Technische Universität Dresden

Statutes for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice, Avoiding Scientific Misconduct, and Handling Violations

of December 22, 2020

Table of Contents

Part 5 Possible Decisions and Penalties in Cases of Scientific Misconduct

Technische Universität Dresden has adopted the following Statutes, with consideration given to the "Guidelines for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice" code of July 3, 2019.

Preamble

(1) Scientific work is based on fundamental principles that apply equally in all scientific disciplines. The foremost principle is truthfulness with respect to oneself and others. It is both an ethical norm and the basis of the rules of scientific professionalism that apply in the individual disciplines.

(2) All members and staff of TU Dresden are obliged to follow these Statutes, to make them the basis of their scientific work and to actively contribute to the avoidance of scientific misconduct within their sphere of activity. TU Dresden shall ensure that the Statutes are known to all members and staff within the university. Any justified suspicion of scientific misconduct within TU Dresden will be investigated and given the utmost attention, with due regard ensured for the rights of those involved. If the suspicion is confirmed, appropriate measures will be taken in the individual case.

Part 1 Good Scientific Practice

§ 1
Basic Principles of Good Scientific Practice

Good scientific practice includes in particular the following basic principles:

1st working according to the recognized rules of the discipline ("lege artis"),
2nd documenting the results in a traceable, verifiable, and complete manner,
3rd consistently second-guessing all results,
4th maintaining strict honesty with regard to one's own and third parties' contributions,
5th complying with ethical standards in the conduct of surveys and studies, and
6th allowing and encouraging critical discourse in the scientific community.

§ 2
Leadership Responsibility and Cooperation

(1) The University Executive Board shall create the framework and conditions for ensuring that legal and ethical standards in research and teaching can be met. It also ensures that those responsible for work units receive the necessary support to create appropriate conditions in their work units.

(2) The supervisor of the scientific working unit is responsible for the appropriate organization of the units. This includes a clear allocation of the tasks, supervision, quality assurance, and conflict resolution to a manageable extent. The supervisor shall ensure that all members and staff of the scientific working unit are aware of their roles, rights, and obligations. Abuse of power and the exploitation of relationships with dependency must be prevented.

§ 3
Commitment to and Informing about the Statutes of Good Scientific Practice

(1) All persons working at TU Dresden in a scientific or non-scientific capacity, early-career scientists, and all students are obliged to comply with the Statutes of Good Scientific Practice.

(2) The Statutes of Good Scientific Practice shall be integrated as a binding component in academic teaching and in the training of early-career scientists.

(3) The entire scientific staff of TU Dresden as well as all doctoral candidates are obliged to complete at least one training course in digital form or one in-person course on the topic of good scientific practice.

(4) TU Dresden undertakes to create and continuously develop the organizational and personnel structures necessary to ensure good scientific practice and to prevent scientific misconduct.

(5) On this basis, the schools are requested to draw up principles of scientific work specific to each department and to announce these in an appropriate manner.

§ 4
Supervision of Early-Career Scientists

(1) The supervision, training, and promotion of early-career scientists are core tasks of TU Dresden.

(2) The rules of good scientific practice shall be communicated in particular by the supervisors in such a way that they are internalized as a basic ethical principle.

(3) It must be ensured that there are contact persons in each teaching and research unit who are able to communicate the principles for ensuring good scientific practice. Corresponding training courses are offered at TU Dresden.

(4) Good supervision involves a balance between support and encouragement of scientific independence. The supervisory tasks also include appropriate career support as well as support for the independent scientific profiling of the early-career scientist, for example, by enabling him or her to participate in scientific events and to take advantage of offers from the Graduate Academy as well as in publication activities.

(5) The supervision of doctoral candidates at TU Dresden is to be organized as follows:

1st In addition to the main supervisor, at least one other experienced scientist is to be provided as part of a supervisory team. Both should be university lecturers. One of them may also be a scientist with advanced qualifications, equivalent to a *habilitation*, for example, an extraordinary professor with membership rights, a *Privatdozent* (a lecturer with a teaching load of at least 2 hours per semester), or a TU Dresden Young Investigator. In addition, other experts can be involved in the supervision in an advisory capacity.

2nd The supervisory teams meet with the doctoral candidate at least once a year to discuss the work progress and make recommendations.

