

University Research Committee

Appendices to the Research and Professional Doctorate Degree Regulations

Contents

Appendix A: Higher Degree Supervision Policy

Appendix B: Policy on the Preparation and Presentation of a Research or Professional Doctoral Thesis
for Examination

Appendix C: Policy on the Appointment of Examiners and the Conduct of the Examination Process

Appendix D: Standards of Scholarly Integrity

Appendix E: Code of Conduct for Research

Appendix F: Research Ethics

Appendix G: Research Data Retention Policy and Guidelines

Appendix H: Intellectual Property Policy

Appendix I: Policy On The Provision Of Physical Facilities And Resources For Research

Appendix A: Higher Degree Supervision Policy

1. Qualifications of Supervisors

- 1.1 The University Research Committee (URC) requires that the principal supervisor of a Master's candidate hold at least a Master's degree or equivalent academic qualifications and/or has an appropriate record of scholarly publications
- 1.2 The URC requires that a principal supervisor of a doctoral candidate hold a Doctorate and/or has an appropriate record of scholarly publications
- 1.3 The URC requires that supervisors of master and doctoral degree candidates:
 - (a) be experienced in research and/or in the supervision of research at higher degree level
 - (b) have relevant knowledge and expertise in the nominated topic area
 - (c) have sufficient time and access to adequate resources, taking account of total work load including the supervision of other higher degree candidates.
- 1.4 Any departure from these criteria must be justified primarily on scholarly grounds.

2. Principal Supervisors

- 2.1 Subject to the approval of the URC, the following categories of staff who are otherwise appropriately qualified may act as principal supervisors of research master's and professional doctorate degree candidates:
 - (a) any staff member holding a continuing academic appointment or an appropriate contractual academic appointment
 - (b) any staff member holding a research appointment, provided that the duration of such research appointment is appropriate
 - (c) Any staff member holding a professional appointment whose professional activities relate significantly to research.
- 2.2 If the principal supervisor is a member of a University Research Centre or Institute and not an academic member of an academic School of Australian Catholic University, a co-supervisor should be appointed from the Faculty accepting the enrolment.

3. Associate Supervisors

- 3.1 The principal supervisor may be assisted by other members of the University staff (who may be co-supervisors) or by outside specialists (who may be appointed as associate supervisors). The candidate may be referred for advice to other staff in the University or elsewhere.
- 3.2 In all cases the principal supervisor remains responsible for directing the candidate's academic work, for ensuring that the candidate submits reports, and meets other administrative responsibilities.

4. Responsibilities of the Principal Supervisors

- 4.1 Before the applicant is accepted as a candidate:

- (a) To examine a brief (approximately 300-500 words) written research proposal provided by the applicant. (This proposal in original or amended form should be accompanied by the Application for Admission as a Higher Degree candidate before the application is lodged with Research Services.)
- (b) To advise the Associate Dean whether the applicant's interests fall within the supervisor's current interests and/or research program, experience and knowledge and whether the applicant appreciates that there may be a need to consult others on some aspects of the research.
- (c) To advise the Associate Dean whether the applicant's qualifications and/or prior research experience indicate capacity to complete a Master's degree in one and a half (1.5) to two (2) years as a full-time student (or part-time equivalent) or a PhD Degree within three (3) to four (4) years as a full-time student (or part-time equivalent), or a DPsych Degree within three (3) years as a full-time student (or part-time equivalent) or an EdD student within three years as a full time student or six years part-time, and in either case justify admission.
- (d) To advise the Associate Dean on the resources likely to be necessary for the project (e.g. library, computing, laboratory, technical assistance, maintenance funds) and whether acceptance of the candidate should be conditional on the guaranteed provision of such resources.
- (e) To advise the Associate Dean how, over a candidature of normal length, the candidate could continue to receive proper supervision in the absence of a supervisor (e.g. during an Outside Studies Program or period of leave greater than three months).
- (f) To inform the Associate Dean of the number of higher degree candidates already being supervised by the proposed supervisor and whether adequate supervision can be given to the extra candidate.

