GOOD RESEARCH PRACTICE AT GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY:
PRINCIPLES, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This document is addressed to all researchers in Griffith University and to those who have related managerial or administrative responsibilities.

1.0 DEFINITIONS

1.1 "Head of School" includes the Director of a College in the University where the context requires.

1.2 "School" includes a College in the University where the context requires.

1.3 "New researcher" includes students, research trainees and any members of staff who by virtue of their limited experience in University research may need special guidance or supervision. References to "supervisor" and "supervision" in connection with a new researcher are distinct from the supervision of an employee of the University which may exist for industrial purposes.

1.4 "Research" includes professional practices in the visual and performing arts and consultancies with research components. Terms such as "authorship", "published" and "research output" are to be given a meaning appropriate to these professional practices and consultancies.

1.5 "Research Centre" means an Allied Centre in the University and any other entity in the University which has been designated by Council as being a Research Centre for the purposes of this document.

1.6 "Research misconduct" is defined at paragraphs 18.3 to 18.6 of this document.

1.7 "The University" means Griffith University.

2.0 DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1 Unless expressly prevented by this document or University legislation or a decision of the University Council the Head of School may delegate in writing the responsibilities imposed upon her or him in this document but only to a Director of a Research Centre in the School and only in respect of research carried out within that Centre.

2.2 Where a research project involves researchers from more than one School the Heads of the relevant Schools may agree in writing that one of them has the responsibilities imposed in this document in relation to that project. In the absence of such an agreement, the Heads of School share the responsibilities concurrently and any information required to be given to "the Head of School below shall be given to all of the Heads of School.

3.0 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT ABOUT RESEARCH IN THE UNIVERSITY

3.1 The processes of research are designed to identify and protect the truth.

3.2 The broad principles that guide research have long been established and regarded as vital to the University. Central to these are the maintenance of high ethical standards, and validity and accuracy in the collection and reporting of data. The Griffith research community acknowledges its responsibility to the public and to the University. This responsibility is
particularly important where professional and industrial practices or public policy might be defined or modified in the light of research findings.

3.3 Communication between collaborators, maintenance of and reference to research records, presentation and discussion of work at meetings of experts, publication of results, including the important element of peer review, and the possibility that investigations will be replicated or extended by other researchers, all contribute to the intrinsically self-correcting and ethical nature of research.

3.4 Competition in research can have a strong and positive influence, motivating effort and enhancing the quality and immediacy of the work produced. Competitive pressures can, however, act to distort sound research practice if they encourage too-hasty preparation and submission of papers, the division of reports on substantial bodies of work into multiple small reports to enhance the ‘publication count’ of the author, or an undue emphasis on safe but mundane research at the expense of more creative and innovative lines of study. Accordingly, the University emphasizes the originality and high quality of its research, as well as the quantity of output.

3.5 A basic assumption of the University is that its researchers are committed to high standards of professional conduct.

3.6 The University acknowledges its own responsibility, and that of its researchers, to ensure the safety of all those associated with the research.

PRINCIPLES

4.0 ETHICS

4.1 Researchers may participate only in work that conforms to accepted ethical standards. They must be aware of and adhere to ethical principles of:

- justice;
- veracity;
- respect for people and their privacy;
- the avoidance of harm; and
- respect for non-human subjects of research

4.2 Researchers must comply with the Workplace Health & Safety Act 1995, the Public Sector Ethics Act 1994 (Old) and any University Code of Conduct made pursuant to the Acts.

4.3 In the design and conduct of research, researchers must comply with all established guidelines, including the NHMRC Statement on Human Experimentation and Supplementary Notes\(^1\) and the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals For Scientific Purposes\(^2\).

4.4 Where research procedures are of a kind requiring approval by a University Ethics Committee, or by other safety or regulatory committees, research must not proceed without such approval.

5.0 COMPETENCE

5.1 Researchers should participate only in work that they are competent to perform.

\(^1\) AGPS 1992
6.0 **COLLEGIALITY**
6.1 When in doubt about good research practice, researchers should seek assistance with their research from their colleagues or peers. Debate about, and criticism of, research work are essential parts of the research process.

7.0 **CONFIDENTIALITY**
7.1 If data of a confidential nature are obtained, for example from individual patient records or from questionnaires, confidentiality must be observed and researchers must not use such information for their own personal advantage or that of a third party.

