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This document shows all the optional comments.

Text *in italics* is the direct wording from the survey

# *Any comments about when your role started or ended? (optional)*

* I think it started about 4 years ago
* Very casual
* I wasn’t aware I’d been nominated as a Reserch Integrity Advisor
* I was on a period of research leave last year so I have not been as involved in recent months
* No training provided - limited understanding of role
* I was there from beginning when Prof […] discussed the role starting, however, I haven’t got any case to handle (i.e. Integrity Issues) Also, note that my comments on the workload/training etc is on SRIA (Integrity) not SREA (Ethics). I see these differently
* The role will end in 27 July 2025
* I was clueless about the role but it seemed manageable and comes with clearly defined workload allocation
* March 2024
* Been doing fo far too long but it is probably the lesser of the evils when it comes to university service roles
* Unclear when I started. I was notified by a College manager.
* My records indicate that I started in 2012
* I became a RI Advisor while working as a clinical academic. Subsequently I have moved to the role of Research Director for our organization and now manage the RI process as a whole.
* I was approached confidentially about taking on the role as an experienced HDR supervisors and researcher in my School, who had also had other senior academic administration roles. I took it on and have stayed in the role as it isn’t much work and no-one else is wanting to do it.
* As Associate Dean (Research), it was deemed suitable that I was placed as the RIA for the School.
* It is part of being the Dean of Research
* Our terms are normally just three years, but I was extended for a second term.
* I am a member of the hREC and have been an advisory as part of the role on the committee
* Linked to appointment as Associate Dean (Research)
* RIA training has been patchy, with no meetings occurring in some years, although there was some (minimal) training in the first year. There have been so few cases/enquiries that I’m not sure whether my current Assoc Head of Research is aware I am an RIA (but I assume he is)
* Senior members of staff were involved in a consultation process about our University RIA role statements before these were advertised or we were asked to participate.
* An important role in university, as we navigate into very unknown spaces where digitalization is taking speed. So the management is now beyond that of between humans but humans and machine. There is much needed research in this area to keep this role in a good top position.
* The role of “Research Integrity Advisor” was added to the responsibilities of school-based Associate Dean’s of Research in October 2020. Further guidelines on the role were provided in early 2021
* I am not entirely sure when this started (2018 or earlier)
* Moved universities
* Lacked structure
* My role actually started earlier than 2016 (in 2011) but 2016 was the first year your system allows to tick.
* Survey tool would not allow me to enter 2011 as start date RIA
* invited by dean
* Yes! I started in 2011, and your form only allows me to select years from 2016- Why?
* My role is still ongoing. I am not sure that I have a scheduled end-date.
* I started my role in 2014
* new position
* It comes with being a Deputy Dean (Research), which I commenced 2.5 years ago
* We needed to install Research Integrity officers in the Faculties after a University-wide review
* Assigned the role when the NHMRC advice came out in May 2022
* 2 years
* My university introduced the role across all faculties at this time, and I applied for the role for my faculty
* We started a new Research Integrity Office last year
* no particular comments about timing
* I was appointed Associate Dean of Research, and being Research Integrity Advisor is part of the role.
* I started formally when I took on the previous version of my current role. Start date approximate.
* I commenced in the role in 2010. I don’t know why your drop down options start at 2016.
* I am just ending my role now as we have someone else now from my school (and I was head of school for a while so not so appropriate)
* role ends this month (going part-time this year)
* On boarding the program commenced in the last quarter of 2022
* I started in August 2015 (date not available in the drop down). At that stage, there was only one Research Integrity Advisor per faculty
* 2025
* It commenced when I took on my current role. It is part of that role description.
* Approx 5 years
* 2022

# *Do you have any comments on your training or time spent as a Research Integrity Advisor? (optional)*

* It was good and relevant
* I haven’t found there to be much for me to do in this role. Perhaps I am under utilized as a more junior member of the suite of advisors or perhaps there is an underutilization of the system as a whole.