4.2 In the first semester of candidature:

- (a) To inform the candidate at the beginning of candidature that research involving contact with human participants (including interviews, use of survey instruments or questionnaires, audio/video taping of participants, or access to an individual's files or records) may not commence until ethical clearance has been obtained in writing from the University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC).
- (b) To inform the candidate that research involving animals, recombinant DNA or ionizing radiation must also be approved by the University Ethics or Safety Committee before commencing work on the project.
- (c) To assist the candidate to develop a realistic program of study (including the preparation of a mutually agreed timetable for completing the degree requirements within the maximum period of candidature) and research on a topic that offers sufficient scope for research training, is likely to prove an intellectually rewarding investigation, and could be expected to produce sufficient results for submission of an acceptable thesis within the time laid down by the URC. The program of study should be designed with the need to obtain ethical clearance in mind if human, animal or recombinant DNA experimentation is involved.
- (d) To ensure that the field and topic will not be unduly constrained by requirements of confidentiality or questions of possible defamation.
- (e) To suggest appropriate background reading and to advise on the literature review.
- (f) To arrange with the candidate mutually acceptable set times of appropriate frequency for formal discussions on assigned reading, criticism of written work, development of experimental procedures or other data gathering and to provide

constructive evaluation of the work submitted. In the research design and data gathering stages of candidature, supervisory meetings may be held weekly but never less than once a fortnight. In later stages of candidature, meetings may be once a fortnight and never less than once a month.

- (g) To direct the candidate to take approved courses relevant to the research degree program being undertaken if this is required by gaps in the candidate's background or by the nature of the program.
- (h) To arrange an oral presentation of completed work to staff and other advanced students and so to develop the candidate's skill in dealing with penetrating questions.
- (i) To give any additional assistance needed by overseas students, especially in respect of advice on problems with language.
- (j) To ensure that the candidate is familiar with the relevant rules and policies of the University, with the administrative requirements (e.g. submission of half-yearly reports by the due date), and with the University facilities likely to be of assistance.
- (k) To agree with the candidate on the structure and nature of the thesis.
- (l) To ensure that the co-supervisor(s) are consulted on mutually convenient times to meet with the candidate.

4.3 During the second and subsequent semesters after commencement:

- (a) To insist on seeing drafts of the major sections of the thesis as they are prepared and to return these to the candidate with reasonable expedition.
- (b) To advise the candidate when an open-ended project has proceeded far enough and to assist the candidate to complete the thesis.
- (c) To refer some, but not necessarily all, sections of the thesis to any associate supervisor or to specialist consultants, if appropriate.
- (d) To ensure that the thesis is not unnecessarily long and that it does not exceed the suggested maximum of 50,000 words in the case of a research master thesis or a Doctor of Education dissertation, or in the case of Doctor of Philosophy Degree the maximum of 100,000 words in the case of the PhD Degree.
- (e) To comment critically on the final draft of the completed thesis before it is submitted to examiners.
- (f) To give the candidate the opportunity to list any persons who should not be appointed as examiners and the reason for such objections and to advise the Dean regarding such objections.
- (g) To ascertain the availability of potential examiners and their willingness for their names to be put forward to the URC. It should be made clear to potential examiners that their name is one of many names being put forward for consideration and that this informal approach does not mean that the University will definitely invite them to serve as an examiner. Potential examiners should be informed of the thesis title, a short summary and the approximate date of submission. They should also be asked if they could submit their report within six to eight weeks at doctoral level or three to four weeks at Master's level, if they were invited. If a potential examiner is not able to submit a report within this reasonable period, alternative examiners should be considered. No further communication on this matter should be entered into by the supervisor and the potential examiner. All communication on the examination process must be via the URC.

- (h) To discuss possible examiners with the Dean before the Dean nominates examiners.

4.4 For PhD Candidates during Semesters three to five of Candidature:

- (a) To arrange mutually acceptable set times with the candidate for formal discussions of the work.
- (b) To arrange each semester for an oral presentation of completed work to staff and other advanced students and so to develop the candidate's skill in dealing with penetrating questions.
- (c) To encourage, when appropriate, the preparation of draft sections of the thesis and of other material for presentation at conferences or through publication.
- (d) To agree with the candidate on the structure and nature of the thesis.

5. Other responsibilities

- 5.1 To report to the Dean and to the URC as required on the candidate's progress and to ensure that the candidate supplies the required reports and other information by prescribed dates.
- 5.2 To ensure that ethical clearances are obtained as soon as possible and that contact with human participants and/or animals, or work involving recombinant DNA or ionizing radiation is not commenced before any necessary ethical clearance is obtained.
- 5.3 To allow the candidate to read the comments in the annual report on academic progress and to allow the candidate the opportunity to attach a reply to any adverse comment.

6. Variations in respect of part-time candidates

- 6.1 Before agreeing to act, the supervisor should determine:
 - (a) That the candidate can attend for discussions at mutually convenient times of appropriate frequency.
 - (b) That the candidate's past record and present circumstances suggest the ability to present an acceptable thesis in the time determined by the URC.

The principal supervisor should be convinced that a part-time applicant has the time available (in the light of other commitments), and the necessary persistence and ability (possibly demonstrated by substantial independent research and publication), to undertake part-time candidature with a reasonable expectation of success.

