Prevention is better than the cure…

Dr Paul Taylor
Director
Office for Research Ethics and Integrity
pmt@unimelb.edu.au

Dr Daniel Barr
Research Integrity Coordinator
Office for Research Ethics and Integrity
dpbarr@unimelb.edu.au
Personal integrity

• personal integrity might include…
Expectations of the general public

Expectations of the research community

Rules and regulations

Personal expectations (morals, ethics etc)

YOU ARE HERE
Research Integrity is an ‘ecosystem’
Why does it matter?

• most people say they are doing research to understand something better or to change the way something is done

• in order for there to be change, someone has to make a decision

• this decision is likely (…hopefully?) to be based on research findings, but, *we don’t know when this decision is going to be made*

• we have to do what we can now to make sure that the ‘decision makers’ can act with confidence on the ethics and integrity of our research – that the research can be trusted and is honest

• the “things that we can do now” are the principles of research integrity – these are the hallmarks of good research
Overview at Melbourne

- more than just acronyms…
  - OREI (Office for Research Ethics and Integrity)
  - RIAs (Research Integrity Advisors)
  - EIDG (Ethics and Integrity Development Grants)
  - TwOREI (“Tuesdays with OREI”)
  - Go8 RIG (Group of Eight Research Integrity Group)
  - U21 RIG (Universitas 21 Research Integrity Group)
  - ARMS RIM (Australasian Research Management Society Research Integrity Module)
  - SCIE90005, Scholarly Selective, MCRP (teaching)…
Policies and guidelines
Three Ingredients for a Culture of Research Ethics and Integrity

1. A voice from the top
2. Education and training
3. Clear statements of expectations
   - Research Governance
   - Code of Conduct for Research
   - Policy, Procedure, Guideline
A Research Governance Framework

Code
- Code of Conduct for Research
  - Conflict of Interest Policy
  - Peer Review Policy
Policy
- Authorship Policy
Procedure
- Authorship Dispute Resolution Procedure
- Conflict of Interest Procedure
Guideline
- Faculty of Business and Economics
- School of Culture and Communication
- Genomics

Scope
Principles-based
Instruction
• Compliance, education, engagement
• Shift from rules to principles

• Components covered:
  – The University code of conduct for research
  – Processes for the handling of allegations of research misconduct
  – Conflict of interest
  – Collaboration
  – Peer Review
  – Publication and communication
  – Human Research Ethics
  – Animal Ethics
  – Gene Technology
  – Supervision of research trainees
  – Authorship
• 12 campuses
• 11 faculties + medical research institutes
• ~ 3100 research staff
• ~ 5000 graduate researchers
• ~ 4300 publications
Research output diversity at Melbourne
Inter-disciplinary journal article publication
Origins of a new Authorship Policy at Melbourne

• Current description of authorship for the University is contained within the Code of Conduct for Research
  – Prescriptive and contains seven dot points
  – Based on the ICMJE guidelines
    • Biomedical focus
  – Deficient

• We require a governance framework for authorship that:
  1. Provides clear statements of expectations
  2. Better fits our current settings
  3. Accommodates diversity
  4. Provides procedures for practice and dispute resolution
  5. Promotes understanding
Evolution of a new Authorship Policy at Melbourne

- Multi-disciplinary reference group
- Extensive consultation

Code
- Code of Conduct for Research

Policy
- Authorship Policy

Procedure
- Authorship Procedure
- Authorship Dispute Resolution Procedure

Guideline
- Faculty of Business and Economics
- School of Culture and Communication
- Genomics
Principles of authorship

- Authorship must only recognise a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to a research output.
- An author is publicly responsible for the integrity and accurate reporting of at least their significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to a research output.

- Honest reflection of contribution
- Assigned fairly and consistently
- Communicated clearly and transparently
- Generosity while remaining true to the requirements
• Sets out authorship criteria – represents a change from an authorship to contributorship model
• Establishes requirements for record keeping, acknowledgments for contributions less than ‘authorship’, and prohibits awarding of authorship if criteria have not been met
• Sets responsibilities for all authors, corresponding authors, senior authors
• Provides a procedure that describes good practice
• Provides a procedure that provides authorship dispute resolution
• Outlines Faculty or Graduate School Guidelines for Authorship
• Directs allegations of plagiarism that primarily relate to authorship inclusion/exclusion to authorship dispute resolution procedure rather than processes for research misconduct
Authorship criteria

- Authorship is attributed only when a researcher has made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to a research output and is willing to take public responsibility for the contribution.

- Researchers qualify as authors if they have made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution through at least one, but often more than one, of the following:
  - Conception and design of the research described in the research output
  - Acquisition of research data where the acquisition has required significant intellectual judgment or input
  - Analysis and interpretation of research data
  - Drafting of the research output, or redrafting the research output so as to critically change or substantively advance the interpretation
Responsibilities of authorship – at a glance

- A person who qualifies as an author must not be included or excluded without their written agreement
  - Must be kept
  - Must include a description of the contribution that each author has made
- Authorship must not be attributed when a researcher has not made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution or is unwilling to take public responsibility for their contribution
- Non-author contributors must be properly acknowledged
- All authors have a responsibility to ensure all contributors to the research output, especially student researchers, are properly recognised regardless of their position or role (or any changes)
- Role of the corresponding author as a communicator and record keeper
- Discipline-dependent recognition of not including supervisors as authors, author order, and the role of a senior author
What do you think?

I DON'T ALWAYS PUBLISH MY RESEARCH

BUT WHEN I DO, I TALK EARLY AND OFTEN ABOUT AUTHORSHIP

WHERE DID YOU GET YOUR AUTHORSHIP PRACTICES?

THE TOILET STORE?

COLLABORATOR

Y U NO AUTHORSHIP?
Processes for errors on the record (or playing nicely)
1. Receipt of allegation (after discussion with RIA)
2. Preliminary assessment
3. Formal investigation
4. Appeals and Review
5. Sanction
6. Correcting the record
• finding the right contact point in a University (search for research integrity)/making the right contact point clear

• understanding the roles of players in the ecosystem – Universities should make their processes more broadly known, understood and available

• recognising the need for cooperation

• communication
Thanks (and questions)