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Message from the Chief Executive Officer

The mission of the Australian Research Council (ARC) is to deliver policy and programs that advance Australian research and innovation globally and benefit the community.

To achieve our mission, and maintain strong and valued relationships with our stakeholders, we aim to ensure that the research we fund is conducted to the highest ethical standards.

The ARC is not a regulatory body and does not investigate allegations of integrity breaches or research misconduct. Under the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2007 (the Code), this is the role of research institutions. These matters have the potential to undermine the integrity of the ARC’s processes, funding decisions and/or funded research. They also have the ability to undermine confidence in the value of publicly funded research. Under the Code, institutions should inform relevant parties, including funding organisations such as the ARC, of the findings from research misconduct inquiries, and actions taken as a result.

This policy outlines, when and how, ARC-funded institutions (mainly Australian Universities) should report information regarding research integrity breaches or research misconduct to the ARC, and how other parties can report research integrity-related concerns or allegations to research institutions through the ARC. The policy also outlines the processes that the ARC may utilise in taking action if it considers that the integrity of its processes, funding decisions and funded research have the potential to be compromised.

In addition, the policy articulates the responsibility that anyone involved in ARC business has in ensuring the integrity of the ARC’s processes and funding decisions by requiring them to self-report when they are implicated in a research integrity matter.

The ARC values the efforts of institutions in ensuring that responsible research practices are maintained. In implementing this policy, we look forward to an open and constructive dialogue with institutions regarding research integrity and research misconduct matters. In doing so, we are committed to protecting privacy and confidentiality.

If you have any questions about this policy or the handling of research integrity or research misconduct matters by the ARC please contact the ARC (02 6287 6600) and ask for the Research Integrity Officer. Alternatively you can send an email to researchintegrity@arc.gov.au marking your correspondence for the attention of the Research Integrity Officer.

Leanne Harvey
Acting Chief Executive Officer
1. Introduction

1.1 The Australian Research Council

The ARC is a Commonwealth entity established under the Australian Research Council Act 2001. Its mission is to deliver policy and programs that advance Australian research and innovation globally and benefit the community.

In seeking to achieve its mission, the ARC provides advice to the Government on research matters and manages the National Competitive Grants Program (NCGP) and Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA).

Through the NCGP, the ARC supports the highest-quality research and research training across all disciplines through national competitive processes. ERA assesses research quality within Australia’s higher education institutions and gives government, industry, business and the wider community assurance of the excellence of research conducted. It provides a national stocktake, by research discipline areas, of research strength against international benchmarks.

1.2 Purpose of policy

Research misconduct has the potential to undermine public confidence in ARC processes, funding decisions or research outcomes.

The ARC expects the highest standards of integrity in all aspects of research it funds. Research must be conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards in a research environment underpinned by a culture of integrity. These standards also apply to the application processes for ARC funding and are outlined in more detail in current ARC Funding Rules for all NCGP schemes. (Available on the ARC website at www.arc.gov.au/funding-rules.)

The ARC’s business processes also rely on individuals of the highest integrity to conduct ARC business, assess research proposals and evaluate research excellence.

The purpose of this policy is to safeguard confidence in the value of publicly funded research by:

- making transparent the ARC’s role in research misconduct matters;
- ensuring the integrity of the ARC’s grant application, peer review, grant selection and research evaluation processes, funding decisions and research outcomes; and
- raising the awareness of the importance of research integrity and of the possible consequences for institutions and for individuals if appropriate standards are not maintained.

For detailed descriptions of research integrity breaches and research misconduct as they apply in this policy please refer to section 2.3.

1.3 Commencement, review and enforcement

The policy commenced on 13 April 2015, the date it was publicly released.

The ARC will review the Research Integrity and Research Misconduct Policy annually. The policy will also be reviewed immediately after any changes are made to the Code, which may delay or bring forward any annual review by the ARC. The date of effect for any amendments to the policy will be the date on which an amended version of the policy is publicly released.
ARC Funding Rules and Funding Agreements published after the commencement of the policy require ARC-funded institutions to comply with the policy.

### 1.4 ARC roles and responsibilities

**Research Integrity Office**

The ARC Research Integrity Office is the point of contact for all matters within the scope of this policy, and is responsible for all associated administrative arrangements within the ARC. Individuals or institutions with questions regarding any matters in this policy, or anyone wishing to report a concern or allegation, may contact the Research Integrity Office via the details provided in section 10, Contacts.

