Academic Practice Code of Conduct

Institute for Logic, Language and Computation

4 October 2024

Contents

1 Introduction

When you get involved in research at the ILLC, the first step is to familiarize yourself with the website on Academic integrity at the University of Amsterdam and read The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. On the UvA website on academic integrity, you will find a list of steps to take if academic integrity has been violated.[1]

1.1 Why does research integrity deserve your attention?

Even if you adopt all the main integrity-principles as described in the Code of Conduct, then still things can, and often do, go wrong! Research as done at the ILLC is a complex and dynamic process, involving a wide range of different tasks[2] and hence many factors can trigger a scientific integrity problem. Here are a number of questions to consider:

- Is there a consensus in your research team on how to acknowledge everyone who contributed to the research results in a fair way?

- For as far as you know or can find out, are you sure that the research question/idea has not already been worked out, presented and/or published by others?

- You didn't delay or obstruct the research publication process that others are waiting for?

- Is the required level of scientific expertise (still) present in your team?

- Are you aware of the latest progress that was made on the research topic?

- Is everyone in the team aware of who is involved and what their responsibility is for the research tasks, at every stage in a research process?

---

[1]This document was written bij prof. Sonja Smets and fixed by ILLC's Management Team on the 4th of October 2024.

[2]Research tasks include: data-collection, designing data-sets, designing axiom systems, designing proof-methods, trying-out proof-methods, programming code, constructing arguments, providing (counter)-examples, designing/finding illustrations, writing and rewriting texts, providing explanations, positioning the results in a wider context, citing relevant sources, applying for (ethics) approvals, discussing results, brainstorming, presenting results, publishing a paper, replying to referees and editors, reviewing papers, applying for research funding, drafting research proposals, reviewing research proposals, presenting a demo, summarizing and studying other work etc.

- Are you aware of the standards used in the discipline(s), knowing that standards (on e.g. the order of co-authors) may also vary from discipline to discipline?

- Did you inform your visiting researcher, your international collaborator or your research student of the Code of Conduct that is applicable at UvA?

- Can your results be replicated on the basis of the data that you made available?

If you answer 'no' to any of the above questions, then an issue of academic integrity can easily occur. A breach of research integrity appears if research tasks are done but not acknowledged in a fair way, if results cannot be validated and replicated, if a publication was deliberately delayed, if you don't cite the right sources in the right way, if you claim scientific credit for an idea that isn't yours, etc. Preventing problems is easier than fixing them later. A research culture that is based on respectful and open communication, not only about the research results but also about the entire research process, and in which everyone adheres to the principles of the Code of Conduct, will work best.

In case a problem does occur or is signaled to you, then don't ignore it but deal with it in the best possible way (do this immediately and possibly with the help of others). A breach of academic integrity is a very serious thing and rightly so as it can directly impact the work and life of researchers and can even undermine the public's general confidence in science.

The remainder of this document will list a number of "do's and don't's" that should be ingrained in the work ethics, and hence the day-to-day practices, of everyone who is engaged in research in some way or other (as an active researcher, as a student, as a supervisor, or as an administrator). This document builds further on Version 2.0 of ILLC's Academic Practice Code of Conduct[3] and on a number of more detailed and comprehensive documents that deal with these matters, such as:

- The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice, published by the Association of Universities of the Netherlands (VSNU)

- A European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, published by the European Academies of Science (ALLEA)

- On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research, published by the American Academies (NAP)

---

[3]The current Version 3 of this document is an extension of version 2.1 of the ILLC management team's adaptation of Version 1.0, originally designed in January 2015 by the ILLC Scientific Integrity Workgroup consisting of Prof. M. Stokhof, Dr. A. Baltag and Prof. K. Sima'an. Version 1.0 was based on the Document designed by the Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics at the University of Amsterdam "IBED Practical guidelines on Scientific Integrity", version 1.0 April 20, 2014" which was adapted to fit with the ILLC research environment.

In addition there are several organizations that are involved in providing guidelines and directions for specific issues. Examples are:

- data management: DANS (Data Archiving and Networked Services),

- privacy: College Bescherming Persoonsgegevens CBP (Authority for the Protection of Personal Data), https://www.cbpweb.nl

2 How to act if you suspect a problem?

Rule one, for all people involved in all cases, is this:

> *Address any potential issue involving academic integrity as soon as it is encountered.*

As a closer inspection of known cases of misconduct shows, more often than not there were in an early stage already observations and even suspicions by relevant parties that were not communicated to, or picked up by, the responsible authorities.

