iDiv Code of Conduct and Scientific Integrity
Version 4 - 07.09.2023

1. Introduction

iDiv is an inspiring and challenging institution that fosters excellence in research and graduate teaching in a highly collaborative, dynamic, and international environment. We aim at having excellence not only in research and teaching, but in how we conduct all aspects of academic life and our working environment.

This document aims at promoting ethical behavior and best practices in order to avoid scientific misconduct and any form of bullying, harassment or discrimination. It applies to all members, PhD students, scientific and non-scientific employees and visitors (e.g. workshop participants) of iDiv and should be **provided to all at check-in**. We aim to empower everybody at iDiv with information about good practices (section 2), supervision, career support and representation (section 3), scientific ethics (section 4), and authorship and data (section 5). We also describe how to proceed when things go wrong (Section 6).

This document compiles information provided by iDiv's host institutions and funding organizations, the German Science Foundation (DFG)[1], as well as information from iDiv itself. It does not replace binding regulations from those organizations (e.g. the DFG Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice; and their implementing documents at the hosting institutions). This document is intended to trigger and foster open conversations on these topics at iDiv. It should be discussed at the first meetings between a supervisor and an employee. It could also serve as a basis for annual discussions within your lab or for social meetings within iDiv.

This is a **living document** to be amended and adjusted in accordance with future experience and developments at iDiv and in our society. Please contribute to it![2] In addition, an annual or biennial survey should be carried out to evaluate the implementation of this document across iDiv, and specifically to assess the prevalence of cases that remain unreported or unresolved.

---

[1] For more info on the DGF guidelines, check https://wissenschaftliche-integritaet.de or https://wissenschaftliche-integritaet.de/en/

[2] Available for comments at https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IicFK0szYK-mt9rIVcfKLAlHAVKYJuOX5EPeUASbcDE/edit?usp=sharing

2. Behavior

iDiv values the diversity of views, expertise, opinions, backgrounds, and experiences of employees and visitors. iDiv is committed to providing a safe, productive and welcoming environment for all. All iDiv members, employees, including scientific and non-scientific staff, students at all levels, interns, volunteers, service providers, and visitors, including workshop and conference participants, are expected to abide by the iDiv Code of Conduct. This section describes expected behavior and unacceptable behavior for all individuals.

This guidance on individual behavior applies to the iDiv building and facilities of partner organizations where iDiv research is carried out, as well as any other facilities where activities associated with iDiv take place. This Code of Conduct also applies to field situations. Fieldwork often happens at remote sites, with new, unfamiliar, unknown or nonexistent local rules of conduct and no reporting mechanisms in place. There may be unfamiliar cultural norms or a foreign language, and long days with physically strenuous work and exhaustion. None of this exempts anyone from their responsibility to follow the iDiv Code of Conduct, as well as to familiarize themselves with the local cultural norms and rules, ensuring a safe and respectful work environment for everyone. Finally, this guidance also applies to social media, where even a private account may be seen as being representative of iDiv, scientists, etc.

Expected Behavior

- Follow the good practice principles outlined in this document regarding authorship and supervision.
- Treat your colleagues, including non-scientific staff and workshop- and conference participants with kindness, respect and consideration, by valuing a diversity of views and opinions (including those you may not share).
- Communication styles differ among cultures worldwide. In some cultures, a lot of information is conveyed nonverbally, and must be derived from context, intonation, or certain phrasings ("high context"). In other cultures (e.g. in much of German society), most information is conveyed verbally and directly ("low context"). Cultural misunderstandings may arise and one is advised to be aware and respectful of cultural differences.
- Be mindful of your surroundings and of your colleagues. Alert iDiv staff if you notice a dangerous situation or someone in distress. **It is the duty of all to report unacceptable behavior**.

