



## Official Bulletin

---

Year 2025

No. 21

Rostock, 8 April 2025

---

First Amending Statutes of the Rules to Secure Good Research Practice and Avoid Academic Misconduct at the University of Rostock of 4 April 2025

**First Amending Statutes of the  
Rules to Secure Good Research Practice and Avoid Academic Misconduct  
at the University of Rostock**

of 4 April 2025

Based on § 51(2) in conjunction with § 2(1) of the *Landeshochschulgesetz* (hereinafter State Higher Education Act) in the version announced on 25 January 2011 (Law and Ordinance Gazette of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (GVOBl. M-V) p. 18), last amended by the Sixth Act to Amend the State Higher Education Act of 21 June 2021 (GVOBl. M-V p. 1018), the University of Rostock has hereby passed the following Amending Statutes of the Rules to Secure Good Research Practice and Avoid Academic Misconduct at the University of Rostock as statute:

**Article 1**

The Rules to Secure Good Research Practice and Avoid Academic Misconduct at the University of Rostock of 5 May 2023 (Official Bulletin of the University of Rostock No. 18/2023) are amended as follows:

1. § 10 is amended as follows:

a. Sub-section (2) is worded as follows:

“(2) Reports of academic misconduct must be made in good faith. They should be made in writing and if possible be accompanied by evidence to substantiate the suspicion. If the ombudsperson has been informed verbally of the suspicion of academic misconduct, a written note must be made of the reported suspicion and the evidence supporting it. An anonymous notification can only be subject to a preliminary investigation procedure if the person providing the information is able to provide reliable and specific facts.”

b. In sub-section (3) the words “German Research Ombudsman” are replaced by the words “Ombuds Committee for Research Integrity”.

2. § 12(2) sentence 2, first clause is amended as follows:

“They may not hold offices in the Rectorate or in the Dean’s Office of one of the university’s faculties;”

3. § 13 is amended as follows:

**“§ 13 Preliminary Investigation Procedure**

(1) The preliminary investigation procedure serves to verify whether the reported suspected case of academic misconduct is sufficient to initiate a formal investigation procedure pursuant to § 15. Sufficient suspicion is given if, in a preliminary judgment of the evidence, it is likely that academic misconduct will be determined later on. The procedure is usually conducted by the ombudsperson who was informed of the suspected case of academic misconduct.

(2) The ombudsperson will immediately take the steps that they deem suitable and necessary to clarify the details of the case as discretely as possible. The ombudsperson examines the allegations with regard to the plausibility of the concreteness, significance and possible motives. The person affected by the suspicion must be given the opportunity to pass

comment as early on in the process as possible. They must be informed that it is their decision to comment on the suspicion and that they can consult their own legal advisor at any point. An appropriate deadline of at least two weeks must be set for the receipt of the comment. The name of the person who provided the initial information will not be named in the preliminary investigation procedure without their consent.

- (3) In cases in which mediation between the parties involved appears possible and appropriate, the ombudsperson should first take measures that are suitable for reaching an amicable settlement of the conflict. If mediation is successful and an amicable settlement is reached between the parties, the preliminary investigation procedure is concluded. If not, the preliminary investigation procedure is continued.
- (4) If the suspicion is deemed sufficient and if possible mediation attempts have failed, following consultation with the other members of the Board of Ombudspersons, the ombudsperson forwards the allegations confidentially in a written report with the results of the preliminary investigation procedure to the Committee of Inquiry for further investigation pursuant to § 15. If necessary, further committees and bodies shall be informed pursuant to § 10(3) and (4). In other respects, the ombudsperson is bound to confidentiality.
- (5) The preliminary investigation procedure must be discontinued if the suspected academic misconduct has been refuted, has not been sufficiently substantiated, an amicable settlement has been reached pursuant to sub-section (3), or alleged misconduct has not been fully clarified. If the preliminary investigation procedure has been discontinued, the person who provided the information must be informed first, in a written notification stating the main reasons. If this person does not agree with the discontinuation of the preliminary investigation procedure, they are entitled to demand the Committee of Inquiry to review the decision regarding the discontinuation of the preliminary investigation procedure within two weeks following notification of its discontinuation. If this deadline has passed without any such action or a final decision has been made by the Committee of Inquiry on the discontinuation of the preliminary investigation procedure, the person affected by the suspicion must be informed in the same manner.
- (6) The preliminary investigation procedure shall last no longer than six months.”

4. § 14(4) sentence 4 is amended as follows:

“They may not hold offices in the Rectorate or in the Dean’s Office of one of the university’s faculties, nor may they be an ombudsperson.”

## **Article 2**

These Amending Statutes shall enter into force on the day after their publication in the University of Rostock’s official bulletin.

Drawn up following the decision made by the Academic Senate of the University of Rostock of 2 April 2025.

Rostock, 4 April 2025

The Rector  
of the University of Rostock, University  
Professor Dr. Elizabeth Prommer