* It is difficult to remember all the training content when I am rarely called upon to use it.
* I have never been contacted in my role since my appointment so it has taken very little time.
* This role is nominal as far as I’m concerned. I have had no training and have not been called on to act in this capacity.
* We have received training across the three years but there are still areas of the role that I am unclear about. One of the reasons for that may also be the limited engagement/update of the Advisory service at our university.
* More training is needed to function responsibly in this role
* While I’m listed as a Research Integrity Officer, the university hadn’t notified me of this, nor have I undergone any training. I’ve never been approached by anyone contacting me in the capacity of Research Integrity Officer.
* There has been some training and no actual issues raised
* Very light role for me. More training and meetings available than I attend.
* I am still learning and have not dealt with any cases myself yet.
* not much work in this space
* I have not been called upon
* I have not been called upon at all in my role, so my entire time commitment is due to training and meetings of the integrity network
* I have completed the training but have yet to be approached to assist with any research issues.
* My university has pretty much paid lip service to the concept. ADRs were appointed to the role, our names were listed on a website, and that was it.
* While I have been listed as a research integrity advisor for about 3 years, I have not been called upon to advise on research integrity.
* We were promised training but staff keep leaving and so organising training for us seems to have been overlooked. We have reminded the organisation about this on many occasions.
* All members of the Research Committee were made Advisors. An overview of the role was given - no real training.
* No issues requiring my advice so far. So my time was spent on training and advising HDR
* Some sessions were really informative and I get to know the research practices and issues of other disciplines as well.
* Haven’t spent a lot of time in the role but some training would be helpful for when a query comes in.
* In general I feel I haven’t spent enough time on it, given the importance of the role.
* To date has been a relatively minimal time commitment, mostly associated with ongoing training rather than providing advice
* No formal process. Now in my role as Research Director I recognize that this is sub-optimal.
* the training was clear and to the point
* Have spent next to no time giving advice/being asked questions. Most of the time is spent on the quarterly training which I attend.
* It is an interesting job.
* Competed online integrity training. Groups secession with other RIA at institution. No other training. Read the occasional policy update eg from ARC/ NHMRC as it is sent through
* this has been rewarding and interesting work
* The training I have done has been useful and I keep up with the different dimensions of RI in my own time as best I can. We are treated as free-floating agents, offering advice to individual staff members with concerns. The Research Ethics unit doesn’t often check up on what is happening from the RO experience on the ground.
* Training should be yearly to refresh information. Also needs to be clearer process around what we do when we receive a query.
* Not enough general training on the problem of corruption in science. Part of my time as Research Integrity Advisor is spent reading and thinking about issues related to research integrity and corruption in science.
* We have quite a few RIAs at my university; work load is very small.
* Much of the Research integrity work is actually handled by the research directorate without needing to involve this role
* I have only been referred one case
* Note I am only RIA with respect to staff not students
* Minimal ongoing training, but it is in line with the very small workload. Mostly I have relied on consulting the Code and my own experience as a researcher to inform advice I’ve given
* The role is seen as a support to Research Integrity office so time commitment has been a minimal and the Research Integrity officer has been excellent and very responsive.
* In humanities, the role seems reactive to rare events which need to be treated sensitively on a case-by-case basis.
* The role needs more clarity around it and also a description of duty which currently doesn’t
* Needs to be part of workloads and more publicity required
* I have only provided advice in my role once or twice in total.
* The role is no longer supported with regular updates from the university integrity office
* I was required to do the full suite of Epigeum modules as an initial ask. Subsequent online training was arranged through the Association of Research Managment (which I confess I have not completed). There has been one formal meeting for training and discussion in 2022 involving all the Research Integrity Advisors, which I did attend..
* it was very STEM based, needed more humanities/social sciences. Was also about big controversies, rather than day to day disputes
* very informal
* We are due to receive further training quite soon.
* Most cases are very quick, some take longer, over months or even years.