As a general rule, any potential ethical issue encountered requires action: looking away is not an option.

A first step could be to check with colleagues to see if your views or observations are shared or not, but either way, the organization should know about any potential issue. This can start with talking to your own superiors, and if needed can be escalated to a complaint issued to UvA's Academic Integrity Committee.

The following step-by-step approach is suggested as a guideline for actions:

1. Contact your superior (supervisor, unit leader, line manager), discuss the issue and decide which further action to take.

2. If the outcome is not satisfactory (for instance the problem is downplayed), or if this step is problematic (for instance because your superior is involved), contact the director of the ILLC. For PhD candidates there is also the possibility of getting in touch with the PVC ("Programme eValuation Committee"), through the secretary of the PVC at the ILLC office.

3. If this is not satisfactory, or problematic, or if you prefer absolute confidentiality, contact one of the university's "Vertrouwenspersonen" (Confidential Advisors) to discuss the issue. The confidential advisors can advise you on a course of action, they treat cases confidentially, and action is taken only after mutual agreement.

4. Finally, you can submit a formal complaint to the Academic Integrity Committee, see: Academic integrity: submitting a complaint - University of Amsterdam (uva.nl)

3 Ethical aspects of collaboration in research

This section deals with a number of specific issues concerning collaborative research.

3.1 Co-authorship of papers and other academic output

Co-authorship

Practices on (co-)authorship differ across (sub)disciplines, even within a research institute such as ILLC. The most important thing is that the rules are clear, and acknowledged by all parties involved, so as to avoid any problems at the stage of publication.

Best practices Authorship in collaborative work should be discussed at the start of a project, and there should be agreement on the criteria that will be used to determine if co-authorship is warranted or not, and what the procedure will be to decide on the order of the authors.

Such criteria are subject to change, and in case of uncertainty, one may seek a binding judgment from a respected expert.

Necessary requirements for authorship are that one has done all of the following:

- a substantial contribution to one or more of: conception and design of the research reported; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; formulation of proofs or algorithms; critical analysis of state of the art of the research on the topic;[4]

- drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content

- final approval of the version to be published

- agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

It is advisable to specify the contribution of all authors to a published work and make this information available upon request.

Contributions by supervisors and senior research staff to the content of a student's work should not necessarily result in claiming co-authorship of the output of such work. Such contributions may be regarded as a normal part of the training process, and are principally different from the way one collaborates with one's peers.

---

[4]Depending on the standard of the field, the here listed contribution can include the acquisition of the research funding that made the investigation possible.

It should also be borne in mind that substantial collaboration with a student on (parts of) his/her MSc- or PhD-project implies that evaluation of the results also concerns the staff member and that hence, the staff member should be careful not to exert influence on the evaluation process.

3.2 'Ownership' of ideas, originality

Ownership

Discussion and exchange of ideas is essential for research. The variety of ways in which such discussions and exchanges take place, and often long time-span that they may cover, sometimes makes it difficult to trace back the origins of an idea, and the lines between a fruitful open exchange, scooping results, or downright stealing, is not always clear.

Best practices Openness and reciprocity is the ideal. But research is also a competitive affair. So, when engaging in substantial discussions and exchanges it is best to be explicit right from the start: inform your discussion partners about your plans, and ask if they foresee any overlap with their own plans, or if they wish to collaborate.

In cases where research is highly competitive, it is advisable to draw up a written agreement with everyone involved that specifies the accepted rules of conduct for disclosure of information. This may include a clause that determines what people are allowed to do with results when they leave a project.

In large collaborative projects such an agreement should also determine how intellectual property rights are dealt with and who will be the potential beneficiaries of knowledge utilization activities derived from the project results.

Contact the faculty legal officer for advice on setting up an agreement among co-workers. The legal expert at Innovation Exchange Amsterdam (ixa.nl) can assist in setting up a consortium agreement for projects with (academic and non-academic) partners.

3.3 Hierarchical relationships among researchers and peer pressure

Hierarchical relationships

In an ideal academic world all researchers are independent and each other's peers: the quality of one's work is what counts, not rank, seniority or prestige. However, hierarchical relationships and group processes may create situations in which independence and equality come under pressure.

Best practices A supervisor must leave ample room for dissenting scientific opinions of people under his/her supervision. This is of special importance in the relation between supervisor and MSc- or PhD-student.

Despite a hierarchical relationship, a junior researcher is responsible for his/her own activities at all times, and must not succumb to (perceived) pressure. In particular MSc- and PhD-students should be given enough space to develop their own ideas and be actively encouraged to pursue them.