- 6.2 In general, except for differences in time, the points in paragraphs 1 to 4 apply.

7 Supervision of Postgraduate Research Students by Staff on Leave Greater Than three Months

- 7.1 In accordance with the Research and Professional Doctorate Degree Regulation, academic staff with responsibilities for postgraduate supervision shall ensure that continuity of such supervision can be maintained when applying for leave from the University for periods greater than three months, e.g. an Outside Studies Program, Long Service Leave or Sick Leave.
- 7.2 Academic staff who apply for leave greater than three months shall as part of the application process, complete and submit a proforma indicating how continuity of supervision will be maintained.

- 7.3 The Head of School and the Associate Dean shall include as part of their recommendation, advice on how continuity of postgraduate supervision can be maintained while the person is on leave and what alternative arrangements are appropriate.
- 7.4 If the application for leave is approved, the Head of School will notify Research Services. The Head of School will negotiate with the supervisor to ensure continuity of supervision.

Appendix B: Policy on the Preparation and Presentation of a Research or Professional Doctoral Thesis for Examination

1. Preparation

- 1.1 It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that the format of the thesis meets the requirements and directions for presenting theses set out below. A thesis which does not meet those requirements may be returned to the candidate before being submitted to the examiners and it may be necessary for the thesis to be retyped and/or rebound. If there are special reasons which justify a departure from the specified format, official approval should be obtained from the Dean and the URC before preparation of typescript and/or diagrams is begun. The candidate should also be aware of the potential implications for publication of the thesis, of entering into a confidentiality agreement or of including potentially defamatory material.
- 1.2 The thesis should not be unnecessarily long. Although length may vary according to the topic and the discipline, in the case of the PhD degree the thesis is expected to be no more than 400 pages or 100,000 words. In the case of professional doctorates, such as the EdD, the length shall not normally be more than 70,000 words. In the case of the Master of Philosophy degree the thesis is expected to be no more than 200 pages or 50,000 words. A professional master's thesis may vary in length between 35,000 and 50,000 words. The maximum word limit for all theses shall include appendices such as maps and diagrams but not bibliography or references. The candidate should consult the principal supervisor on the appropriate length of the thesis.
- 1.3 Because a thesis must have continuity in format and in content, relevant published materials should normally be submitted as supporting papers with the thesis. Such materials as a whole or in part may also be incorporated in typescript in the thesis, if they form an integral part of the thesis. Where published materials are incorporated in the thesis, they must be edited and updated to eliminate repetition and inconsistency and to ensure continuity in form and content.
- 1.4 It is also the responsibility of the candidate to submit drafts of the major sections of the thesis to the supervisor and to discuss them with the supervisor during the program. The candidate is also required to submit a final draft of the thesis to the supervisor for advice and comment before the thesis itself is bound.
- 1.5 The thesis in a scientific field should provide sufficient information to enable an external examiner to appreciate that the investigation has been conducted with a high level of technical skill, that the candidate is familiar with and has employed (if relevant) the most suitable statistical techniques and that the procedures are clearly of higher degree research standard.
- 1.6 It should be made clear in the thesis which part of the work has actually been performed by the candidate and in which cases the results obtained by another person have been analysed and used.
- 1.7 There should be an appropriate balance between the different parts of the thesis. In particular, the original contribution to knowledge should be clearly distinguishable from the introductory material and the survey of the literature.

2. Presentation

- 2.1 Before submitting the thesis the candidate should ensure that:
 - (a) all typing errors have been corrected

- (b) spelling, grammar, punctuation and choice of language are worthy of a higher degree by research thesis
 - (c) the bibliography is thorough and exact.
- 2.2 The thesis should be word processed and must be printed on 1 side of the paper in not less than 1.5 line spacing on international size A4 paper (297 mm x 210 mm) or a standard size as close to this as possible. The copies must be reproduced by a good reprographic process on one side of the paper only.
- 2.3 The inside margin must be 3cm wide and the top, bottom and outside margins at least 2cm wide to allow for trimming by the binder.

3. Binding

- 3.1 At the time of submission for examination, **three bound copies and one electronic copy of the thesis** are to be submitted to Research Services.
- 3.2 The binding should be stitched or similarly bound to a standard that is suitable for postage.
- 3.3 Following examination and prior to the award of the degree, a candidate shall cause **one acid free copy and two digital** copies of the thesis, including any corrections, to be bound in a permanent form and presented to the University. The electronic copies shall use PDF File Format on a **read only CD-R Rom** (not CD-RW, which are rewritable).
- 3.4 A permanent binding shall consist of a full cloth stiff cover. The candidate's surname and initials and a short title shall be printed on the spine and front cover in gold lettering. A date should not be added. Lettering on the spine should be along the spine from top to bottom.
- 3.5 After the examination and final acceptance of the thesis, the acid-free bound copy and the digital copy will be lodged with Research Services to deposit in the Melbourne Campus library. The acid free copy will be the archive copy and shall not be available on loan. The thesis will be available electronically on the library website.
- 3.6 A candidate shall provide a copy of the corrected thesis directly to the Principal Supervisor and to the School of the Principal Supervisor.

