



# **CODE OF CONDUCT**

**FOR**

**RESEARCH**

**Approved by:  
Academic Board 19 May 2004  
Vice-Chancellor 7 September 2004**

Information in this booklet is correct as at 19 May 2004. The University reserves the right to alter any information contained herein at any time without notice.

## INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The contents of this booklet are based upon the following documents:

*Joint NHMRC / AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice* (May 1997)

*Guidelines for the Conduct of Research* (La Trobe University, November 1993)

*Code of Conduct for Research* (Australian Catholic University, Research Management Committee, 1994).

The booklet *Code of Conduct for Research* has been compiled by the University Research and Research Training Management Committee and approved by the Academic Board on 19 May 2004 for distribution throughout the University.

This *Code of Conduct for Research* is a policy of Australian Catholic University and is intended to be read in the light of other University guidelines or policies, for example, Equal Opportunity, Enterprise Bargaining Agreements.

Published by Australian Catholic University  
Produced and printed by Australian Catholic University  
19 May 2004

## CONTENTS

### Code of Conduct for Research

#### Preamble

#### Part I Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research

- 1.1 General Considerations
- 1.2 Data Collection and Storage
- 1.3 Authorship and Publication
- 1.4 Student/Research Trainee Supervision
- 1.5 Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest

#### Part II Procedures for Dealing with Allegation of Misconduct in Research by Academic Staff

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Definition of Misconduct in Research
- 2.3 Procedures
  - 2.3.1 Protection of Interested Parties
  - 2.3.2 The Receipt of Complaints
  - 2.3.3 The Preliminary Investigation
  - 2.3.4 Action if the Accused Resigns

#### Part III Policy Statement on Misconduct by Honours and Higher Degree Candidates

## CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESEARCH

The following is a statement adopted by Australian Catholic University on the appropriate practices for the conduct of research. It is closely based upon the *Joint NHMRC / AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice*, May 1997 (ref: [http://www.avcc.edu.au/news/public\\_statements/publications/glrespra.htm](http://www.avcc.edu.au/news/public_statements/publications/glrespra.htm))

Whilst this document emphasizes the practice of research in the areas of science, and in particular medical and health sciences, the NHMRC has stipulated that adherence to its guidelines by all areas of the institution "is essential for all institutions applying for and receiving funds from the NHMRC."

### PREAMBLE

Research and the pursuit of truth are vital institutional functions. Research in this document is defined as all research (funded or unfunded, contract or otherwise) conducted by staff or by students at Australian Catholic University. (cf Definition of Research in *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans pp 6-7*)

The broad principles that guide research have long been established. Central to these are the maintenance of high ethical standards, and validity and accuracy in the collection and reporting of data. The responsibility of the research community to the public and to itself is acknowledged. This responsibility is particularly important where professional practice or public policy may be defined or modified in the light of research findings.

The processes of research protect the truth. Communication between collaborators; maintenance 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 repeated or extended by other researchers, all contribute to the intrinsically self-correcting and ethical nature of research.

It is a basic assumption of institutions conducting research that their researchers are committed to high standards of professional conduct. Researchers have a duty to ensure that their work enhances the good name of their institution and the profession to which they belong.

Researchers should only participate in work which conforms to accepted ethical standards and which they are competent to perform. When in doubt they should seek assistance with their research from their colleagues or peers. Debate on, and criticism of, research work are essential parts of the research process.

Institutions and researchers have a responsibility to ensure the safety of all those associated with the research. It is also essential that the design of projects takes account of any relevant ethical guidelines.

If data of a confidential nature are obtained, for example from individual patient records or from certain questionnaires, confidentiality must be observed and researchers must not use such information for their own personal advantage or that of a third party. Secrecy may also be necessary for a limited period in the case of contracted research or of non-contractual research which is under consideration for patent production. In general, however, research

results and methods should be open to scrutiny by colleagues within the institution and, through appropriate publication, by the profession at large.

