

## **GUIDELINES FOR THE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH**

---

### **PREAMBLE**

The University recognises research and research-led teaching as primary responsibilities of its academic staff. It places value on fostering, publishing, and disseminating research of the highest international quality, and University research should serve to develop intellectual independence and promote community learning.

The University must ensure that it maintains the highest ethical standards (Education Act 1989). Dishonesty of any kind in research is unacceptable. Such dishonesty damages the search for truth, the individual(s) themselves, their colleagues and the general community. The University cannot permit the integrity of its research programmes to be placed in doubt.

The definition of research used for the purpose of this document is the definition used in the Report of the Performance-Based Research Fund Working Group (2002). It is as follows:

‘Research is original investigation undertaken in order to gain knowledge and understanding. It typically involves enquiry of an experimental or critical nature driven by hypotheses or intellectual positions capable of rigorous assessment. It is an independent, creative, cumulative and often long-term activity conducted by people with specialist knowledge about the theories, methods and information concerning their field of enquiry. Its findings must be open to scrutiny and formal evaluation by others in the field, and this may be achieved through publication or public presentation. In some fields, the results of the investigation may be embodied in the form of an artistic work, design or performance.

Research includes contributions to the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines (e.g. dictionaries and scholarly editions). It also includes the experimental development of design or construction solutions, as well as investigation that leads to new or substantially improved materials, devices, products or processes.

### **APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES**

These Guidelines apply to:

1. Students who have been engaged in or who are engaged in independent research, whether supervised or unsupervised, that results in a thesis, dissertation or project valued at four (4) or more points. The Guidelines: Conduct of Coursework apply to students who have been engaged in or are engaged in coursework;
2. Academic staff;
3. Other members of the University (as defined in clause 12 of these Guidelines).

These Guidelines are in two parts; firstly, ethical guidelines for the conduct of research and secondly, procedures for dealing with concerns relating to misconduct in research.

The ethical guidelines in Part One are relevant to all three parties referred to above.

The clauses of Part Two apply as follows:

- (a) Clauses 12, 13, 25-27 apply to all three parties, i.e. students, academic staff and other members of the University;
- (b) Clause 14 applies to students only;
- (c) Clauses 17, 18, 21-24 apply to both academic staff and other members of the University;
- (d) Clauses 15 and 19 apply to academic staff only;
- (e) Clauses 16 and 20 apply to other members of the University only.

### **REFERENCES TO OTHER UNIVERSITY POLICIES etc.**

All references to other University statutes, policies, regulations and procedures in these Guidelines are to statutes, policies, regulations and procedures which are current as at the date of the adoption of these Guidelines.

Should any of the statutes, policies, regulations or procedures referred to in these Guidelines be amended or repealed, these Guidelines shall continue to apply with such amendments or modifications as are necessary to make them effective.

## **PART ONE: ETHICAL GUIDELINES**

### **1. General Standards for Research**

- 1.1. It is a basic assumption that researchers are committed to the highest standards of professional conduct in undertaking and supervising research. They have a duty to maintain the highest standards of probity in research applicable to their science or discipline, and thus to protect and enhance the University's good name in research.
- 1.2. Research workers should only participate in work that conforms to accepted ethical standards and which they are competent to perform. When in doubt they should seek assistance with their research from their colleagues or peers. Debate on, and criticism of, research work are essential parts of the research process.
- 1.3. Institutions and research workers have a responsibility to ensure the safety of all those associated with research. It is also essential that the design of projects conform to any relevant ethical guidelines.

### **2. Confidential Data**

- 2.1. If data of a confidential nature are obtained, confidentiality must be observed and research workers must not use such information for their own personal advantage or that of a third party. In general, however, research results and methods should be open to scrutiny by colleagues within the institution, and through appropriate publication by the profession and the world at large. Withholding publication for a limited period may be necessary in the case of contracted research.
- 2.2. Because of the requirements for informed consent for the involvement of human subjects in research, data relating to them must be retained in a manner that maintains the confidentiality promised in the informed consent document.

### **3. Privacy Act 1993**

- 3.1. This Act regulates the collection, holding, retention, use and disclosure of information about identifiable individuals. Most, and in some cases all, of the 12 Privacy Principles in the Act will have direct application to personal information obtained for the purpose or in the course of research. All persons to whom these Guidelines apply need to be familiar with Privacy Principles and ensure that they are faithfully observed in the conduct of research and the publication of its results.

