Guidelines for Research Integrity Advisors (RIAs)

The RIA role is explained in Section 10 of the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (ACRCR).

The guiding principle for RIAs is to promote good research practice rather than react to concerns. The role is advisory, not investigatory or compliance oriented. Serious concerns, investigation and compliance need to be referred as described in some of the contexts below.

**Topics for sharing your knowledge (with resources)**

1. How to find and apply for research funding
2. Research data and primary materials
   - ACRCR §2; IRDS [http://library.uwa.edu.au/research/irds]
3. Supervision of research trainees
   - ACRCR §3; GRS [http://postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/]
4. Dissemination of research findings
5. Authorship
   - ACRCR §5; Policy UP12/13 [see: UWA Policy Library](http://library.uwa.edu.au/research/ersddu); Statement of Authorship Form; COPE (https://publicationethics.org/)
6. Peer review
   - ACRCR §6; various guides to review, such as Nature’s: [http://nature.com/authors/peer_review](http://nature.com/authors/peer_review); COPE (https://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_Guidelines_For_Peer_Reviewers_2.pdf)
7. Conflicts of interest
   - ACRCR §7; Key words: ‘perceived CoI’, ‘disclose & plan to manage’.
8. Collaboration
   - ACRCR §8.

**Authorship disputes** are best managed by the following process, in this order:

1. Members of a research team should make an authorship agreement for publications expected to arise from their research: included, excluded, acknowledged, and in what order – these should be based on expected contributions. This agreement should be a living document, revisited over the life of the project. Doing this will avoid most disagreements occurring later.
2. Disagreements arising over authorship should be resolved by:
   a. Negotiation among the project team;
   b. Mediation by a Research Integrity Advisor or by a Head of School;
   c. Mediation by the Associate Director for Research Integrity;
   d. Arbitration by the DVC(R) if all of the above fail.

**Research Ethics**

Research involving people, animals, or GMOs, must be reviewed and approved first. Academic staff or research students might ask you for assistance on these subjects.

- Human Research Ethics – “Working with people” even includes simple things like: making observations about people; surveys, interviews, and focus groups.
• Animal Ethics – Working with “animals” means lab animals and wildlife, vertebrates (including fish), cephalopods (e.g. octopus and squid) and decapods (e.g. crayfish).
• Biosafety reviews – Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) and bio-hazardous material (e.g. blood, mutagens and teratogens) also includes quarantine (e.g. bringing plants, animals and soil into WA).

Each of these requires reviews, usually by an ethics committee:
• Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) – via Human Ethics Office;
• Animal Ethics Committee (AEC) – via Animal Ethics Office;
• Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) – via Biosafety Office.

Each has regulatory instruments, listed below – it would be good for you to have some knowledge of these.
• National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research;
• Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes;
• Gene Technology Act and Regulations and OGTR.

Please refer inquiries on review processes and compliance to the corresponding research support office in ORE (see Key Contacts, below).

There are additional reviews required for radiological & nuclear materials, and hazardous chemicals (refer such inquiries to: UWA Safety and Health).

Breaches of the ethics codes for animals, research with people, or research with GMOs should be referred to the chair of the approving ethics committee, via its support office on ORE. RIAs are not required to investigate, and should not do so – instead refer the inquiry to the central Research Integrity or Ethics office (see Key Contacts, below).

Research Integrity

Any evidence or allegation of research misconduct must be referred to the DVC(R). This can be via the Associate Director for Research Integrity. Examples of research misconduct include: plagiarism (including self-plagiarism or recycling academic publications), falsification of data, fabrication of data, improper use of research funds, conflict of interest affecting an outcome, ghost-written academic work, or research conducted without relevant ethical review and approval. Some matters also involve non-research behaviours. We forward those to the UWA complaints office.

Defence Trade Controls

The Commonwealth Department of Defence’s Defence Export Controls section (DEC) oversees research collaborations with overseas parties that involve topics that can potentially be weaponised. Those are listed in a document called the Defence Strategic Goods List (DSGL). International collaboration on these may need to be licenced by Department of Defence. The Associate Director for Research Integrity can help staff assess that.

Sanctions

The Commonwealth Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) oversees our working with visiting academics or HDR students from countries sanctioned by Australian Legislation. The Associate Director for Research Integrity can help staff assess potential liability from training foreign nationals.

Key Links


Key Contacts

Animal Ethics Office – 6488-7887 – aeo@uwa.edu.au
Biosafety office – 6488-4701 – biosafety@uwa.edu.au
Human Ethics office – 6488-4703 – human-ethics@uwa.edu.au
Integrity (misconduct, defence trade, sanctions) – 6488-7613 / 0413 820 071 – mark.dixon@uwa.edu.au

Copies of this guide are available from: http://research.uwa.edu.au/RIAguide.pdf