This document is in three parts. Part I sets out a Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research. The procedures which are followed at Australian Catholic University when dealing with allegations of misconduct in research against a staff member are presented in Part II. Part III deals with academic misconduct by Higher Degree candidates.

## DEFINITIONS

**"ACU"** means Australian Catholic University Limited (ABN 15050192660), a company limited by guarantee.

**"Academic staff"** means any member of staff employed by the University as an academic and whose salary and conditions of employment are those which apply to academic staff in accordance with the relevant provisions of an Enterprise Agreement.

**"Administrative staff"** means any member of the University staff who is engaged in activity required for the effective administration of the University.

**"Authorship"** is substantial participation, where all the following conditions are met: (1) conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of data; and (2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and (3) final approval of the version to be published. Participation solely in the acquisition of funding or the collection of data does not justify authorship. General supervision of the research group is not sufficient for authorship. Any part of an article critical to its main conclusion must be the responsibility of at least one author. An author's role in a research output must be sufficient for that person to take public responsibility for at least that part of the output in that person's area of expertise. No person who is an author, consistent with this definition, must be excluded as an author without his or her permission in writing.

**"Casual staff"** means a staff member of the University who is classified as such under, and is employed on an hourly basis in accordance with, an Enterprise Agreement in force and as varied from time to time.

**"Close personal relationship"** means a relationship of friendship, association or otherwise which could give rise to or be perceived as giving rise to a real or potential conflict of interest between the staff member and their obligations to the University.

**"Code"** means this Code of Conduct.

**"Company"** means Australian Catholic University Limited (ABN 15050192660), a company limited by guarantee.

**"Consultant"** means any person who is engaged as an independent contractor to assist and/or advise the University.

**"Continuing staff"** means a member of the University staff who is employed on a continuing basis as set out in an Enterprise Agreement.

**"Contract"** means a legally-enforceable relationship entered into between two or more parties.

**"Dean"** means any person appointed to a position so designated at the University (including Deans of Faculties and Dean of Students).

**"Delegated senior University manager"** means a senior manager of the University who is delegated to perform specific roles in relation to this Code of Conduct. These officers are specified in Clause 17.3 of this code.

**"Director"** means any person holding a position so designated at the University.

**"Enterprise Agreement"** means any and all enterprise agreements in force at any time covering any category of staff member of the University.

**"Family relationship"** means a relationship between a staff member and a member of their family or a member of their household and includes de facto relationships.

**"Financial relationship"** means a relationship which could give rise to, or be perceived as giving rise to, a financial benefit being received by a staff member (or any person with whom the staff member has a family or close personal relationship).

**"Fixed-term staff"** means a person who is employed on a contract for a specified and finite period.

**"General staff"** means any member of staff employed by the University in a position classified by the Higher Education Worker Classification Scheme operating in the University and whose salary and conditions of employment are those which apply to general staff in accordance with the relevant provisions of an Enterprise Agreement.

**"Harassment"** means behaviour that is not wanted and not asked for and that a reasonable person would have anticipated would cause humiliation, offence or intimidation.

**"Head of School"** means any person assigned to a role of academic leadership and management in a role so designated in a School of the University.

**"Manager"** means a person who is the head of an organisational unit as defined by the University structures as determined from time to time.

**"Member of the public"** means any person who is not a member of the University community.

**"Member of the University staff"** means all persons employed or engaged by the University and all persons assigned to the University.

**"Mission"** means the Mission as set out in the Mission Statement of Australian Catholic University as endorsed by the University Senate.

**"Nominated supervisor"** means a person who is formally assigned the responsibility of supervising one or more staff or a group of staff.

**"Occupational health and safety legislation"** means all legislation enacted by the Commonwealth or a state/territory government which addresses the health and safety of persons at or visiting the workplace.

**"Outside work"** means work performed by a staff member which is performed in addition to her/his contract of employment with the University.

**"Primary employer"** means the University which as the main employer of a staff member has first call on their services and loyalty in their employment role.