'Incorporation into the Borg' of the supervisor's research should be avoided, as this may hamper their individual development and damage their later careers.

This can be a delicate problem, and should preferably be discussed openly, for instance with an independent colleague as mediator. ILLC's Programme eValuation Committee (PVC) has an active role to play here as well.

If this is too problematic or does not solve the issue, one of the "Vertrouwenspersonen" can be contacted.

4 Ethical aspects of reporting results, fraud and plagiarism

This section deals with key aspects of publication and reporting, and of data management. The relevance of research output depends on its integrity, and that means that the entire chain, from initial data-collection to final reporting, and all the intermediate steps, needs to be transparent and accountable. This requires independence, adequate reporting, and openness.

4.1 Data

Data-intensive research is becoming an increasingly important part of ILLC-research.[5] This raises a number of issues concerning collection, manipulation, and storage and curation of data. There are rapid developments in this area, also concerning the issue of 'Open Data'.

In order to guarantee the integrity and responsibility of data-intensive research, projects should draw up a so-called 'data management plan' at the start and follow the institute's protocol as described in illc-rdm-protocol.pdf (uva.nl).

Examples of concrete data management plans for individual projects from other researchers at the ILLC can serve as a guide for designing one's own data management plan.

---

[5]In late 2015/early 2016, following UvA-regulations and in accordance with the interpretation of these regulations in the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Humanities, the ILLC formulated a *Data Protocol* relating to management of research data: illc-rdm-protocol.pdf (uva.nl).

4.1.1 Authenticity of (primary) data

Authenticity

Some of the most extreme cases of fraud in science involved the fabrication of data. Especially data-based research is almost always teamwork, which means that responsibilities are shared that checks and balances can be implemented to guarantee accountability for data-collection.

Best practices Follow the protocol as specified in illc-rdm-protocol.pdf (uva.nl). In experimental and observational studies, but also in research that uses existing data collections or that collects data from other sources, an accurate logbook that details the actual data-collection should be maintained, and the raw data should be stored in a safe and un-manipulated form. The procedures should be laid down in a protocol, to ensure that reconstruction of the methods that were followed to obtain the data is possible. This protocol is part of the data-management plan that is drawn up before the research starts. The responsibility for seeing to it that the protocol is followed, is shared by all members of the project team.

4.1.2 Transparency of workflows for data mining and data processing

Workflows

Raw data often needs to be processed to prepare them for further analysis, and, ultimately, to obtain a publishable result. This may include procedures to remove outliers, transformation and aggregation of data, and combination with data from other sources. Any such action is prone to unintentional human mistakes, as well as malicious manipulation in extreme cases.

Best practices Follow the protocol as specified in illc-rdm-protocol.pdf (uva.nl). As with the initial data-collection, this phase should be accurately logged. Only such algorithms and other procedures should be used that allow a full reconstruction of this phase at a later date by independent researchers. All algorithms and procedures should be identified and logged, including all details that are needed for later reconstruction (e.g. version of the programmes used for each step of a work flow, parameter settings, input/output/log files).

The procedures for logging this part of the projects are laid down in a protocol that is part of the project's data-management plan.

As in the case of initial data collection, the responsibility for seeing to it that the protocol is followed is shared by all members of the project team.

4.1.3   Storage of data, statistical analyses and workflows, audits

Storage

Independent inspection and verification of data, methods, and results is essential for the reliability of research output and the integrity of science.

Therefore, raw data, workflows, input/output files, programmes (versions) used, as well as the final results, need to be stored in a suitable form and curated so as to make later inspection and verification possible.

Best practices   This part of the chain is a shared responsibility of the researchers that carry out the project and the institution.

The ILLC has adequate procedures and a suitable infrastructure to allow implementation of these requirements as specified in the illc-rdm-protocol.pdf (uva.nl)

In case the raw data are too unwieldy to store, appropriate procedures are to be implemented: including an exact description of the flow from raw to archived data; storage of a subset of raw data.

4.2   Reporting and publication

4.2.1   Independence of reporting from provider of funding

Independence

Most research is (still) paid by general public funding, but increasingly also contracted by private or semi-private organizations, or by specific governmental institutions (such as ministries, city councils, etc.).

In some cases, the funders may only want to hear their preferred outcome, and may exert pressure to present the results in a particular way, or to omit certain results. Clearly, research integrity requires complete independence in reporting and accountability for all results.