Unacceptable Behavior

Demeaning, discriminatory, intimidating, violent or harassing behavior and/or speech is unacceptable. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Physical or verbal abuse; physical assault
- Unwelcome or offensive verbal comments, exclusionary behavior, direct or indirect discrimination related to: age, career stage, ethnic, social or national origin, appearance or body size, gender identity and expression, individual lifestyle, marital status, physical or cognitive ability, citizenship, pregnancy status, membership in a national minority, education, socio-economic background, political affiliation, sexual orientation, skin color, or religion
- Unwanted physical contact
- Unwanted sexual attention
- Providing alcohol or other drugs to someone without that person's knowledge, or unreasonably pressuring the person to consume alcohol or drugs, with or without the purpose of causing incapacitation in order for one to take sexual advantage of the person
- Display of sexually explicit or discriminatory images
- Deliberate intimidation, stalking, following
- Recording, photographing, or filming of individuals without consent
- Sharing intimate materials of another person without consent
- Sustained disruption of talks, discussions or other events
- Bullying behavior
- Retaliation for reporting unacceptable behavior or conflicts regarding authorship or supervision
- Pressure to work overtime, change or extend contracts, or generally go beyond contractual duties out of "loyalty" to an individual, a project, or a workgroup
- Any behavior that is intended to personally offend someone. Behavior that is acceptable to one person may not be acceptable to another, so be sensitive to varying thresholds from colleagues. Harassment intended in a joking manner still constitutes unacceptable behavior
- Aggressive scientific communication, disruption of talks, unnecessary comparisons

External resources
Partner institutions' codes of conduct:
- Max Planck Gesellschaft: https://www.mpg.de/14172230/code-of-conduct.pdf
- Max Planck Gesellschaft Policy against harassment and violence: https://www.mpg.de/11961177/policy-against-sexualized-discrimination-harassment-and-violence.pd

Other resources:

- Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency list of forms of discrimination:
  https://www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de/EN/about-discrimination/what-is-discrimination/forms-of-discrimination/forms-of-discrimination-node.html
- Transcultural communication: High vs low context cultures:
  https://historyplex.com/difference-between-high-context-low-context-cultures
  https://www.techtello.com/high-context-culture-vs-low-context-culture/
- AdvanceGeo Partnership resources on transform workplace climate:
  https://serc.carleton.edu/advancegeo/index.html
- Specific considerations regarding fieldwork:
  https://serc.carleton.edu/advancegeo/resources/field_work.html

3. Supervision, career support and representation

Supervisees in iDiv include students, doctoral and postdoctoral researchers, technical and administrative staff, and coordinators. **Doctoral and postdoctoral researchers make substantial contributions to iDiv's** research as well as in communicating iDiv's research to the scientific community and to the public. **Technical and administrative staff and coordinators** are essential to the work and success of iDiv. iDiv aims at offering a supportive and pleasant working environment for all employees and researchers, including adequate supervision arrangements. iDiv follows the **recommendations for supervision of the German Research Foundation (DFG)**.

All temporary and permanent employees as well as doctoral researchers, postdocs and trainees are given appropriate access to personnel development measures. The personnel development offers take into account the personal interests of the employees, their competences and potentials as well as the organizational requirements to support their careers and maintain work-life balance, particularly for individuals with care duties.

Communication between supervisees and supervisors

Open and clear communication is extremely important. In particular, mutual expectations should be expressed (e.g. frequency of supervision meetings) and responsibilities clearly communicated. Communication should always be **honest, respectful** and **with consideration of individual and cultural differences**. Supervisors should lead by example and create a culture of mutual respect and a healthy working environment. They should encourage and support all supervisees as well as their team members. Supervisors and supervisees agree that everyone needs free space and time in order to reflect, develop independently, perform care duties outside work, and regenerate from work. Communication should respect personal boundaries from both sides, avoiding non-work times such as weekends, holidays and in general non-work hours, although exceptions can occur and the supervisor/supervisee may jointly opt for an arrangement that better matches their joint preferences. **Abusive use of supervision power is in clear violation of good scientific conduct and can also be illegal under Germany's Occupational Safety Act and other laws**. This includes bullying and sustained hostile behavior, such as ridiculing, threatening, backbiting, and blaming. It also includes the misuse of seniority to encourage violations of research integrity, e.g. in the publication process.