**"Privacy Act 2000"** means the Privacy Amendment (Private Sector) Act 2000.



**"Private practice"** means work of a private nature performed by a staff member with the approval of the University in addition to, and outside of, their contract of employment.

**"Procedurally fair practices"** means practices that are impartially applied free from bias, prejudice or injustice in line with established processes or conventions.

**"Pro-Vice-Chancellor"** means any person holding such a senior academic leadership and management position so designated at the University.

**"Public comment"** means speaking engagements, conference presentations, comments on radio or television and expressing views in letters to newspapers or in books, journals or notices made in the public arena or made where it might be expected that the publication or circulation of the comment will spread to the community at large.

**"Reasonable care"** means that level of attention required as appropriate in a particular set of circumstances.

**"Rector"** means any person appointed to a position so designated at the University.

**"Research"** is as defined in the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans* pp 6-7)

**"Senior managers, line managers and supervisors"** means all Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Rectors, Deans, Directors, Managers, Heads of Schools and nominated supervisors of the University.

**"Students"** means any persons effectively enrolled in any course of study offered by the University.

**"University"** means Australian Catholic University Limited (ABN 15050192660), a company limited by guarantee.

**"University community"** means any person who is either employed/engaged by, assigned to, enrolled at, or involved in the governance of the University.

**"Vice-Chancellor"** means the chief executive officer of Australian Catholic University.

**"Workplace"** means any place where the work of the University is conducted.

## **PART I**

## **CONDUCT FOR THE RESPONSIBLE PRACTICE OF RESEARCH**

### **1.1 General Considerations**

- (a) It is a basic assumption at Australian Catholic University that research staff are committed to high standards of professional conduct. Research workers have a duty to ensure that their work enhances the good name of Australian Catholic University and the discipline to which they belong.
- (b) Research workers should participate only in work which conforms to sound ethical standards and guidelines and which they believe they are competent to perform. They will be familiar with the requirements of the relevant institutional ethics committees and regulatory bodies.
- (c) Both the institution and individual research workers have a responsibility to ensure the safety of all those associated with research. Where appropriate they should seek guidance from the University Occupational Health and Safety Committees.

### **1.2 Data Collection and Storage**

- (a) All original data should be held in an appropriate durable form (for example, paper, electronic or photographic records, etc) by individual researchers for a minimum period of five years after publication or five years following the completion of the research if publication is not intended.
- (b) If data of a confidential nature are obtained, for example from individual patient records or from certain questionnaires, individual confidentiality must be observed and research workers must follow the guidelines laid down by the relevant research ethics committees concerning privacy and confidentiality.
- (c) All original data involving questionnaires, consent forms, surveys, interviews or observations of human participants, research involving animals, ionizing radiation, and recombinant DNA must be stored on University premises. Data associated with research deemed by the University's Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) to be "more than minimum risk" must be retained in accordance with the HREC's Data Retention Procedures, administered by the Research Services unit. All data storage must be in accordance with the University's Retention and Disposal Schedule.
- (d) Individual researchers should be able to hold copies of the data for their own use. Retention solely by the individual researcher provides little protection to the researcher or the institution in the event of an allegation of falsification of data.
- (e) In normal circumstances, research results and methods should be open to scrutiny by colleagues within the University and, through appropriate publication, by the profession at large. Secrecy should be necessary for a limited period in the case of contracted research or in specialized areas where co-operation of subjects will not otherwise be attainable.