7.2 Secrecy may also be necessary for a limited period in the case of contracted research, or other research which is under consideration for patent protection, or for other commercial-in-confidence reasons.

8.0 **SCRUTINY**
8.1 Subject to the above principles of confidentiality, research results and methods should be open to scrutiny by colleagues within the institution and, after publication, by other members of the profession at large.

9.0 **REPUTATION**
9.1 Researchers have a duty to ensure that their work enhances the good name of the University and the profession to which they belong.

10.0 **HONESTY**
10.1 Researchers have an obligation to achieve and maintain the highest standards of intellectual honesty in the conduct of their research.

11.0 **ACCESSIBILITY**
11.1 Researchers have an obligation to keep records and data in such a way as to facilitate the verification of the research by other researchers or future research
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

12.0 DATA STORAGE AND RETENTION

12.1 Data (including electronic data) must be recorded in a durable and appropriately referenced form. Data management comply with relevant privacy protocols, such as the Australian Standard on Personal Privacy Protection in Health Care Information Systems.\(^3\)

12.2 The location of data must be recorded on the Griffith University Statement of Authorship and Location of Data proforma. It is the responsibility of individual researchers to forward a copy of this proforma to the Head of School and to update the information as necessary. It is the responsibility of the Head of School to retain the records of data location.

12.3 Data must be held for sufficient time to allow reference to them. For data that are published, this may be for as long as interest and discussion persists following publication. As a general rule, the minimum period for retention is 5 years from the date of publication but for specific types of research, such as clinical research, 15 years may be more appropriate.\(^4\)

12.4 Data related to publications must be available for discussion with other researchers. Where confidentiality provisions apply (for example, where undertakings have been given to third parties, such as the subjects of the research), the researcher must ensure that data are kept in such a way that reference to them by others can occur without breaching such confidentiality.

12.5 Where computing systems are accessible through networks, particular attention to the security of confidential data is required.

12.6 When data are obtained from limited access data-bases, or via a contractual arrangement, a written indication of the location of the original data, or key information regarding the data-base from which it was collected, must be retained by the researcher.

12.7 Security and confidentiality must be assured in a way that copes with multiple researchers and the departure of individual researchers from the University.

12.8 Secrecy agreements to protect intellectual property rights may be entered into between the University, a researcher and a sponsor of the research. Where such agreements are intended to limit free publication and discussion, the limitations must be explicitly agreed.

12.9 All secrecy agreements should be made known immediately to the Head of School.

12.10 It is the obligation of every researcher to enquire whether any confidentiality or secrecy agreements apply to a project before he or she commences work on the project and of the Head of School to inform researchers of their obligations with respect to any such provisions.

12.11 Any confidentiality or secrecy agreement involving a student must not conflict with the University's primary expectations for examination of and access to a student's thesis after examination.

---

\(^3\)Australian Standard AS 4400-1995.

\(^4\)The December 1991 Guidelines for Good Clinical Research Practice in Australia, published by the Therapeutic Goods Administration of the Commonwealth Department of Health and Family Services, recommends retention of data for at least 15 years.
13.0 **AUTHORSHIP**

13.1 To be named as an author of an article or other work for publication, the person must have had substantial participation in all three of the following:

- conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of data;
- drafting or revising critically for important intellectual content; and
- final approval of the version to be published.

13.2 In addition, the person must have played such a role in the research output as to be sufficient for her or him to take public responsibility for at least that part of the output which is in the person's area of expertise.

13.3 It follows that participation solely in the acquisition of funding or the collection of data does not justify authorship. Nor does general supervision of the research group.

13.4 Naming as an author a person who fails to meet the requirements in 13.1 and 13.2 is the practice of "honorary authorship" and is not permitted.

13.5 The authorship of all research output must be agreed between researchers at an early stage in a research project, and reviewed whenever there are changes in participation.

13.6 When there is to be more than one author, the authors must decide which of them is to be nominated the executive author. The executive author is responsible for all record-keeping regarding the research output.

13.7 No person who qualifies as an author within the definition in 13.1 and 13.2 may be excluded as an author without her or his permission in writing.

13.8 Any part of an article or other work for publication which is critical to its main conclusion must be the explicitly agreed responsibility of at least one author.