**Senior Research Integrity Officer**

The ARC Senior Research Integrity Officer is responsible for making decisions (under Section 9.1) regarding any precautionary and consequential actions if the integrity of the ARC’s processes, funding decisions or research outcomes are considered at risk as a result of an alleged or proven research integrity breach or research misconduct. The Senior Research Integrity Officer is advised by senior ARC staff, the Research Integrity Officer and Legal Counsel, as appropriate.

### 1.5 Privacy

The ARC respects privacy and confidentiality. In managing all information related to issues of research integrity or research misconduct we will manage private information in accordance with the *Privacy Act 1988*.

The ARC will not disclose any confidential information collected under this policy without the consent of the institution or individual the information relates to. The ARC will not be taken to have breached its obligations to the extent that the ARC discloses confidential information:

a) to its officers, employees, agents, external professional advisers or contractors solely to comply with obligations, or to exercise rights, under this Policy;

b) to its internal management personnel solely to enable effective management or auditing of a Funding Agreement, Scheme or the NCGP;

c) for a purpose directly related to the enforcement or investigation of a possible breach of any Commonwealth, State, Territory or local law;

d) to the Minister, or in response to a demand by a House or a Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament;

e) within the ARC, the Department or another Commonwealth entity or authority, where this serves the ARC’s, the Department’s or the Commonwealth’s legitimate interests;

f) as required or permitted by any other law, or provided for under a contract; or

g) that is in the public domain.

All notifications of allegations of research integrity breaches and research misconduct submitted by institutions to the ARC will be handled confidentially by the Research Integrity Office. All information will be appropriately classified and only accessible to this Office. The information will be stored in locked cabinets and restricted areas of ARC IT systems. If ARC action is required in response to an allegation, or a finding of a research integrity breach or research misconduct, information that is essential to enabling and implementing decisions will be disclosed to appropriate ARC officers on a strictly need to know basis. This information is restricted to the name and institution of the relevant individual(s) and the action that needs to be implemented.
### 1.6 Access to personal information

Under Australian Privacy Principle 12, outlined in Schedule 1 of the Privacy Act 1988, individuals are entitled to obtain, on request, personal information about them that is held by the ARC. Requests to obtain personal information relating to matters reported under this policy can be made to the ARC Research Integrity Officer (researchintegrity@arc.gov.au).

### 2. Scope

#### 2.1 Overview

This policy requires institutions, and in some circumstances individuals engaged in ARC business, to report to the ARC the details of research integrity matters which have been investigated and resulted in a finding of a research integrity breach or research misconduct, or which require a formal inquiry to be undertaken by institutions. It also describes pathways via the ARC through which allegations of research integrity breaches can be referred to institutions for investigation.

The ARC does not investigate allegations of research integrity breaches or research misconduct—under the Code this is the role of the relevant research institution. An exception to this is that the ARC may instigate its own investigation where the matter involves misuse of funding, as the ARC has obligations under the Commonwealth Fraud Control Framework.

This policy complements and supports all ARC Funding Rules and Funding Agreements, which require compliance with this policy, the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2007, the documents specified in section 2.3 of this policy, and any related successor documents.

#### 2.2 Who does the policy apply to?

The policy applies to allegations and findings of research integrity breaches and research misconduct that relate to:

- current or past ARC-funded projects;
- current ARC-funded researchers, regardless of whether the matter relates to their current ARC-funded projects;
- current ARC funding proposals;
- named applicants on proposals in current ARC selection rounds, regardless of whether the matter relates to an ARC funding proposal; and
- ARC employees and anyone engaged on ARC business such as, College of Experts members, Committee members, Panel Members, external assessors and all other contractors.

#### 2.3 What is a research integrity breach and research misconduct?

**Definition of a research integrity breach**

For the purposes of this policy, a “research integrity breach” means a breach of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) (the Code) including research misconduct.
As the Code requires adherence to the documents listed below, the definition of a research integrity breach encompasses a failure to comply with any of the principles contained in these documents:

- the NHMRC/ARC/AVCC *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007)*
- the NHMRC *Values and Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research (2003)*
- the Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies (2012)*; and
- the NHMRC/ARC/CSIRO *Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes, 8th edition (2013)*.

