ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

IN THE

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND CHILD STUDIES

2014

Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Institute of Education and Child Studies
Central Office Education and Child Studies

To: all staff of the Institute of Education and Child Studies

INTERNAL MEMO

Reference		*Date*	2014-04-17
Your letter of		*Telephone*	071 5273445 / 3434
Subject	Academic integrity	*Contact*	H. de Frankrijker

Dear colleague,

Public confidence in science and the humanities, and in the integrity of academics, has come under considerable pressure in recent years because of a number of cases of fraud, plagiarism and faked research results. Moreover, in the Netherlands the "Stapel affair" (2012) has also shown that procedural improvements are possible and even necessary, in order to prevent both intentional and accidental violations of integrity.

In my view, it is primarily the task of the universities themselves to maintain integrity and trust, and improve these wherever necessary and possible. In line with this view the Board of the Institute of Education and Child Studies has formulated a number of benchmarks and measures intended to stimulate an ethical and reliable scientific and scholarly practice within our Institute. For this reason, all staff members are expected to read the attached information brochure about academic integrity. With this brochure the Board wants to provide guidelines for the behavior and attitude it expects from all of its staff members.

I invite you to study this brochure in detail and hope that it will stimulate you to do your part in ensuring the integrity of the pursuit of scholarship within our Institute.

Best regards,

Judi Mesman (Institute Director)

Pieter de la Court building
Wassenaarseweg 52
P.O. Box 9555
2300 RB Leiden The Netherlands
Telephone +31 71 527 3973/3445
Fax +31 71 527 3945
e-mail: nhoekman@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

CONTENT:

Profile of an ethical pursuit of science and scholarship

within the Institute of Education and Child Studies

I. Introduction

All staff members and students of the Institute of Education and Child Studies are expected to be familiar with the faculty research protocol (only available in Dutch) (http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/Protocol%20ethiek%20FSW%201997.pdf), and the APA Ethics Code (http://www.apa.org/ethics/code2002.html). Professional codes and research protocols guide and support researchers towards achieving integrity in their research. However, expanding and fine-tuning professional codes and protocols into ever more detail alone does not offer an effective answer to seriously unacceptable behavior on the part of individual researchers. What is equally important is the way in which the work environment is organized and contributes to a shared sense of responsibility regarding integrity.

The Board of the Institute of Education and Child Studies considers an ethical pursuit of science and scholarship to be the joint responsibility of staff and students. It sees as its task to offer a suitable framework for both teaching and research in which accountability can be openly discussed, and concerns about integrity can be expressed. With this wake-up call to everybody in the Institute, staff as well as students, the Board wants to highlight the importance of responsible and transparent behavior in a safe environment, together with a shared commitment and responsibility. Discussions with colleagues, cooperation in mutual trust and a shared commitment are important ingredients of an ethical, reliable and sound pursuit of science and scholarship.

II. Profile of an ethical research policy – benchmarks

The Board of the Institute of Education and Child Studies works with three benchmarks for an optimal ethical quality of research. Research that is part of an ethical, reliable and sound pursuit of science and scholarship within the Institute of Education and Child Studies is characterized by:

1. **Exchange between colleagues and institutional embedding**

   - Organizationally, all research forms part of a research program registered at the Institute, whose scientific quality has been positively evaluated by the Institute of Education and Child Studies or an external organization;

   - Prior to being actually carried out, each research program has been subjected to a process of organized *peer review* and *peer pressure* (KNAW 2013a, pp.50-55). The latter term includes discussions about and presentations of research plans for colleagues in the institute or in an informal network, at a very early stage. It is part of the shared responsibility that there should be space for critical scrutiny in a safe, constructive and transparent atmosphere;

- Research within Education and Child Studies can be carried out only after a positive assessment by an ethics review board recognized by the Board of the Institute of Education and Child Studies;

- For each research project actually carried out the division of labor, for instance regarding personnel, finances, and data management (KNAW, 2013b), as well as the responsibilities of the researchers in question must be clearly set out. A careful *division and distribution* of responsibilities in a research project ensures optimal integrity and reliability in the pursuit of science and scholarship.