13.9 Where research is to be published, whether electronically (including audio-visual material) or in hard copy, the co-authors must acknowledge their authorship and respective contributions in a document signed by each of them. The document must also state (a) that the signatories are the only authors (within the definition above) or (b) name any person who has agreed in writing not to be an author although qualified to be named as such, and (c) that the signatories have seen the version of the paper submitted for publication.

13.10 The written acknowledgment of authorship (on the proforma entitled Statement of Authorship and Location of Data) must be given to the Head of School and placed on file and retained safely in the School or (if the responsibility to receive the information has been delegated to the Director of a Research Centre) the Centre of the executive author at the time of submission of the research output for publication. If, for any reason, one or more co-authors are unavailable or otherwise unable to sign the statement of authorship, the Head of School or Director may sign on their behalf, noting the reason for their unavailability.

13.11 Every author must ensure that others who have contributed to the work are recognised in the research output. Postgraduate students in particular are often relatively inexperienced in research and the allocation of authorship. Consequently, where they are to be involved in a research project, postgraduate students should be provided with a written statement at the commencement of the project outlining the nature and proposed recognition of their contribution. Where this is not possible, the statement should include a reasonable time frame within which the situation will be clarified.

13.12 All authors of a work must approve the final draft which is to be published, other than in respect of trivial corrections made since the last draft was approved.

13.13 In the event of a dispute about authorship, or conflict between authors, the advice of an Adviser on Integrity in Research may be sought (see 17.00 below). If this fails to bring about a resolution of the matter, the University's grievance procedures must be invoked.
14.0 PUBLICATION. DESCRIPTION AND OTHER PUBLIC REPORTING OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

14.1 The policies and procedures below take effect subject to any contractual arrangements which apply to a particular project. In the event of apparent inconsistency between the terms of a contract and anything contained below, the researcher must seek advice from the Office for Research and may seek the advice of an Adviser on Integrity in Research.

14.2 The publication of multiple papers based on the same set or subset of data is not acceptable, except where there is full cross-referencing between the papers (for example, in a series of closely related works), or where a complete work grew out of a preliminary publication and this is fully acknowledged.

14.3 An author who submits substantially similar work to more than one publisher must disclose this to the publishers at the time of submission.

14.4 A researcher must ensure that he or she is familiar with the terms of the University's policy on Intellectual Property. In any case where the University might have a claim to intellectual property in the research findings, or where commercial exploitation by the University might be jeopardised by their disclosure in public, research findings should not be disclosed without the prior written approval of the appropriate officer in the Office for Research.

14.5 In all other cases, and assuming there is no contractual arrangement to the contrary, as a general principle research findings should not be disclosed to the public media before they have been reported to:

(a) the Office for Research; or
(b) a research audience of experts in the field of research - preferably by publication in a peer-reviewed journal or presentation at a recognised scholarly conference, or presentation at a recognised public performance.

14.6 Where issues of public policy and concern make prior advice of research findings to a public or professional authority desirable, such advice must be tendered to the responsible authorities before reporting to the media, and the unreported status of the findings must be advised at the same time. Only where the responsible authorities fail to act within a reasonable time can reporting to the media be justified, and the unpublished status of the findings must be disclosed to the media at the same time.

14.7 Where there is private reporting of research that has not yet been exposed to open peer-review scrutiny, especially when it is reported to prospective financial supporters, researchers must explain fully the status of the work and the peer-review mechanisms to which it will be subjected.

14.8 Each publication must include information on the sources of financial support (including University infrastructure) for the research. Financial sponsorship that carries an embargo on the naming of a sponsor should be avoided.

14.9 Out of courtesy, individuals and organisations providing facilities should be acknowledged in each publication.

14.10 Accuracy is essential in describing the state of publication (in preparation, submitted, accepted), research funding (applied for, granted, funding period), and awards conferred, and where any of these relate to more than one researcher. Deliberate or reckless inclusion of inaccurate or misleading information relating to research activity in curricula vitae, grant applications, job applications or public statements, and deliberate or reckless omission of relevant information, is a form of research misconduct.

14.11 All reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that published reports, statistics and public statements about research activities and performance are complete, accurate and unambiguous.
15.0 SUPERVISION OF NEW RESEARCHERS

15.1 It is the responsibility of the Dean to ensure that there is a specific, responsible and appropriately qualified supervisor of each new researcher in the School (see 1.00 for the meaning of “new researcher” and "supervisor" in this context).

