



Australian Code 2018: What institutions should do next

At first glance, there is much to be pleased about the new version of the [Australian Code](#) that was released on 14th June. A short, clear document that is based upon principles and an overt focus on research culture is a positive move away from the tight rules that threatened researchers and research offices alike for deviation from standards that might not be appropriate or even workable in all contexts.

The [2007 Code](#) was rightly criticized on several grounds. First, weighing a system down with detailed rules burdened the vast majority with unneeded compliance for the recklessness and shady intentions of a very small minority. Second, there was reason to suspect the detailed rules did not stop the '[bad apples](#)'. Third, those detailed rules probably did not inspire early career researchers to engage with research integrity and embrace and embed better practice into their research activity. Finally, the Code did little to create an [overall system](#) able to undertake continuous improvement.

But, before we start to celebrate any improvements, we need to work through what has changed and what institutions and researchers need to do about it. And, then, maybe a quiet celebration might be in order.

[Read more](#)

Vigilance versus vigilantism in science: Are ethics no longer important?

In July 2016, the University of Adelaide received an allegation of research misconduct involving the PhD thesis work of a graduate student. We were her supervisors.

We first heard about the allegation not from the University but from a journalist working for ABC TV Australia. It was alleged to have occurred in our laboratory over 15 years ago.

The ABC journalist was in possession of confidential emails between the complainant and the University of Adelaide and the journalist was persistent in attempts to obtain our comments. Although the University process was confidential, it appeared that the complainant was working with the journalist to run a story on unsubstantiated claims before an investigation had commenced.

[Read more](#)

New resources coming soon from AHRECS

AHRECS has always had two primary missions: to provide relevant and up-to-date information services on human research ethics and research integrity and to provide expert consultancy services in those areas. We have developed and maintain free services – the Research Ethics Monthly and the Resources Library – that feedback shows are increasingly used and valued. We actively maintain these by regular surveying relevant literature to identify items of interest and value. We have attracted a regular community of readers and user of our services.

We have come to the view that, in order to ensure that these are maintained, a subscriber or patronage arrangement is needed. This patrons' area will provide additional online services and resources.

We plan to establish such a subscription/patron's area on 1 July. Our aim is to make available to subscribers material that supplements what we continue to offer at no charge and so rewards those who commit to this way of supporting us..

[Read more](#)

Things You Have Missed...

Resource Library (<https://ahrecs.com/ahresources>)

1. [NDA \(Ireland\) Ethical Guidance for Research with People with Disabilities \(Guidance I 2009\)](#)
2. [Paper Accepted...Unless the Letter Was Forged – Scholarly Kitchen \(Angela Cochran I April 2018\)](#)
3. [‘How was Your Trip?’ Self-care for Researchers Working and Writing on Violence \(Kimberly Theidon I 2014\)](#)
4. [Harassment should count as scientific misconduct – Nature \(Erika Marín-Spiotta I May 2018\)](#)
5. [Colin Thomson recognised in this week’s Queen’s Birthday Honours List](#)

Blog (<https://ahrecs.com/blog>)

1. [The inclusion of retracted trials in systematic reviews: implications for patients’ safety](#)
2. [Stop centring Western academic ethics: deidentification in social science research](#)
3. [Can Your HREC Benefit from Coaching?](#)
4. [What’s been going on at AHRECS](#)

5. [On the Problem of “Worldlessness”. Do The Declaration of Helsinki and the Council for International Organizations of Medical Science Guidelines Protect the Stateless in the Research Context?](#)



Do you know someone who hasn't subscribed yet to the Research Ethics Monthly? Please encourage them to subscribe now and help us grow this community



Got an idea for a post or a suggestion for a guest?

Send an email to gary@ahrecs.com



Do you have a view, feedback or some constructive criticism on this or other posts? Every item has comment link so you can have your say and continue the conversation.



RESOURCE LIBRARY

Have you checked out the resource library recently? New items are added daily. There are separate sections for Human Research Ethics and Research Integrity. There are subsections for different categories of items e.g. 'In the news' and books.

We hate spam and definitely don't want to bother you with unwanted emails.

[Click here](#) to change your subscription settings.

This newsletter is authorized by the AHRECS team, [click here](#) for contact and other details.

We would never divulge your details to anyone else, including not disclosing you're a subscriber, without your permission.

This email was sent to gary@lathroug.com

[why did I get this?](#) [unsubscribe from this list](#) [update subscription preferences](#)

Australasian Human Research Ethics Consultancy Services (AHRECS) · 14 Sovereign Way · Samford Valley, Qld 4520 · Australia

MailChimp.