2. **Ethical pursuit of science and scholarship:**

- *Academic integrity* is a topic regularly on the agenda in all degree programs, from Bachelor to Research Master/PhD (KNAW, 2012);

- Research assistants and students should sign a 'Student declaration' about the confidentiality and responsible handling of research data, see: http://www.socialsciences.leiden.edu/educationandchildstudies/rommertcasimirinstitute/organisation/ethics-review-board-ecs.html

- Academic integrity is explicitly discussed during initial performance and development (P&D) interviews, and is a standard topic in the yearly P&D interviews with staff (see section III).

3. **Trust and confidentiality**

- Research results will be presented in substantively consistent form, irrespective of the audience (potential sources of funding, policy makers, fellow-researchers or other groups). One of the reasons for using forms of peer review/peer pressure is the wish to prevent over- or under-reporting, which can seriously damage not only trust among colleagues but also public confidence in science and scholarship.

- Colleagues have regular discussions about each other's research projects;

- The Institute has designated the Education and Child Studies Ethics Review Board as a first port of call for confidential consultation by staff or students with questions or concerns about an ethical, reliable and sound pursuit of science and scholarship: http://www.socialsciences.leiden.edu/educationandchildstudies/rommertcasimirinstitute/organisation/ethics-review-board-ecs.html . This point of contact first and foremost offers an opportunity to exchange doubts and worries about integrity. In principle this precedes, and is a separate track from, any formal notification procedure. In case of worries about integrity, members of staff may also consult the Faculty confidential counsellor at all times: http://www.fsw.leidenuniv.nl/medewerkers/p-and-o/over/onafhankelijk-facultair-vertrouwenspersoon-fsw.html

References

- Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (2012). *Zorgvuldig and integer omgaan met wetenschappelijke onderzoeksgegevens. Advies.* Den Haag: KNAW.
- Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (2013b). *Responsible research Data Management. Advisory Report.* Den Haag: KNAW.
- https://www.knaw.nl/and/topics/ethiek/wetenschappelijke-integrity

III. Executive measures promoting the ethical pursuit of science and scholarship

This section contains a number of concrete measures regarding personnel policy, teaching and research, all intended in an amicable spirit, to stimulate responsible academic behavior .

However, it is not these measures, but rather the daily actions of our staff members that in the end determine the actual ethical quality of teaching and research throughout our Institute. With this detailed profile the Board hopes to provide some guidance to the staff of the Institute of Education and Child Studies regarding a consciously ethical behavior, and so to contribute to the continuation and further development of a responsible organizational culture in the Institute.

1. **Personnel policy**

   Line managers and staff will see to it that during the yearly P&D interviews the topic of integrity is explicitly put on the agenda. The question should be addressed in how far all research in which a staff member participates has been approved by an ethics review board. The manager will also check whether over the preceding period the staff member in question has had experiences with teaching, doing research or fulfilling administrative tasks that has raised questions of ethics, or require closer consideration (see Appendix 1: checklist).

   > In part B "Other Topics" of the digital Performance & Development Interview Form, the manager will always fill in the answers to the following two questions:
   >
   > - Have all research activities been carried out within a project, or subproject, that has been approved by a recognized academic ethics board?
   >
   > - Has the researcher/staff member been confronted with any aspects mentioned in the attached checklist? (see Appendix 2)

2. **Teaching**

   In the spirit of 'teach what you preach', responsible and respectful behavior is expected of both teaching staff and students. This includes not only mutually correct manners in written and oral communication, but also adequate care for privacy, mutual trust and safety on both sides. See also:
   http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/Gedragscode%20DOCENTEN%20en%20STUDENTEN%20binnen%20ICT%20en%20Onderwijs.pdf

   http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/gedragscode%20omgangsvormen.pdf

http://www.fsw.leidenuniv.nl/pedagogiek/onderwijs/reglementen/oers-pedagogiek.html

http://www.fsw.leidenuniv.nl/pedagogiek/onderwijs/reglementen/protocol-ethiek.html

