

Response ID ANON-X8FR-8PNR-G

Submitted to Consultation: Good Institutional Practice Guide
Submitted on 2024-05-31 12:51:46

Introduction

1 Privacy Collection Notice

I have read the security warning/disclaimer in the Privacy Collection Notice and accept the risks and conditions outlined.:
Yes

2 Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an institution?

On behalf of an institution (skip to question 10)

About your institution

10 What is the name of your institution?

Name of institution:
Animal-Free Science Advocacy Inc

11 Please provide an email contact in case NHMRC needs to clarify any part of the submission.

Email address:
rachelsmith@animalfreesci.org.au

12 What type of institution are you lodging a submission on behalf of?

Other

If other, please specify below.:
Not-For-Profit

Feedback on sections of the draft Guide

13 How well does the 'Snapshot' section summarise the contents of the draft Guide?

Very well

If you would like to provide feedback on the 'Snapshot' section, please provide details below.:

14 How helpful are the 'Definitions'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on the 'Definitions', please provide details below.:

15 How helpful is the information in the 'Introduction'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on the 'Introduction', please provide details below.:

16 How helpful is the information in Section 1 'Values'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 1 'Values', please provide details below.:

17 How helpful is the information in Section 2 'Approaches: implementing change to improve institutional research culture'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 2 'Approaches: implementing change to improve institutional research culture', please provide details below.:

18 How helpful is the information in Section 3.1 'Modelling and leadership'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 3.1 'Modelling and leadership', please provide details below.:

19 How helpful is the information in Section 3.2 'Institutional resources to support the conduct of high-quality research'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 3.2 'Institutional resources to support the conduct of high-quality research', please provide details below.:

20 How helpful is the information in Section 3.3 'Education and training about good research practices'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 3.3 'Education and training about good research practices', please provide details below.:

21 How helpful is the information in Section 3.4 'Rewards and recognition'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 3.4 'Rewards and recognition', please provide details below.:

22 How helpful is the information in Section 3.5 'Reporting and addressing research quality issues'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 3.5 'Reporting and addressing research quality issues', please provide details below.:

23 How helpful is the information in Section 3.6 'Communication'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 3.6 'Communication', please provide details below.:

24 How helpful is the information in Section 3.7 'Monitoring, evaluation and reporting'?

Moderately helpful

If you would like to provide feedback on Section 3.7 'Monitoring, evaluation and reporting', please provide details below.:

General feedback

25 How would you rate the content of the draft Guide overall?

Good

If you would like to provide any general comments on the draft Guide as a whole, please provide details below.:

Animal-Free Science Advocacy is supportive of the draft Guide which is clearly written with relevant case studies. Our comments are restricted to how the draft Guide applies to the use of animals in research most directly.

1. We note the ARRIVE guidelines are referred to in Table 2 Abbreviations, as per subsequent reference to in a case study. Could the associated PREPARE guidelines be referenced to within the guide?
2. Per table 4 Appoint qualified statisticians as advisors to/members of Human Research Ethics Committees and Animal Ethics Committees. Suggest this be extended to qualified statisticians and qualified ethicists.
3. In terms of respecting the community, as per the background on pg 7, perhaps would be fitting to reference public opinion and acting within the expectations of the community within the document as an example of respecting the broader community.
4. Intended outcomes- pg 8, it would add value if it were clear whether the NHMRC as the administrative agency of funding will be expected to adopt the same culture and values as institutions in receipt of NHMRC-funding and reaffirming the same values for both would strengthen the document.
5. Intellectual freedom and autonomy- pg 11
'Individuals should exercise this freedom and autonomy in a way that upholds the other values outlined in this section'. This is a very important caveat and suggest could be supported by examples of where this balance has been met and where is has not.
6. Pleased to see the case study 3.6.3 on Openness on Animal Research included.
7. Whistle-blower protection appears to be absent from the draft Guide in any explicit way and suggest this could be covered by a case study.

26 If you would like to submit a brief synopsis (in no more than 200 words) describing an occasion when members of your institution confronted an issue involving poor research culture and what they did to remedy the situation, please provide details below.

case study:

27 If your synopsis appears useful for inclusion in the Guide, NHMRC may contact you for further information. Please provide your name and email address below.

name and email address:

Permission to Publish

28 In the event that NHMRC does decide to publish submissions, do you give NHMRC permission?

Yes, NHMRC may publish my submission.