

POLICY STATEMENT 27 AUTHORSHIP GUIDELINES AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

POLICY DIGEST

Monitoring Unit: Office of Research & Economic Development
Initially Issued: November 9, 2018
Last Revised:

I. PURPOSE

Louisiana State University (LSU) is committed to the highest standard of integrity in all areas of research and intellectual inquiry, including those related to the publication and presentation of scholarly and creative works. This commitment to ethical conduct is critical to research and academic progress, to maintaining public trust, and for the public to benefit from academic pursuits. In every discipline, publication and presentation are essential to professional development and career advancement, and authorship is often a significant means by which to acknowledge the efforts and contributions of collaborators. At the same time, the benefits of authorship are accompanied by a number of responsibilities for the proper planning, execution, analysis, and reporting of research and the content and conclusions of other scholarly works.

This policy establishes the standards and procedures that should be followed with regard to determination and attribution of authorship for purposes of creative and scholarly works, the responsibilities of authors, and the procedure for authorship dispute resolution.

II. DEFINITIONS

Publication : as used in this policy is meant generically, representing as inclusively as possible any publicly shared academic or creative work, including any manner of report, paper, manuscript, article, electronic publication, discovered or derived dataset, artistic creation, or other research manifestation.

Author : an

some fields as "corresponding") authors are the norm, collaborators should designate one author as lead author as early in the planning process as possible. Lead designation is often intended as an administrative role and does not necessarily imply greater individual contribution to the publication. In disciplines where authorship practices are typically more consensus based, collaborators are encouraged to proactively discuss responsibility for administrative matters relating to publication submittal.

In any discipline, proactive communication about responsibilities and expectations helps to clarify roles and minimize potential authorship disputes. Additionally, written agreements specifying the details of authorship and contributions may be warranted in many cases, and are good practice in all cases.

- a. Lead Author : Depending on the discipline and the nature of the collaborative work, the lead author need not be the first, last, or mostsenior author, nor necessarily the principal investigator or project leader. The lead author assumes overall responsibility for the execution of the work, and also often servesas the managerial and/or corresponding author. In some disciplines, the terms "lead author" and "corresponding author" are used interchangeably, while in others the terms are used to signify separate roles and responsibilities. This variation underscores the importance of communication at the earliest practical stage. The lead author is responsible for:

- c. Order of Authorship : Several different ways of determining order of authorship exist across disciplines and publications. Such examples of authorship policies include descending order of contribution, placing the person who took the lead in writing the manuscript or doing the research first and the most senior contributor last, and alphabetical or random order. While the meaning of a particular order may be recognized in a given setting or discipline, order of authorship has no generally agreed-upon meaning at LSU.

Given this variation, the lead author should facilitate discussions regarding the contributions, recognition, and order of authors. All authors, regardless of position, have a voice in this discussion. Ideally, the order of authorship is agreed to proactively, formally, and in writing as soon as practical. A sample agreement that allows for formal recognition and agreement on authorship can be found as an appendix to this policy. (See Appendix I. <http://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-agreement.pdf>)

As the study or work evolves, agreements regarding authorship may need to be further discussed and modified. Most journals and other scholarly outlets do not include statements on author order, so the lead author should guide this process and adhere to the norm of the discipline.

- d. Acknowledgements and Disclosures : Anyone who does not meet the authorship criteria or who has declined authorship credit, but who has made othersubstantial contributions, should be acknowledged and/or disclosed in the final product as appropriate to the publication and discipline. Failure to make proper attribution could constitute plagiarism or another form of research misconduct prohibited under PS69. These principles are meant to provide guidance but not contradict the requirements prescribed by specific publications or PS69.

- i. Acknowledgements: Acknowledgements convey specific identifiable contributions that are insufficient under this policy to justify authorship. Such contributions may include general supervision of a research group, assistance in obtaining funding, technical support, enabling research or work, and assistance in compiling and editing the manuscript.

- ii. Disclosures: All authors e(s):15 (A3(r)5d)(p6 (t)9 ()004 Tc 0.00 (u)6 5.06 0 Td ()Tj En)6

on a sense of obligation, tribute, or dependence, within the context of an anticipated benefit, to an individual who has not appropriately contributed to the work.

- iii. Acceptance or ascription of ghost authorship. Ghost authorship is the failure to identify as an author someone who made substantial contributions to the scholarly work, thus meriting authorship or allowing significant editorial control by an unnamed party, which may constitute a real or perceived conflict of interest that should be disclosed.

3. Dispute Resolution

referred to the appropriate Dean(s).

- iii. Stage 3: To refer the dispute to a Dean, the requesting party should provide the Dean(s) with a written position statement with a copy to all other authors and parties. The other involved parties and authors shall be provided at least seven (7) business days to provide their own position statements. The appropriate Dean(s) should meet with the parties to mediate the dispute.

If the Dean(s) cannot mediate a consent resolution, then any author or party may request an Authorship Dispute Panel.