* Most people at the university don’t know what a RIA is, or the support we might provide
* I said that we received too little training, but honestly the training and advice I’ve gotten from the research integrity office has not been very good, so I’m not sure I would want more training of that kind. I do think we need better training, and if it was good training, we would definitely benefit from more of it, but simply increasing the amount of training without improving the quality would likely do more harm than good.
* Participatory exercises within the training are really helpful and probably should have a greater share of training time
* It was very rare for me to be called upon for use as an RIA
* There were less than 10 staff or students who contacted me as an integrity advisor over 3.5
* Quite decent.
* Most of our training so far has been with the head of research integrity at WEHI, discussing strategies to get best practice amongst all staff.
* As a point of contact, I probably only advised ~20 staff/HDR candidates over the last 12 years
* The training was comprehensive and focussed more about the current university guides and polices regarding research integrity
* not onerous
* In the 10+ years that I’ve been in the role, I’ve only received an approach from a staff member/student about 7 times. Most of these were simply asking for an opinion on whether an idea/event sounded reasonable. 3 cases were more serious.
* Due to Senior role and previous training
* The time above counts only the “general duties” expected of a Research Integrity Advisor at my Insitution. I have also spent time on committees investigation potential breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research.
* Research integrity cases have been rare, as such engagement has been limited
* Training provided by the RIO is necessary and valuable.
* on-going training & refresher material is essential
* Little training was provided for the primary job of a Research Integrity Advisor (at least what I perceive to be the primary role), which is advising researchers on a range of ethical conduct and integrity issues and making decisions about when to escalate cases.
* I have not had to do much work in this area as there has only been one potential grievance referred to me
* it is quite a dynamic part of the academy and keeping up to date is challenging..
* Training has been worthwhile and adequate. Part of the training generally involves example scenarios that you break off into groups to practice conversations.
* I have averaged it out as about 50 hours per year. Regarding training we have consistently been told that there will be training but that has not materialised. We were initially provided with an introduction to the role and different people and systems in the university, but in general I do not feel I have been provided appropriate training
* It was thorough but I needed to do it several times to fully understand
* Very helpful with both online and in person training
* Re time spent - We are a very small organisation with a limited number of research projects. I have briefed personally all relevant staff on the NHMRC guidelines and respond to queries as required.
* No specific training received
* The lack of training regarding the university philosophy and position is a little unfortunate.
* training provided has been ‘about right’ given the service role is only one small part of academic workload, but I think RIA role could be expanded greatly to include proactive training of students and staff to improve integrity in research
* am a journal editor and have extensive experience with COPE
* the training is scheduled but the advice sought and given varies and is not predictable. it is however manageable
* The training is sufficient. There is also a system in place where I can always get advice if necessary even though I did not need it.
* Limited training provided, but support on call as needed. Time spent on RIA duties really minimal - perhaps a reflection of strong emphasis on RI at institution?
* I was offered a lot of initial training, but until I started to handle cases the training felt slightly abstract. Four times a year I get together with my fellow RIAs and we present cases to each other (anonymized) and that is a great learning experience.
* In my view, ongoing training and information exchange across all parts of the university (e.g. with other RIA from other Faculties or Colleges) would be helpful. I found it important to promote the role of RIA in our College as staff did not appear aware of the role and its purpose. This included all staff emails, presentations at all staff events and regular conversations with research-active staff.
* The initial training was sufficient and the university’s research integrity advisor network’s quarterly meetings are an opportunity to catch up with developments and events, either university-specific or national-international. Perhaps an annual refresher workshop on basics (principles and processes) would be useful.
* Time varies a lot from year to year depending on needs.
* Training has mostly been “on the job”, but I also had significant experience as Chair of AEC and member of HREC to draw on - at my Uni Integrity and Ethics are managed by the same people, who I knew well when I started my role, and who I can talk to any time.
* The training assumes people breach integrity as a personal matter rather than seeing structural drivers.