- (f) Confidentiality agreements to protect intellectual property rights may be agreed between the institution, the researcher and a sponsor of the research. Where such agreements limit free publication and discussion, limitations and restrictions must be explicitly agreed. It is the obligation of the researcher to enquire whether confidentiality agreements apply and of the Head of School or research unit to inform researchers of their obligations with respect to these provisions. All confidentiality agreements should be made known at an early stage to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International), or nominated representative.
- (g) Researchers are responsible for ensuring appropriate security for any confidential material, including that held in computer systems. Where computing systems are accessible through networks, particular attention to security of confidential data is required. Security and confidentiality must be assured in a way that copes with multiple researchers and the departure of individual researchers.
- (h) In the case of postgraduate research, the student and the supervisor should draw up a signed written statement detailing where the original data are being stored, who should maintain copies of what parts of the data, and what rights of publication each party has during the student's candidature and when the student completes the degree or withdraws from the project. This original signed statement should be held on the Student File held by Research Services; a copy should also be retained in the relevant School(s). (See template attached; available on Research Services Web Site: <http://www.acu.edu.au/research>)

### **1.3 Authorship and Publication**

- (a) Where there is more than one author of a publication, one author (by agreement in writing among the authors) should formally accept overall responsibility for the production and handling of the entire publication.
- (b) In multiple-author papers, the responsible author should keep a record of the contribution made by each author. All authors should keep a record of the location of all data relevant to each publication.
- (c) The criteria for authorship of a publication will of course vary across research units and Schools. The minimum requirement for authorship should be participation in conceiving and/or executing and/or interpreting at least that part of the publication in a co-author's field of expertise, sufficient for him/her to take public responsibility for it.
- (d) All co-authors of a publication must acknowledge their authorship in writing. This signed statement of authorship must specify that the signatories are the only authors according to this definition. It must state that the signatories have seen the version of the paper submitted for publication.
- (e) Such written acknowledgement of authorship must be placed on file in the School or unit of the executive author, at the time of submission of the

research output for publication, and must remain in safe keeping in that School or unit.

- (f) 'Honorary authorship' occurs when a person is listed as an author of a publication when he/she has not participated in a substantial way in conceiving and/or executing and/or interpreting at least part of the work described in the publication. 'Honorary authorship' is an unacceptable practice.
- (g) Due recognition of all participants is a part of a proper research process. Authors should ensure that the work of non-authors, including research assistants and technical officers, is properly acknowledged. Courtesy demands that other individuals and organisations providing facilities should also be acknowledged.

#### **Publications:**

- (h) Publication of multiple papers based on the same set(s) or subset(s) of data is improper unless full cross-referencing occurs. Simultaneous submission of papers based on the same set(s) or subset(s) of data to more than one journal or publisher should be disclosed to each journal or publisher at the time of submission.
- (i) As a general principle research findings should not be reported in the public media before they have been reported to a research audience of experts in the field of research – preferably by publication in a peer-reviewed journal, except where there is contractual arrangement preventing this.
- (j) It is acknowledged that where issues of public policy and concern make prior advice desirable, such advice must be tendered first to the public or professional authorities responsible, and the unreported status of the findings must be advised at the same time. Only where responsible authorities fail to act can prior reporting to the media be justified, and again the unpublished status of the findings must be reported at the same time.
- (k) Publications must include information on the sources of financial support for the research. Financial sponsorship that carries an embargo on naming of the sponsor should be avoided.
- (l) Deliberate inclusion of inaccurate or misleading information relating to research activity in curriculum vitae, grant applications, job applications or public statements, or the failure to provide relevant information, is a form of research misconduct. 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.

#### **1.4 Student/Research Trainee Supervision**

- (a) Good research practice starts early in a researcher's career; undergraduate training in research methods, experimentation and data collection should emphasize the value of scholarly analysis and of obtaining genuine data

(rather than the 'right answer') and the necessity of organized and accurate reporting.

- (b) Supervision of each research student/trainee investigator (including honours, master's, doctoral and newly qualified postdoctoral research workers) should be assigned to a specific, responsible and appropriately qualified research worker in each research unit or School in accord with the University's policy on supervision.
- (c) The ratio of students/trainees to supervisors should be small enough to assure effective scholarly interaction, as well as effective supervision of the research at all stages.
- (d) Research supervisors should advise each trainee of applicable government and institutional guidelines for the conduct of research, including those covering ethical requirements for studies on human or animal subjects, and requirements for students involving potentially hazardous agents and techniques.
- (e) Research supervisors should be primary sources of guidance to research students/trainees in the matter of sound research practice.
- (f) As far as possible, research supervisors should ensure that the work submitted by research students/trainees is their own and that, where there are data, they are valid.