### **4. Retention of Data**

- 4.1. Original data of published material should be kept, preferably indefinitely, but for at least 6 years. Each Faculty should be responsible for deciding on an appropriate policy for the storage of research data. Any policy must take into account the need to comply with ethics approvals and contracts in any particular work of research. Individual research workers should be entitled to hold copies of the data. While such action does not of itself prevent the falsification of primary data, it is vital if there are questions asked subsequent to publication. If data are not available genuine errors may be mistaken for misconduct to the detriment of individual research workers and the University. Long-term retention of original data that consists of personal information needs to be justified to avoid a breach of Privacy Principle 9.

### **5. Expectations for Research and Publications**

- 5.1. It is neither desirable nor practical for the University to supervise the creation of books, papers or articles. The very nature of the University makes this a matter for the responsibility of each person to whom these guidelines apply.
- 5.2. All persons to whom these Guidelines apply must be very careful in using material from other authors and ensure that it is properly acknowledged. The deliberate copying of other people's work and the presentation of it as one's own constitutes plagiarism, which is unacceptable to the University. Those who use material which is not produced by them have a responsibility to make its status and origins quite clear to those to whom it is presented. It is a fundamental principle of academic life that individuals can claim credit for and make material use of only those works or parts of work to which they have a legitimate claim. Further, these Guidelines do not distinguish between plagiarism for purposes external and internal to the University.
- 5.3. In addition to the obligations outlined in clause 5.2 above, academic staff also have responsibilities to provide guidance to, and oversight of, students in these matters when requesting a student to write draft material for publication. In such a case, the academic staff member must clarify with the student at the outset the terms of the student's role

- including matters relating to acknowledgment and authorship. It is the responsibility of the academic staff member to ensure as far as practicable that the student does not have any misunderstandings or mistaken expectations as to acknowledgment or authorship.
- 5.4 The principles governing attribution of authorship apply independently of whether an author is paid for their time. Typically, the criterion for acknowledgment of authorship of any scholarly publication is the significance of the contribution to the final publication.
  - 5.5 It is important that all authors listed on the publication should have contributed in a significant way to the work. The principal author is responsible for the entire publication and should ensure that other authors accept, in writing, responsibility either for the entire paper or, where the contributions are distinguishable, for that part of it which they have authored. When collaboration between institutions is involved in a publication, each institution should be aware that all authors have accepted appropriate responsibility.
  - 5.6 Where an author submits similar papers, articles or abstracts to several journals he or she must properly declare this to the publishers concerned.

## **6. The Role of Supervisors of Graduate Student Research**

- 6.1. The University is responsible for ensuring that graduate student research is properly supervised. Individuals given responsibility for research supervision should be competent in the field and have the time to supervise adequately. This may mean limiting the number of people one person may supervise.
- 6.2. Research supervisors should ensure that students are aware of the ethical standards relevant to their work, which includes the nature of intellectual property. Supervisors should ensure that work submitted by students is the students' own and that where there are data they have been validly obtained.

Note: Guidelines and Policy for Postgraduates (including the Senate Policy on student supervision is available from the Postgraduate Committee's website:  
[http://www.auckland.ac.nz/cir\\_students/index.cfm?action=display\\_page&page\\_title=studentadmin\\_postgrad\\_general\\_policyandguidelines](http://www.auckland.ac.nz/cir_students/index.cfm?action=display_page&page_title=studentadmin_postgrad_general_policyandguidelines)

## **7. Research Groups**

- 7.1. Wherever appropriate and taking into consideration relevant issues such as confidentiality and intellectual property, the head of the unit or director of the research should be personally involved in research supervision. Within a group, there should be wide discussion of the work of all individuals by their peers.

## **8. Areas Governed by Specific Regulations**

- 8.1. In some disciplines there will be specific areas which are regulated, for example, animal and human experimentation. These activities must conform to the legal and institutional guidelines covering them. Where approval for research is required from an ethics committee, this must be obtained before research commences.

## **9. Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest**

- 9.1. Disclosure of any potential conflict of interest is essential for the responsible conduct of research. All members of the University who may be involved in the decision making processes of the University (including staff) must be familiar with and comply with the University's Disclosure of Interest policy in the conduct of any research.