* training was usuful but hard to remember all the details, still need to go to RIO for support at times, even though training had covered those things
* training is incorporated into integrity advisors’ meetings. Case studies are presented for discussion as well as up dates.
* It has been a good experience that all researchers should do at some stage in their career.
* Early intense training including online and face to face training.Review of Australian Code of Responsible Conduct of Research. Establishment of RIA strategy for […]
* Epigeum course is great foundation
* I usually provide advice a couple of times a year – this seems infrequent given the sense from the Research Office that a lack of integrity is rampant across the sector. On the other hand, it used to be very difficult to find a RIA on the website.
* excellent training which was essential to role
* It sounds fair and about right
* I could have been more active in promoting my position as a RIA which would have led to more work which I would have welcomed
* I have only had one matter to deal with officially in my role as RIA since 2020. As someone with training and with previous experience on HRECs and having had NHMRC HREC training as well as other RIA specific training I am consulted more generally about broader RI matters - but specifically about supporting a complainant during the reporting of a RI issue - only one since 2020.
* Minimal demand for advice but worthwhile when approached

# *Do you have any comments on the advice you have provided or situations you have encountered? (optional)*

* No, other than it is clear from other services I set on at the university, ethics board and HDR milestone panels, that students/staff are not fully aware of the role a Research Integrity Advisor could play.
* Although I’m available, I have yet to be contacted in my capacity as an RIA
* My advice has not been called upon
* Although I have indicated zero advice given on the above matters, I have actually given a lot of advice on these things, just not as a Research Integrity Advisor. People approached me as the ADR.
* I have not had to provide advice, so I cannot comment.
* Authorship power imbalance between research students and supervisors seems common
* Sometimes it can be difficult to determine what is a general conversation, and when I’m being asked specifically for advice.
* Most discussions were about a junior researcher understanding the context and boundaries of decision making rather than advising on next steps in relation to specific incidents
* Mostly corridor informal chats as I knew the staff well and wanted opinion. In most cases were not really research integrity issues- they were HR or just general dealing with people issues.
* In my most serious case there was data fabrication by a student. But there are often complicating factors in how to address issues, and in this case, fears that the student may be suicidal. I was advising a co-supervisor who was distressed and wanted the primary supervisor to act. The primary supervisor was cautious because of the suicide risk and wanted to get the whole situation sorted out with a retraction before contacting the integrity office. I advised that the supervisor needed support, especially in dealing with the mental health issue, and needed to contact the integrity office as soon as possible. Sometimes although someone comes with one problem (e.g. authorship), when you dig you find that underlying it can be bullying or harrassment or other issues. Other than advising people on how to sort out simple authorship issues themselves, our job is not to mediate or make judgements but just to advise people on how to proceed. In serious cases this just involves referring it on to the integrity office.
* Where I have been helpful it has usually resulted from just providing a different perspective and encouraging reserach team members to have open communication about issues such as authorship, data sharing etc.
* Mostly, the enquirer has a good understanding of the issue and really want’s someone to corroborate their perspective on their experience. Some are concerned about the career implications of taking a complaint forward so the discussion is about weighing up the pros and cons here. Enquirers also want to know about the process, including whether they can back out if they change their minds.
* Please note that I am not so much an advisor, but rather review cases that are brought to my attention by the Research Office. Advice is normally provided by people in the Research Office.
* Most advice is general, if the matter is more serious I will pass it on to the apporiate colleage responsible for thos matters.
* Much of the advice and situations have come via my involvement on HREC
* I only dealt with one supervisor and she did not take my advice very well, very defensive
* None of the times I provided advice was there a complaint raised against another researcher by the person making the enquiry. So far the advice has been able to help resolve potential problems. Another situation in which I more frequently give advice of a general nature on RI matters is in my role as Graduate research Coordinator - this is mostly to students regarding establishing their entitlements, authorship expections, ethics requirements, data integrity etc at the beginning of their relationship with a supervisor. There are some useful synergies between the two roles.