In addition, the definition of a research integrity breach encompasses a failure to comply with any of the principles contained the Australia Council for the Arts *Indigenous Cultural Protocols for Producing Indigenous Music; Writing; Visual Arts; Media Arts; and Performing Arts (2007)*, with which ARC-funded research is required to comply, and a failure to comply with any Commonwealth and/or State or Territory legislation where that legislation relates to research integrity.

Institutions are required to exercise judgement in determining whether there has been a failure to comply with the principles in the applicable documents and, therefore, whether a research integrity breach has occurred. In general, a research integrity breach for the purposes of the policy includes all breaches where corrective and/or disciplinary action is required.

**Examples of research integrity breaches**

**Not meeting required research standards**
- Conducting research without ethics approval as required by the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and the Australian Code for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes and/or failing to conduct research as approved by an appropriate ethics review body.
- Conducting research without the requisite approvals, permits or licenses.

**Fabrication, falsification, plagiarism**
- Fabrication of research data, including source material.
- Falsification of research data or source material.
- Misrepresentation of research data and source material.
- Plagiarism of someone else’s work, including theories, concepts, research data and source material.
- Duplicate publication (also known as redundant or multiple publication, or self-plagiarism) without acknowledgment of the source.
- Falsifying or providing misleading information in a funding proposal.
- Concealment or facilitation of breaches of the Code by others.

**Record keeping**
- Failure to maintain research records, and/or the inappropriate destruction of research records, research data and source material.

**Supervision**
- Failure to provide adequate guidance or mentorship for researchers or research trainees under their supervision.

**Authorship**
- Failure to acknowledge the contributions of others fairly.
- Misleading ascription of authorship including failing to offer authorship to those who qualify or awarding authorship to those who do not meet the requirements.

**Conflicts of interest**
- Failure to disclose and manage conflicts of interest.
Definition of research misconduct

As defined in the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007)* (the Code)

A complaint or allegation relates to research misconduct if it involves all of the following:

- an alleged breach of the Code
- intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence
- serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

Research misconduct includes fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research, and failure to declare or manage a serious conflict of interest. It also includes avoidable failure to follow research proposals as approved by a research ethics committee, particularly where this failure may result in unreasonable risk or harm to humans, animals or the environment. It also includes the wilful concealment or facilitation of research misconduct by others.

Repeated or continuing breaches of the Code may also constitute research misconduct, and do so where these have been the subject of previous counselling or specific direction.

Research misconduct does not include honest differences in judgment in management of the research project, and may not include honest errors that are minor or unintentional. However, breaches of the Code will require specific action by supervisors and responsible officers of the institution.
3. Reporting research integrity matters—requirements for institutions

This section outlines the reporting requirements, including when and what to report, and processes for institutions. For any questions regarding these processes, please see section 10, Contacts.

3.1 Reporting requirements for issues identified by institutions

The ARC provides funding under its programs to Administering Organisations, not to individual researchers. Under the Code, institutions are required to maintain an environment which establishes responsible and ethical behaviour in research. This must include the good stewardship of public resources used to conduct research\(^1\). It is the responsibility of institutions to investigate cases of alleged research misconduct as they arise. The Code requires institutions to have a written policy on receiving complaints or allegations related to research.

Where the matter relates to a person covered by this policy (see section 2.2), with the exception of individuals engaged in ARC business who are not ARC-funded researchers or applicants, institutions must inform the ARC within 10 working days when:

- a research integrity breach or research misconduct is proven (and not contested) without the need for a formal research misconduct inquiry to be established;
- a formal research misconduct inquiry is instigated;
- a formal research misconduct inquiry is concluded (regardless of whether an allegation is proven or dismissed);
- an institution has suspended funding to an individual or team involved in ARC funded research whilst any action is being undertaken in relation to an alleged research integrity breach or research misconduct.