## **10. Use of University Resources**

- 10.1 The use of University resources for the undertaking of research must be approved in accordance with the University's policies on funding for research.
- 10.2 In particular, a person to whom these Guidelines apply may not engage another person to undertake research and remunerate them out of University funds unless specific approval has been given for that remuneration by the University or unless he or she is entitled to do so, for example by virtue of a scholarship. A person to whom these Guidelines apply who does not comply with this requirement and who has an interest in the research being undertaken may be in breach of the University's Disclosure of Interest policy.

## 11. Other Responsibilities

Part One of these Guidelines does not contain an exhaustive list of the responsibilities of persons engaged in research. The Senate Guidelines on Thesis Supervision, ([HTTP://WWW.AUCKLAND.AC.NZ/DOCS/SA/POSTGRADUATE/DOWNLOAD/SUPERVISION.PDF](http://www.auckland.ac.nz/docs/sa/postgraduate/download/supervision.pdf)) for example, lists further responsibilities of thesis supervisors and students for Masters degrees which have a major research thesis component and all doctoral degrees that have a supervised research component.

## PART TWO: PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH CONCERNS OF MISCONDUCT IN RESEARCH

### 12. Definitions

- 12.1 In this Part Two of the Guidelines, the following definitions apply:
- (a) **“Complainant”** means a person, including a non-University member, who has a concern or concerns that an academic staff member or other member of the University may have committed misconduct in Research;
  - (b) **“Delegate”** means a member or members of the University to whom the Vice-Chancellor delegates the authority to investigate and decide upon a possible case of Misconduct in Research;
  - (c) **“Disciplinary Procedures”** means the Disciplinary Procedures for Academic Staff (Schedule 3 to Academic CEC 2000-2002);
  - (d) **“Disciplinary Statute”** means the Disciplinary Statute 1998;
  - (e) **“Misconduct in Research”** includes but is not limited to:
    - (i) The fabrication or falsification of data, including changing records;
    - (ii) Claiming results that have not been obtained;
    - (iii) Plagiarism, including the direct copying of textual material, the use of other people's data without acknowledgement and the deliberate use of published or unpublished ideas from other people without adequate attribution;
    - (iv) Misleading ascription of authorship, including the listing of authors without their permission and attributing work to others who have not in fact contributed to the research and failing to acknowledge work primarily produced by a research student/trainee/associate;
    - (v) Other serious misdemeanours in specific disciplines including breaches of relevant professional practices and codes of ethics. For example, in human or animal experimentation, departing from protocols approved by the University;
    - (vi) Other research practices which bring or are likely to bring the University into disrepute.
  - (f) **“Ombudsman”** means a person appointed by the Vice-Chancellor to undertake a preliminary assessment of any concern/s relating to Misconduct in Research;
  - (g) **“Other Members of the University”** means members of the University other than academic staff or students who are engaged in research involving the University, such as where applications for funding have been processed through the University or where the research involves facilities or resources of the University (including but not limited to: Emeritus Professors);
  - (h) **“Respondent”** means a person to whom these Guidelines apply about whom concerns are raised that he or she has committed Misconduct in Research.

### 13. Research Funding Agencies

13.1 Where a research funding agency has its own policy for dealing with and reporting possible Misconduct in Research, and the University of Auckland has elected to adopt that policy, the procedures outlined in that policy must be followed. For example, the Office of Public Health and Science in the USA is such an agency which has its own policy with respect to allegations of scientific misconduct involving US Public Health Service funding. (The University of Auckland has elected (29 April 1999) to adopt the provisions given in 42 C.F.R. Part 50 Subpart A: Responsibility of PHS Awardee and Applicant Institutions for Dealing With and Reporting Possible Misconduct in Science. Refer to Appendix 1.4 for the PHS policy statement.)

