Conclusions and recommendations

The section of the report to which the relevant recommendation refers is shown in parentheses.

Recommendations for clients (VSNU, KNAW, NWO, NFU):

1. Have a new code of conduct drawn up that complies with the conclusions and recommendations of this report.

2. Regard the code of conduct as a dynamic document that, on occasion, must be aligned with CWI and LOWI 'case law' and with changing concepts in the international context. Ensure, however, that the code continues to comply with the guidelines set out in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (by ALLEA and the European Science Foundation) (1.3).

3. Continue to publicise cases involving academic integrity and see that they are properly documented in a sufficiently standardised manner, based on mutual agreements (1.3).

4. Promote continuation of the recent practice of regularly scheduled meetings between CWIs at national level (1.3).

Recommendations for the designers of a new code of conduct:

5. Add an appendix to the code of conduct that lists relevant related rules (whether or not statutory in nature), such as the Dutch Clinical Trials Act (WMO), the Dutch Animal Experiments Act, the Dutch Personal Data Protection Act, and the VSNU National Model Complaints Procedure (1.4).

6. Adhere to international mainstream practices by having the code also cite standards of conduct (where necessary in brief and referencing the relevant rules elsewhere) that are relevant for everyday research practice but that do not strictly belong to the domain of academic integrity (for example how to deal with patients, test subjects and laboratory animals) (1.4).

7. Adhere to international mainstream practices by having the code distinguish between 'research misconduct' (RM) and less serious 'questionable research practices' (QRP) (1.4; 3.2).

8. See that the code differentiates between:
    (i) principles (where relevant with their impact in different types of context)
    (ii) standards
    (iii) violations

9. and deal with these three subjects separately (3.1; 3.2).

10. Uphold the following five key principles (3.1):
    *   honesty
    *   scrupulousness

- transparency
- independence
- responsibility

11. In elaborating on 'scrupulousness' and 'responsibility', have the code differentiate between the application of these principles in differing contexts (3.1).

12. In elaborating on the standards, generally apply the methods of the Danish code (which is based on the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, issued by ALLEA and the European Science Foundation), which defines standards for the different phases of the research process (3.2).

13. Restrict the code of conduct to research (therefore removing any provisions concerning academic education, except where they are research-related) (3.1).

14. In the text of the code itself, identify which responsibilities the endorsing institutions have for publicising and enforcing the code, embedding it in their teaching, and creating a working climate that promotes enforcement of the principles and standards contained in the code (3.1).

15. Where necessary and possible, have the code specify divergent standards to be applied in individual contexts (for example, indicate which general rules may not apply in the context of applied or public-private research) and, in some respects, allow for specific effects (beyond the code) in individual disciplines or institutions (3.2).

16. Ensure that the new code of conduct for scientific practice will be applicable for all public and public-private research in the Netherlands; at the very least, amend the current text of the code for the subjects (i) discovery of the truth, (ii) replication of research, (iii) long-term storage and availability of research data and publication of results, and (iv) academic freedom in the choice of research topics (4.2).

17. Do not include specific provisions in the code about complaints procedures, but refer instead to institutional responsibility and to existing rules (3.2).

18. Do not include specific sanctions in the code for certain violations, but take a more general approach by offering a number of examples of sanctions in an annex (3.2; 5.2).

19. In the sections concerning correct citation and plagiarism, apply the OECD definition of plagiarism and use the evaluative classification of forms of reuse without attribution in the Academy report *Correct Citeren* (5.1).