3rd The form and scope of supervision are to be determined at the beginning of the doctoral project in the form of a supervision agreement with the doctoral candidate. In addition, the application for acceptance of the doctoral candidate must be submitted to the faculty at the beginning of the project.

4th The completion of the doctorate within a reasonable period of time is encouraged by the supervisors.

(6) The dissertation must be assessed by at least one external, full-time assessor from outside TU Dresden, who was not involved in the supervision of the dissertation and does not work in the same institute as the main supervisor.

(7) The respective doctoral regulations govern the supervision of doctoral projects.

§ 5
Performance and Evaluation Criteria

(1) Originality and quality shall always take precedence over quantity as performance and evaluation criteria for examinations, the awarding of academic degrees, promotions, recruitment, appointments, and resource allocations.

(2) When the performance of scientists is evaluated for the purposes of promotions, recruitment, appointments, and resource allocations, other performance dimensions shall be taken into account in addition to the production of knowledge and its critical reflection. These are, for example, the degree of commitment to teaching, academic self-management, and the transfer of knowledge and technology; contributions in the interest of society as a whole can also be acknowledged.

(3) Applications may specify a maximum number of publications to be submitted as proof of performance.

§ 6
Neutrality in Appraisals

Reasons for bias must be disclosed in the case of supervision and review activities. Possible biases must be reported immediately to the relevant committee. This applies to supervisory, examination, and reviewer activities. Further details are governed by the relevant regulations.

§ 7
Cross-phase Quality Assurance in the Research Process

(1) The scientists shall carry out each step in the research process in a *lege artis* fashion.

(2) Scientists are continuously aware of the danger of misuse of research results. Their responsibility is not limited to the compliance with legal requirements, but it also includes the obligation to apply their knowledge, experience, and skills in such a way that risks can be identified, assessed, and evaluated. In doing so, they take particular account of the aspects and ethical principles associated with safety-relevant research (dual use). Identified risks are proactively reported by the scientists to the Vice-Rector for Research. After examining the facts, the Vice-Rector for Research arranges for the matter to be referred to the committees responsible for it.

(3) As a matter of principle, all information relevant to the generation of research results shall be documented. This also includes, as far as this is possible and reasonable, making available the research data, materials and information on which the results are based, the methods applied, and the software used, and providing a comprehensive description of the work processes. If personally

developed research software is to be made available to third parties, it will be provided with an appropriate license. Scientists' own preliminary and external preliminary work must be completely and correctly proven.

(4) Primary data as a basis for publications shall be stored on durable and secured carriers in the institution in which they were created. TU Dresden ensures that the necessary infrastructure and support services are available. Primary data also includes measurement results, collections, study surveys, material samples, archaeological finds, questionnaires, audio recordings, and film recordings.

(5) As a rule, the primary data must remain accessible in the institution for ten years. In the case of primary data that cannot be stored on durable and secure media, shortened retention periods may be established in justified cases. As a rule, the original data and documents remain at the place of origin; however, duplicates may be made or access rights determined.

(6) If the primary data contain personal data – individual information about personal or factual circumstances of an identified or identifiable natural person – the characteristics with the help of which a personal reference can be established shall be stored separately; the characteristics shall be erased as soon as the research purpose permits this. In this respect, these data are to be removed from the primary data to be archived.

(7) The scientists involved in a research project shall, as far as possible and reasonable, reach documented agreements at the earliest possible point in time on who is entitled to access rights and use rights to the research data. The use of research data is available in particular to the scientists who collect them.

(8) For reasons of traceability, research connectivity, and reusability of research work in the future, scientists shall, whenever possible, save the research data and main materials on which the publication is based – in accordance with the FAIR principles ("Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable") – in recognized archives and repositories.

§ 8
Scientific Publications

(1) An author is a person who has made a genuine, traceable contribution to the content of a scientific text, data, or software publication and has consented to its publication.

(2) The answer to the question of when a contribution is genuine and traceable is based on a separate examination in each individual case and depends on the subject area in question. A contribution in this sense is deemed to have been made in particular if a scientist contributed in a scientifically significant way to

1st the development and conception of the research project or
2nd the development, collection, acquisition, provision of the data, software, sources, or
3rd the analysis/evaluation or interpretation of the data, sources, and the conclusions drawn therefrom; or
4th the development of scientific results in a substantial manner or
5th the writing of the manuscript.

(3) Honorary authorship in which no such contribution has been made is not permissible. A managerial or supervisory position does not in itself establish authorship.