Unless an institution has suspended funding for ARC-funded research, the ARC is not required to be informed when:

- an allegation, complaint or concern regarding a potential research integrity breach or research misconduct is reported to an institution;
- an institution is undertaking a preliminary assessment of a research integrity breach or misconduct allegation; or
- an allegation is dismissed without the need for a formal inquiry to be established;

In addition, institutions are not required to inform the ARC when:

- an individual implicated in a research integrity matter is engaged in ARC business, as an assessor or committee member, and is not otherwise covered by the policy. Individuals engaged in ARC business are required to self-report directly to the ARC (see section 4); or
- the institution is not aware that the individual is a named investigator on an ARC funding proposal submitted by another institution.

\(^1\) Section 1 of the Code
The requirements for institutions to report to the ARC are summarised below:

When notifying the ARC that a formal inquiry has been instigated, an institution must provide:
- the name(s) of the individual(s) implicated in the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct;
- an outline of the findings of the preliminary assessment;
- ARC project IDs for any ARC-funded projects or proposals implicated in the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct; and
- notification of whether funding for any ARC-funded projects has been suspended by the institution while the inquiry is underway.

When notifying the ARC of the outcomes of a preliminary assessment, where a breach has been proven without the need for a formal inquiry, or of the outcomes of a formal inquiry, an institution must provide:
- the name(s) of the individual(s) who was the subject of the preliminary assessment and/or formal inquiry;
- an outline of and rationale for the findings;
- any relevant contextual information, such as whether the breach was inadvertent or involved intent or negligence, or if the conduct was a repeat offence or a one-off incident;
- the corrective action(s) being undertaken;
- ARC project IDs for any ARC-funded projects or proposals implicated in the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct; and
- notification of whether funding for any ARC-projects has been suspended by the institution.

The purpose of requiring this information is to allow the ARC to determine whether the allegations or findings have the potential to undermine the integrity of the ARC’s processes, funding decisions, research outcomes, or confidence in the value of publicly funded research. Institutions should provide any further information as requested by the ARC.
Where a matter directly relates to an ARC-funded research project and the implicated researcher is not located at the Administering Organisation, the investigating institution must notify the Administering Organisation if a research integrity breach or research misconduct requiring corrective or disciplinary action has occurred.

Where possible, the Administering Organisation should notify any other participating organisations, including any Partner Organisations, involved in the project. The ARC acknowledges that the details that can be provided will sometimes be subject to privacy obligations.

The ARC reserves the right to refer matters to the Australian Research Integrity Committee (see section 6).

### 3.2 Reporting requirements for issues referred to institutions by the ARC

The ARC may refer to institutions concerns or complaints which have been raised by:

- ARC employees, contractors or others engaged in ARC business; or
- members of the public.

Where a matter is referred to an institution by the ARC, that institution is required to promptly confirm the matter is being/will be investigated and report to the ARC the outcome of the preliminary assessment of the allegation **within eight weeks**, including if the matter has been dismissed. If the outcome of the preliminary investigation is not finalised within eight weeks, please contact the ARC Research Integrity Office to discuss an extension.

The reporting requirements set out in section 3.1 of this policy also apply.

The requirements for institutions to report to the ARC on research integrity matters referred by the ARC are summarised below.

Where the ARC has provided the name and contact details of the individual who raised the concern, the ARC expects that the institution will provide sufficient assurance to this individual that the matter has been addressed.

The ARC reserves the right to refer matters to the Australian Research Integrity Committee (see section 8).
4. Self-reporting where individuals engaged in ARC business are implicated research integrity matters

ARC employees and anyone engaged on ARC business, such as ARC College of Experts members, Selection Advisory Committee members, ERA Research Evaluation Committee members and other contractors, are required to advise the ARC Research Integrity Office within 10 working days when:

- a research integrity breach or research misconduct is proven against them (and not contested) without the need for a formal research misconduct inquiry to be established;
- a formal research misconduct inquiry of which they are a subject is instigated; or
- a formal research misconduct inquiry is concluded (regardless of whether an allegation is proven or dismissed).

Sufficient information regarding the allegation and/or finding should be provided to enable the ARC to assess whether the matter provides a risk to the integrity of ARC processes and, therefore, whether any action is required in relation to the individuals’ involvement in ARC business.

5. Reporting of issues identified through ARC business

ARC employees and anyone engaged on ARC business, such as ARC College of Experts members, Selection Advisory Committee members, external assessors, ERA peer reviewers and other contractors, are required to report potential breaches of research integrity or research misconduct issues identified through the conduct of ARC business as soon as practical to the ARC Research Integrity Office.