### 14. Misconduct in Research by Students

14.1 Misconduct in Research by a student shall be dealt with as follows:

- (a) If the Misconduct in Research involves unacknowledged copying or plagiarism it is treated as an “examination offence” pursuant to the Examination Regulations (refer clause 2(c) of the Examination Regulations);
  - (b) If the Misconduct in Research involves any dishonest practice in the preparation or submission of any work (whether in the course of an examination or not) which counts towards the attainment of a pass in any subject, or otherwise occurs in connection with any examination it shall be treated as an “examination offence” pursuant to the Examination Regulations (refer clause 9(a) of the Examination Regulations)).
- 14.2 The procedures to be followed in determining whether Misconduct in Research has occurred by a student pursuant to clauses 14.1(a) or 14.1(b) above, and the penalties which may be imposed where it is found to have occurred in those circumstances, are outlined in clause 9 of the Examination Regulations. The Examination Regulations are to be read in conjunction with the Disciplinary Statute 1998.
- 14.3 Misconduct in Research by a student in circumstances other than as referred to in clause 14.1(a) and 14.1(b) above will be regarded as a breach of either of the following clauses of the Disciplinary Statute 1998:
- (a) Clause 4(i): acting in a manner contrary to the good government of the University or so as to bring the University into disrepute; or
  - (b) Clause 4(iii): wilfully impeding the activities of the University in research.
- 14.4 Misconduct in Research by a student pursuant to clause 14.3 above will be dealt with pursuant to the terms of the Disciplinary Statute.

#### **15. Misconduct in Research by Academic Staff**

- 15.1 The Disciplinary Procedures, together with clauses 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 24 of these Guidelines, outline the procedures to be followed for determining whether an academic staff member has committed Misconduct in Research. Clauses 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 24 of these Guidelines are to be read in conjunction with the Disciplinary Procedures when they apply to academic staff. Misconduct in Research by an academic staff member may constitute either misconduct or serious misconduct pursuant to the Disciplinary Procedures.

#### **16. Misconduct in Research by Other Members of University**

- 16.1 Clauses 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 of these Guidelines outline the procedures to be followed for determining whether an Other Member of the University has committed Misconduct in Research. Misconduct in Research by an Other Member of the University may constitute either misconduct or serious misconduct.

#### **17. Raising Concern(s) of Misconduct in Research**

- 17.1 Where any person, including a non-University member, has any concern/s that an academic staff member or Other Member of the University may have committed Misconduct in Research, the following procedures shall apply:
- (a) Such a person shall be referred to as the Complainant;
  - (b) The Complainant should raise his or her concern/s with:
    - (i) the Head of Department of the relevant Faculty; or
    - (ii) if the involvement of the Head of Department is inappropriate, with the Dean of the relevant Faculty; or
    - (iii) if the involvement of both the Head of Department and the Dean is inappropriate, with the Vice Chancellor who may then appoint an ‘Ombudsman’ to undertake the preliminary assessment pursuant to clause 18 below.
  - (c) A Complainant who raises a concern/s should be given a copy of these Guidelines;
  - (d) The Complainant should be advised that any information supplied by him or her in relation to another person will be personal information in accordance with the Privacy Act and/or Official Information Act and subject to this legislation;
  - (e) The University will protect the confidentiality of the Complainant as far as possible and within legal constraints.

17.2 The Vice Chancellor may raise a research concern of his or her own volition. The Provisions of clause 17.1 (a) – (e) above shall then apply. The Vice Chancellor will be referred to as the Complainant in such instances.

## **18. Preliminary Assessment**

- 18.1 When the concern/s are raised, the Head of Department, Dean or Ombudsman should:
- (a) Inform the Respondent that he or she is making a preliminary assessment; and
  - (b) If necessary, make some preliminary inquiries of the Complainant regarding the nature of his/her concerns; and
  - (c) Invite the Respondent's preliminary response.
- 18.2 A preliminary assessment will be based upon the information provided by the Complainant, the preliminary response of the Respondent, and any other relevant material.
- 18.3 The Head of Department, Dean or Ombudsman may decide to take no action if the preliminary assessment does not disclose a possible case of Misconduct in Research or if he or she is satisfied that the subject matter is trivial or that the concern/s were raised in bad faith. In these circumstances he or she should:
- (a) inform the Complainant and the Respondent that no further action will be taken;
  - (b) record this conclusion officially in the Respondent's record
  - (c) if the concern/s were raised in bad faith or vexatiously, consider disciplinary or other action against the Complainant (note that the Disciplinary Procedures must be followed for University staff members);
  - (d) cease the case if the concern/s were reasonably brought but incorrect or without sufficient foundation.
- 18.4 In reaching a preliminary assessment, the Head of Department, Dean or Ombudsman must consider if, in the event Misconduct in Research occurred, whether it would be likely to constitute misconduct or serious misconduct by taking into account the following:
- (a) "Misconduct" is conduct that is not so serious as to destroy the relationship of trust and confidence between the University and the Respondent but does justify a disciplinary action. For example, an honest error may constitute misconduct.
  - (b) "serious misconduct" is conduct which impairs the trust and confidence which are essential to the relationship between the University and the Respondent. Conduct that involves dishonesty will generally constitute serious misconduct.

