

Summary of changes and responses to public consultation of research policies and procedures

Responsible Conduct of Research Policy

Section	Public consultation	Comments	Outcome
1	Rewording of the statement around failure to follow the principles.	Agreed.	Reword policy to “, and the consequences of failing to follow those principles”.
2	Rewording of the statement “The University’s conduct expectations..”	Agreed.	Reword policy to “The University’s standards of professional behaviour are set out..”
2.1	Query over the inclusion of the statement that links research misconduct and misconduct or serious misconduct as described in the staff Enterprise Agreement. Addition of Statue 10 for students to the sentence “...staff Enterprise Agreement.”	The statement in the policy is factually correct. Research misconduct may also constitute misconduct in accordance with the staff Enterprise Agreement. It is noted however, that the EA only applies to current staff.	Addition of the following text “...staff Enterprise Agreement for staff or Statue 10 for students.”
4	Query over legal issues for the policy applying to former staff and students.	Research misconduct can be investigated regardless of the employment status, or the status of the student.	No change.
	Typographical errors, formatting etc	Noted.	Changes made.

Responsible Conduct of Research Procedures

Procedures will be redrafted following the final meeting of the Working Group on Resolution of Complaints and Research Misconduct.

Authorship, peer review and publication of research findings policy

Section	Public consultation	Comments	Outcome
2.2	Definition of contribution of authors should also provide the opportunity by community members on outputs.	The definition outlined in section 2.2 is broad enough to include community members as it states “substantial contribution to the work”.	No change.
2.3	Clarification of the nature of the kind of peer review referred to.	Agreed.	Addition of the following text to the definition in section 5 “Peer review has a number of important roles in research and research management, in the assessment of grant applications, in selecting material for publication, in the review of performance of researchers and teams, and in the selection of staff.”
3.1	Addition of copyright permissions.	Agreed.	Addition of the following point: “Where work includes or builds on third-party copyright materials, the authors are responsible for seeking permission of the copyright holder”.
3.1.2	Consistency with section 3.1.5 in procedures.	Agreed.	Modification of 3.1.2 to “named, consent must be obtained as outlined in the Authorship, Peer Review and Publication of Research Findings Procedure”.
3.1.4	Consistency with text in section 2.5.1	Agreed.	Modification of 3.1.4 to “Authors will ensure that publications are freely available online as soon as possible or within twelve (12) months of publication via the open access institutional repository, taking into consideration any legal or contractual obligations, and funding body rules.”
	Typographical errors, formatting etc	Noted.	Changes made.

Authorship, peer review and publication of research findings procedures

Section	Public consultation	Comments	Outcome
3.1.1	Recognition of community members and external organisations.	The criteria for authorship are outlined in the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct for Research which is reflected in these updated procedures.	No change.
3.3.1	Should make reference to the procedure not the policy in this section.	Agreed.	Modification of 3.3.1 to read “criteria for authorship outlined in section 3.1.1”.
3.5.1	Recognition of community members and external organisations.	This is covered in the IP policy.	The first section of this section has been deleted to remove ambiguity with the IP policy.
3.6	Addition of regulatory statements in publications.	Agreed.	Addition of point 3.6.18 “Where regulatory permits or other discipline specific approvals are required to conduct the research, these will be recorded within the publication arising from that research in the manner generally accepted for that discipline”.
3.6.4	Clarification of fragmented publication.	Section 6 provides a definition of fragmented publication.	No change.
3.6.12 and 3.6.13	Consider a generic statement with examples.	Agreed.	Modified to “Publications arising from grant funded projects must comply with the rules of the funding body . E.g., NH&MRC Dissemination of Research Finding, ARC Open Access Policy.
3.6.14	Section does not account for instance where this is not permitted. May contravene duplication publication clause.	Agreed.	This section has been modified to read “Publications will be made freely available online as soon as possible or within twelve (12) months of publication via the open access institutional repository espace@Curtin, taking into consideration any legal or contractual obligations, and funding body rules.”
3.6.15	May result in apparent duplication of outputs in ERA.	It is a staff member’s responsibility to ensure that any ‘duplication’ of publications is appropriate under The Code, the authorship policy, copyright provisions pertaining to both outlets, appropriate acknowledgement of the other publication, and generally accepted discipline behaviours. Since inherent within the definition of research is originality, duplication from practices such as ‘conference papers converted to a journal articles’ must either (1) show differentiation of research content, or (2) cannot both be “research” publications. If the former then they are both research papers subject to being recorded and any questions pertaining to duplication should not raise undue concerns, can be easily answered and are not untoward	No change.