* Having the research integrity office staff as a confidential source of support and advice for the RIA is key in promptly assessing level of issue and supporting the staff queries involved
* A manual would be good checkpoint for some FAQ
* supervision issues are dealt with in the role of Postgraduate Research Director
* There is certainly a rapidly changing regulatory environment and staff and students are sometimes not fully aware of their obligations.
* 2 key issues brought to me - 1. authorship issues concerning papers led by PhD candidates and 2. unethical data sharing, particularly relating to disseminating of results through the media without agreement
* In one instance, conferred with the HREC chair to clarify some of the issues involved.
* It has occurred to me that the quality of advice people may be receiving is highly dependent on the individual RIA, and their level of experience, as well as personal opinions. I’m not sure extent to which training can be provided to cover all aspects of issues raised with our RIAs.
* I have provided quite a lot of advice on authorship to many individuals, not necessarily as part of the RIA role. I was also Dean/Deputy Dean of Graduate Research for 6-7 years
* prompt and patient
* It is at times difficult to distinguish between inquiries for RIA and more informal discussions commensurate with supervisor and mentorship roles. The few I have listed have been conducted with RIA status noted
* Most advice has been provided in form of teaching. I have had very few people coming to me with problems (hence the low number in the previous question).
* The numbers I have provided also include a workshop I conducted during the annual meeting of a national research centre funded by ther ARC.
* Cases needed to be referred to university management as they involved power dynamics between students and their supervisors
* I chose “all of the time” because on all occasions the people who consulted me indicated that the advice or experience was helpful. It’s hard to know if that was true or of they were being polite.
* Yes, have had positive feedback.
* Given the lack of training, I felt that my advice was necessarily restricted to pointing out the relevant section of the Code for Responsible Conduct of Research. I felt relatively powerless to help either of the situations I provided some advice for.
* No, it has gone well because I have many years of experience in the research area and the staff involved were happy to accept my mediation
* I find ‘Confllicts of Interes’ is the most complecated area to advise and manage. Almost 60-70% of cases I deal with are realted to some form of Authorshiip.
* All situations are unique. As part of the role we are asked to document confidentially the content to assist with training.
* A common sense approach is required. Generally, researchers are trying to navigate complex systems.
* In one situation I was able to precent a major escalation of an incident by providing advice, at other times I have felt a bit useless
* Takes time and also not always easy understand complex situations
* This is a badly needed and critical role in the Faculty
* Background information provided to inform questioner
* Be a known and trusted person
* Arguments over authorship take up the largest amount of time.
* By far the biggest barrier to people proceeding to the point of raising concerns re research integrity is concerns about the ‘reporter’s’ career backlash
* the questions tend to be technical and have been covered in discussions by COPE and many journals
* Important to have the correct document
* there are some standard situations especially with students and these could be encountered or encompassed within classes or courses. staff have more specific issues and often these are complex involving one ir more of the items identified above, for example bullying by a research team member who also plagiarised material
* For most cases I involved, the work was much of giving a third view, especially for academics, who know the issues rather well. For students and HDRs, the advice is more helpful.
* Advice provided is usually just going over some options. Typically limited action has resulted.
* I am able to resolve the majority of resesarch integrity cases with a single meeting, and a quick explanation of correct behaviours.
* The majority of situations requiring advice have involved relationships between higher degree by research candidates and supervisors, providing advice to both sides of the relationship. The advice provided usually seems helpful to the advisee, though it does not always resolve the problem, which can involve personality clashes as much as integrity issues. Apart from these specific cases, I have also run a number of workshops canvassing situations (real or hypothetical) or responding to questions about integrity issues. I advise colleagues and candidates across different disciplinary fields and, in particular, research in creative practice fields can raise interesting problems in the application of research integrity concepts (authorship, the definition of a peer, the definition of data, the nature of collaboration, etc.).
* In many cases resolution has been possible by facilitating communication and having a neutral party present; hardest situations are where compliants are made as hypotheticals or on the way out, with an explicit request not to act on the information supplied (this is mostly around perceived bullying)
* The situations are usually extremely complicated involving power imbalances. (The straightforward stuff people can solve themselves.)