3. Research

- All research staff of the Institute of Education and Child Studies are bound to the general rules for integrity in teaching and research of Leiden University: http://www.organisation.leiden.edu/complaint-box-students/regulations-for-research-integrity-and-academic-conduct.html

  http://organisation.leiden.edu/complaint-box-staff/scientific-integrity.html

- Each staff member of the Institute of Education and Child Studies is expected to be familiar with the "Singapore Statement on Research Integrity"(see appendix 2) and the main "Types of Research Misconduct" (see appendix 3);

- Within the Institute of Education and Child Studies staff members will carry out only research which has received a positive assessment in writing from a recognized ethics review board. See: http://www.fsw.leidenuniv.nl/research/wetenschappelijkeintegriteit/reglement-commissie-ethiek-peda.html

APPENDIX 1: CHECKLIST OF TOPICS FOR P&D INTERVIEWS

Staff members must check which of the questions below have applied during the past year, and discuss those that have with their manager in the P&D interview. Managers are expected to explicitly ask about the staff member's experiences regarding integrity issues.

1. Teaching

- Have you experienced difficulties or improprieties in contacts with students and/or colleagues?
- When teaching, have you been confronted with situations that require closer consideration from an ethics perspective?
- Have the various study components been assessed responsibly and correctly?
- From an ethics perspective, do the course evaluations suggest that changes should be made in the course program for the next academic year?

2. Research

- Over the past period, have any situations occurred during research activities that from an ethics perspective have led you, or may still lead you, to renewed consideration, internal discussion, or a revised approach to your research work?
- Can you unequivocally confirm that over the past year you have been able to carry out your research activities in an ethically sound way, and have indeed done so?
- Over the past year, have you had experiences in the Institute of Education and Child Studies that raise questions or worries with you regarding an ethical pursuit of science and scholarship?

3. Administration and management

- Over the past year, have you had experiences that raise questions or doubts regarding the reliability and integrity of administration and management?
- At consultations or decision-making sessions you attended, did you experience any incidents during which integrity may have been compromised?
- Have you felt restricted in the opportunity to raise doubts regarding academic integrity?
- Did you carry out subsidiary activities that conflicted with your main function?

Universiteit Leiden

Performance & Development Interview Form

Part A - Assessment
Part B – Agreements
Part C – Annual report (for academic staff, executive staff and non-academic staff in salary scale 8 and above)

General Information

Name			
Position			
Faculty/Expertise Centre/Administration and Central Services			
Unit/Institute/Department			
Supervisor			
Supervisor's Superior/Assessing Authority			
Personnel & Organisation (P&O) Advisor			
Evaluation Period		to	
Previous Evaluation Period		to	
Date of P&D Interview			
Annual Report Available	Yes	No	◄ Remove what is not applicable

Total Assessment Score (number Score, same as 1.3)

Administrative Processing

	Initials	Date
P&O (seen and processed)		../../2013

Signature of Assessment [1]

	Signature	Date
Employee Seen/Approved [2]		
Supervisor		
Supervisor's Superior / Assessing Authority		

Signature of Agreement [3]

	Signature	Date
Employee Seen/approved [4]		
Supervisor		
Supervisor's Superior / Assessing Authority		

---

[1] The employee should sign the assessment as seen or approved (*procedure for P&D interviews*, section 8, paragraph 3). The supervisor should sign as endorsed (*procedure for P&D interviews*, section 8, paragraph 6). The supervisor's superior should sign as seen or endorsed in cases where there has been a request for revision (*procedure for P&D interviews*, section 10).

[2] Cross out what is not applicable.

[3] The employee should sign the agreement as seen or approved. The supervisor should sign as endorsed.