Best practices   The principle of independent reporting must be clearly specified and agreed upon by all parties in any contract. While the funding organization can request clarification of the results, pressure to modify any findings is never permissible. Agreed upon conditions on the timing of publications is permissible but should be part of the contract.

Requests from a funder to modify reports, as well as other attempts to influence the way in which the research is carried out, should always be communicated and discussed with the entire research team and reported to the research unit leader and/or the ILLC-management.

4.2.2 Duplicated reporting in abstracts, symposium talks, peer-reviewed papers

Re-use

Science is work-in-progress, and preliminary results might be published in a symposium abstract, or results from contract research might become available first in the form of a report, and later as a peer-reviewed publication. How often can the same materials be presented before 'self-plagiarism' applies?

Best practices Results submitted to peer-reviewed journals, conferences, and other venues should be original and new. Any previously published part that is included, e.g., for reasons of exposition, should be identified as such and appropriately referenced. If it concerns work done with others their permission should be obtained and explicitly mentioned.

If the submission is already published as a report, this should be mentioned and the report should be made available to the editor(s).

Publication of preliminary results and 'work in progress' (e.g., as a symposium abstract, poster or talk) requires permission of all authors working on the project that are planning to publish the results later on.

4.2.3 Proper references and citations

References

Proper references are part of a rigorous academic method: they show how new results relate to older findings, and are a crucial tool for the reader to critically investigate the results presented.

Although it may not always be possible to reconstruct the origins of an idea, one should always attempt to make sure that the proper persons receive appropriate credits. Deliberately not referencing relevant work of others, or including irrelevant references, is a breach of confidence with the reader and should be avoided at all times.

Best practices Since different (sub)disciplines, and even different journals, have different policies, it is not possible to lay down strict guidelines. But the following are sound 'rules of thumb':

- give credit where credit is due, by referring in a polite and professional way to the relevant literature

- avoid too many references (i.e. over-citing) to authors who have shaped a discipline and whose work can be assumed to be familiar to all your readers ('Don't show off')

- avoid selective referencing, do not leave out relevant references because the authors are from a competing school of thought ('Be fair')

- avoid irrelevant references, do not include a reference only because the author happens to belong to your school of thought (or your institution, research unit, . . .) ('Be independent')

- avoid indiscriminate self-referencing: only reference your own work if it is important for the reader to understand the paper

- if a reference contains a citation, use the appropriate tools to make sure the reader is aware that your quoting from another source; double-check wording; and make sure you are not quoting out of context

4.2.4 Public media and popularising science venues

Public outreach

Public outreach, by means of publication in popularising science venues or appearance in public media, is an important aspect of academic practice, and where relevant and possible it is a duty that comes with being a researcher who is funded by public means. It does carry a number of risks.

Best practices   The pitfalls that may be encountered when engaged in public outreach are many. The following rules of thumb apply:

- be clear about the proper interpretation of the results reported

- outline the limitations and inherent revisability of results

- avoid anything that could lead to a wrong or disproportional interpretation of the importance of the results themselves, or of their academic and/or societal impact

- make proper reference to the institutions that are involved in funding the research you report on

4.2.5 The use of AI tools to assist in an academic research process

Use of AI tools:

As the use of AI tools becomes deeper ingrained in our academic practice, several questions arise: from which moment onwards ought the use of an AI tool to be treated as a research-method in a scientific process that is referred to as such? Where lies the responsibility and accountability for the content of the output generated by an AI tool? Can the use of an AI tool for a research publication affect the authorship?

While the use of AI tools is available and can be of assistance to researchers in many stages of a research process, its use is not yet well-regulated. We can however offer some rules of thumb:

- If you claim authorship of (fragments of) a text, image, illustration, sound etc. that you did not conceive of, or design, fully by yourself but that are produced via the use of a generative AI tool, this will be marked as fraud. There is a grey-zone of how much use of an AI tool is needed before it needs to be mentioned, here one can best err at the side of caution and be as transparent and as explicit as possible. Do consult with your superior when in doubt.

- References and citations are due for all material that is generated by someone or something else, including text-fragments that you did not write yourself and are produced by a generative AI tool.

- Be as honest and transparent as possible about the use of AI tools in your research process.

- Certain AI tools, such as basic spell-checkers are so ingrained in our scientific practice that a reference to their use is not required.

- As a (co)-author of a paper based on the use of generative AI tools, you bear the co-responsibility for all the content in the paper including the parts that are possibly generated by generative AI.