Annual appraisal

A performance and appraisal interview should take place annually. During this appointment, **supervisees receive useful and honest individual feedback** from the supervisor about their current work performance and progress, competencies

and skills, development opportunities within the research group, goals and priorities. When the direct supervisor is not the group leader, it may be appropriate that both the group leader and the direct supervisor participate in the conversation. This conversation should also be an opportunity for **supervisors to receive feedback on their supervision**, including suggestions on how they can more effectively support the work of the supervisee. The group leaders are responsible for creating an atmosphere that allows everybody to provide feedback about their supervisors without fearing retaliation. Supervisors should also provide guidance for the future career development of their doctoral researchers' and postdocs' career paths in both academia and outside academia. It is the task of the supervisor to invite their team members to the annual appraisal interview.

Doctoral researcher supervision

Each doctoral researcher should have **one primary supervisor**. In addition to the supervision by this supervisor, yDiv doctoral researchers have a **PhD advisory committee (PAC)** that assists them in their **research** as well as in all aspects of **career planning** and integration into the international scientific community. Individual members of the PAC other than the main supervisor can also be approached in cases of conflict with the supervisor. Both supervisors and doctoral researchers strive to successfully complete the doctoral process in a reasonable amount of time according to the specific requirements and conditions of the respective research field. Doctoral degrees are awarded by the respective faculties at the universities, in accordance with the doctoral regulations in force - which may differ between faculties in the same university. Supervisors should discuss the publication strategy (where to submit: high vs. low impact journals, number of publications) early on with doctoral researchers. The **consequences of submitting to high-impact journals should be discussed** (extra effort; time needed to prepare, write and resubmit manuscripts repeatedly; psychological pressure; potential for critical replies and exposure; rejections and fear of having to retract; higher open-access fees), and compensated (e.g. by more involvement of the PI in writing and/or offering contract extensions). The publication strategy should consider the personal circumstances (priorities, career goal, PhD program requirements) of the doctoral researcher. **The wish not to publish in a high impact journal should be respected.**

Support for early-career researchers

All doctoral and postdoctoral researchers (co-)financed by iDiv (e.g. via Flexible Pool or a core group) automatically become part of yDiv. yDiv is iDiv's support unit for early-career researchers, from doctoral researchers to postdoctoral researchers and junior group leaders, offering support in academic and non-academic careers.

Early-stage researchers supervised by iDiv members and not funded by iDiv have the option to enroll with yDiv as well.

Integrative research is essential for understanding and solving the biodiversity crisis and for promoting biodiversity science. iDiv supervisors therefore encourage and enable their doctoral and postdoctoral researchers to approach biodiversity science beyond their specialization. At iDiv, **early-career researchers should get to know different approaches**, investigation objects and methodologies of biodiversity research, e.g. by attending yDiv courses or seminar series talks, participating in sDiv working groups, and engaging in the activities of multiple research groups (e.g. lab meetings). In addition, iDiv supervisors encourage their doctoral and postdoctoral researchers to participate in international conferences and to invite scientific guests to iDiv. Depending on the specific mandates of the funding sources and individual profiles, the supervisor should empower early-career researchers to develop their own scientific profile and respect their scientific autonomy.

Support for non-scientific staff
The possibilities of part-time and/or flexible working hours and mobile work are important elements for retaining employees and improving work-life balance. The existing possibilities of early level advancement as well as performance bonuses and performance awards are to be used as special instruments of staff retention. The necessary processes for this are described in the personnel administrations of the partner institutions. Further and advanced training is another important element of personnel development for non-scientific staff. The corresponding guidelines of the partner institutions also apply here.

Support for supervisors
iDiv is committed to enhancing supervision skills and **strongly encourages all supervisors to participate in courses and other forms of supervision training**. iDiv considers this essential for maintaining high quality of supervision.

Representation
Scientific and non-scientific staff should be represented in relevant iDiv boards and committees, e.g. the **iDiv council** and the **yDiv board,** and various task forces. iDiv highly encourages their participation in academic self-administration to ensure that the specific needs of all iDiv staff can be adequately expressed and communicated.