* sometimes needed to go to RIO for support and get back to person, but RIO always very helpful for my role
* The role only started in November and there was a significant institute break so the data for the time period being assessed in this survey for me is biased. Please note this in your survey analysis. However I have provided A LOT of advice to human research and data committees at my institution and other centres within the […] as well as national data initiatives.
* some of the advice provided with another hat on (eg manager, supervisor) but informed by RA training
* The advisors usually provide advice to the DVC (or PVC in some universities) of Research about specific cases where a breach in research integrity might have occurred, but do not find out about the final outcome of the case.
* There is certainly a wide gulf between the rules that operate and people’s understanding of them. In some/many cases, the “rules” (i.e. the Code) are disregarded often actively
* I felt I gave helpful advice when needed

# Lastly, do you have comments about your role as a Research Integrity Advisor or about this research? (optional)

* I am not sure how well known the role is, as yet I have not been called on on my capacity as RIA
* I’m lucky to work in a discipline and School with a strong ethical research culture. I feel the role would be more active in other Schools.
* It would good if it was recognised as important in research.
* I think my role is potentially very important but so far, I have not been asked to do very much other than undertake training and participate in discussions about how Office of Integrity and the committee of RIAs will work.
* nil
* My role is in a hospital affiliated with a large university. The University RIA office is very active, organising meetings and get-togethers with the RIAs and providing regular email updates. Perhaps because of the hospital affiliation there has been less for me to do? My role is advertised by email (along with 3 other RIAs for the hospital) about every 6 months.
* Universities should take this role seriously and devise proper strategies to promote it.
* I’ve just started so there is not much activities going on other than attending meetings.
* None
* Please to see a research project in this area. Please keep up your good work
* I think it is viewed a bit as a ‘volunteer’ role, not a crucial part of someone’s role. Therefore, the RIA is likely to feel permanently under-resourced.
* I feel this is an underutilized role in my institution
* My concerns relate to the processes that follow on from the actions/advice of an RIA. The existence of well-trained and well-supported advisors is only a first step to improving research integrity and safety for staff & students.
* Prevention is better than cure. It would be best if we can find time to provide guidance to people to help avoid integrity cases. This would be largely about avoiding authorship issues. (I think everyone knows that they are not supposed to fabricate data.) We are preparing short 10 minute presentations for staff meetings that can be used to educate people about common issues that arise. I think this is better than offering 2 hour training sessions that a fraction of staff attend.
* The RIA role needs to be nuanced to reflect different institutional and discipline norms and circumstances. Any training provided to RIAs shouldarguably be provided to all researchers and supervisors.
* I became an RIA because I had done research on plagiarism, which I did because I was plagiarised. I wonder how often this is the case.
* It is low profile and RI issues are given little priority across the institution, If I leave the university, my School would struggle to find anyone who understood the role enough to want to do it. Doing research has much more emphasis than making sure it is done well.
* My experience is that Institutions seem to ‘tick and flick’ research integrity advisors. They are required to have them under The Code, but they often just nominate someone in each school and then forget about them once initial training is provided. There ae no clear procedures in place to deal with enquiries to Research Integrity advisors, and no updated training. I think a review of the quality of training, amount and effect of training and also Institutional support for Research Integrity Advisors would shed light on these issues across the Australian University Community.
* I would greatly appreciate receiving a copy of the publications arising from this research when ready. Great initiative! Good luck
* As indicated, the advice normally comes from specialists in the Research Office. But where breaches or potential breaches are identified and they need a review undertaken, then I am called upon as the Dean of the area to complete the review (though in complex cases I may seek out the advice or specialists). Thus I am not providing advice up-front, but rather part of the process for investigating and reviewing breaches (including possible penalties).
* As above - in my insitution many of the issues of research integrity come via the HREC on which I am very involved.
* We have several and so I have not been very busy in the role.