(4) If a contribution is not sufficient to justify authorship, such support may be appropriately acknowledged in footnotes, the preface, or the acknowledgements.

(5) The scientists involved in the publication shall agree on who should be the author of the research results or who he or she is in accordance with paragraph 1. Agreement on the order in which the authors are listed is reached in good time, usually at the latest when the manuscript is being prepared, on the basis of traceable criteria and with consideration given to the conventions of each field.

(6) It is against the rules of good scientific practice to terminate without good cause the collaboration on a publication, without sufficient reason or to prevent the publication of the results as a co-author on whose approval the publication is dependent. Refusals to publish must be justified with written, verifiable criticism of data, methods, or results.

(7) Publications that are intended as reports on new scientific results must describe the methods and the results in a traceable way – if necessary with reference to additional literature.

(8) In scientific publications, significant findings supporting the results and hypotheses, but also those contradicting them, must be reported. An author's own preliminary work and external preliminary work and relevant publications of other authors on which the work is directly based must be named as completely and correctly as possible.

(9) An author's own results that have already been made publicly available must be cited, unless the discipline-specific self-conception allows this to be dispensed with in exceptional cases.

(10) If the publication is to contain personal data – individual details of personal or factual circumstances of an identified or identifiable natural person – this shall only be permissible if the data subject has consented thereto or if this is indispensable for the presentation of research results on events in contemporary history and is not contrary to the overriding interests of the data subjects which are worthy of protection.

Part 2 Scientific Misconduct

§ 9
Identification and Forms of Scientific Misconduct

(1) Scientific misconduct shall be deemed to have occurred if, in a context relevant to science, ethical standards are violated intentionally or through gross negligence, false statements are made, the intellectual property of others is infringed, or their research activities are impaired in any other way. The circumstances of each individual case are decisive, while the respective culture of the field must be considered.

(2) Scientific misconduct by false statements occurs in particular

1st by incorrectly claiming authorship (ghostwriting),

2. by inventing data,

3rd by falsifying data and sources, for example, by incomplete use of data and sources, by not including undesired results without disclosing this, and by manipulating sources, representations, or illustrations,

4th by the incongruent representation of figures and corresponding statements,

5th by providing incorrect information in an application letter or grant application or in the context of the reporting obligation,
6th by providing incorrect information on the scientific achievements of applicants in selection and review committees.

(3) Scientific misconduct also results from infringement of intellectual property relating to a copyrighted work created by another person or to substantial scientific knowledge, hypotheses, tenets, or research approaches originating from others as a result of
1stunauthorized exploitation under assumption of authorship (plagiarism),
2nd the exploitation of research approaches and ideas of others, especially as a reviewer (theft of ideas),
3rd the assumption of scientific authorship or co-authorship,
4. the falsification of content,
5th the unauthorized disclosure of data, theories, and findings to third parties,
6th unauthorized publication or sharing with third parties as long as the work, finding, hypothesis, teaching, or research approach has not yet been published,
7th claiming the (co-)authorship of another person without his or her consent,
8th arbitrarily delaying the publication of a scientific paper, in particular as editor, reviewer, or co-author.

(4) Scientific misconduct also occurs in the case of interference with the research activities of others by means of
1stsabotaging the research projects of others, for example, by
a) damaging, destroying, or tampering with literature, archival, or source materials, experimental setups, equipment, records, hardware, software, chemicals, or other items needed by another person to conduct a research project,
b) the falsification or unauthorized removal of documentation of research data,
c) the misappropriation or theft of books, archival records, manuscripts, or data sets,
d) the rendering unusable of scientifically relevant information carriers such as books, documents, or other data;
2nd the elimination of primary data, insofar as this violates legal regulations or field-specific recognized principles of scientific work;
3rd the public expression of an incorrect suspicion of scientific misconduct.

§10
Joint Responsibility for Scientific Misconduct

Joint responsibility for scientific misconduct can result, among other things, from participation in the sense of instigating or aiding and abetting the scientific misconduct of others, joint knowledge of falsifications by others, co-authorship in the case of knowledge of publications containing falsifications, as well as gross neglect of the duty of supervision.