Diversity in recruitment

iDiv promotes diversity in the recruitment of employees, regarding gender, ethnicity, cultural background and research contribution, and is committed to support disadvantaged individuals in research. We believe that a diverse group has the highest potential to carry out high quality research and to be able to connect to society at large.

External resources

External supervision guidelines:

- Authorship section in the DFG Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice (2019): https://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/rechtliche_rahmenbedingungen/gute_wissenschaftliche_praxis/kodex_gwp_en.pdf

Guidelines for annual appraisal meetings at the universities:
- Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (in German only): https://personal.verwaltung.uni-halle.de/service/personalentwicklung/service/smg/
- Friedrich Schiller University Jena: https://www.uni-jena.de/Mitarbeitergespr%C3%A4ch and https://www.uni-jena.de/en/Mitarbeitergespr%C3%A4ch
- Leipzig University (in German only, via UL intranet): https://intranet.uni-leipzig.de/zentralverwaltung/personal/downloadbereich/

Career development resources at the universities:
- Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg (in German only): https://personal.verwaltung.uni-halle.de/service/personalentwicklung/
- Friedrich Schiller University Jena: https://www.uni-jena.de/en/fortbildung (English)
- Leipzig University (in German only, via UL intranet): https://intranet.uni-leipzig.de/zentralverwaltung/personal/downloadbereich/

iDiv Bylaws and governance:
https://www.idiv.de/fileadmin/content/Files_CentralManagement/Bylaws_iDiv_210820.pdf

4. Scientific ethics

Science is established to a large degree on trust. Research, funding, management and policy decisions are made based on the assumption that published research is conducted under strict scientific standards and is reported transparently. In recent years, with the onset of the replication/reproduction crises, it has become clear that an alarming proportion of the scientific record is likely to be unreplicable or unreproducible. In addition to undermining scientific, financial, or medical decisions, it also undermines public trust in science. To a small degree, this results from intentional data fabrication or manipulation. But disturbingly, it is largely not the result of intentional misconduct, but rather sloppy conduct such as p-hacking and selective publication. These are often the result of flawed incentive structures: journals are less likely to publish "negative" results or the media tends to highlight only "sexy" results, which together affect funding and hiring decisions, thus incentivizing individuals to conduct sloppy science.

iDiv is committed to the highest standards of scientific conduct. Its principles - and warning against unintentional misconduct - should be discussed and transmitted in all groups and to researchers at all levels. iDiv members with positions of power, from anonymous reviewers to editors and members of hiring committees, should be aware of these issues and ensure that they act against, rather than enforce, incentive structures that promote poor science.

Helicopter science

"Helicopter science" is the practice in which researchers from industrialized countries or wealthy regions within a country conduct research in developing countries or remote regions with little or no involvement of local researchers, students, or service providers. Such research practices do not contribute to knowledge exchange, and are of little or no scientific and financial benefit to the local communities. Hence, they maintain the gap between the global north and the global south or center and periphery.

iDiv researchers who either work in developing countries or marginal regions, or base their work on data collected by others in developing countries are therefore encouraged to:
- Involve local collaborators with necessary expertise or infrastructure in early stages (e.g. grant writing, research question formulation, site selection, etc.).
- Train local students and provide access to resources and networking opportunities (conferences, workshops, visiting institutes).
- Use local infrastructure, hire local field technicians to promote the local economy
- Apply fair and transparent authorship and data management standards

- Follow local regulations with regards to research and export permits, the use of controlled substances, requirements to supervise local students, etc.
- Be respectful of the local culture. Exchange with people to foresee any cultural conflict and solve any that arise in a constructive and respectful way.
- Make your science available for researchers and the general public locally by publishing in open access journals and, when possible, translating your work into the local language

Recognizing range of contributions to science

iDiv recognizes and values a wide range of contributions to science: data collection, data and code publication, peer-reviewed publications, committee work, teaching, supervision, mentoring, editorial work and ad-hoc reviewing, national and international collaboration, public outreach, and science-policy activities. Research quality is to be measured by the quality of a publication rather than solely by the impact factor of the journal or other bibliometrics. Research groups are encouraged to celebrate all achievements, and to speak openly about mistakes, difficulties, rejected papers or grants, and failed job applications. This will foster a more honest research culture that is not built around myths of perpetual success, and will show that failure is an inherent part of science that happens to everyone.