15.2 The Head of School should ensure that the ratio of new researchers to supervisors is low enough to allow effective intellectual interaction and effective oversight of the research at all times.

15.3 Each new researcher should be provided with all written material on applicable government and institutional guidelines for the conduct of research, including those covering ethical requirements for studies on human or animal studies, requirements relating to confidentiality, and occupational health and safety matters.

15.4 Supervisors should provide guidance in all matters of good research practice.

15.5 The supervisor must ensure, as far as reasonably possible, the validity of research data obtained by a new researcher under her or his supervision.

16.0 DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

16.1 Actual and potential conflicts of interest can arise in many different research contexts in a university for example, when providing an assessor's report on a grant application, sitting on a committee which decides grant applications or the allocation of scholarships, supervising a student's research, or when commenting on the quality or volume of another person's research.

16.2 All staff should be sensitive to the possibility of conflicts of interest and avoid both the actuality and the perception of them by declining to act or by withdrawing from a situation where they might arise. In any case of doubt, the fullest disclosure should be made to the relevant responsible person (such as the chairperson of a committee) before any participation takes place. Advice may also be obtained from an Adviser on Integrity in Research in the School.

16.3 When seeking support for research, submitting work for publication or making public the findings of research, researchers must disclose any conflict of interest which has the potential to influence, or to have influenced, the research, interpretation of data or manner of publication.

16.4 Where a researcher is affiliated with, or has a financial involvement with, an organization or entity with a direct interest in the subject matter or findings of the research, full details must be disclosed to the Head of School at the earliest opportunity. In cases of any doubt, the researcher should err on the side of caution and make full disclosure to the Head of School. Such disclosure should cover any situation in which the conflict of interest may, or may be perceived to, affect any decision regarding other people. The Head of School may not delegate the responsibility to receive or act upon this information.

16.5 The connections which might invoke the responsibilities immediately above include where the organisation or entity is sponsoring the investigation, or providing indirect benefits such as the provision of materials or facilities, or supporting the researcher's travel or accommodation expenses.

17.0 ADVISERS ON INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH

17.1 The Head of School must appoint at least two members of the School as Advisers on Integrity in Research, one of whom may be herself or himself Any appointment must be specific to the person and not made contingent upon her or him holding a particular office.

17.2 The Head of School may only appoint a member of the School who is:
a) familiar with the contents of this document;
b) has the appropriate degree of experience in research; and
c) has the appropriate personal and other qualities to carry out the duties involved.

17.3 Where circumstances permit, the Head of School should aim to ensure that Advises on Integrity in Research are drawn from the main discipline areas reflected in the School and, if applicable, the cross-campus nature of the School’s activities.

17.4 Advisers on Integrity in Research share with the Head of School the responsibility of ensuring that the contents of this document are known by all staff who carry out research or whose duties relate to research matters in the School.

In addition to responsibilities in connection with actual or possible research misconduct (below), Advisers on Integrity in Research have the responsibility to give advice on integrity in research at the request of members of the School and also to proffer advice when circumstances come to their notice which may call for the giving of advice.

17.5 Advisers on Integrity in Research should make themselves familiar with the research taking place in the School for the purpose of assisting them in carrying out their duties.

RESEARCH MISCONDUCT: GENERAL

18.1 The provisions in this document dealing with research misconduct are not intended to exclude anything in an industrial Award or enterprise bargain (in relation to staff in the University) or the policies on-Academic Misconduct (in relation to students in the University). They are intended to deal with matters not covered by such an Award, bargain or policy and to supplement them where appropriate.

18.2 The procedures below must be modified appropriately where necessary to avoid any actual or possible conflict of interest in the handling of a complaint about research misconduct.

18.3 For the purposes of this document, “research misconduct” includes fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific or research community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research. It includes the misleading ascription of authorship (such as the listing of authors without their permission), attributing work to others who have not in fact contributed to the research, and the lack of appropriate acknowledgment of work primarily produced by a research student, trainee or associate. It does not include honest errors or honest differences in interpretation or judgments of data.

Research misconduct includes, but is not limited to misappropriation, interference and misrepresentation.