#### **1.4 Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest**

Research workers must disclose (on a confidential basis) any affiliation with, or financial involvement in, or payments or other assistance in kind from, any organisation with direct interest in the subject matter to: the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International) or his/her nominee, to the editors of journals to which papers are submitted, and to bodies from which funds are sought.

#### **1.5 Procedures in the Event of Allegations of Misconduct**

The procedures outlined in Part II of the Code will be followed in the event of any allegation of breach of the Code.

## **PART II            PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH BY ACADEMIC STAFF**

The following procedures are taken from the *AVCC Guidelines for Responsible Practice in Research and Dealing with Problems of Research Misconduct*.

### **2.1     Introduction**

The *Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research* (Part I above) aims to ensure a research environment that minimizes the incidence of misconduct in research. In the event, however, that an allegation of misconduct is made against a staff member, the procedures which follow for dealing with such allegations should ensure that proceedings uphold natural justice principles and are fair.

These procedures (Part II) cover allegations against staff members; allegations against research students/trainees are covered in Part III. The application of these procedures shall not substitute for those applicable to disciplinary action under the relevant provisions of the enterprise agreement and shall serve to inform the Vice-Chancellor of the nature of the misconduct/serious misconduct allegations.

### **2.2     Definition of Misconduct in Research**

*Misconduct in research* includes:

- (a)     The fabrication of data: claiming results where none have been obtained.
- (b)     The falsification of data including changing records.
- (c)     Plagiarism, including the direct copying of textual material, the use of other people's data without acknowledgement and the use of ideas from other people without adequate attribution.
- (d)     Misleading ascription of authorship including 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 acknowledgement of work primarily produced by a research student/trainee or associate.
- (e)     Other practices that seriously deviate from those commonly accepted within the research community for proposing, conducting or reporting research, including but not limited to the following:
  - (1)     Misappropriation – A researcher makes use of any information in breach of any duty of confidentiality associated with the review of any manuscript or grant application.
  - (2)     Misrepresentation – A researcher or reviewer shall not with intent to deceive, or in reckless disregard for the truth,

- (aa) state or present a material or significant falsehood; or
  - (bb) omit a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.
- (f) Intentional infringements of the University's published *Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research* (Part I above.)

Misconduct does not include honest errors or honest differences in interpretation or judgments of data.

The list above is not meant to be all inclusive. There may be other serious misdemeanours. For example, in human or animal ethics, departing from protocols approved by the University's Research Ethics Committee(s), or departing from protocols accepted by a specific discipline, might constitute serious misconduct.

## **2.3 Procedures**

### **2.3.1 Protection of Interested Parties**

Allegations of misconduct in research require careful handling. This may include, where appropriate, having regard to the protection of interested parties.

Interested parties may include:

- ◆ the person making the allegation;
- ◆ the staff member against whom an allegation is made;
- ◆ research students/trainees and staff working with the staff member concerned;
- ◆ journals in which allegedly fraudulent papers have been or are about to be published;
- ◆ funding bodies, which have contributed to the research; and
- ◆ in some cases the public – for example, if a drug, hazardous agent or procedure is involved.

Protection of the parties referred to above will include, where practicable, appropriate confidentiality and reasonable speed in the early stages of an assessment concerning an allegation of misconduct. Of course, in some circumstances, it may not be practicable to maintain confidentiality and some disclosure of information may be required.