- iv. Stage 4: Authorship Dispute Panel: An Authorship Dispute Panel (Panel) shall be convened by the appropriate Dean(s) to resolve a dispute under this Policy when one of the following circumstances arises:

Any disputing party requests resolution by an Authorship Dispute Panel after all means of resolution described in Stages 1–3 have been exhausted, provided that the party makes such request in writing to the appropriate Dean(s) within ten (10) business days after the conclusion of the mediation described in Stage 3; or

If, after a dispute has finished a Stage 3 review, a Chair or Dean of a department-level unit or college involved in any stage of the attempted resolution believes that the dispute involves any of the Unacceptable Authorship Practices; or

Allegations that any of the Unacceptable Authorship Practices were committed are brought to the attention of a department-level unit or college in a context other than a dispute between authors and/or potential authors (e.g., allegation received from a non-author who reviewed the article; allegations from a journal; allegation received through Ethics & Integrity Hotline). Additionally, the author(s) against whom the allegations are made shall be the sole “disputing party,” and whether the Unacceptable Authorship Practice occurred and if so what actions should be taken shall be considered the “dispute” for purposes of the process under this section. If the individual who brings the allegations forward has self-identified, then that individual may provide relevant information to the Authorship Dispute Panel, but shall not participate in the process under this Policy as a disputing party.

b. Composition of Authorship Dispute Panel

Except as otherwise provided in this Policy, the Authorship Dispute Panel shall consist of three faculty members from the college of the disputing parties as chosen by the appropriate college Dean.

In the event that the disputing parties are from two different colleges, the relevant Deans may each appoint one faculty member from their respective college, and the third member shall be mutually agreed upon by the Deans or chosen by the Vice President for Research (or their representative), who serves as the University's Research Integrity Officer if no agreement can be reached.

In the rare event that three or more colleges are involved, the Authorship Dispute Panel shall be comprised of one appointed faculty member from each college.

If the disputing parties include persons at institutions other than LSU, the relevant LSU college(s) of the LSU disputing parties will work with the other institution(s) as deemed appropriate and/or as agreed upon by the multiple institutions. In such cases, a faculty member for another institution may serve on the Panel.

c. Notice of Formation

The Authorship Dispute Panel shall be formed and written notice of its formation shall be provided to the disputing parties within 30 calendar days after a qualifying request or reason to convene. No member of the Panel may be an author or content contributor to the work that is the subject of the authorship dispute, or otherwise have a Conflict of Interest. The disputing parties shall have 10 days from the receipt of this notice in which to provide any written "good faith" objection to the compo

reasons therefore. The Dean(s) shall provide a copy of the administrative determination (which shall include a summary of the Panel's recommendations and rationale therefore) to the parties, and shall enforce the administrative determination, including correspondence from the Dean(s) to relevant academic journals or publications as appropriate. In most instances, the administrative determination should be provided within 60 calendar days of the Panel's formation; provided, however, that extensions of time may be granted at the Dean(s) sole discretion.

e. Appeal

Any disputing party shall have the option to appeal the administrative determination to the Vice President for Research & Economic Development within 10 business days of receipt by the party of the final administrative determination. The only grounds for appeal are procedural error or substantive new relevant information. The Authorship Dispute Panel's determination of which written standards of authorship apply to the dispute is considered a substantive determination and is not a basis of appeal.

The appeal must be in writing and must specifically enumerate the grounds for appeal and provide documentation or affidavits of any substantive new information for consideration. If no appeal is received by the end of the 10 business day period, the parties shall be deemed to have waived any objection to the administrative determination.

If an appeal enumerating qualifying grounds is received in a timely fashion, the Vice President for Research or their designee shall have 30 calendar days within which to review the record of proceedings and the substantive new evidence (if any), and issue an appeals decision to the Dean(s) as follows:

- i. If the Vice President for Research determines that there were no procedural errors and there is no substantive new information that could justify reversing the administrative determination, then the appeal shall be denied, and the decision of the Dean(s) upheld.
- ii. If the Vice President for Research determines that there were procedural errors or that there is substantive new information that could justify reversing the administrative determination, then the Vice President for Research may either grant the appeal and recommend re-initiating dispute resolution by formation of a new Authorship Dispute Panel or consider the dispute de novo and render a final decision.

B. Institutional Administrative Action

In the event that improper authorship practices are identified and substantiated, the Vice President for Research or their designee may consult with appropriate collegiate or departmental offices in determining appropriate sanctions and whether to pursue formal disciplinary action.

C. Related Procedures

To the extent that the subject matter of the authorship dispute falls within the scope of another LSU policy or falls under the jurisdiction of another LSU unit, such matters shall be

handled in accordance with the relevant LSU policy and referred to the relevant LSU unit as appropriate. Non-limiting examples include referrals to the following units:

1. Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) for matters falling within the scope of IRB policies and procedures;
2. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for matters falling within the scope of IACUC policies, procedures, and guidelines; and
3. Office of Research and Economic Development for matters falling within the scope of the Policy on Research Misconduct (PS 69) or the Policy on Reporting Financial Irregularities (PS 76). In the event an authorship dispute is identified in the context of allegations of research misconduct covered under PS69, then the RIO shall have discretion as to when and what extent to refer the authorship dispute for handling under this policy.

In cases of potentially contradictory policies, the University's Research Integrity Office shall determine which policy or policy provisions shall apply.

Appendix I

Sample agreement can be found at:

<https://www.apa.org/science/leadership/students/authorship-agreement.pdf>

Appendix II

PUBLICATION RESOURCES