External resources

Codes of conduct and guidelines from funding agencies and other scientific bodies:
- Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice:
  https://www.dfg.de/en/research_funding/principles_dfg_funding/good_scientific_practice
- European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity:
  http://www.allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/ALLEA-European-Code-of-Conduct-for-Research-Integrity-2017-1.pdf
- Other guidelines:
  https://www.dfg.de/en/research_funding/principles_dfg_funding/good_scientific_practice/international_standards/index.html

Sources on inclusive recognition of scientific contribution and diversity:
- The Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), a worldwide initiative that can be signed by individuals and organizations: https://sfdora.org/
- The Charta der Vielfalt, an initiative that aims to promote the recognition, appreciation and integration of diversity into Germany's business culture:
  https://www.charta-der-vielfalt.de/en/diversity-charter-association/about-the-diversity-charter/terms/
- The European Charter for Researchers:
  https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/am509774cee_en_e4.pdf

5. Authorship and data

Scientific publications are often written by multiple authors. Authorship is a recognition of the work and intellectual contribution someone has put into the publication and the research leading to it. However, the responsibilities and the impact of authors listed in different positions within the authorship order and the author identified as the corresponding author differ. In particular, the impact of having first or last/corresponding authorships has gained importance for scientific careers. For this reason, authorships are a potential source of conflict in collaborative projects. One important source of conflict which may be specific for iDiv is that we are an interdisciplinary research institute. Different scientific disciplines have different traditions when it comes to acknowledging authorship. Cultural differences between researchers from different countries, and between research groups, are another aspect that may lead to conflict.

Agreeing on authorship in a project

The first and most important advice to avoid conflicts about authorship is **to discuss it openly at an early stage of the project**. Preferably this should happen the first time a project team gets together or when a doctoral researcher starts the project. At such meetings, the expectations of the responsibilities taken by each author and author role (first, middle, last, corresponding) should be specified and agreed upon. It is important to recognize that not all collaborations lead to co-authorship, and that supporting colleagues with ideas and feedback should be encouraged independently of co-authorship. For iDiv research groups and sDiv, agreements on authorship could be documented and based on the DFG guidelines (see link below). Defining the roles of authors early on in a project or writing process results in transparency and makes each author accountable for her or his role. During the course of the project, the topic of authorship should be re-discussed when needed, e.g. when new collaborators join the team or when one of the authors performs a different role than initially foreseen. In principle, the first and last author are responsible for the process of communication about author roles.

Protecting the interests of early career researchers and responsibilities of project leaders

When assigning author roles, particular attention should be given to early career scientists. iDiv wants to **encourage young researchers to lead publications** as first or last authors. iDiv will **eliminate honorary authorships** which are based on seniority or hierarchical position, rather than actual intellectual contribution to the project or the paper. **Last authors** need to have made a substantial contribution to the paper at multiple stages, providing continuous guidance and support to the

work. The **corresponding author** is sometimes also the investigator that provided overall guidance, but often is simply the author who is tasked with being the point of contact for the journal and taking care of the submission. Small contributions can be recognized in the acknowledgements rather than via authorship. In summary, all authors must have made a concrete contribution to the manuscript, such as proposing the idea, generating data, data analyses, interpretation and discussion of results, or writing sections of the manuscript. In addition, all authors should be accountable for the content of the manuscript. It is the responsibility of the project leaders - primarily the first and last and/or corresponding authors - to clearly communicate the exact criteria, based on this document and the DFG Code of Conduct, that need to be met for co-authorship to each contributor *early on in the project.*

Author responsibilities towards open and reproducible science

iDiv aims to foster open and reproducible science, as outlined in the updated **iDiv Data & Code Sharing Policy and Guidelines**[3]. Open and reproducible science allows for other scientists to build on previous results and promotes equity in access to scientific results around the world, an important aspect of iDiv's mission of contributing to the management of our planet's biodiversity. Two important aspects of this are open access publications and data and code sharing, which are increasingly required by funding agencies (e.g. DFG and the European Commission).

iDiv strongly encourages the publication of results in **Open Access** journals (Gold Open Access). If that is not possible, authors should use other options for making papers publicly available, e.g. via preprints archives. Most journals allow for preprints to be made available publicly on the internet (i.e. Green Open Access).