Part 3 Committees and Representatives

§ 11
Ombudsperson

(1) If proposed by the University Executive Board, the Senate shall appoint an ombudsperson and his or her deputy. The deputy shall take the place of the ombudsperson if he or she is unable

to attend or is biased. The appointment of the ombudsperson and his or her deputy shall be for three years. Reappointment is possible.

(2) TU Dresden shall take sufficient care to ensure that the ombudsperson is known at the institution.

(3) The ombudsperson is the contact person, advisor, and mediator in all cases of suspected scientific misconduct. If necessary, he or she will be supported by the Review Board for Scientific Misconduct.

(4) The ombudsperson shall report annually to the Senate on his or her activities. This may include recommendations on how to deal with scientific misconduct.

(5) The ombudsperson shall maintain a regular exchange with the confidential counsellors of the faculties (§ 12), the Review Board for Scientific Misconduct (§ 15) as well as the other advisory bodies of TU Dresden. Conflict cases that are not related to scientific misconduct can be forwarded confidentially to the responsible offices of TU Dresden (e.g., Personnel Representation Council; conflict mediator of the Graduate Academy, psychosocial counselling, etc.) with the consent of the informant.

(6) Scientists with personal integrity and management experience shall be selected for the office of ombudsperson and for the office of deputy ombudsperson. They perform this task independently. In order to avoid conflicts of interest, persons who (still) hold an active management position at TU Dresden should generally not be selected for this task.

(7) Every member and all staff of TU Dresden have the right to speak to the ombudsperson personally in a timely manner.

§ 12
Liaison Officer for Early-Career Researchers

(1) Each faculty appoints one male and one female scientist as a Liaison Officer for early-career scientists. For Central Scientific Units, Liaison Officerscan also be appointed for early-career scientists. The same regulations apply to them as to the Liaison Officerfor early-career scientists at the faculties.

(2) These are the first contact persons for early-career scientists at the faculty level. They advise and can mediate in problematic situations. If necessary, and only with the consent of the person seeking advice, they can pass the conflict case on to the ombudsperson. The Review Board for Scientific Misconduct is then informed of the conflict case. This shall not affect the right of direct recourse to the ombudsperson.

(3) The faculties shall take sufficient care to ensure that the Liaison Officerin the faculty is known at the institution.

§ 13
Investigative Committee

(1) In order to investigate scientific misconduct, the University Executive Board shall, in consultation with the Senate, appoint an Investigative Committee consisting of the chairperson and four

other members. The University Executive Board shall appoint the chairperson and the other members of the Investigative Committee for a period of three years; reappointment is possible. The chairperson should not be a member or staff of TU Dresden and should preferably be qualified to hold the office of a judge. The other members of the Investigative Committee must be members or staff of TU Dresden and come from different academic disciplines.

(2) The Investigative Committee may at any time consult individuals who have special expertise in the scientific field to be assessed or who have experience in dealing with relevant procedures. If necessary, he or she will be supported by the Review Board for Scientific Misconduct.

(3) The Investigative Committee shall meet in private and be subject to strict confidentiality. Decisions made by the Investigative Committee shall be adopted by simple majority, unless stipulated otherwise. The Investigative Committee shall make its decisions on the basis of the facts established and the evidence gathered, and shall act on its own free accord.

§ 14
Regular Examination Boards

(1) In suspicious cases where the misconduct concerns academic examinations (e.g., bachelor's, master's, *diplom* examinations) or graduations (doctorates, habilitations), the board designated in the respective examination or graduation regulation shall be responsible for the review ("Regular Examination Board").

(2) A Regular Examination Board may refer a case to the Investigative Committee or consult its expertise in the handling of the case. The Investigative Committee may refer a case at any time.

(3) As long as the Investigative Committee is working on a case, this shall prevent other bodies from taking action on the same matter.

§ 15
Review Board for Scientific Misconduct

(1) The Review Board for Scientific Misconduct is responsible for supporting the ombudsperson and the Investigative Committee as well as the regular examination boards in cases of suspected misconduct, in particular for assisting with the respective ombudsperson proceedings and the file management.

(2) The Review Board for Scientific Misconduct accepts reports of suspected misconduct confidentially and provides information on possible procedural steps. This shall not affect the right of direct recourse to the ombudsperson or the Investigative Committee.

(3) The Review Board for Scientific Misconduct provides technical services in the form of plagiarism detection software.

(4) The Review Board for Scientific Misconduct supports all teaching staff in the prevention of scientific misconduct, conducts training courses, and contributes to raising awareness of scientific honesty.