4. Thesis Title

There is no requirement for formal approval of the final thesis title. It is assumed that the final thesis title will be selected after discussion with the principal supervisor.

5. Order and Format of Contents

- 5.1 The thesis must be preceded by a title page, which should show: the title in full; the full name and degrees of the candidate; the School in which the candidate submitted the work; the degree for which the thesis is submitted; the name and address of the University Research Services Office; and the date of submission of the thesis.
- 5.2 The title page should be followed by a signed *Statement of Authorship and Sources*, in the following words:

This thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No parts of this thesis have been submitted towards the award of any other degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

All research procedures reported in the thesis received the approval of the relevant Ethics/Safety Committees (where required).

Further paragraphs shall be included in the *Statement of Authorship and Sources* if **applicable**, specifying:

- (a) the extent of collaboration with another person or persons
 - (b) the extent and the nature of any other assistance (e.g. statistical analysis, computer programming, editorial writing) received in the pursuit of the research and preparation of the thesis,
- 5.3 Immediately following the *Statement of Authorship and Sources*, the abstract, a Statement of Appreciation or Dedication (if desired by the candidate), the Table of Contents, a list of all illustrations and diagrams, the main text, the appendices and the bibliography should follow
- 5.4 A list of additional publications by the candidate on matters relevant to the thesis may be shown immediately following the abstract or as an appendix.
- 5.5 The abstract, summarising under the appropriate headings the aims, scope and conclusions of the thesis, should not normally exceed 700 words. Statements of acknowledgement of professional assistance with interpretation of data, use of statistics, or translations of texts from or into foreign languages should be included.
- 5.6 Notes in the text, where used, should be presented consistently so that they are easily accessible to a reader. Individual schools and/or disciplines may specify a particular approach to notation, appropriate to their discipline.

6. Diagrams and Figures

- 6.1 Full-page diagrams or illustrations should appear at the first opportunity after reference to them in the text. The legend for such a diagram should be below it; i.e., the diagram (or illustration) plus legend should not exceed a full page. Alternatively, figures, diagrams, etc., may be placed on the left-hand side facing the relevant right-hand page of text. If for the sake of clarity, a diagram or illustration is of such a size that the accompanying legend requires a separate page the diagram should appear on the left-hand side immediately following reference to it, with the legend on the right-hand side, opposite it.
- 6.2 Technical advice may be required concerning the advisability of reproducing typescript on the reverse of full-page diagrams, photographs, etc., in case the printing 'shows through'.
- 6.3 Smaller diagrams should be incorporated in the text. There should be a list of all diagrams and illustrations after the table of contents. (Note: If illustrations and diagrams are fewer than ten in number, they need not be listed).
- 6.4 Except with the permission of the appropriate Dean, diagrams, maps and tables exceeding normal-page size should be folded so that, when opened out, they can be easily read while the thesis is open at the appropriate page of text. This means that there should be a left-hand margin of approximately 22mm for each one. Such materials should be bound at the back of the thesis.
- 6.5 All diagrams etc must be reproduced by an electrostatic or photographic process which is known not to fade.

- 6.6 Full-page photographs should be properly bound into the thesis. Smaller photographs must be firmly fixed to the page.
- 6.7 In special circumstances, for example in a case where a thesis includes a large number of photographs or electron micrographs which are cited at various places in the text, they may, with the permission of the Dean, be bound into a separate volume.

7. Bibliographic Citation

7.1 Style of Citation

- (a) All sources from which information has been derived, sources of quotations, and authorities for statements of fact and opinion must be clearly, concisely and accurately cited in any scholarly work.
- (b) There are no standard rules for the citation of references; however, some schools may prescribe a style appropriate to a particular discipline. Bibliographic style should be established early in the preparation of a thesis, otherwise a great deal of time-consuming work is required at the time of preparation of the final manuscript. The reference list below indicates work which will assist the candidate in selecting an appropriate style, if none has been prescribed by the relevant school. Candidates should also be guided in their treatment of references by accepted library practice or the advice of their principal supervisor or the reference librarian. **It is essential that the style adopted is followed consistently.**

7.2 Content of Citation

- (a) For books, the minimum citation must include author(s), title, edition (if other than first), place of publication, publisher, date of publication and relevant pages. For periodical articles the citation must give at least author(s), title of article, name of periodical, volume number, part number (if volume is not paginated continuously), date of publication and relevant pages. In certain subjects more detailed citation may be required, and candidates should consult their principal supervisor on this matter.