		given obligations (on researchers and the Institution) under The Code. If the latter, then only one is subject to being recorded as a research publication. Thought should also be given to whether there has been true publication in both cases – publication may be taken, at its simplest, as entry into the public domain in a manner that makes it reasonably discoverable to others within the discipline area. Many conferences, for example, are moving away from a ‘published proceeding’, so while the work may have been presented at a conference, with the full paper being submitted for peer review, it may not be published (except perhaps in abstract form).	
4.1.2	Inconsistency between 3.1.5 and 4.1.2.	3.1.5 refers to acknowledgements not authorship. 4.1.2 refers to authorship, but it is noted this is unclear therefore wording will be modified.	Modification of 4.1.2 “Where individuals are to be named as an author , their consent must be obtained as per section 3.2 ”.
4.1.3	Appointment of executive author is not practicable and authorship is not usually finalised until authors have made their contribution.	The appointment of executive author is outlined in the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research also explicitly states that agreement on authorship of a publication should occur at an early stage in the research project and should be reviewed periodically.	No change.
4.1.5	There is no obligation for non-Curtin authors to abide by Curtin policies and procedures.	Agreed. This has been modified to refer to the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.	Modified to “Authors should ensure that all collaborating authors are aware of The Code ”.
6	Second sentence of duplicate publication is a causal statement and not part of a definition.	Agreed.	Removed.
6	Self-plagiarism definition includes an example of abstracts published. This may weaken papers due to appearance of excessive self-citation.	Agreed.	Example removed.
6	Add definition of plagiarism.	Agreed.	Addition of the following definition taken from the staff and student plagiarism handbooks: “Plagiarism: Presenting the work or property of another person as one’s own, without appropriate acknowledgement of the other person’s work.”
	Typographical errors, formatting etc	Noted.	Changes made.

Research data and primary materials policy

Section	Public consultation	Comments	Outcome
2.2.1	Differentiation of the responsibility of the University and researchers	Agreed.	Section to now read: 2.2.1. The University will provide facilities for the safe and secure storage of research data and primary materials. 2.2.2. Researchers are responsible for maintaining records of where research data and primary materials for their research program are stored.
2.2.2	Not always practicable while fieldwork is underway.	Agreed. However, this policy does not specify timeframes for capturing data on the Curtin system. This information would be better placed in a procedure document.	No change.
2.4.2	Should include contractual agreements with data providers or data custodians.	Agreed.	Modified to add “an contractual obligations”.
2.5.1	Should include data provider or data custodian and publisher requirements.	Agreed. Contractual arrangements will cover data custodians. Publisher requirements are already included in this statement.	No change.
2.7	Should include reference to data custodian requirements that often require data to be returned at the end of the study.	Agreed.	Section added to read “unless contractual agreements state otherwise”
2.8	Should include reference to data custodian requirements that often require data to be returned at the end of the study.	Agreed.	Section added to read “unless contractual agreements state otherwise”
3.3	Update Records and Information Management responsibilities.	Agreed.	Modified to “....for providing advice to support the collection, Records and Information Management is also responsible for providing approval for the destruction of research data and primary materials. ”
3.4	Consider alternative wording suggested.	Agreed.	Changed to “University Librarian is responsible for providing education, training and support in research data management issues such as copyright, licensing of data, embargoes, re-use and privacy”.
3.5	Update Researchers responsibilities.	Agreed.	Addition of “maintaining records of storage” and deletion of “destruction” to point (a). Addition of point (b) “seeking approval for the destruction of research data and primary materials from Records and Information Management;”
3.6 (c)	Data may not be stored within Schools, particularly if archived.	Agreed.	Reference to “within Schools” has been deleted.

5	Add commercially sensitive to Confidential data definition.	Agreed.	Modified to "...because their release may be commercially sensitive or damaging..."
	Data accessed from external agency who are the legal custodians of those data should be included.	Agreed.	References have been made to contractual agreements, which will cover arrangements with data custodians, in sections 2.2.2, 2.4.2, 2.7.1 and 2.7.2
	Typographical errors, formatting etc	Noted.	Changes made.

Research management policy

Section	Public consultation	Comments	Outcome
2.1.2	Addition of the Curtin Code of Conduct	Agreed.	Modified to "... Signature Behaviours and the Curtin Code of Conduct."
2.2.3	Statement appears to be at odds with 2.2.2 and 2.2.4 – is it just policies that make up the framework.	Agreed.	Removed.
2.2.5	Reference to Health and Safety required.	Agreed.	Modified to "Researchers must adhere to the University's Health and Safety Policy and Health and Safety Responsibilities Procedures (link https://policies.curtin.edu.au/findapolicy/#H) and act in accordance with all legislation regulating hazardous materials ".
2.2.6 (d)	"proper practices" is a bit vague. Name relevant policy/procedure.	Agreed.	This point has been deleted as it is covered in section 2.2.4
2.2.6 (e)	Point to should be separated into awards and degrees, and publications.	Agreed.	This point has been separated into two points.
2.4.2	Add indemnity arrangements and/or insurance obligations.	Agreed.	Modified to "... ethics approval, ownership of equipment and data, indemnity arrangements, insurance obligations and reporting to relevant agencies as applicable".
2.5.4	Change "trained supervisor" to "supervisory team".	Agreed.	Modified to "...qualified and trained supervisory team in accordance..."
2.5.5	Statement is vague and does not include staff.	This statement falls under the heading "Students undertaking research" and therefore is specific to students. This terminology is used in the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.	No change.
2.5.6	Please define "after starting research".	Agreed.	Modified to "as soon as practical after enrolment ".
2.6.5	Add reference to the Fieldwork Policy.	Agreed.	Modified to "A risk assessment on research projects must be completed in accordance with the Fieldwork Policy and relevant risk treatments followed."
3	Update responsibilities.	Agreed.	Updated.
3	Heads of Schools etc., and Directors of Research Institutes etc., should change "assessing research grant applications" to "providing advice on".	Agreed.	See above.
	No reference to the Authorship, peer review and publication of research findings procedures	Agreed.	Reference is now made to the procedures in point 2.2.11, 2.4.3 and related documents/links.
	Typographical errors, formatting etc	Noted.	Changes made.