

AUTHORSHIP OF RESEARCH GUIDELINE – D09/2027P



THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEWCASTLE
AUSTRALIA

Uncontrolled if printed.

Please refer to UoN Policy Library website for most recent revision.

Please email policy@newcastle.edu.au if you wish to be included on this policy document's stakeholder list.

Date of first edition:	25 June 2008	Date this review will take effect:	13 July 2015	Date of next Review:	13 July 2017
TRIM Folder Ref:	09/3412	Document Number:	D15/239989	Revision Number:	3
Approved by, date:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation)				
Owner:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation)				
Contact:	Manager, Research Integrity Unit				
Governing Legislation/Policy:	Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research Responsible Conduct of Research Policy 000873				
Supporting documents & forms of this procedure/guideline:	Research Publication Responsibility Guideline 000857 Statement of Authorship & Location of Data Form Research Data and Materials Management Procedure 000870				
Subordinate Documents:					
Audience:	Researchers				
Keywords:	Authorship, criteria, acknowledgement, publication				
Expiry Date (if applicable):					
Important Notes:	This guideline replaces the Authorship of Research Policy				

1. Introduction

Authorship of a research publication is an acknowledgement of the substantial contribution made by a researcher. It carries with it both recognition of work done and responsibility for the material contributed. Authorship must therefore be attributed with due regard for the appropriate conventions.

This guideline supports the principles articulated in the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (ACRCR) and the University's Responsible Conduct of Research Policy, and should be read in conjunction with these documents.

The guideline details the criteria and protocols for acknowledging authorship and seeks to recognise the restrictions associated with commercial publication.

The guideline also details pathways for resolving any conflict that may arise as a result of the attribution of authorship.

This guideline extends to web-based publications.

2. Criteria for Authorship

2.1. As detailed in the ACRCR, authorship must be based on substantial scholarly contribution in a combination of the following:

2.1.1. conception and design of the research;

2.1.2. determination, analysis and interpretation of research data; and

2.1.3. drafting or revision of significant parts of the work so as to contribute to the interpretation.

2.2. Research higher degree candidates may qualify for authorship and should be encouraged to participate in publication as an author.

2.3. Examples of contributions that are not considered to meet the criteria for authorship are detailed in Clause 5.5 of the ACRCR.

2.4. Contributions that do not meet the criteria for authorship may need to be acknowledged in line with discipline practice on a discretionary basis, and the basis for the exercise of the discretion must be clearly documented.

3. Consent and Statement of Authorship

3.1. A person who qualifies as an author can only be included or excluded as an author with their written permission, unless clause 3.7 applies.

3.2. The researcher must also provide detail of their contribution, as relates to the criteria listed in clause 2.1.

- 3.3. Permission may be indicated by email in cases where it is not practical to obtain signed notification of consent.
- 3.4. Where research is published, the executive author will be required to complete and facilitate the completion of a Statement of Authorship and Location of Data Form (attached) unless 3.5 applies. The executive author will also be responsible for ensuring that the completed Statement of Authorship and Location of Data Form is stored with the data underpinning a research publication.
- 3.5. Where the publication process includes documentation that would duplicate the information provided on the Statement of Authorship and Location of Data Form, it will not be necessary to complete the form as well. In these circumstances the executive author will remain responsible for ensuring that such documentation is stored with the data underpinning a research publication.
- 3.6. All notifications of consent must be retained by the Executive Author.
- 3.7. If an author has not provided permission because they are deceased or, despite reasonable efforts, cannot be contacted, the publication can proceed, provided there is no basis to believe that this person would have objected.
- 3.8. Where another acknowledgment of contribution is given in line with clause 2.4, permission must also be obtained from the contributor prior to publication.

4. Agreement of Authorship

- 4.1. Collaborating researchers must agree on their status as an author of any publication resulting from research at an early stage in the collaboration, and this should be reviewed prior to the commencement of writing any publication evolving from research.
- 4.2. Where a work has multiple authors, an executive author should be determined prior to the preparation of a manuscript.
- 4.3. The Executive Author should be determined by agreement with collaborating researchers and/or in line with discipline conventions.
- 4.4. Where an author's position in an authorship list has significance, positioning in the list should be determined by agreement with collaborating researchers and with consideration of:
 - 4.4.1. Principles used to determine sequence (e.g. discipline standards)
 - 4.4.2. The contribution made or required by each author.

5. Disputes about Authorship and Acknowledgment

- 5.1. Where agreement on acknowledgement, attribution or ordering of authorship is not achieved, collaborating authors and other stakeholders must reconsider the principles and criteria, and take all reasonable steps to try to resolve the matter themselves or with assistance from the relevant Faculty Advisor in Research Integrity and/or Head of School.
- 5.2. Where agreement cannot be achieved with guidance from the relevant Head of School the matter may be referred to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) for consideration of the principles, criteria and contributions of the researchers, as well as any other relevant facts of the matter in making a determination.
- 5.3. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) will receive and review any requests for an appeal of the Pro Vice-Chancellor's determination.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

- 6.1. Researchers must offer authorship to all those - including research higher degree candidates - who meet the criteria set out in 2.1. Authorship should not be offered to those who do not meet that criteria - regardless of their role, or the extent of their technical or other contribution.
- 6.2. Researchers must ensure that all those who have contributed to the research, facilities or materials, are properly acknowledged where discipline conventions permit such acknowledgement.
- 6.3. Researchers are responsible for assigning authorship in accordance with this guideline and the principles of authorship identified in the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*, and the University's *Responsible Conduct of Research Policy*.
- 6.4. Researchers are responsible for maintaining a knowledge of and applying any relevant discipline conventions.
- 6.5. The executive author is responsible for recording and retaining records regarding the attribution of authorship, the management of the research data underpinning a publication and managing communication with publishers.
- 6.6. Researchers are responsible for attempting to resolve and/or co-operate in any process undertaken to resolve a dispute regarding authorship.
- 6.7. Faculty Advisors in Research Integrity and Heads of School are responsible for providing advice and assisting collaborating researchers to resolve disputes regarding authorship.

- 6.8.** The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) is responsible for managing disputes regarding authorship or acknowledgement where agreement cannot be reached by the collaborating researchers with the assistance of the relevant Head of School.
- 6.9.** The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) is responsible for reviewing any requests for appeal.

Version Control	Date Effective	Approved By	Amendment
3	13 July 2015	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation)	<p>The approval authority has been relocated to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) based on a resolution by Academic Senate (AS15:012).</p> <p>The Policy was re-formatted using the new template and was re-badged as a guideline consistent with the Policy on Policy.</p> <p>The requirement for an executive author to declare that all named authors had met the authorship criteria was amended to require all authors to provide signed notification of consent as required in 5.4 of the Code.</p> <p>Reference to the Complaints Resolution Policy previously listed in 3.4 of the policy document as the means of resolving complaints has been removed. The guideline includes Faculty Advisors in Research Integrity, Heads of School and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation) as avenues for the resolution of complaints.</p> <p>The Statement of Authorship Form was amended to include provisions for authors to sign the document, to include the location of the data underpinning the publication and to</p>

			acknowledge the Research Data and Materials Management Procedure.
2	7 September 2012		Minor amendments – included Amendment Date, attached Statement of Authorship Form (as Appendix) and hyperlinked supporting documents and appendix, Governance and Policy.
1	25 June 2008		First Version.