Data and code used for a publication should be made available under open licenses (e.g. CC0 or CC BY 4.0) and following the **FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable)** principles in a suitable public repository. This should be done as early as possible, and at the latest in conjunction with publication of the associated manuscript (indeed, journals increasingly mandate that data is deposited *before* manuscript submission). In practice, individuals can do much to achieve FAIR output by providing detailed and high quality metadata, selecting repositories that provide (meta)data curation, and obtaining permanent identifiers for their research products (e.g. a DOI). Commonly, the corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that data and code will remain publicly available for a minimum of ten years. In cases where the corresponding author is not the principal investigator of

---

[3] All research which has been funded by, and/or relied upon iDiv equipment, platforms, facilities, or personnel, is now required to adhere to iDiv's Data & Code Sharing Policy and Guidelines, available at: https://www.idiv.de/data-policy

the project, the last author shares this responsibility with the corresponding author and should be credited accordingly. A similar responsibility for the principal investigator of experimental labs is to keep the lab books documenting all the research work for at least ten years after the project has ended. As for authorship, project leaders need to make sure that **all data and code contributors are credited** appropriately, e.g. through citations or acknowledgements. The rules on data and code contribution have to be discussed along with authorship rules. When using *others'* data or code, researchers should also take care to **conform to the license or terms** under which the material was originally made available for reuse. Apart from the legal and/or reputational consequences that may follow from reuse of others' material without permission, the license(s) of the original source data or code libraries may restrict the degree to which a researcher can later make their own work derived from that material open. This issue applies particularly to those who conduct synthesis research.

External resources

Authorship guidelines in professional societies, journals, funding agencies and networks:
- Authorship in the DFG Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice (2019, **binding for research at iDiv**): https://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/rechtliche_rahmenbedingungen/gute_wissenschaftliche_praxis/kodex_gwp_en.pdf
- DFG code-of-conduct in English (**binding for research at iDiv)**: https://www.dfg.de/en/research_funding/principles_dfg_funding/good_scientific_practice/index.html
- Authorship Editorial policies, *British Ecological Society*: https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/hub/editorial-policies
- Authorship in the Code of Ethics of the Ecological Society of America (2020): https://www.esa.org/about/code-of-ethics/
- Authorship of NutNet Manuscripts, https://nutnet.org/authorship

Describing contributions in papers:
- CRediT – Contributor Roles Taxonomy: https://casrai.org/credit/
- Who gets credit? Survey digs into the thorny question of authorship, *Nature* (2018): https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-05280-0#ref-CR1

Advice on multi-authored papers, authorship order and on negotiating authorship:

- How do you decide authorship order, *Dynamic Ecology Blog (2013)*: https://dynamicecology.wordpress.com/2013/03/13/how-do-you-decide-authorship-order/
- Determining and negotiating authorship, *American Psychological Association*: https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-paper

- Ten simple rules for collaboratively writing a multi-authored paper, PLOS Computational Biology (2018): https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006508
- Strategies for effective collaborative manuscript development in interdisciplinary science teams, *Ecosphere* (2018): https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ecs2.2206

Analysis of authorship practices and research dynamics:

- Author contributions to ecological publications: What does it mean to be an author in modern ecological research?, *PLOS One* (2017): https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0179956
- Last and corresponding authorship practices in ecology, *Ecology and Evolution* (2017): https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ece3.3435
- Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology, *Nature (2019)*: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-019-0941-9?wpisrc=nl_science&wpmm=1&wm=3292_9015

