Waterford Institute *of* Technology
INSTITIÚID TEICNEOLAÍOCHTA PHORT LÁIRGE

Authorship and Data Retention Policy

Document Reference and Version No:	AC/R&D/040209 Version 1.0
Purpose:	This document outlines the policies relating to authorship of research papers and other scholarly artefacts and the retention of any data used in their creation.
Commencement Date:	4 February 2009
Date of Next Review:	February 2014
Who Needs to Know About this Document:	Academic Council, Executive Board, Heads of School, Heads of Dept., All Staff, Students
Policy Author:	Dr Brendan Jennings and Ms Fiona Dowling / Research & Development Committee of Academic Council
Policy Owner	Academic Council

Table of Contents

1.   Introduction

This document outlines Waterford Institute of Technology's policy on authorship of research papers and other artefacts produced by members of the WIT academic community that are made available to the external community in a manner acknowledging the author's or authors' affiliation with the Institute. It covers the following: criteria for authorship; acknowledgement of the contribution of non-authors; order of authorship; responsibilities of authors; authorship dispute resolution; and issues relating to retention of data used in the preparation of the paper/artefact. The development of this policy document was informed considerably by similar policy documents from the Michigan State University [1], Harvard Medical School [2], The University of Michigan Medical School [3] and Oxford Brooks University [4].

The Oxford English Dictionary defines an author as "the person who originates or gives existence to anything" and as "one who sets forth written statements" [5]. The first entry indicates that an author is responsible for the entity created, whilst the second entry reflects that fact that authorship is generally used in the context of written work. For the purpose of this policy we take the view that authorship can be associated with any scholarly or creative artefact that is created or co-created by one or more members of the WIT academic community (lecturing staff, research staff, students and others) and is published or otherwise made available to the wider community in a manner acknowledging those authors' affiliation with the Institute. Typically, this will be in the context of scholarly papers published in journals or conference proceedings.

Authorship provides a means of recognising an individual's contribution to a piece of intellectual work. As such it plays an important role in reputation building, academic promotion and grant support for the individual, and in development of the visibility and reputation of the Institute as a whole. Given this, it is important that authorship practices in the Institute accurately reflect individuals' contributions to the development of a given artefact.

2.   Authorship Criteria

To be listed as an author an individual should have made a substantial and direct intellectual contribution to the work. For scholarly articles, research papers, books, abstracts, or other written manuscripts an individual claiming authorship would normally satisfy all of the following criteria:

a) have substantially participated in the conception and design of the work carried out, or in the analysis or interpretation of data;
b) have substantially participated in the drafting or editing of the manuscript describing the work carried out;
c) have explicitly approved the final version of the manuscript to be submitted or resubmitted to a publisher;
d) have the ability to explain and defend the work in public or scholarly settings.

An individual claiming authorship of an artefact other than a written work would normally satisfy all of the following criteria:

a) have substantially participated in the conception and design of the work and/or in the concrete realisation of the final artefact;
b) have explicitly approved the final realisation of the artefact to be presented externally;

   c)   where appropriate, have the ability to explain and defend the work in public or scholarly settings.

In contrast, individuals would not normally be included as authors if their contribution to generation of an artefact is confined to one or more of the following:

   a)   provision of work space, or access to tools, used in the generation of the artefact.
   b)   involvement in the provision or securing of funding that facilitated generation of the artefact;
   c)   routine technical or support work;
   d)   status as postgraduate supervisor, research group leader, departmental head or similar role;
   e)   proof reading or minor editing of manuscripts;
   f)   provision of advice relating to narrowly defined problems encountered in the generation of the artefact.

2.1   Acknowledgement of Non-Authors

Contributions that are not considered to justify authorship should be explicitly acknowledged as appropriate (for example, in a manuscript footnote). Such contributions may include: general supervision of a research group; technical support; or execution of routine research tasks. If an artefact has been generated with the support of external grant funding then that funding body should be explicitly acknowledged[1].