[4] Cross out what is not applicable

Part A – Assessment

1.   Assessment of Evaluation Period Results
(to be filled in by the supervisor)

Scores
5 = Excellent (far exceeds the conditions set)
4 = Good (more than meets the conditions set)
3= Satisfactory (meets the conditions set)
2= Poor (improvement needed)
1= Unsatisfactory (improvement needed in short term)

1.1 Previous Agreements with regard to:

Performance area	Results (including an assessment of the results, in words)	Score:

1.2 Agreements Regarding Development, Areas of Competence and Other Issues [5]

Agreement	Results (including an assessment of the results, in words	Score:

---

[5] The assessment of areas of competence is optional (please refer to *notes on the P&D form*)

1.3 Total Assessment Score (number score)

1.4 Assessment of overall results (a brief, concrete assessment of the employee's performance, in 50 words or less

1.5 The employee's Response to the Assessment of the Results
(to be filled in by the employee, should s/he so desire)

1.6 Other Topics for Discussion

Part B - Agreements

In the space provided below, note down concrete agreements with regards to the employee's expected results and professional development. Indicate what will be done when and who will take the initiative. Also indicate the period for which these agreements are applicable.

1.1 Agreements with regard to

Performance area	Expected results	Period

1.2 Agreements with regard to Development, Areas of Competence and Other Issues [6]

Performance area	Expected results	Period

---

[6] The assessment of areas of competence is optional (please refer to the *notes on the P&D form*).

Singapore Statement on Research Integrity

Preamble. The value and benefits of research are vitally dependent on the integrity of research. While there can be and are national and disciplinary differences in the way research is organized and conducted, there are also principles and professional responsibilities that are fundamental to the integrity of research wherever it is undertaken.

PRINCIPLES

Honesty in all aspects of research

Accountability in the conduct of research

Professional courtesy and fairness in working with others

Good stewardship of research on behalf of others

RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Integrity: Researchers should take responsibility for the trustworthiness of their research.

2. Adherence to Regulations: Researchers should be aware of and adhere to regulations and policies related to research.

3. Research Methods: Researchers should employ appropriate research methods, base conclusions on critical analysis of the evidence and report findings and interpretations fully and objectively.

4. Research Records: Researchers should keep clear, accurate records of all research in ways that will allow verification and replication of their work by others.

5. Research Findings: Researchers should share data and findings openly and promptly, as soon as they have had an opportunity to establish priority and ownership claims.

6. Authorship: Researchers should take responsibility for their contributions to all publications, funding applications, reports and other representations of their research. Lists of authors should include all those and only those who meet applicable authorship criteria.

7. Publication Acknowledgement: Researchers should acknowledge in publications the names and roles of those who made significant contributions to the research, including writers, funders, sponsors, and others, but do not meet authorship criteria.

8. Peer Review: Researchers should provide fair, prompt and rigorous evaluations and respect confidentiality when reviewing others' work.

9. Conflict of Interest: Researchers should disclose financial and other conflicts of interest that could compromise the trustworthiness of their work in research proposals, publications and public communications as well as in all review activities.

10. Public Communication: Researchers should limit professional comments to their recognized expertise when engaged in public discussions about the application and importance of research findings and clearly distinguish professional comments from opinions based on personal views.

11. Reporting Irresponsible Research Practices: Researchers should report to the appropriate authorities any suspected research misconduct, including fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, and other irresponsible research practices that undermine the trustworthiness of research, such as carelessness, improperly listing authors, failing to report conflicting data, or the use of misleading analytical methods.

12. Responding to Irresponsible Research Practices: Research institutions, as well as journals, professional organizations and agencies that have commitments to research, should have procedures for responding to allegations of misconduct and other irresponsible research practices and for protecting those who report such behavior in good faith. When misconduct or other irresponsible research practice is confirmed, appropriate actions should be taken promptly, including correcting the research record.

13. Research Environments: Research institutions should create and sustain environments that encourage integrity through education, clear policies, and reasonable standards for advancement, while fostering work environments that support research integrity.