7.3 Content of Bibliography

A candidate must cite in the bibliography all sources from which information is derived and all works quoted or referred to in the text or notes to the text.

8. Abbreviations

- 8.1 If the full titles of periodicals and other serials are not used, abbreviations should normally be those used in the *World List of Scientific Periodicals*, (see URL: <http://alice.library.ohiou.edu/search/o?SEARCH=556109>) or the *Bibliographic Guide for Editors and Authors* (Washington, D.C.: American Chemical Society, 1974) or the *International List of Periodical Title Word Abbreviations* (ISO 833-1974).

9. Reference List

- 9.1 *The Columbia Guide to Online Style* by Janice R. Walker and Todd Taylor (Columbia UP, 1998) presents a guide to locating, translating, and using the elements of citation for both a humanities style (i.e., *MLA* and *Chicago*) and a scientific style (*APA* and *CBE*) for electronically-accessed sources.
- 9.2 For a guide on the citation guide in the humanities, see *A Brief Citation Guide for Internet Sources in History and the Humanities* (<http://www2.hivolda.no/asf/kkf/citation.html>).

- 9.3 *The Chicago Manual of Style for Authors, Editors and Copywriters*. 15th edition rev. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- 9.4 *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. 6th edition. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2003.
- 9.5 *Publication Manual*. 5th edition. Arlington, Va: American Psychological Association, 2001..
- 9.6 *CBE Style Manual*. 6th edition. Bethesda, Md: Council of Biology Editors, 1994.
- 9.7 *American National Standard for Bibliographical References ANSI Z39.29-1977* New York: American National Standards Institute, 1977.
- 9.8 *Style Manual for Authors, Editors and Printers of Australian Government Publications*. 6th edition. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 2002.
- 9.9 *General Notes on the Preparation of Scientific Papers*. 3rd Edition. London: Royal Society of London, 1974.

10. Corrections

Corrections inserted after the examination should be made neatly in the text and in such a way that they will not interfere with the legibility of the volume. If corrections are likely to be obtrusive or confusing the relevant section should be retyped.

11. Availability of copies of theses in the Library

- 11.1 While the copyright of theses remains with the respective authors, graduands are strongly encouraged to publish their research findings and to agree to access to their theses by scholars and researchers, in the collegial spirit of university research.
- 11.2 After the thesis has been passed by the URC, the author shall be asked by the URC to consent in writing on forms provided for the thesis to become available for publication on the internet. As soon as that consent is received the Library shall make the theses available for these purposes.
- 11.3 If the author declines to consent the thesis shall in any case become available for perusal, loan or photocopying in the Library three years after the award of the degree
- 11.4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the sub-paragraphs above, the URC may in exceptional circumstances determine that a thesis be withheld from general availability in whole or in part for a period not exceeding 30 years after the award of the degree. In such a case the thesis or any of its parts as the case may be shall only be made available with the permission of the Director, Libraries or on conditions specified by the Director, Libraries after consultation with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research).

Appendix C:

Policy on the Appointment of Examiners and the Conduct of the Examination Process

1. A candidate's research project shall be examined by the submission and assessment of a thesis based on that research. Oral and written examinations, or both, related to such assessment, may be required by the University Research Committee (URC) on the recommendation of the examiners.
2. A candidate shall be given an opportunity by the principal supervisor to discuss the suitability of potential examiners. A candidate may neither demand nor reject the appointment of any particular examiner, but may offer reasons for inclusion or exclusion of potential examiners for consideration by the supervisor. A candidate may not either demand or reject the appointment of any particular examiner. It will be made quite clear to a candidate that there must be no contact between the candidate and the examiners during the examination period. Such contact may result in the URC appointing a replacement examiner.
3. For all research higher degrees, the principal supervisor shall provide to the Head of School and the Associate Dean (Research) of the relevant Faculty the names of at least three people who have agreed, in principle, to serve as examiners. The first two will be invited and the third used as a reserve.
4. For the research doctorate, examiners shall normally be external to the University and at least one shall come from outside Australia. For the master's degrees, at least one examiner shall normally be external to the University. A supervisor may not be appointed as an examiner.
5. Reports of examiners
Each examiner shall submit a report on the thesis, and shall recommend one of the following results:
 - A. Pass. The thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without amendment or further examination.
 - B. Pass subject to minor amendments. The thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy without further examination but **subject to** the amendments detailed in this report being successfully completed.
 - C. Pass conditional on major amendments. The thesis should be classified as PASSED and the candidate awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy only after the **substantive** amendments detailed in this report are successfully completed.
 - D. Defer. The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months (F/T) to revise and re-submit the thesis for examination.
 - *I am willing to be involved in the re-examination process; or*
 - *I do not wish to be involved in the re-examination process.*
 - E. Fail. The thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, nor can the thesis be re-submitted for examination.