- Generative AI can be used in a responsible way in education and it is best to familiarize yourself with it: Responsible use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in education - Overview | Rise 360 (articulate.com)

5 Ethical aspects of research topics or its methodologies

This section deals with a number of issues that relate to what is being researched and how research results are used.

5.1 The way results are used

Although much of the research at ILLC is of a theoretical nature, all ILLC-researchers need to be aware of the fact that research results, once published or shared by other means, can be used by others in ways that are not intended and that may be harmful.

Potential unintended use or misuse of results

Research can sometimes deliver knowledge that can be used for unintended purposes, illegal activities (e.g., privacy violations, identity theft), or societal/ethically disputable applications.

Best practices At the level of individual researchers the topic is addressed explicitly in appointment procedures, and subsequently, whenever relevant, in the annual 'functionerings- en beoordelingsgesprekken'.

Periodically, an open discussion at the level of research teams and that of the research units should be held to maintain awareness of these issues, to identify potential problems and to discuss ways of preventing them.

More specific issues regarding research topics and methodologies include the following three broad categories: observation and observational data involving humans; experiments and experimental data involving humans; experiments and experimental data involving non-human animals.

5.2 Observation and observational data involving humans

Observation of humans and human behaviours concern a relevant part of research done at ILLC, either directly, when it is part of a project carried out by an ILLC-researcher, or indirectly, when ILLC-researchers are members of larger projects in which such research is being done by others.

Direct and indirect observation of humans and their behaviours

Research in human behaviour can be direct (observations, experiments) or indirect (data logs, corpora, and other data sets). It may concern individuals or aggregations of individuals. This raises issues on anonymity and privacy that must be properly addressed.

Best practices If you work with personal data then closely follow the information and protocol on Personal data - Research Data Management - University of Amsterdam (uva.nl) and make sure you do obtain the right approvals before your investigation starts. UvA's online Research Management Services environment is designed so you can ask for all required approvals in one place, including the required ethics check and the data protection review. UvA's Data Protection Officers can give you advice on the use of personal data in research.

You have to make sure that any data on individuals that is stored will adhere to the relevant legislation that applies. But even if data is obtained by indirect means and the individuals that provided the data cannot be directly identified, a protocol must be followed to guarantee the anonymity of the data sources.

It is also conceivable that observations lead to discoveries about individuals that are completely outside the specified scope of the actual research question. Any such findings should be ignored and the relevant results should not be kept in any way (in writing, electronically, or otherwise) or communicated to others. When possible, an attempt should be made to prevent that the same accidental discoveries be made by others that have access to the data. This may include informing the subjects (in the case of direct observation), or deleting relevant data. Only if the discovery points at potential criminal activities this must be

reported to the relevant authorities. In such a case the first step is to contact the relevant faculty legal expert.

5.3 Experiments and experimental data involving humans

There is some experimental research done at the ILLC with human and/or medical subjects. Additionally, ILLC-researchers may collaborate in larger projects in which such research is carried out by other project members.

Although they will not be directly responsible, they need to be aware of the issues involved.

If ILLC-researchers become aware of potential cases of misconduct they should report this to the person(s) in charge of overseeing the relevant part of the project, and they should inform their supervisor(s) at the ILLC.

The following are the relevant points to note.

Use of individuals as subjects in medical experiments.

(Bio-) medical research often necessitates the use of individual subjects, for instance in clinical trials. This is strictly regulated (Wet medisch- wetenschappelijk onderzoek met mensen, WMO).

Best practices Permission is needed from the relevant authorities at all times, see http://www.ccmo.nl/ for details and consult UvA's online Research Management Services (RMS) environment. Via your faculty's ethical committee, you can get in contact with the AMC ethical committee for dealing with this type of research done the University of Amsterdam so you be advised on the proper procedures needed to get the required permissions from the authorized ethical committee.

Researchers must strictly adhere to the approved protocols and log all performed experiments.

5.4 Experiments and experimental data involving non-human animals

Use of non-human animals

Biological and (bio)medical research often involves working with animals and (especially for vertebrates) there are strict regulations ("Wet op Dierproeven") on who is allowed to handle animals and what a treatment may and may not involve, the number of animals used, etc.

Best practices For this type of research, check with UvA's online Research Management Services environment and find out where you can apply for the permission from relevant authorities so you can get in touch with a certified

employee at the Faculty of Science ("dierproefdeskundige", animal testing expert). Researchers must strictly adhere to the approved protocols and log all performed experiments.