* Very timely investigation into a relatively new role. It is still an emerging role at our University and although there is a […] site with a list of names, I am not sure how well advertised this is.
* I feel that the role is treated at my position of late if not last resort in difficult situations. I agree with this view.
* Its a critical role in the university that needs publicity and recognition
* the graduate research office and post graduate chairs deal with most issues that involve postgraduate studies. These rarely come to the RIA
* Australian culture doesn’t celebrate “dobbers.” Once a colleague accused me of “throwing someone under the bus.” To me, this underscores the importance of having someone (as the RIA) who has a core work responsibility not only to advise but to report any suspicions of sub-optimal research conduct for further investigation. Otherwise, what happens is that a culture of sweeping things under the carpet to avoid embarrassment can become the norm. While my university has an anonymous reporting mechanism available, as RIA I have often found it impossible to avoid being known (as the one who reported something). The very act of talking to people often opens up areas of possible misconduct. So while this can be awkward, I see it as a necessary part of the job (like a medical professional being a “mandatory reporter” of potential child abuse).
* I am only called in for this role when there is a problem. I do a lot of research integrity modelling and advice-giving outside of the formal role.
* n/a
* My institution has taken an approach of appointing RIA as part of our roles - i.e. all voting members of our Research Committee are RIAs. While on one hand this increases potential workload for staff already in management/service roles, it does mean we are well informed of current research strategy, practice, and so on.
* The organisation has to have its act together. There’s is no point having RIAs if senior managers are not answerable to the same set of criteria as all researchers. There also can be a blind spot when students or junior staff make complaints on the grounds of research integrity, due to perceptions of power imbalance rather than focusing on the issue. Managers and senior staff need to be aware of the principles of RIA in order to avoid these types of institutional biases.
* I study research integrity, so I am perhaps more opinionated/obstrepurous than most on this topic, but I feel like the people running the research integrity office at my university lack expertise on research integrity. They focus quite narrowly on topics having to do mostly with authorship disputes, and when I’ve asked them for advice in responding to researchers who’ve come to me with tricky situations, their approach is quite pragmatic and somewhat cynical - it doesn’t seem to be primarily about doing the right thing. I don’t think this is because they are shills for the university (though having to prioritise the university’s legal interests may be part of it), but I think they just aren’t used to thinking about integrity issues, and have similar knee-jerk reactions to many people who accept the status quo and discourage researchers from rocking the boat too much.
* I enjoy the RIA role, do not find it a burden at all (including running a few Lunch & Learn training sessions each year) and could manage a few more cases a year than I currently have.
* I am glad I signed up for this and fully support this and other research projects which aim to support this aspect of life in a research institution.
* This is an important role in universities and can be vey helpful to staff to have a safe conversation about research integrity
* I believe that the fundamental issue is why people behave badly. I guess it can be put down to the pressures we place ourselves, about the need for publishing, about the need for measurable success. I guess that till the time the Universities are working on the drivers of ranking, that may often lack integrity, bad behaviour in research is going to grow.
* I believe that it is becoming increasingly important to have good practices in place in research organizations to train staff about best practice, how to spot potential problems with good scientific practice and the steps a member of staff can and should take if they see something that concerns them.
* Although initially I felt that I was not adequately prepared for this role, I have now received some training and had the opportunity to talk to other RIA in our institution. I feel more comfortable with the role and my ability to give advice or list options for researchers.
* Role has expanded to help promote research integrity in my institute, which is good, but takes up more time.
* Other than RIAs being critical to the research culture of any organisation
* it’s not about the rules. it is about listening and avoiding escalation.
* Good to see research in RIA
* I believe having several RIAs from a range of disciplines is a good idea, and also with diverse backgrounds. Ensuring no conflict of interest is important too. I am not sure about actively promoting the role so that its more about turning to RIAs when needed. As long as the means to find them is clear (known within the research and postgrad offices, and listed on website), then I think this is best. I am not consulted often, but when I have, I believe the responses I provide help the person seeking advice and avoid a negative situation from escalating.