### **2.3.2 Receipt and Dealing with Allegations**

- 2.3.2.1 Allegations of misconduct in research may originate from inside the institution, from other institutions, in learned journals or in the press. All allegations, whether from outside the University (for example, from other institutions) or from inside the University (for example, from members of staff or from research students/trainees) should be referred directly to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International).
- 2.3.2.2 Following the receipt of any allegation of misconduct in research, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International) shall determine what steps should be taken to assess how the allegation should be dealt with. In doing so, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International) will have regard to the terms of the enterprise agreement.
- 2.3.2.3 If appropriate, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International) shall determine whether the allegation of misconduct in research should be dealt with as a formal allegation of misconduct, serious misconduct or unsatisfactory performance under the enterprise agreement. If the allegation is not dealt with under the enterprise agreement, it will be dealt with under this policy or perhaps informally. The outcome of these procedures will determine whether the matter be referred to the Vice-Chancellor for disciplinary procedures, or allowed to lapse.
- 2.3.2.4 Depending on all the circumstances, including the allegation of misconduct and the nature of the research activity, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and International) may determine that other individuals or organisations should be informed of the matters relating to the allegation of misconduct including the outcome of the assessment referred to above, and its referral to the Vice-Chancellor.
- 2.3.2.5 If the staff member against whom an allegation of misconduct is made is in receipt of a grant from an external funding body, it may be necessary for the University to advise the secretary of that funding body that an allegation of misconduct has been made after the matter has been referred to the Vice-Chancellor. The funding body could take whatever action it considers appropriate (which may include suspension of funding either temporarily or permanently).
- 2.3.2.6 If disciplinary action is taken against a staff member in accordance with the relevant disciplinary procedures in the enterprise agreement, the University may also notify any relevant publisher(s) and/or sponsoring agency(ies).
- 2.3.2.7 If an external funding body was advised of an allegation of misconduct under paragraph 2.3.2.6 above and the allegation of misconduct has not been proven, then subject to the terms of the enterprise agreement, the external funding body will be advised accordingly.



2.3.2.8 If the allegation of misconduct has been proven and the staff member is in receipt of a current grant from an external funding body or was in receipt of a grant from an external funding body when the misconduct occurred, or is currently an applicant for a grant from an external funding body, then the University may need to provide the secretary of such funding bodies with a full written report of the disciplinary process and outcome.

2.3.2.9 The matters referred to above are not intended to limit in any way the terms of the enterprise agreement. In the event of any inconsistency, the terms of the enterprise agreement shall prevail.

### **2.3.3 Action if the Staff Member Resigns**

If a staff member against whom an allegation of misconduct in research has been made resigns before the procedures in the enterprise agreement have been exhausted, then those procedures will usually cease.

Notwithstanding the resignation of the staff member and the cessation of proceedings under the enterprise agreement, the University may still be obliged to report on the allegation, the status of the research and on any remedial action that may be needed (for example, to protect the interests of those persons listed in Section 2.3.1 above). In addition, it may be necessary to provide a report concerning the allegation, the status of the research and on any remedial action recommended to any external funding bodies that supported the research or the staff member involved.

**PART III      POLICY STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT BY HONOURS  
(OR EQUIVALENT) AND HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH CANDIDATES**

1. Academic misconduct in research, in accordance with the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee *Guidelines for Responsible Practices in Research and Dealing with Problems of Research Misconduct* includes:
  - (a) The fabrication of data: claiming results where none have been obtained.
  - (b) The falsification of data including changing records.
  - (c) Plagiarism, including the direct copying of textual material, the use of other people's data without acknowledgement and the use of ideas from other people without adequate attribution.
  - (d) Misleading ascription of authorship including 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 acknowledgement of work primarily produced by a research student/trainee or associate.
  - (e) Other practices that seriously deviate from those commonly accepted within the research community for proposing, conducting or reporting research, including but not limited to the following:
    - (1) Misappropriation – A researcher makes use of any information in breach of any duty of confidentiality associated with the review of any manuscript or grant application.
    - (2) Misrepresentation – A researcher or reviewer shall not with intent to deceive, or in reckless disregard for the truth,
      - (aa) state or present a material or significant falsehood; or
      - (bb) omit a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.
  - (f) Intentional infringements of the University's published *Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research* (Part I above.)

