and the Rector for information.

(3) If the Committee does not reach a consensus, the minority position and reasons must be stated separately.

Appeals

Section 12. Rulings by the Practice Committee cannot be appealed to any other administrative authority.

Part 4. Date of commencement, etc.

Section 13. The rules in the Danish Public Administration Act apply to committees and ad hoc committees and their reports.

Section 14. These rules come into force on 1 September 2013.

(2) When necessary, the Committee submits a report to the Rector about the application of the rules, including proposals for any amendments.

The University of Copenhagen, 1 September 2013

Ralf Hemmingsen, Rector

/Torben Rytter Kristensen, group leader