## **19. Applicable Procedures – Academic Staff**

- (a) Where the Respondent is an academic staff member:
- (i) If the person with whom the concern/s has been raised decides that the conduct of concern is, if established, likely to amount to misconduct, then the procedures outlined in clause 4 and (where necessary 5 and 6) of the Disciplinary Procedures apply. The reference to the Head of Department in those clauses will be substituted with the person with whom the concern/s has been raised if that person is different from the Head of Department. Where clauses 5 and 6 of the Disciplinary Procedures apply, the Vice Chancellor's appointment of the Delegate shall be made in accordance with clause 20 below;
  - (ii) If the person with whom the concern/s has been raised decides that the conduct of concern is, if established, likely to amount to serious misconduct, then the procedures outlined in clause 8 of the Disciplinary Procedures should be followed in conjunction with clauses 21 – 24 below.

## **20. Applicable Procedures – Other Members of University**

- 20.1 Where the Respondent is an Other Member of the University:
- (a) If the person with whom the concern/s has been raised decides that the conduct of concern is, if established, likely to amount to misconduct, then that person should:
    - (i) Offer the Respondent the opportunity to be represented;
    - (ii) Invite the Respondent to a meeting to discuss the concerns;
    - (iii) Invite the Respondent's explanation for the concerns;
    - (iv) Decide, following consultation with the Vice Chancellor if he or she wishes, what action, if any, should be taken (which may include a warning).

- (b) If the person with whom the concern/s has been raised decides that the conduct of concern, if established, is likely to amount to serious misconduct then he or she should refer the matter to the Vice Chancellor and the procedures outlined in clauses 21 – 24 below apply.

## **21. Appointment of Delegate**

- 21.1 The Vice Chancellor will appoint a Delegate to investigate and decide upon a possible case of Misconduct in Research. Where the Respondent is an academic staff member, the appointment will be made pursuant to clause 5 of the Disciplinary Procedures (in a possible case of misconduct) or clause 8 of the Disciplinary Procedures (in a possible case of serious misconduct).
- 21.2 In appointing the Delegate, the Vice-Chancellor shall, where appropriate:
  - (a) Appoint a small committee of persons rather than a single person;
  - (b) Include in the committee a member or members of the University Research Committee (which includes the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research));
  - (c) Appoint persons in the committee who are not directly affected by the research in question or who have any other conflict of interest pursuant to the University Disclosure of Interest policy;
  - (d) Appoint someone in the committee who understands the discipline concerned;
  - (f) Include in the committee a lawyer.

## **22. Change from Misconduct to Serious Misconduct and Vice Versa**

- 22.1 At any time during the investigation of a possible case of Misconduct in Research pursuant to these Guidelines (and, in the case of an academic staff member, the Disciplinary Procedures) the Delegate (or, in the case of an investigation pursuant to clause 4 of the Disciplinary Procedures, the person with whom the concern/s have been raised) may decide, based on the evidence, to change the investigation from one relating to misconduct to one relating to serious misconduct, or vice versa. This will result in different procedures applying pursuant these Guidelines (and, where the Respondent is an academic staff member, pursuant to the Disciplinary Procedures).