Other options:

- Pass (*Summa Cum Laude*). The thesis is of outstanding merit, in the top 5%.
- Awarded a minor degree. The thesis is not of Doctor of Philosophy standard but the lesser degree of the Master of Philosophy may be awarded. (My report has indicated the changes necessary for the achievement of a satisfactory Master of Philosophy degree).

6. The Associate Dean (Research) may, with the approval of the examiners, arrange for the candidate to be examined by oral or written examination, set by the examiners of the thesis. The candidate's written answers to any such examination will be sent to the examiners for comment. A candidate's answers to any such oral or written examination shall be taken into account by the examiners in their final assessment and recommendation.

7. After considering examiners' reports where both examiners have identified category A, B or C, the Associate Dean (Research) as a representative of the Research Training Standing Committee (RTSC) will recommend a course of action in accordance with the following procedures.

1. Pass: The student is expected to make the identified typographical changes which will be signed off by the supervisor.
2. Pass with minor amendments: The student is expected to make the minor amendments identified by the examiners and these will be signed off by the supervisor and the Associate Dean of the faculty in which the student is studying.
3. Pass with substantive amendments. The student will forward an amended copy of the thesis to an independent assessor nominated by the Head of School (or nominee). The report will be forwarded to the Associate Dean of the faculty (via the Research Office) who will approve the amendments if satisfactory or recommend further discussion at the next RTSC meeting.

NB: The awarding of the thesis as a *Summa Cum Laude* will be made only if both examiners have identified that category.

8. If there is a discrepancy between the two examiners, where the result is not clear, or where the result is likely to be other than a PASS, the matter will be referred to the next RTSC meeting.

Anonymous reports will be sent to all members of the committee. Reports will also be sent to the supervisors who will be invited to take part in the discussion.

The Committee will choose one of the options below. Once the overall result is determined, the student will be notified.

1. Pass with substantive amendments. The student will forward an amended copy of the thesis to an independent assessor nominated by the Head of School (or nominee). The report will be forwarded to the Associate Dean of the faculty (via the Research Office) who will approve the amendments if satisfactory or recommend further discussion at the next RTSC meeting.
2. Send thesis to third examiner.
3. Defer. The thesis should be classified as DEFERRED and the candidate be given up to twelve months (F/T) to revise and re-submit the thesis for examination by the deferring examiner(s).

The options open to the deferring examiner(s) will be PASS or FAIL. If the deferring examiner is not able to re-examine the thesis, a new examiner will be invited. He/she will be invited to approve the guidelines for re-writing, drawn up by the supervisors, before undertaking the task.

4. Fail. The thesis should be classified as FAILED and the candidate should not be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, nor can the thesis be re-submitted for examination.

The Principal Supervisor, Head of School and Associate Dean of the Faculty will decide the best course of action for communicating the news to the candidate. The candidate will also be given the information about any appropriate appeal process noting that an appeal against a failed thesis can only be made on procedural grounds

5. Award of a Master's Degree. (For PhD candidates only) The thesis cannot be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy but the lesser degree of the Master of Philosophy may be awarded.

This option must only be taken if at least one examiner has ticked this box and has outlined in his/her report the necessary amendments needed to achieve the standard of Master of Philosophy.

Appendix D: Standards of Scholarly Integrity

Practices used in preparing reports vary among the many disciplines of the University; but whatever their form, integrity in carefully recording the sources of ideas attributed to others is, like training in methodology and techniques, an integral part of training in research. Integrity applies to all courses, Schools and disciplines.

1. Confidentiality of Data

In some disciplines, particularly in the social sciences, education and health fields, the research worker must obtain the consent of individuals to gather and record data or to access data concerning them. Those who have made the research possible must be protected from inconvenience or embarrassment through the release of personal information. The confidentiality of the individual records must be protected during and after the study and anonymity must be preserved in the publication of results. When data are stored in computers, arrangements should be made to prevent unauthorised access to the files.

Candidates undertaking research with human participants, animals, recombinant DNA or ionizing radiation are required to have ethical aspects of their project considered by the supervisor and Dean and approved by the University Research Projects Ethics Committee before commencing work on the project.

