



Australian Research Integrity Committee (ARIC) Request for Review

What is ARIC's role?

ARIC was established to provide a mechanism to review institutional processes used to manage and investigate potential breaches of the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018](#) (the Code). This review system is intended to ensure that when investigating such complaints, institutions observe processes that are fair as well as consistent with the requirements of the Code and institutional policies and procedures.

Further information about ARIC, may be found in the ARIC Framework, which is available on the [Australian Research Council](#) (ARC) and [National Health and Medical Research Council](#) (NHMRC) websites.

Lodging your application

A review by ARIC of institutional processes may be requested by a person, a group, or an organisation. A request for review must be lodged using this form, either by post or by email.

To lodge this form by **post**:

ARIC-ARC Secretariat [IN CONFIDENCE]
Australian Research Council
GPO Box 2702
Canberra ACT 2601

OR ARIC-NHMRC Secretariat [IN CONFIDENCE]
National Health and Medical Research Council
GPO Box 1421
Canberra ACT 2601

To lodge this form by **email** and for assistance regarding ARIC:

Email: aric@arc.gov.au
Phone: (02) 6287 6701

Email: aric@nhmrc.gov.au
Phone: 1300 064 672

The ARIC Secretariat will only consider requests for review made in writing via email or by regular post to the addresses listed above.

Important information

ARIC can only review matters that are consistent with the [ARIC Framework](#).

The Framework sets out time limitations for lodging a request for review.

ARIC will not review institutional processes that are still underway unless the application for review alleges institutional delay and/or inaction. The Framework contains more information about how ARIC deals with applications involving ongoing investigations.

If this form does not contain sufficient information to enable an assessment of whether the request falls within ARIC's remit the request may not proceed to an ARIC review.

While ARIC endeavours to respond expeditiously to a request for review, a review may take up to 12 months to complete, depending on the complexity of the matter.

Please ensure that prior to submitting your request for review you are familiar with ARIC's Framework and have completed the Application Checklist below.

Application Checklist

Please ensure you have completed the following sections:

- 1. Contact Details of the Applicant
- 2. Status of the Complaint
- 3. Details of concerns about handling or investigation of the complaint by the institution/s
- 4. Organisations/Regulators contacted prior to requesting review by ARIC
- 5. Key Supporting Documents

(By signing below you attest that you have attached copies of supporting documentation and completed the table at section 5 of this form)

Signature of applicant (or person submitting application on behalf of a group or organisation):

(Please note that a signature is not required if you are submitting your request for review by email)

Printed name of applicant:

Date: / /

Section 2

Status of Complaint

1. ARIC reviews the **process** followed by an Australian research institution (i.e., a university or other research organisation) in response to complaints about potential breaches of the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research \(the Code\)](#). However, it cannot review the merits of any findings or decisions. Does your request for review relate directly to the process undertaken in response to a complaint that has been made to an Australian research institution about a potential breach of the Code?

- Yes – continue to Q2
- No – ARIC cannot undertake a review (see ARIC Framework)

2. Which Australian research institution was responsible for managing and/or investigating the complaint? (Note: Requests for review may be made only in relation to institutions that are eligible to receive funding from the ARC and/or NHMRC)

Name of institution: _____

Name and position of key person who handled the complaint: _____

3. On which date did the institution first receive the complaint (if known)?

Date: / /

4. What was your relationship (if any) to the original complaint about a potential breach of the Code?

- Complainant (i.e., the person, or one of the persons, who made a complaint to an institution about the conduct of research)
- Respondent (i.e., the person who was the subject of a preliminary assessment or investigation into whether their conduct breached the Code)
- Other interested party (please specify): _____

5. Have you received formal notification (in writing, including by email) that the institution has finalised/concluded the processes it commenced in response to the complaint?
(Note: ARIC will not review institutional processes that are still underway unless the application for review alleges institutional delay and/or inaction. If you have already contacted the institution about perceived delay or inaction, you must provide documentary evidence of this and include details of the document/s in the table at Part 5 of this form.)

- Yes – continue to Q6
 No – continue to Q8

6. On which date did you receive the notification? / /
(Note: a request for ARIC review must be lodged within 12 weeks of an institution finalising the process and informing parties of the outcome)

7. Have you attached a copy of this notification?

- Yes -- Please provide details of the document in part 5 of this form
 No – Please indicate why in the field below (limit your response to 150 words)

8. If this application is being lodged more than 12 weeks after the date you gave in response to question 6, you are required to justify why ARIC should review the case outside the time limit (limit your response to 150 words).
(Note: later requests will be assessed on a case by case basis, taking exceptional circumstances into account.)

Section 3

Details of concerns about handling or investigation of the complaint by the institution/s

9. Please provide a brief summary of your concerns about the process/es undertaken under the 'Summary' sub-heading in the field below, followed by a more detailed explanation under the 'Details' sub-heading. Be concise, limit your total response (i.e. summary and details) to 1500 words and, if possible, refer to the specific requirements of the Code, the [Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#) (the Investigation Guide), and/or any relevant institutional policies and procedures that you believe have not been correctly observed by the institution.

<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Type your succinct summary here</p> <p><u>Details</u></p> <p>Provide a more detailed account of your concerns here, being careful to limit your total word count to 1500.</p>
--

10. If you were not the respondent in the institution's preliminary assessment and/or investigation, provide details of the respondent/s in the table below.