Sufficient information should be provided to allow the ARC to assess whether there is a basis for referring the matter to the institution for investigation; and to enable the relevant institution to progress an investigation into the allegation (if required).

Individuals notifying the ARC of concerns relating to a potential research integrity breach or research misconduct must provide:

- their name and contact details;
- the name of the individual(s) who they allege has/have committed a research integrity breach or research misconduct;
- the name of the institution at which the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct may have occurred;
- the nature and details of the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct;
- when the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct occurred;
- ARC project IDs, where known, for any ARC-funded projects or proposals implicated in the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct.

Subject to the ARC agreeing that there is a basis for a concern that a research integrity breach or research misconduct may have occurred, the ARC Research Integrity Office will refer the matter to the relevant institution for investigation in accordance with the requirements of the Code. To protect the confidentiality of the ARC’s processes, the name of any assessor or committee member who raised the concern with the ARC will not be provided to the institution.

Institutions are required to report to the ARC on matters that the ARC has referred to them in accordance with section 3 of this policy.
6. Concerns raised by members of the public—pathways for making complaints to institutions via the ARC

Members of the public are able to notify the ARC Research Integrity Office if they are concerned that a potential research integrity breach or research misconduct relating to ARC-funded research or ARC business has occurred.

Sufficient information should be provided to allow the ARC to assess whether there is a basis for referring the matter to the institution for investigation; and to enable the relevant institution to progress an investigation into the allegation, if required.

Individuals notifying the ARC of concerns relating to a potential research integrity breach or research misconduct must provide:

- their name and contact details, unless they wish to make an anonymous complaint;
- the name of the individual(s) who they allege has/have committed a research integrity breach or research misconduct;
- the name of the institution at which the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct may have occurred;
- the nature and details of the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct;
- when the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct occurred;
- ARC project IDs, where known, for any ARC-funded projects or proposals implicated in the potential research integrity breach or research misconduct; and
- an indication of whether they consent to the ARC providing their contact details to the institution responsible for investigating the alleged incident(s).

Anonymous correspondence or referrals will be considered, but may limit the ability of an institution to investigate a matter or for feedback to be provided as to whether the matter has been resolved.

The ARC will notify the individual of whether or not the matter has been referred to the relevant institution for investigation. If you have provided your contact details, we may be able to provide you with a summary of the outcome, within the constraints of privacy and confidentiality.

Members of the public are also able to notify the institution involved directly if they are concerned that a potential research integrity breach or research misconduct has occurred.

7. Options for referral to other external processes

Individuals have the right to refer matters to the Australian Research Integrity Committee (see section 8) or an external agency at any time; examples of which include:

- Commonwealth Ombudsman
- Privacy Commissioner
- Australian Information Commissioner
- Industrial review boards
- Human rights agencies
8. The role of the Australian Research Integrity Committee (ARIC)

The Australian Research Integrity Committee (ARIC) provides a review system of institutional processes to respond to allegations of research misconduct. ARIC was jointly established by the ARC and the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC). While the ARC and NHMRC provide secretariat support to ARIC, it acts as an independent body.

If a research misconduct investigation or inquiry process has been finalised by the Administering Organisation, but an individual is unsatisfied with the process of that investigation, they may wish to request a review of the process by ARIC. Additionally, in instances where institutional delay and/or inaction is alleged, an ARIC panel may be able to review whether the delay is unreasonable or breaches the Code. Further information about the ARIC is available on the ARC website at www.arc.gov.au.

9. ARC actions

9.1 Processes for ARC actions

The ARC may take precautionary and consequential actions if it considers that the integrity of its peer review processes, grant selection processes, funding decisions and research outcomes have the potential to be compromised, or if confidence in the value of publicly funded research is potentially undermined. The ARC will ensure a fair and robust process for making decisions regarding the nature and application of legally permissible actions.

Precautionary actions

The ARC may take precautionary actions once notified that a prima facie case for research misconduct has been established and a formal research misconduct inquiry has commenced.