FAIR data and code resources:
- A guide to reproducible code in ecology and evolution, BESA 2017: https://www.britishecologicalsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/guide-to-reproducible-code.pdf
- The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship: https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18
- European Comission note on Open Access to Scientific Publications and Open Research Data: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/cross-cutting-issues/open-access-data-management/open-access_en.htm
- Course on reproducible science in R: https://nceas.github.io/sasap-training/materials/reproducible_research_in_r_fairbanks/

6.What to do when problems arise

In case of conflicts, there are several ways to find **advice or support for mediation**. If you are in the core groups in Leipzig or a Flexpool-funded iDiv employee at one of the partner institutions, the first point of contact would be your advisor or one of the iDiv counselors[4]. You can also reach out to any of the members of the Speaker Board directly. They will hear your case, and help to find a solution. If desired, they can act as mediators. Furthermore, they can point you to the right persons at the institute that formally employs you. You may contact the persons at your employer institution directly - it is your free choice to whom you turn. You are encouraged to inform one of the iDiv counselors as soon as you bring your complaint to a local contact person.

Anyone requested to stop unacceptable behavior is expected to comply immediately.

Bystanders that observe unacceptable behavior could follow the "4Ds" of active bystanding to intervene: (1) Direct Action, (2) Distraction, (3) Delegation, (4) Delay [5]. iDiv offers active bystander training on a regular basis. They should also report it according to the guidelines below (under "iDiv employees" or "Participants of iDiv events").

The sub-sections below outline sequential steps that may be taken by affected individuals in different categories to address issues linked to the iDiv Principles of Good Practice and the iDiv Code of Conduct.

iDiv employees

Encompasses scientific and non-scientific staff, including Flexpool doctoral and postdoctoral researchers stationed at iDiv member groups and guests.

Recommended actions for affected individuals:
If speaking to the perpetrator is not possible:
1. Talk to group leader (if possible)
2. Contact one of the two iDiv counselors (currently Nicole Sachmerda-Schulz & Marten Winter); Alternatively, you may contact a trusted member of the Scientific and Professional Conduct committee directly

---

[4] As of 2.6.2023, Nicole Sachmerda-Schulz (yDiv) and Marten Winter (sDiv).
[5] The 4Ds of bystander intervention: (1) Direct Action: Directly intervene by calling out negative behavior, e.g. by telling the person to stop. Do this as a group if possible and remain calm. (2) Distraction: Interrupt or change the subject or the focus or come up with an idea to get the victim out of the situation. (3) Delegation: Inform a senior colleague or head of your department/group. (4) Delay: Wait for the situation to pass and check if the victim is OK. You can take action later (e.g. to report) - it is never too late to act! You can find more information on bystander intervention (including a 5th D) here.

3. If counselors decide that a solution at this level cannot be achieved, they forward it to the Scientific and Professional Conduct committee. Confidentiality and anonymity of the person filing the complaint is guaranteed until necessary for the due process, and all steps will be followed in coordination with the person filing the complaint. The committee implements a due process in which it hears both sides and determines a course of action to be recommended to the SB. The SB decides on further actions and reaches a decision within 4 months. SB members will recuse themselves from dealing with a case in which they have relevant COI.

In case of questions and conflicts related to Good Scientific Practice or in case of scientific misconduct, you can also contact the ombudsperson at your institution or the German Research Ombudsperson[6] (for contact information see below). The ombudsperson will decide together with you on further steps. For non scientific-misconduct issues, you may contact the institute equal opportunity counselors or other contacts at your university/non-university research institute directly.

Consequences

After due process, which is described in the institutions' policies, the ultimate consequence for iDiv members for serious or repeated breaches of the Code of Conduct is temporary exclusion from iDiv funding (to be decided by the Speaker Board) or in extreme cases the loss of iDiv membership (to be decided by the Scientific Strategy Board). This does not exclude further actions taken by the member's institution, upon complaints from the affected individual or from the iDiv Speaker Board.