2.2   Order of Authorship

For artefacts with multiple authors the order of authorship may be significant, depending on the scholarly discipline, or the manner in which the artefact is made available. However, in most cases it is understood that the primary author of the artefact is the individual listed first; as outlined in section 4 below, the role of primary author carries with it responsibilities over and above those of other authors. Many different policies governing determination of order of authorship exist across different scholarly disciplines, different research groups and different cultures. Examples include: descending order of relative contribution to the work as a whole; descending order of relative contribution to the preparation of a manuscript; most experienced contributor first; most experienced contributor last; and alphabetical listing by surname. Given that the significance of a particular order may be understood in a given setting, this document does not mandate a particular policy for determination of order of authorship. However, in settings where there is no generally held consensus on the interpretation of the order of authorship, it is recommended to base it on descending order of relative contribution to the work as a whole.

3.   Author Responsibilities

In addition to the benefits of recognition as an author of an artefact authorship carries with it certain responsibilities; in this section we outline these responsibilities.

---

[1] In many cases the contract between a funding body and the Institute explicitly requires that the funding body is explicitly acknowledged in all publications resulting fully or partially from the research programme.

3.1   Primary Author Responsibilities

a) must discuss with all authors and contributors how their contributions will be acknowledged. this dialogue should result in the completion of form a08 (reproduced in appendix a of this document), which lists the author names in their order of appearance on the paper/artefact and should be signed by all (wit-affiliated) authors. the main purpose of the a08 form is to act as an informal agreement between the authors – the intention is to avoid harmful disputes regarding authorship. the primary author should forward the original signed copy of the form to his/her school administrator and all his/her co-authors should be given a copy;

b) must be able to identify the contributions of each of his/her co-authors;

c) must understand the general principles of all the work undertaken and be able to explain and defend the work as a whole in public or scholarly settings;

d) must seek the approval of other authors for the final version of the artefact that will be published or otherwise disseminated to the wider community;

e) where appropriate, must ensure that data and/or artefacts used in the preparation of the work is retained, in a suitable manner, for a suitable period of time (see section 5 below for further discussion of this responsibility);

f) where appropriate, should be available to describe in detail to other researchers the methodologies used to generate and/or analyse/interpret data and/or artefacts used in the preparation of the work;

g) where appropriate, must liaise with publishers, the wit research support unit, and other relevant actors, regarding intellectual property issues associated with the generation or public dissemination of the work undertaken;

h) in the case of a funded research program, must liaise with the principal investigator to ensure that any specific obligations related to the research funding agreement and the institute's intellectual property policy, as published and in effect at the that time, are complied with;

i) must, subject to restrictions of publishers to which copyright has been transferred[2], lodge an electronic copy of the published paper, or a pre-print thereof, in the wit institutional repository [6].

3.2   All Authors Responsibilities

a) should be able to explain and defend the work, particularly that which they themselves contributed, in public or scholarly settings;

b) must agree with the general conclusions and interpretations of the work, as indicated by their approval of the final version of the artefact to be published or otherwise disseminated to the wider community;

c) must ensure that where ideas, concepts, or text of others are used, that appropriate citations are provided;

d) where relevant, must ensure that the thesis or conclusions forwarded in the work are not contradicted by any pertinent data that the authors' are aware of and that are not discussed in the work.

4.   Disputes over Authorship

Disputes over authorship, be they relating to whether an individual's contribution justifies their listing as an author, or regarding the order of authorship, should be resolved in collegial

---

[2] The majority of academic publishers allow authors make available a pre-print of their papers on personal websites and/or institutional repositories.

consultation between all of the authors. If resolution cannot be achieved the authors should arrange for arbitration by a knowledgeable and disinterested third party acceptable to all the authors. If the authors cannot agree on a mutually acceptable arbitrator, the R&D subcommittee of the Academic Council shall appoint an arbitrator. During the arbitration process all the authors are expected to refrain from unilateral actions that may damage the authorship interests and rights of the other authors.

5.   Data Retention for Authored Artefacts

It is the responsibility of the Institute to ensure that all material used in the preparation of, or resulting from generation of an artefact with WIT authorship is managed effectively. Individual departments and research centres should have clearly formulated policies on the retention and maintenance of records, research data, publications and other artefacts. In this section we provide information on retention of data used in the generation of scholarly and creative artefacts.