5.5 General data policies

Since the use of data in ILLC-research is growing and requirements and regulations by funding organizations and other relevant institutions can change, the ILLC will discuss developments on this front regularly, at the level of projects and research units, as well as in the management team, and update its policies accordingly.

6 Ethical aspects and conflicts of interest in research evaluations

This section deals with some issues that concern another aspect of academic work, viz., judging the work of others.

6.1 Reviewing papers

Reviewing papers

Independent peer review of papers before publication is considered to be one of the cornerstones of rigorous academic practice. In many cases this is done anonymously. This enables the reviewer to judge freely, but also it contains some ethical pitfalls. For example, unfounded or overly harsh criticisms can be voiced without the reviewer being held accountable. And a reviewer might reject a good paper and use the information or ideas for his own benefit. Obviously, this is highly unethical behaviour.

Best practices: The rules to follow here are the following:

First, as a reviewer:

- be objective: if you think a submission conflicts too much with your own work or ideas, you might not want to take the assignment
- never review a submission by someone to whom you bear a personal relationship, such as a close colleague, a student, a friend, or a family member
- be fair: it is easy to focus on what is wrong, try to come to a balanced judgment
- respect the confidentiality of the process: don't share (parts of the) information about the reviewing process with others; don't reveal your identity

to the authors; don't communicate the outcomes of a review process to other parties

- avoid creating a bias by reviewing the work of the same author or work on the same topic too often

Second, as an editor:

- make sure you are ok with the journal's policies regarding reviewing before you accept the position, in particular with regard to suggestions from authors to exclude reviewers

- select reviewers carefully, be aware of heated debates and potential mud-throwing. As an editor you are responsible for the professional conduct of the reviewers you have selected, hence you are expected to intervene in case your reviewers do not conform to the expected professional standards.

As stated, the above rules are pretty obvious and simple, it is applying them in concrete contexts that may be very hard. Rely on your judgment, also 'outside' the rules, and when in doubt consult an experienced and trusted colleague. Usually it is possible to give enough information without breaching confidentiality to get useful advice.

6.2 Reviewing research proposals

Reviewing proposals

Peer review of proposals is a key step to obtain funding for research, and can make or break careers. Given the extreme competition, it is very easy for a reviewer to kill a proposal, by giving it a low mark (anything below 'excellent' in fact). Also, panel members can have conflicting interests, leading to unfair outcomes.

Best practices   Many of the same principles of independence and objectivity as for reviewing papers apply to reviewing research proposals. As reviewer, decline to review if you are in doubt and suspect that conflicts of interests may arise. Make sure that your comments correspond to your final mark.

Only accept membership of a panel in which a common opinion has to be reached if you feel the panel as a whole has the expertise, independence and reputation to do this well.

If you have your own interests in a particular proposal (or for instance a close colleague) make this explicitly clear and do not partake in the discussion of this proposal (e.g., leave the room).

6.3 Quality assessments of institutes / programmes

Other peer review

In the constant quest for excellence of all research institutions, peer review of research is a big responsibility (as well as a huge task), as the future of people and entire research groups may depend on the outcome of the review.

Best practices   Many of the same principles of independence and objectivity as in the previous sections apply here. Again, this is a group process, which helps to reach a balanced judgment.

In addition, some principles for reviewing:

1. If you are in a panel, ensure that you are aware of how your judgment will be used by the organization; ask for the terms of reference.

2. If you feel that some panel members have too much influence and too big an impact on the outcome, address the issue openly in the group.

3. Likewise, listen to others and attempt to reach consensus, but claim a dissenting opinion if you have sufficient grounds not to accept a certain conclusion.

7   Relevant websites, documents and contact pages

- *ILLC's Social Code of Conduct*
  Diversity & Social Code of Conduct | Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (uva.nl)

- *The Ethics Committees for ILLC*
  Ethics Committees Faculty of Science - UvA-medewerkers - Universiteit van Amsterdam Commissie Ethiek FGw - Universiteit van Amsterdam (uva.nl)

- *Programme eValuation Committee (PVC)*
  PVC | PhD Programme (uva.nl)

- *Social Safety*
  Social safety - University of Amsterdam (uva.nl)

- *Academic Integrity, Codes of Conduct and Confidential Advisors*
  Wetenschappelijke integriteit - Universiteit van Amsterdam (uva.nl) Academic integrity - Universiteit van Amsterdam (uva.nl)

- *Research Management Services at UvA*
  Research Management Services - UvA-medewerkers - Universiteit van Amsterdam

- *Landelijk Organaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit*
  Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit (lowi.nl)