Participants of iDiv events (e.g. workshops and conferences)

Recommended actions for affected individuals
If speaking to perpetrator is not possible:
- Talk to the PI chairing the event or an iDiv member participating in the event
- Talk to sDiv Head (Marten Winter) or to the Speaker Board

Consequences
Misconduct at a workshop or conference can lead to immediate exclusion from the event. At workshops, this can be decided by the workshop PI's or, in case of sDiv workshops, by the sDiv Head. At conferences, this can be decided by the

---

[6] "HEIs and non-HEI research institutions appoint at least one independent ombudsperson to whom their members and employees can turn with questions relating to good research practice and in cases of suspected misconduct." (see guideline 6, Code of Conduct: "Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice").

organization committee. Very serious misconduct can lead to a ban from future working groups, to be decided by the Speaker Board after due process.

Participants of yDiv courses

Recommended actions for affected individuals
If speaking to perpetrator is not possible:
- Talk to teacher
- Go to yDiv coordinator (doctoral researchers: Nicole Sachmerda-Schulz, postdoctoral researchers: Ulrike Krumrey)

Consequences
Misconduct of a participant at a yDiv course can lead to eviction from the course, as decided by the teacher, or by the teacher in consultation with the yDiv coordinator. Misconduct of a teacher can lead to suspension of the course by the yDiv Board Chair. Very serious misconduct can lead to a ban from future courses for participants or teachers, to be decided by the yDiv Board after due process.

Resources and contacts
iDiv Contacts:

- iDiv Counselors:
  https://www.idiv.de/en/about-idiv/support-for-scientists/counselling.html
- iDiv Speaker Board:
  https://www.idiv.de/?id=2148#slide19318

German Research Foundation (DFG):

- Ombuds Committee:

  https://ombudsman-fuer-die-wissenschaft.de/?lang=en

University Leipzig:

- Ombudsperson in case of scientific misconduct (including supervision):
  https://www.uni-leipzig.de/en/research/research-service/office-of-ombudspersons
- Psychosocial Counseling (for students and doctoral researchers):
  https://www.studentenwerk-leipzig.de/en/counselling-social-issues/psychosocial-counselling
- Equal opportunity counselor:
  https://www.uni-leipzig.de/en/equality
- Direct link to support in case of sexual discrimination and violence:
  Universität Leipzig: Prevention and Support
- Conflict mediation for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers and their supervisors:
  https://www.uni-leipzig.de/en/quality-development/conflict-mediation-for-doctoral-and-postdoctoral-researchers
- Conflict mediation for all UL employees (in German only, via UL intranet):
  https://intranet.uni-leipzig.de/zentralverwaltung/personal/sachgebiet-34/beratungsangebote/#c230818

Friedrich Schiller Universität Jena:
- Ombudsperson in case of scientific misconduct (including supervision): https://www.uni-jena.de/en/university/central-institutions/senate/committee-on-safeguarding-good-scientific-practice
- Diversity office: https://www.uni-jena.de/en/diversity_office
- Equal opportunity counselor: https://www.uni-jena.de/en/gsb
- Psychosocial counseling https://www.stw-thueringen.de/en/counselling/
- Consulting in cases of conflict for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers and their supervisors: https://www.uni-jena.de/en/phd-ombud

Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg:
- Ombudsperson in case of scientific misconduct (including supervision): https://www.uni-halle.de/forschung/wiss_fehlverhalten/ombudsgremium/
- Equal opportunity officer: https://www.gleichstellung.uni-halle.de/
- Counseling services office (in English): https://diskriminierungsschutz.uni-halle.de/beratung/beratung-mlu/?lang=en

UFZ:
- Ombudspersons in case of scientific misconduct (including supervision): https://www.ufz.de/index.php?en=36448
- Equal opportunity counselor: https://www.ufz.de/index.php?en=36902
- Consultation in case of conflict (UFZ intranet): https://www.intranet.ufz.de/index.php?en=47430

What to do when you witness harassment:
- University of Cambridge guidelines: https://www.breakingthesilence.cam.ac.uk/prevention-support/be-active-bystander