No.	Name of respondent	Institution with which respondent is affiliated
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

11. What outcome or remedy are you hoping to achieve by seeking a review by ARIC?
(Note: ARIC can recommend that an institution: improve its processes for managing and investigating potential breaches of the Code; offer an apology; engage an independent individual to review the merits of any finding; or, if the circumstances warrant, conduct a new preliminary assessment or formal investigation.)

--

Section 4

Organisations/Regulators contacted prior to requesting review by ARIC

12. Have you contacted any other organisations or regulators (e.g. Ombudsman's Offices, Fair Work Australia, or a state or territory corruption watchdog agency) about matters directly/substantially related to the complaint or to the request for review?

- Yes – continue to Q13
 No – continue to Section 5

13. Which organisation/s or regulator/s have you contacted?

No.	Organisation/Regulator Name	Have you received a formal written response to your complaint or inquiry?
1.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please attach a copy to this application and continue to Section 5 <input type="checkbox"/> No – continue to Q14
2.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please attach a copy to this application and continue to Section 5 <input type="checkbox"/> No – continue to Q14
3.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – please attach a copy to this application and continue to Section 5 (overleaf) <input type="checkbox"/> No – continue to Q14

14. Do any of the organisations or regulators identified at Q13 have any ongoing inquiries, investigations, or other processes related to the subject/s of this request for review?

- Yes – provide details in the field below
 No – continue to Section 5

Section 5

Key Supporting Documents

15. ARIC requires that any claims you make in your request for review are supported by documentary evidence. Please complete the following table to explain to ARIC what each supporting document is (including each documentary notification you may have received from another organisation or regulator and identified at question 13) and its relevance to your request for review. *The first row below the headings is an example to provide guidance on how to complete the table.*

(Note: if you need to attach more supporting documents, please reproduce the following table in another document and use it to continue your list: attach the file containing the supplementary table to your request for review.)

No.	Document Title/Description	Relevance to your request
e.g.	Decision letter from <person> of <institution> dated 19 October 2018	Letter outlines the process that was followed to progress the research misconduct investigation, and the information that was relied upon to make findings.
1.		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below ¹)	
2.		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
3.		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	

¹ An appropriate reason may be, for example, that a document is on the World Wide Web, in which case your explanation should include a URL to the document you have identified.

No.	Document Title/Description	Relevance to your request
4.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below ²)		
5.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)		
6.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)		
7.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)		

² An appropriate reason may be, for example, that a document is on the World Wide Web, in which case your explanation should include a URL to the document you have identified.

No.	Document Title/Description	Relevance to your request
8.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below ³)		
9.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)		
10.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)		
11.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)		

³ An appropriate reason may be, for example, that a document is on the World Wide Web, in which case your explanation should include a URL to the document you have identified.

No.	Document Title/Description	Relevance to your request
12.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below ⁴)		
13.		
Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (if not, please explain why in the space below)		

⁴ An appropriate reason may be, for example, that a document is on the World Wide Web, in which case your explanation should include a URL to the document you have identified.

Section 6

Glossary

Term	Definition
Allegation	A claim or assertion that a breach of the Code has occurred. May refer to a single allegation or multiple allegations.
Applicant	A person or persons who has sought a review by ARIC of processes undertaken by a research institution to investigate a Complaint. To be clear, the person or persons who submits a request for review by ARIC is the Applicant.
ARIC	Australian Research Integrity Committee
ARIC Secretariat	Refers to both NHMRC-ARIC and ARC-ARIC Secretariat staff who provide administrative support to ARIC.
Breach	A failure to meet the principles and responsibilities of the Code. May refer to a single breach or multiple breaches.
Code	The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.
Complainant	A person or persons who has made a complaint about the conduct of research, either directly to an institution, or to an institution via the ARC or NHMRC.
Complaint	The referral of a suspected Breach of the Code by a Complainant to an Institution (either directly or via the ARC or NHMRC).
Delay and/or inaction	A delay or inaction which, in all the circumstances, could prejudice the findings or fairness of an investigation/inquiry or imposes hardship on the relevant person.
Institution	Includes universities, independent research institutes, hospitals or any other organisation that conducts research. May refer to one or multiple institutions. ARIC can only review complaints considered by an institution eligible to receive funding by ARC or NHMRC.
Investigation	For ARIC's purposes, the term 'investigation' is used to describe the action of investigating an allegation of a breach of the Code following a preliminary assessment by the institution. The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether a breach of the Code has occurred, and if so, the extent of that breach, and to make recommendations about further actions.
Merits Review	Refers to the correctness of an institution's decision; that is, whether or not a decision was sound in view of the essential facts of the matter under consideration. ARIC is not permitted to consider the merits of a matter.
Panel	Refers to the person or persons appointed by an institution to investigate a potential breach of the Code.
Preliminary assessment	For ARIC's purposes, the term 'preliminary assessment' is used to describe the gathering and evaluating of evidence by the institution to establish whether a potential breach of the Code warrants further investigation.
Process Review	Refers to the processes undertaken by an institution in arriving at a decision. ARIC reviews will consider whether, in conducting an investigation of a breach of the Code, it undertook processes that were consistent with the requirements of the Code and institutional policies and procedures.
Research Misconduct	A serious breach of the Code that is also intentional or reckless or negligent.
Respondent	Person or persons subject to a complaint or allegation about a potential breach of the Code.