## **23. Investigation by Delegate of Possible Serious Misconduct**

- 23.1 Where the Delegate is investigating possible Misconduct in Research as a possible case of serious misconduct pursuant to these Guidelines, (and where the Respondent is an academic staff member pursuant to clause 8 of the Disciplinary Procedures) the Delegate will as a general rule take the following steps:
  - (a) Offer the Respondent the opportunity to be represented during the investigation;
  - (b) Interview relevant persons;
  - (c) Review relevant documentation;
  - (d) Seek clarification or make inquiries as relevant;
  - (e) Provide information obtained in the course of the investigation to the Respondent;
  - (f) Offer the Respondent the opportunity to submit a written response if he or she wishes, in addition to an opportunity to respond orally (if the Respondent is an academic staff member this will occur at the meeting referred to in clause 8.3 of the Disciplinary Procedures);
  - (g) Examine and evaluate relevant facts and evidence to determine whether serious misconduct has occurred;
  - (h) Prepare a written report that summarizes the evidence reviewed and includes the conclusions of the Delegate.
- 23.2 During the investigation by the Delegate into possible Misconduct in Research which may be serious misconduct the Delegate may require any member of the University to be interviewed by the Delegate or to produce any written material in their possession relating to the matters at issue. The Delegate may also require the Respondent to produce material such as research data. All material produced shall be kept secure during the investigation.
- 23.3 If concern/s are raised which appear to cast doubt on the validity of one or more research publications by the Respondent, it may be necessary for the Delegate to investigate other research (including past research) by the Respondent as well as that covered by the concerns raised.

## **24. Referral by Delegate to Vice Chancellor**

24.1 At any time during the investigation by the Delegate into a possible case of Misconduct in Research pursuant to these Guidelines where the Respondent is an academic staff member or an Other Member of the University, the Delegate may refer relevant information to the Vice Chancellor for his or her guidance and/or recommendation on any matters (including on what action should be taken if the concern/s are established). The Respondent should be informed of the Vice Chancellor's advice and given the opportunity to comment on it. The final decision on the Misconduct in Research will rest with the Delegate.

## **25. Protection of Interested Parties**

25.1 In a possible case of Misconduct in Research, it is important that all interested parties are protected as far as reasonably practicable. Interested parties in any given case may include:

- (a) The person or persons who raised the concern/s;
- (b) The Respondent;
- (c) Possible research students and staff working with the person/s concerned;
- (d) The Department/s in which the research is or was conducted;
- (e) Publishers, actual or potential, of possibly fraudulent work;
- (f) Funding bodies which have contributed to the research;
- (g) Human subjects of on going or past research;
- (h) In some cases the public - for example, if a medicine is involved.

25.2 As to 25.1(a) above, the privacy of a person or persons who raise concern/s in good faith should be maintained as far as reasonably practicable. If necessary, efforts should be made to protect the reputation and career of this person or persons.

25.3 As to 25.1(b) above, the Respondent should be afforded confidentiality as far as reasonably practicable during the investigative stages. Where, however, in the opinion of the Delegate, the protection of other interested parties including but not limited to those referred to in 25.1 (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), above, necessarily involves some disclosure prior to the completion of the investigation, that disclosure shall be only to the extent that is necessary and on the express basis that no final conclusions have been made.

## **26. Outcome of Investigation**

26.1 If it is found that, pursuant to these Guidelines, there is Misconduct in Research by the Respondent:

- (a) Where the Respondent is a student, action should be taken pursuant to the Examination Regulations and/or the Disciplinary Statute, as applicable;
- (b) Where the Respondent is an academic staff member, disciplinary action should be taken pursuant to the Disciplinary Procedures;
- (c) Where the Respondent is an Other Member of the University, the Delegate may seek advice from the Vice Chancellor on the appropriate action to be taken. Possible action may include the removal of an honour bestowed by the University;
- (d) It may be necessary to clarify the position of past or present co-workers with respect to the research in question;
- (e) It may be necessary to inform other individuals or organizations, including but not limited to the parties referred to 25.1 (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h);
- (f) It may be necessary to take remedial action, such as a change to attributed authorship and any other remedy to repair any damage caused by the Misconduct in Research.

26.2 If it is found that, pursuant to these Guidelines, there is no Misconduct in Research by the Respondent:

- (a) Action may be needed to redress any damage to the Respondent, including any costs incurred in defending himself or herself;
- (b) A statement should be placed on the Respondent's record to this effect;
- (c) It will be necessary to consider whether the initial concerns were made maliciously and, if so, what appropriate action should be taken.

**27. Action if the Respondent Resigns**

27.1 In the event of the Respondent resigning or leaving the University prior to the conclusion of an investigation into Misconduct in Research, a Delegate will nevertheless report on the status of the research and on any necessary remedial action needed to protect affected people (including but not limited to those listed in clause 25.1).