Part 4 Procedure in Cases of Suspected Scientific Misconduct

§ 16
Suspected Cases and Suspicious Activity Reports

(1) In cases of suspected scientific misconduct, members and staff of TU Dresden shall contact the ombudsperson. External persons can also contact the ombudsperson in cases of suspected misconduct related to scientists at TU Dresden.

(2) Any report must be made in "good faith" that the allegation is true.

(3) If the suspicion of scientific misconduct is reported to a body other than the ombudsperson and that body is not the Regular Examination Board, it should be recommended that the ombudsperson be contacted.

(4) The report of suspicion shall be made in writing and include the incriminating facts and evidence. An oral report shall be followed by a written note setting out the suspicions and the facts and evidence on which they are based. The ombudsperson may also take up suspicious activity reports if they are made without disclosing the identity of the informant or the information. The prerequisite is that the allegations have sufficient credibility.

(5) The ombudsperson shall obtain the information and statements necessary to investigate the facts of the case, while safeguarding the data subject's interests that are worthy of protection, and shall also consult experts in individual cases.

(6) If, in the view of the ombudsperson, there is reasonable suspicion of scientific misconduct, he or she may inform the Investigative Committee or the competent Regular Examination Board and the Review Board for Scientific Misconduct about the facts of the case. If, in the view of the ombudsperson, there is a significant case of scientific misconduct, he or she must inform the Investigative Committee or the relevant Regular Examination Board and the Review Board for Scientific Misconduct.

§ 17
Participation and Protection of Parties During Proceedings

(1) The incriminating facts and, if applicable, evidence shall be made known to the data subject, insofar as this does not jeopardize the clarification of the facts, together with the request to make a statement thereon. As a rule, the period for submitting statements is four weeks. The informant and the person concerned shall be informed of their rights and obligations and also of the possible consequences of failure to comply with the obligations.

(2) Persons who provide a specifiable indication of suspected scientific misconduct (whistleblowers) shall not suffer any disadvantages with respect to their own scientific and professional advancement as a result. This is to be ensured by the University Executive Board of TU Dresden. The ombudsperson, the Review Board for Scientific Misconduct, the Investigative Committee, and the Regular Examination Boards must work to provide this protection in an appropriate manner. Therefore, both the ombudsperson and all members of the aforementioned bodies are obliged to maintain confidentiality about the identity of the persons who have contacted them with a specifiable indication of suspected scientific misconduct (whistleblowers), as well as about circumstances that allow conclusions to be drawn about these persons, even after their activities have ended. This

does not apply insofar as this person has released them from the obligation to preserve confidentiality.

(3) The reporting of such allegations shall be treated confidentially by all parties involved. Confidentiality serves to protect the whistleblower as well as the person suspected of misconduct. Prior to the final review of a suspicion, it is essential to avoid prejudging the person concerned.

(4) The person concerned, the informant, and the ombudsperson shall be informed of the decision of the respective committee. The main reasons which led to the decision must also be disclosed.

(5) The whistleblower shall also be protected in the case of unproven scientific misconduct, unless it can be proven that the report of the allegations was made against their better judgement.

(6) At the end of an investigation process, care shall be taken to ensure that persons who have been involved in acts of scientific misconduct through no fault of their own do not suffer further damage to their personal and scientific integrity. Appropriate measures can be counselling by the ombudsperson or a written, if necessary also public declaration by TU Dresden that the person concerned is not guilty of scientific misconduct.

§ 18
Preliminary Investigation

(1) As soon as the Investigative Committee or a Regular Examination Board learns of concrete suspicions of scientific misconduct, proceedings shall be initiated in accordance with the principles of Section 17 or the case shall be referred to the ombudsperson.

(2) All incriminating and exculpating facts and evidence shall be documented in writing.

(3) After receipt of a statement of the persons concerned or after expiry of the period in accordance with Section 17 para. 1, the Investigative Committee or the Regular Examination Board shall decide within four weeks whether the proceedings are to be terminated – with notification of the reasons provided to the persons concerned and the informants – because the suspicion has not been confirmed or whether a transfer to formal investigation proceedings is to be made.

(4) If the informant does not agree with the discontinuation of the proceedings, he or she may present his or her objections in writing or orally to the Investigative Committee or the Regular Examination Board within two weeks. The Investigative Committee or the Regular Examination Board shall deliberate and decide on the objections, considering the rights of participation and protection in accordance with Section 17.

