



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]	OR	ARIC-NHMRC Secretariat [IN CONFIDENCE]
Australian Research Council		National Health and Medical Research Council
GPO Box 2702		GPO Box 1421
Canberra ACT 2601		Canberra ACT 2601

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

Email: aric@arc.gov.au

Email: aric@nhmrc.gov.au

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 12 months or more to complete, depending on the complexity of the matter.

Please ensure that prior to submitting your request for review you are familiar with the ARIC Framework and have completed the Application Checklist (Section 6).

Section 1

CONTACT DETAILS OF APPLICANT

ARIC accepts anonymous requests for review; however, anonymity can make it difficult to obtain all evidence required for the review. ARIC often requires additional information to be able to undertake a review. The inability to contact the applicant or other persons who have standing in the matter may make this process slower and more difficult.

Full name (given name, surname) _____

Contact Address Line 1 _____

Line 2 _____

Suburb, State, Postcode _____

Country, if not Australia _____

Phone Home (____) _____

Mobile _____

Work (____) _____

Email _____

What is your preferred mode of contact?

☐ Phone

☐ Email

Anonymity

Do you agree to your name being shared with the institution? If not, then all reference to you in correspondence with the institution and ARIC's findings will be as an 'anonymous applicant'. Please note that, given the nature of the review process, ARIC cannot guarantee the institution would not be able to identify you even if you choose to withhold your name.

☐ Yes, my name can be shared with the institution.

☐ No, I wish to remain anonymous to the institution.

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 \(the Code\)](#). It **cannot** review the merits of any findings or decisions following an institution's preliminary assessment or investigation. If your request for review does not clearly outline your procedural concerns in this matter, it may be declined for review.

Does your request for review relate directly to the process undertaken by an Australian research institution in response to a complaint 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 (if known): _____

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 that the institution has finalised/concluded the process it commenced in response to the complaint? / /

(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).

Section 3

DETAILS OF CONCERNS ABOUT HANDLING OR INVESTIGATION OF THE COMPLAINT BY THE INSTITUTION/S

9. In the table below, please provide a brief summary of your concerns about the process/es undertaken by the institution. Your summary should clearly state how your concern relates to one or more of the following categories:
- The process undertaken by the institution (including preliminary assessment and/or investigation) did not follow the procedures outlined in the Investigation Guide and/or the institution's own policies.
 - There was inadequate communication and/or transparency between the institution and the complainants and/or respondents.
 - The complainants and/or respondents were not given adequate opportunities to respond to allegations.
 - There was a conflict of interest with the personnel investigating the complaint.
 - The process undertaken by the institution (including preliminary assessment and/or investigation) was completed in an untimely manner that compromised its procedural fairness or resulted in detriment to the complainants and/or respondents.
 - The institution's process did not afford procedural fairness, in another way not included above.

Be concise, limiting your total response (i.e. summary and details) to 1500 words and specifically to your concerns with the process undertaken by the institution in this matter. You do not need to provide a response for every category. Where 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. If your request for review does not clearly outline your procedural concerns in this matter, it may be declined for review.

Summary

Summarise your concerns as they relate to one or more of the categories listed above.

Details

Provide a more detailed account of your concerns here. Note: The total word limit for the Summary and Details sections combined is 1,500 words or less.

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.

	<i>Name of respondent</i>	<i>Institution with which respondent is affiliated</i>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

11. What outcome or remedy are you hoping to achieve by seeking a review by ARIC? Select all that apply.

- ☐ ARIC to provide advice to the institution on improvements it could or should make to manage or investigate potential breaches of the Code in the future.
- ☐ An independent individual or individuals be engaged by the institution to provide an independent review of the merits of any finding of a breach of the Code.
- ☐ The institution to offer an apology to yourself, and/or the complainant or the respondent to the original complaint about a potential breach of the Code.
- ☐ The institution to conduct a new preliminary assessment or investigation.
- ☐ Other (please describe below).

Note: The outcome(s) selected will not determine whether ARIC accepts a request for review or what recommendation ARIC may ultimately make.

Provide detail on the outcome or remedy you are hoping to achieve. Please note that ARIC can only make recommendations as set out in the [ARIC Framework](#).

Section 4

ORGANISATIONS/REGULATORS CONTACTED PRIOR TO REQUESTING REVIEW BY ARIC

12. Have you contacted any other organisations or regulators about matters directly/substantially related to the complaint or to the request for review? This may include, but not be limited to, Ombudsman’s Offices, Fair Work Australia, a state or territory corruption watchdog agency, or legal proceedings including seeking legal advice.

If the outcomes you hope to achieve by seeking a review by ARIC may be more suitably addressed by another organisation or regulator, your request for review may be declined.

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

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

	<i>Organisation/Regulator Name</i>	<i>Have you received a formal written response to your complaint or inquiry?</i>
1.		☐ Yes – please attach a copy to this application and continue to Section 5 ☐ No – continue to Q14
2.		☐ Yes – please attach a copy to this application and continue to Section 5 ☐ No – continue to Q14
3.		☐ Yes – please attach a copy to this application and continue to Section 5 (overleaf) ☐ 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 table on the following page 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.

Only submit documents that are needed for ARIC to determine whether your request for review should be accepted. If further documentation is required, ARIC will request it. Please attach only the following documents, where relevant and available:

- Original complaint regarding a potential breach of the Code.
- Preliminary assessment report.
- Terms of reference for the investigation panel.
- Investigation report.
- Formal notification (in writing, including by email) that the institution has finalised/concluded the processes it commenced in response to the complaint, including notification of decision to dismiss your complaint.
- Formal notification (in writing, including by email) of any decisions or actions by the institution in response to the finalisation/conclusion of the process.

Please do not submit additional documents unless requested. Any documents provided that are not listed above may not be reviewed or considered by the Secretariat or an ARIC panel.

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.	<i>Decision letter from <person> of <institution> dated 19 October 2018</i>	<i>Letter outlines the process that was followed to progress the research misconduct investigation, and the information that was relied upon to make findings.</i>
1		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
2		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
3		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
4		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
5		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	

6		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
7		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
8		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
9		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	
10		
	Have you included a copy of this document with this request for review? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if not, please explain why in the space below)	

Section 6

CHECKLIST AND DECLARATION

Application Checklist

Please ensure you have completed the following sections:

- ☐ 1. Contact details of applicant
- ☐ 2. Status of the complaint
- ☐ 3. Details of concerns about the handling or investigation of the complaint by the institution
- ☐ 4. Organisations/Regulators contacted prior to requesting review by ARIC
- ☐ 5. Key supporting documents
- ☐ 6. Checklist and declaration

Declaration

In submitting this application for review I attest that I:

1. understand the importance of confidentiality of the ARIC review process
2. understand that ARIC conducts reviews of an eligible institution's process in managing an alleged breach of the Code
3. understand that ARIC does not:
 - investigate allegations of breaches of the Code
 - act as an appeals mechanism for findings by an institution following a research integrity investigation, or
 - act as an appeals mechanism for sanctions applied by an institution following a research integrity investigation
4. declare that this application is, to the best of my knowledge, based on facts
5. declare that this application is made in good faith
6. have attached copies of the supporting documentation.

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 7

GLOSSARY

<i>Term</i>	<i>Definition</i>
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	<i>The Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.</i>
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).
<i>Delay and/or inaction</i>	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.