Precautionary actions may include, but are not limited to:

- requiring institutions to suspend ARC-funded projects while an inquiry is underway;
- placing conditions on grants that address or mitigate any potential or proven risks;
- suspending or ceasing the progression of ARC funding proposals in accordance with the relevant Funding Rules;
- suspending individuals from participating in ARC business;
- preventing individuals from being engaged in ARC business.

Where a prima facie case of research misconduct has been established and the matter has been referred to a formal inquiry, the Research Integrity Office may update ARC records to ensure that the subject(s) of the allegation does not participate in ARC peer review processes while the inquiry is underway. The Research Integrity Office will inform the institution if this action is taken. Should the subject(s) of the allegation already be actively participating in ARC business, the Research Integrity Office will discuss the matter with the institution and recommend that the subject(s) of the investigation remove themselves from ARC business processes until such time as the matter has been finalised.

In most cases, to ensure the integrity of ARC processes, the ARC will suspend or prevent individuals from being engaged in ARC business but will generally not take any other precautionary action. However, in serious cases where the ARC believes that there would be a high risk to the integrity of ARC processes or reputation from not taking action, the ARC will consider applying one or more of the additional precautionary actions outlined above.
Whilst the ARC will not generally take precautionary action prior to a formal inquiry being instigated, where an individual is engaged in ARC business and their continued involvement could pose a high risk, the ARC may suspend the individual’s involvement prior to the conclusion of any preliminary assessment and/or formal inquiry.

Consequential actions

The ARC may take consequential actions once the outcomes of a research integrity breach or research misconduct inquiry (including corrective actions if applicable) have been reported to the ARC. Consequential actions may include, but are not limited to:

- ceasing and/or recovering any or all ARC funding relating to a Funding Agreement(s) in accordance with the provisions in the relevant Funding Agreement(s);
- ceasing the progression of ARC funding proposals in accordance with the relevant Funding Rules;
- placing conditions on the consideration of any future funding proposals (such as additional certifications);
- placing of conditions on grants that address or mitigate any identified risks (such as additional reporting);
- removing individuals from ARC business;
- preventing individuals from being engaged in ARC business.

Actions taken by the ARC, including the duration for which they will apply, will be proportionate to the nature and potential consequences of the research integrity breach or research misconduct and will take into account actions taken by the ARC in response to similar matters and any corrective measures already taken by the institution. Where the ARC decides to place conditions on the consideration of future funding proposals or remove or prevent individuals from being engaged in ARC business, the duration of the action will normally be between two and five years. The ARC may also take into account whether a matter is subject to further review by ARIC or another body.

9.2 Appeals

If an institution or individual wishes to appeal a precautionary or consequential action taken by the ARC under this policy, appeals must be lodged, in writing, through the relevant institution’s Designated Person (under Section 10.3 of the Code).

If an individual affected by a precautionary or consequential action wishes to appeal, they must make a request to their institution’s Designated Officer to do this on their behalf. Where an institution does not agree to the individual’s request to lodge an appeal, the individual may appeal directly to the ARC.

The appeal must be received by the ARC within four weeks of the date the Administering Organisation is notified of a decision by the ARC to implement an action, or six weeks in the case of an appeal by an individual that is not supported by their institution. The appeal should be sent to:

Email: researchintegrity@arc.gov.au

Mail: The Research Integrity Officer
Australian Research Council
GPO Box 2702
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Appellants should provide the ARC with all the information necessary to enable the appeal to be considered without the need for further written or oral explanation or reference to additional
material. More information can be found in the ARC Complaints Handling and Appeals Policy and procedures on the ARC website.

Appeals will be considered by an appropriate senior ARC officer who was not involved in making the original decision.

10. Contacts

To notify the ARC of an alleged integrity breach or misconduct, or for any questions regarding this policy, please contact the ARC via the details below.

By phone
You can telephone the ARC during business hours (except public holidays) on 02 6287 6600. Please ask for the Research Integrity Officer.

By email
You can email the Research Integrity Officer at researchintegrity@arc.gov.au

By mail
You can write to the ARC at:

The Research Integrity Officer
The Australian Research Council
GPO Box 2702
CANBERRA ACT 2601

In person
The ARC office is located at 11 Lancaster Place, Canberra Airport, Canberra. The reception (Level 2) is open Monday – Friday from 9am – 5pm AEST, excluding public holidays and public service holidays. Appointments are recommended to ensure appropriate staff availability.
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