18.4 Misappropriation: A researcher or reviewer shall not:

a) intentionally or recklessly plagiarize, which shall be understood to mean the presentation of the documented words or ideas of another as her or his own, without attribution appropriate for the medium of presentation;

---

5 The definition of ‘Research misconduct’ in paragraphs 18.3 and 18.6 is drawn from the Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice, May 1997, which in turn notes the definition in the Report of the Commission on Research Integrity (“Integrity and Misconduct in Research”) to the U>S> Secretary of Health and Human Services: U>S> Department of Health and Human Services, 1995.
b) of confidentiality associated with the review of any manuscript or grant application;
c) intentionally omit reference to the relevant published work of others for the purpose of inferring personal discovery of new information.

18.5 Interference: A researcher or reviewer shall not intentionally and without authorization take or sequester or materially damage any research-related property of another, including without limitation the apparatus, reagents, biological materials, writings, data, hardware, software, or any other substance or device used or produced in the conduct of research.

18.6 Misrepresentation: A researcher or reviewer shall not with intent to deceive, or in reckless disregard for the truth

a) state or present a material or significant falsehood; or
b) omit a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.

19.0 RESEARCH MISCONDUCT: PROCEDURES

19.1 Procedures in respect of possible research misconduct may be initiated following a complaint to an Adviser on Integrity in Research or on the initiative of an Adviser on Integrity in Research.

19.2 On receipt of a complaint, an Adviser on Integrity in Research who is not the Head of School must inform the Head of School unless, after discussion between the Adviser and the complainant, they both agree that the matter should go no further.

19.3 Thereafter, the Head of School must conduct a preliminary of the matter personally or appoint an Adviser on Integrity in Research to do so. A preliminary investigation should be limited to determining whether a case exists that research misconduct may have occurred.

19.4 As soon as practicable after the commencement of a preliminary investigation, the investigator must provide to the person or persons under investigation a written statement describing the allegations against her or them. A reasonable time, which shall not be less than 5 working days, must be allowed to enable the recipient to provide a written response. The investigator must inform the recipient of the time for a written response.

19.5 Any inquiries made during the period of preliminary investigation shall be carried out as discreetly as possible in the circumstances.

19.6 Within a reasonable time of receiving the written response or the expiry of the time stipulated for the receipt of a written response (whichever is the earlier), the investigator must decide whether a case exists that research misconduct may have occurred.

19.7 If the investigator decides that such a case does exist, the investigator must immediately inform the Head of School and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research).

19.8 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) must then decide whether the matter is covered by procedures in an industrial Award or an existing University policy on Academic Misconduct and, if so, ensure that further action is commenced in line with the Award or policy. In all other cases, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) must commence a formal investigation by constituting a Committee of Inquiry of at least three persons, which may include himself or herself, to inquire into the matter and recommend any appropriate action to the University.

19.9 The Committee of Inquiry may contain members who are internal to the University or external, or a mixture of both. They are to be chosen because of their expertise and other qualities relevant to the investigation.

19.10 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), upon or after receiving the investigator’s opinion that a case exists that research misconduct may have occurred, may decide to advise, in confidence, the secretary of any funding agency currently supporting the research by the
person under investigation and in respect of which the allegations arise, but only on the understanding that the agency will not terminate its support on the basis only of the investigator's opinion.

19.11 The Committee of Inquiry must comply with principles of natural justice. The standard of proof shall be the balance of probabilities but taking into account the principle that the more serious the allegations or the consequences flowing from them, then the more demanding are the evidentiary requirements.

19.12 Because of the need to rectify any distortions of the research record, a Committee of Inquiry may continue its investigation even though the person under investigation has left the service of the University but it may not come to the conclusion that research misconduct has taken place if that would breach the requirements of natural justice or the requisite standard of proof.

19.13 If research misconduct is found to have occurred, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) must report the decision to the secretary of any funding agency which is supporting or has supported the research in question insofar as it relates to that researcher's contribution to the project. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) may also report the decision to journals and other media through which the research was reported. ~

19.14 During the preliminary investigation and any formal investigation of an allegation of research misconduct, those charged with investigating the matter must act in a manner which protects the interests of those who in good faith have made allegations or provided evidence in respect of them, and others affected by the allegations, including:

a) staff, student and trainees working with persons making an allegation, or with persons against whom an allegation is made;

b) journals and other media which have reported the research which has become subject to suspected, alleged, or demonstrated research misconduct;

c) funding bodies supporting the persons or research involved; and

d) the public

provided that such actions are consistent with the requirements as to natural justice and standard of proof and with the principle that the processes of research are designed to identify and protect the truth.