* The role of a Research Integrity Advisor, and the breadth of their duties, needs to be better articulated and ideally homogenised across institutions. If the Advisor is epxected to be an expert in policy and offer detailed advice the training and service recognition needs to refelct this. I am currently doing the role on top of other duties, with no workload allowance.
* Important area where I suspect a high degree of under-reporting. Overall, I feel research integrity issues receive more attention as research students are made aware of their rights and their IP
* I think that RIA’s are well supported at my University but inevitably I’m sure that many people are not aware of our role. I think that there’s a bigger role that RIA’s could play in providing education (to staff and students) around good practices and emerging issues, for example AI.
* I have also developed a 2-hour workshop which I deliver to all new Honours students in my School. I received input from the RIO when I initiated this and RIO staff attend and assist with facilitating case study discussions. I have received excellent support from the RIO throughout my time as RIA.
* Proactive communication about the advice RIA can provide to new and established researchers is key to education and will help ensure researchers embed research integrity into their research
* The vast majority of my work as a Research Integrity Advisor was attending meetings or leading poorly-attended workshops about research integrity. I would much prefer that the promotion of the RIA network and functions be performed by administrative staff and that more of my work involved training in the nature of appropriate advice and decision-making for different integrity-related situations. I would also say that, at least at my institution, the line between issues that should be handled by the ethics administrators and committees and the Research Integrity administrator and advisors was very unclear - clarity here would help.
* It is sometimes difficult dealing with personalities so better training in dispute resolution would be useful.
* I would like to be updated on the results and any publications from this research […]. I think this is important work and if I can contribute in any way I am happy to assist. Thank you.
* Good to be able to give back and help
* Some training would be great!
* I am lucky in having many years of experience in the UK prior to starting this role. It is an activity, however, that is seen as solving problems rather than improving general standards.
* I am delighted that the university introduced this role and office
* I appreciate being able to use my 50+ years of experience to advise academics and students with ethical problems.
* it’s a valuable and often not acknowledged role and it’s affirming to see research in this area
* I hope this survey and its project will help improve research integrity among Australian universities.
* I think RIAs are a useful resource for institutions/departments. I gave regular updates at quarterly staff meetings about any new resources/common issues, which I think was useful in building capacity and raising awareness.
* RIAs can only work when Institutions decide that the time has come to make integrity a core part of their research and teaching philosophy, and make it a key promotion consideration. We keep assuming that people will do the right, and while many do, enough don’t … we don’t only need “lectures” or “training” about integrity, institutions need to practice it, and be proud of doing so.
* Role needs greater recognition. Most staff/students are unaware that the role exists and it is usually not considered in institutional workload models.
* I’ve made comments throughout on this theme: the role and the training do not adequately recognize the power differentials and politics that is driving poor practices in my area (medical sciences). People are caught in tricky situations where renewal of their contract, for example, would be threatened if they raised poor practices. Research teams exploit more junior researchers because of a highly competitive environment that lacks safety nets for research fellows etc. So Research Integrity Advisors are a rhetorical response (that is occasionally useful) rather than a structural response.
* This role is important as a content expert but also a sounding board for researchers (senior, junior and student). Also provides a pathway for issues to be resolved.
* It is so important as so many RI issues are preventable with education
* I truly enjoy the role and have a lot of respect for my peers. I would like to learn from the advisors from other universities.
* About this research: Interested to know the purpose and how and by whom the results will be used. I understand the results will be openly accessible.
* We have a dynamic and committed Research Integrity Network
* Research Integrity is being taken more seriously at my institution (at least in terms of low level compliance). At the moment a MASSIVE obstacle to students and staff acting with integrity is a very lengthy ethics process (taking more than 6 months for low risk ethics). This has created a sense of alienation from many students and a sort of anti RIA feeling.
* I am honoured to have been selected for this challenging and rewarding role.
* Nothing more than abovr