WIT has two separate policy documents: "Waterford Institute Of Technology Records and the Retention Schedule" [7] and "Waterford Institute Of Technology Record Retention Policy" [8], which collectively define what records must be held by the Institute. These documents outline the Institute's responsibilities under the Data Protection Acts 1988 and 2003. The information below summarises aspects of these documents but does not replace them:

a)   individual departments and research centre must have established procedures for the retention of data and for the keeping of records of data held;

b)   data (including electronic data) must be recorded in a durable and appropriately referenced form. data management should comply with relevant privacy protocols on personal privacy protection. in particular, departments and research centres will be responsible for ensuring appropriate security for any confidential material, including that held in computing systems. where computing systems are accessible through networks, particular attention to security of confidential data is required. security and confidentiality must be assured in a way that caters for multiple authors/researchers and the departure of individual authors/researchers;

c)   data related to generation of artefacts should be available for discussion with other authors/researchers. where confidentiality provisions apply (e.g. where the authors/researchers or the institute have given undertakings to third parties, such as the subjects of the research), it is desirable for data to be kept in a way that reference to them by third parties can occur without breaching such confidentiality;

d)   data must be held for sufficient time to allow for references. for data that is published this may be for as long as interest and discussion persists following publication. it is recommended that the minimum period for retention is at least 5 years from the date of publication. however for specific types of research, such as clinical research, 15 years may be more appropriate;

e)   wherever possible, original data must be retained in the department or research centre in which they were generated. individual authors/researchers should be able to hold copies of the data for their own use. however, retention solely by the individual researcher provides little protection to the author/researcher or the institute in the event of an allegation of falsification of data.

6. References

[1]   "Michigan State University Guidelines on Authorship," Michigan State University, available (21/01/2008): http://www.msu.edu/~vprgs/authorshipguidelines.htm

[2]   "Authorship Guidelines," Harvard Medical School, available (21/01/2008): http://www.hms.harvard.edu/integrity/authorship.html

[3]   "Guidelines for the Responsible Conduct of Research," University of Michigan Medical School, available (21/01/1008): http://www.responsibility.research.umich.edu/UMMSauthor.html

[4]   "Oxford Brooks University Intellectual Property Policy Document," Oxford Brooks University, available (21/01/2008): http//www.brookes.ac.uk/res/policies/ip_policy.pdf

[5]   "Author, n," The Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford University Press, 2nd ed. 1989.

[6]   Waterford Institute of Technology Institutional Repository, available (6/2/2009): http://repository.wit.ie.

[7]   "Waterford Institute Of Technology Records and the Retention Schedule," Waterford Institute of Technology, March 2007.

[8]   "Waterford Institute Of Technology Record Retention Policy," Waterford Institute of Technology, September 2007.

Appendix A: Form A08

Form: WIT / Res: Author /

Statement of Authorship and Location of Data.

Completion of these forms is a requirement under WIT's Authorship and Data Retention policy.

Department / School:

Authorship is participation in conceiving and/or executing and/or interpreting at least that part of the research leading to a publication or other scholarly artefact in a co-author's field of expertise, sufficient for him/her to take public responsibility for it. According to this definition, the authors of the artefact entitled:

| |
| |
| |

Made publicly available via or submitted/resubmitted to *(name of Publisher):*

| |
| |
| |

On *(date)*

| |
| |

are the undersigned, and there are no other WIT-affiliated authors under this definition.

NAMES (in the order they will appear in the publication)	SIGNATURES

Form: WIT / Res:Data /

It is noted that, wherever possible, original data, whether in paper or electronic form, should be retained in the department or research group in which they were generated. Data should be safely held in a durable and appropriately referenced form for as long as readers of publications might reasonably expect to be able to raise questions that require reference to it. This should be at least 5 years. Where it is impossible or impracticable to hold data, a written indication of the location of the data, or key information regarding its location (e.g. the way in which it was called up from a limited-access data base), must be kept in the School.

Any confidentiality agreements which might impact on the release of original data, should be clearly highlighted and appended to the stored version.

The Primary data relating to the above paper are stored at *(name location precisely and provide access codes or passwords if applicable):*

SIGNED: _____

Primary Author

DATE: _____

Completed forms should be returned to the School Administrator.