§ 19
Formal Investigation Proceedings

(1) The Rector and the ombudsperson shall be notified of the opening of the formal investigation proceedings by the chairperson of the Investigative Committee or the Regular Examination Board.

(2) The Investigative Committee or the Regular Examination Board shall document the proceedings and prepare a report on the result of the investigation, which shall contain the supporting reasons for the result.

(3) The main reasons shall be communicated in writing to the person concerned, the informant, and the ombudsperson before the conclusion of the proceedings. They may make a statement on the report. If the Investigative Committee or the Regular Examination Board considers scientific misconduct to be proven, the report, including the statements and files, shall be submitted to the rector. In these cases, the report also contains a recommendation on how to proceed, in particular on the academic consequences for the person concerned. The Rector shall, where appropriate, forward the documents to the competent authority, and the latter or the Rector shall pursue the measures referred to in Section 21. In other cases, the proceedings shall be discontinued.

(4) The Rector may, in justified cases, demand that the result be re-examined.

§ 20
Duration of the Entire Proceedings and Obligation to Preserve Records

(1) As a rule, overall proceedings should not take longer than six months.

(2) The files of the investigation proceedings shall be retained for 30 years. The university archive ensures the transfer and archiving of the files. Any digital documents resulting from this process are transferred to the digital long-term archiving system.

Part 5 Possible Decisions and Penalties in Cases of Scientific Misconduct

§ 21
Measures in Cases of Scientific Misconduct

(1) Since each case of scientific misconduct is different and the severity of the scientific misconduct discovered also plays a central role in the respective decision, there are no uniform guidelines for the adequate consequences in each case. The decision on the action to be taken in cases of scientific misconduct depends on the circumstances of the individual case. The following measures may be considered:

1st In less serious cases, the Rector of TU Dresden may issue a reprimand or a more severe reprimand.

2nd Consequences under employment law may include, in particular, a warning, extraordinary termination, ordinary termination, termination of contract, or removal from job.

3rd Civil law consequences may include, in particular, the issuing of a ban from the premises, claims for restitution against the persons concerned, for example, with regard to stolen scientific material, claims for removal and injunctive relief based on copyright law, personal rights, patent and competition law, claims for repayment (for example, of scholarships, third-party funding or similar) or claims for damage compensation by TU Dresden.

4th Academic consequences can be initiated at different levels and with different objectives.

a) Intra-university: Withdrawal of academic degrees if they are based on scientific misconduct or were otherwise fraudulently obtained, in accordance with the relevant doctoral or habilitation or examination regulation, or withdrawal of the authorization to teach.
b) Non-university scientific institutions and associations: Such institutions must be informed of scientific misconduct in any event if they are directly affected by it or if the scientist concerned holds a management position or, as in the case of funding organizations, participates in decision-making bodies.
c) Withdrawal of scientific publications.

5th There may be criminal consequences if there is suspicion that the scientific misconduct also constitutes an offence under the German Criminal Code [*Strafgesetzbuch*] or other criminal provisions or an administrative offence, in particular in the case of copyright infringements, forgery of documents (including forgery of technical records), damage to property (including alteration of data), property and asset offences (as in the case of theft, misappropriation of funding, or embezzlement), violation of personal privacy or secrecy (as in the case of spying on data or exploitation of other people's secrets), loss of life or physical injury (as in the case of test persons as a result of false data).

(2) Whether and to what extent criminal charges are to be brought by TU Dresden in such a case shall be left to the dutiful discretion of the Rector.

(3) The respective applicable regulations of the examination and doctoral regulations remain unaffected by this.

§ 22
Entry into Force/Expiry

The Statutes for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice, Avoiding Scientific Misconduct, and Handling Violations shall enter into force after publication in the Official Announcements of TU Dresden. At the same time, the Guidelines for Ensuring Good Scientific Practice, Avoiding Scientific Misconduct, and Handling Violations of March 5, 2014 (Official Announcements of TU Dresden No. 02/2014 dated March 14, 2014, p. 6) shall expire.

Issued on the basis of the resolution adopted by the University Executive Board on December 22, 2020, following a statement by the Senate.

Dresden, December 22, 2020

The Rector
of the Technische Universität Dresden

Prof. Dr. Ursula M. Staudinger