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**Article 1:** **Purpose**

The purpose of the Committee in general terms is to optimize the quality of research at TSB. The Committee focuses specifically on the quality of data handling and methods reporting (DHMR) at TSB.

DHMR is defined as collecting, processing, storing and reporting on scientific data and the research materials used for this purpose (methodology, software, completed questionnaires, etc.) scrupulously and with integrity; also reporting data and the research materials used in such a way that these are easy for other researchers to understand and use.

**Article 2:** **Composition**

1. The Committee shall consist of a minimum of five and a maximum of seven members, who shall be appointed by the Dean for a period of four years. The Committee members shall act not in their personal capacity but as officers of TSB.
2. The Committee shall comprise members of the tenured TSB staff of the rank of assistant professor, associate professor and full professor.
3. The Dean shall appoint a Chair (a professor) and a Deputy Chair from among the Committee members.

**Article 3:** **Meetings and Decision-Making**

1. The Committee shall meet at least four times a year and shall be convened by the Chair.
2. The Committee shall also be convened by the Chair if at least two Committee members so request in writing, stating the subject to be discussed.
3. Committee decisions shall be taken by a majority vote. Decisions may only be taken if more than half of the sitting members are present.
4. For the rest the Committee shall regulate its own procedures.

**Article 4:** **Duties and Powers**

1. The Committee is specifically responsible for:
2. Drawing up and annually updating the TSB Guideline on DHMR.
3. Overseeing the implementation of the guideline referred to at 4.1.a. and evaluating it by means of internal evaluations (see Article 5).
4. Drawing up an annual report to the Dean/MT.
5. Making recommendations on aspects of research connected with DHMR to the Dean/MT on request or on its own initiative. These can relate to such things as data storage infrastructure (IT/physical); legal aspects of data management; training in the principles of the Gedragscode Wetenschapsbeoefening (Code of Conduct on Scientific Practice); the Code of Honour for Scientific Practice; research culture and ethics.
6. The Committee shall focus its activities on the domain of scientific research, e.g. published in the form of articles in scientific journals, books, chapters of books and theses.
7. The Committee’s remit does not include advising on the ethical aspects of proposed research and assessing research proposals. Also does the Committee’s remit not include advising on the content of research at TSB.

**Article 5:** **Evaluating Research**

1. Only articles with a TSB researcher as the first author will be evaluated.
2. The evaluation in accordance with this version of the Regulations covers articles that have been published in 2015 in final form and for which data have been used (this usually involves a publication on paper, but sometimes may involve an electronic document).
3. When evaluating research the Committee shall examine, through a conversation based on a checklist, whether (1) the researcher in question has observed the TSB Guideline on DHMR; and (2) how the researcher(s) responsible for data processing has/have processed, documented and stored the data for a particular article.
4. The evaluations shall number 18 to 20 of the articles/chapters etc. written by TSB researchers accepted for publication during that year. (At random) two publications from each research program will be selected for evaluation.
5. What articles/chapters are to be evaluated shall be decided by the Committee based on a stratified sample of TSB’s total research output, as registered in PURE.
6. For the purpose of an evaluation an inspection appointment shall be made in consultation with the researcher in question two weeks in advance.
7. Inspections shall always be carried out by at least two Committee members.
8. Committee members shall not be involved in inspecting a researcher in their own research group.
9. The Chair of the Committee shall always be informed of the findings of the inspection.

**Article 6:** **Procedure and Reporting**

1. A brief written report of each evaluation shall be made for the researcher in question. This report will be submitted to the researcher for a check on factual inaccuracies.
2. If shortcomings in DHMR have been identified this shall be reported confidentially in writing to the researcher in question, and to his manager (usually the program leader of research). The researcher and the program leader of research shall be asked to respond in writing.
3. In the event the Committee concludes that the written response of the researcher and/or the program leader of research is inadequate, the Committee may decide: (a) to raise the case with the Dean of Faculty; (b) to advise the Dean to conduct further investigation; (c) to advise the Dean to inform any co-authors; (d) to advise the Dean to bring in the University’s independent Integrity Ombudsman.
4. Committee members and support staff shall handle all the information involved in the work of the Committee confidentially.
5. In the annual report to the Dean/MT, the Committee shall not mention any researchers concerned by name. The confidentiality of the information obtained and the anonymity of the evaluated researchers will be respected. In the annual report the Committee will only provide information on the number of articles examined, the findings of the evaluation according to the checklist, the nature of any identified shortcomings, and/or the areas for improvement that were suggested.

These Regulations were passed by the TSB MT

on 18 January 2016.