2. Ethical Standards to be followed

Scholars are expected to develop a pervasive attitude of intellectual honesty. Except where access to data has been provided on the basis that confidentiality will be maintained and that publication of results will be restricted, the high standards expected include a willingness to make results available to others for evaluation and review and the avoidance of any conflict of interest. In the interest of maintaining quality, premature publication should be avoided. In scientific laboratories there will normally be written, detailed and explicit procedures for gathering, storage and analysis of data so that results can, when necessary, be checked by others.

Generosity in recognising the accomplishments of one's predecessors, co-workers and research assistants is an important component of integrity. This is achieved by appropriate citation of the contributions of others in any report or publication. Failure to acknowledge adequately the work of others is a form of plagiarism. At times students will make material they have produced available to staff members: for example, when supervisors are asked for advice. In such cases staff members should take care not to use the material for any purpose other than the one for which they have received it. At other times, data will be produced by one member of a research team for which it will normally be the case that other members of the team will also be free to use the data. In every case, appropriate acknowledgment for the work of others must be made.

3. Cheating

Cheating is a form of deceit with a view to gaining an advantage. Research workers who cheat usually do so by plagiarism, and falsification, and deliberate misinterpretations of data.

4. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as reproduction and presentation of the work of others without acknowledgment. It is the attempt by an individual to receive credit for the ideas or language of others. A major form of plagiarism occurs when a substantial segment of another's work is reproduced without acknowledgment. Lesser levels of plagiarism occur through presenting as novel the ideas of others but paraphrasing the words used in the original text.

Examples of plagiarism have been given by Brian Martin in the October 1984 issue of the Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration. These include:

'word-for-word' - this usually occurs through taking whole paragraphs, pages or even chapters, either published by others or given a more limited circulation through typewritten drafts or mimeographed material circulated to a limited few. In course work this often occurs when an assignment submitted by a student in an earlier year is resubmitted by another student.

'paraphrasing plagiarism' - may involve the presentation of generalisations on the work of a classic author drawn from an unacknowledged secondary source. This gives the impression that the researcher has examined the original work and has derived new interpretations of it.

Nevertheless, it is not always easy to distinguish between plagiarism of an individual's work and drawing on the common stock of knowledge.

In all academic work, and especially in a thesis, it is important to cite the sources from which ideas have been drawn. Martin comments on the significance of plagiarism as follows -

.....The significance of plagiarism can vary widely depending on its extent, strategic location, and the context in which it occurs. An isolated instance of plagiarism - one sentence or paragraph, for example - would not usually be cause for concern, whereas a paper copied almost verbatim would be considered a gross violation of academic norms. Strategic location refers to centrality in an academic presentation. Plagiarism in crucial points of argumentation is more serious than in a largely extraneous literature review. Finally, the overall context of plagiarism must be considered: the nature of the contribution, scholarly or otherwise..... (1Martin, p.185).

Each candidate is required to include in the thesis a signed statement that the work is original 'except as acknowledged in the text'. The full statement is contained in the section of these regulations concerning the preparation and presentation of the thesis

5. Research Fraud

The most common forms of fraud in research are falsification and misrepresentation of data. In some cases the fraud is not detected at the time but later, and in such cases any degree awarded is revoked, and the consequences for career and reputation are severe. The dangers of falsification of data are well expressed in this quotation:

Since scientific advances depend on accurate collection, analysis and reporting of information, dishonest reporting misleads others and results in a waste of resources, both human and monetary. If practiced in clinical research, falsification could even be directly dangerous to humans. Falsification of data ranges from fabrication to selective reporting, including the omission of conflicting data (*Association of American Universities*, p.1).

Note: The compilers of these standards acknowledge a general debt to the provisions of the University of Queensland Doctor of Philosophy Regulations.

¹ Brian Martin: 'Plagiarism and Responsibility', Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration. 16(2) October 1984

Appendix E: 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.

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 One 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 Two. 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 One: Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research

General Considerations

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.

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.

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.

Data Collection and Storage

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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), or nominated representative.

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.

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>)

Authorship and Publication

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

'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.

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:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Student/Research Trainee Supervision

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.

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.

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.

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.

Research supervisors should be primary sources of guidance to research students/trainees in the matter of sound research practice.

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.

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) or his/her nominee, to the editors of journals to which papers are submitted, and to bodies from which funds are sought.

Procedures in the Event of Allegations of Misconduct

The procedures outlined in part two of the code will be followed in the event of any allegation of breach of the Code.

Part Two: 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*.