14. Societal Considerations: Researchers and research institutions should recognize that they have an ethical obligation to weigh societal benefits against risks inherent in their work.

APPENDIX 4: TYPES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT
Source: OECO Report (2010). Best Practices for Ensuring Scientific Integrity and Preventing Misconduct. P.3.
See: https://www.knaw.nl/en/topics

During the course of preparing the OECD workshop, interviews with experts revealed a broad spectrum of types of misconduct by scientists, as shown in the following table:

Core "Research Misconduct" **F**abrication of data **F**alsification of data **P**lagiarism FFP normally includes: Selectively excluding data from analysis Misinterpreting data to obtain desired results (including inappropriate use of statistical methods) Doctoring images in publications Producing false data or results under pressure from a sponsor	Research practice misconduct Using inappropriate (e.g., harmful or dangerous) research methods Poor research design Experimental, analytical, computational errors Violation of human subject protocols Abuse of laboratory animals
Data-related misconduct Not preserving primary data Bad data management, storage Withholding data from the scientific community NB: The above applies to physical research materials as well	Publication-related misconduct Claiming undeserved authorship Denying authorship to contributors Artificially proliferating publications ("salami-slicing") Failure to correct the publication record
Personal misconduct Inappropriate personal behaviour, harassment Inadequate leadership, mentoring, counselling of students Insensitivity to social or cultural norms	Financial, and other misconduct Peer review abuse e.g., non-disclosure of conflict of interest, unfairly holding up a rival's publication Misrepresenting credentials or publication record Misuse of research funds for unauthorised purchases or for personal gain Making an unsubstantiated or malicious misconduct allegation

At the core of the spectrum of inappropriate behaviours is "Research Misconduct", consisting of Fabrication, Falsification and Plagiarism (FFP). Various definitions of these terms are possible. For example, the United States government defines research misconduct in a way that has been adopted in some other countries:

> Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.
>
> Fabrication is making up results and recording or reporting them.

---

[2] The chosen classification scheme is not intended to be exhaustive, or to constitute a universally valid intellectual framework for theoretical studies of research misconduct. In this report, it is presented merely as a way to summarise the information distilled from the expert interviews.

[3] The definition given above is not unique. It can, for example, be broadened to include "… significant departure from accepted practices of the scientific community". Alternative broad formulations can be used, such as "Behaviour by a researcher, intentional or not, that falls short of good ethical and scientific standards". The latter text has been adopted by the Committee on Publication Ethics.

Statement on Scientific Integrity

The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice drawn up by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands sets out the principles to be observed by scientists at our university individually, towards one another and towards society.

The Code applies to scientific activities, including teaching and research, at all universities in the Netherlands.

Scrupulousness, reliability, verifiability, impartiality and independence are the key principles on which the Code is founded.

Scientific activities must at all times be governed by standards of the most scrupulous care. Pressure to perform cannot be regarded as a reason for any lowering of these standards.

Each and every scientist shares in the responsibility for the reputation of the scientific world for reliability. A scientific practitioner must demonstrate reliability in how he or she conducts research and reports on the findings of such research, as well as in disseminating his or her knowledge through teaching and publications. A scientific practitioner will not claim the scientific work of another individual as his or her own.

All information presented must be verifiable. When research findings are made public, a clear indication must be given of the sources on which the information and conclusions are based, from where the findings are derived, and where they can be verified.

Scientific practitioners will be motivated in their work only by scientific interests, and will be prepared at all times to justify their actions.

Scientific practitioners carry out their work in an environment of academic freedom and independence. Any restrictions on this freedom will be clearly indicated.

The Code of Conduct can be downloaded via http://www.medewerkers.leidenuniv.nl/

The undersigned confirms that he or she has read the content of the Code, undertakes to observe the Code and will do all in his or her power to promote and maintain the integrity of the Code in his or her academic environment.

Date

Name

Signature