Misconduct does not include honest errors or honest differences in interpretation or judgments of data.

The list above is not meant to be all inclusive. There may be other serious misdemeanours. For example, in human or animal ethics, departing from protocols approved by the University's Research Ethics Committee(s), or departing from protocols accepted by a specific discipline, might constitute serious misconduct.

2. High standards at all levels in a university are vital to the protection of the academic standing and future employment of its graduates. The reputation and integrity of the University is directly linked to the standards of all its degrees, including those at master and doctoral level.

3. Academic misconduct by higher degree candidates is considered to be an extremely serious offence, which, if proven, may result in a thesis being failed, or a degree being withdrawn.
4. Any evidence of possible academic misconduct by any present or former higher degree candidate should be reported immediately to the Chair of the University Committee responsible for administering the degree in question.
5. On receiving an allegation of misconduct the Chair of the Committee shall immediately inform the Committee, and the Vice-Chancellor.
6. The allegation shall be investigated as quickly as possible.
7. The person making the allegation shall be invited by the Chair of the Committee to provide the available evidence, and the Chair shall bring the evidence directly to the Committee.
8. If the Committee decides that a *prima facie* case of misconduct exists, the Committee shall:
  - (a) determine and initiate an appropriate procedure for ascertaining whether an act of misconduct has taken place. The Committee may seek expert advice from outside the University, and
  - (b) inform the Supervisor(s) that an allegation has been made and ask him or her to provide preliminary comments on the matter, and
  - (c) inform the person against whom the allegation has been made and ask him or her to respond to the allegation if he or she so wishes.
9. If the Committee decides that there is a *prima facie* case to be answered, the Committee shall advise the person against whom the allegation has been made of the case against him or her, and invite the person to comment on it in writing.
10. In the course of its deliberations the Committee shall ensure that the interests of all parties are protected as far as possible.
11. At all stages of the investigation the Committee shall seek the advice of a University Solicitor concerning the protection of all interested parties.
12. Interested parties may include:
  - ◆ the person making the allegation;
  - ◆ the person bringing the allegation to the attention of the University;
  - ◆ the person against whom the allegation has been made;
  - ◆ other research students/trainees and staff working with the person concerned;
  - ◆ the supervisor(s) of the candidate;
  - ◆ journals in which allegedly fraudulent papers have been or are about to be published;
  - ◆ funding organisations or industry partners which have contributed to the research;
  - ◆ the public and, where appropriate, research participants;
  - ◆ the University.

13. Deliberations will be conducted observing strict confidentiality. If disclosure of confidential information is required, this shall be done only with the approval of the Vice-Chancellor on the advice of the Committee.
14. The Committee shall provide the Academic Board with a full report and recommendations (if any) on the matter as soon as the investigation has been concluded.

AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY  
University Research and Research Training Management Committee

**PROFORMA STATEMENT ON RETENTION AND STORAGE OF PRIMARY DATA FOR HONOURS  
(OR EQUIVALENT) AND HIGHER DEGREE RESEARCH THESES**

Student ID No:		
Candidate's Surname:		
Other Names:		
Contact Address:		
Telephone No:		Facsimile No:
Email Address:		
Supervisor(s) Name(s)		
School:		
Campus:		
Degree:		
<b>Where primary data are being retained (place and address):</b>		
Contact Person:		
Address:		
Telephone:		
<b>All persons who hold copies of the primary data:</b>		
Name & Contact Details	Name & Contact Details	
<b>Publication rights:</b>		
1. Outline the publication rights of the student during candidature:		
2. Outline the publication rights of the student upon leaving the University:		
3. Outline the publication rights of the supervisor(s) during the student's candidature:		
4. Outline the publication rights of the supervisor(s) after the student leaves the University:		
Student Signature & Date:		
Principal Supervisor's Signature & Date:		

This proforma must be lodged with Research Services when a thesis is submitted for examination.