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. Definition of Misconduct in Research

Misconduct in research includes:

- The fabrication of data: claiming results where none have been obtained.
- The falsification of data including changing records.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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:
 - 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.
 - Misrepresentation – A researcher or reviewer shall not with intent to deceive, or in reckless disregard for the truth,
 - State or present a material or significant falsehood.
 - Omit a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.

- An intentional infringement of the University's published *Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research* (Part One 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, or departing from protocols accepted by a specific discipline, might constitute serious misconduct.

3. Procedures

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. These may include:

- (a) the staff member against whom an allegation is made
- (b) the person making the allegation
- (c) research students/trainees and staff working with the staff member concerned
- (d) journals in which allegedly fraudulent papers have been or are about to be published
- (e) funding bodies, which have contributed to the research;
- (f) 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.

3.2 Receipt and Dealing with Allegations

- 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).
- 3.2.2 Following the receipt of any allegation of misconduct in research, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) shall determine what steps should be taken to assess how the allegation should be dealt with. In doing so, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) will have regard to the terms of the enterprise agreement.

- 3.2.3 If appropriate, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) 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.
 - 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) 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.
 - 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).
 - 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).
 - 3.2.7 If an external funding body was advised of an allegation of misconduct under paragraph 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
- 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 Three: Policy Statement on Academic Misconduct by Honours (or Equivalent) and Higher Degree Research Candidates

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:

- The fabrication of data: claiming results where none have been obtained.
- The falsification of data including changing records.

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.

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.

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:

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.

Misrepresentation – A researcher or reviewer shall not with intent to deceive, or in reckless disregard for the truth, state or present a material or significant falsehood; or omit a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.

Intentional infringements of the University's published *Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research* (Part One 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.

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.

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.

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.

On receiving an allegation of misconduct the Chair of the Committee shall immediately inform the Committee, and the Vice-Chancellor.

The allegation shall be investigated as quickly as possible.

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.

If the Committee decides that a *prima facie* case of misconduct exists, the Committee shall:

- 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
- inform the Supervisor(s) that an allegation has been made and ask him or her to provide preliminary comments on the matter, and
- 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.

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.

In the course of its deliberations the Committee shall ensure that the interests of all parties are protected as far as possible.

At all stages of the investigation the Committee shall seek the advice of a University Solicitor concerning the protection of all interested parties.

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.

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.

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 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		
School:		
Campus:		
Degree:		
Where primary data are being retained (place and address):		
Contact Person:		
Address:		
Telephone:		
All persons who hold copies of the primary data:		
Name & Contact Details	Name & Contact Details	Name & Contact Details
Publication rights:		
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.

Appendix F:
Research Ethics

Students intending to undertake research involving human participants should refer to the Research Ethics section of the ACU Research website.

Appendix G: Research Data Retention Policy and Guidelines

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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), or nominated representative.
7. 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.
8. 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>)

Appendix H:
Intellectual Property Policy

Students should refer to the University's Intellectual Property Policy, available on the Human Resources website, under Policies and Procedures.

Appendix I: Policy On The Provision Of Physical Facilities And Resources For Research

1. **Accommodation**
Accommodation provided to Research Students will be appropriate to the discipline, that is secure, ventilated, heated, and lit to ASA standards. Students enrolled part time will be provided with office accommodation on a shared basis.
2. **Access**
Access to buildings will be according to the levels of access provided to staff at each of the University campuses, and will comply with University Occupational Health and Safety Policy. Students will be provided with their own keys.
3. **Furniture**
Offices should include:
 - An ergonomically sound chair as specified by the University's Occupational Health and Safety Policy.
 - Desk
 - Bookshelves.
 - Access to a lockable filing cabinet or appropriate space therein.
4. **Library Support**
Full library services including access to inter-library loans. (Refer to the Library Website for full details of Library Support for Research Students)
5. **Communications**
Access to communications will include:
 - Shared access to an internal phone extension and a reasonable level of free access to a telephone for research related local calls. Permission is required for STD/ISD calls for research related purpose.
 - Shared mailbox and mail out facilities.
 - Operational and regularly serviced photocopier.
 - School stationery, such as School letterhead when necessary
6. **Computer Facilities**
Shared dedicated postgraduate computing facilities will be provided including:
 - computer/work station
 - networked printing,
 - e-mail facilities and an address,
 - Internet and Intranet access,
 - IT support,
 - Commonly used research related software where appropriate.
7. **Amenities**

- Access to staffroom facilities as made available to ACU staff
- Access to washroom facilities as made available to ACU staff.

8. **Additional infrastructure support.**

Any additional support may be provided as appropriate to the individual student's needs as detailed in the Research Proposal for the Confirmation of Candidature and approved by the Head of School.

9. Funding of infrastructure for Research Students by Schools should take into account Weighted Research Student EFTSUs.