

Appendix S

Authorship

I. General Overview and Background

The Commission on Research Integrity, established by Section 162 of Public Law 103-43, stated in its final report, entitled *Integrity and Misconduct in Research* (1995), under the heading of “Authorship”:

“The Commission heard many examples of the conflicts that can and do arise as a result of disputes over authorship. Such conflicts can generally be avoided if researchers have early and frequent discussions on the allocation of authorship and intellectual property. Those conflicts that do arise can be handled more effectively if institutions have a mechanism in place.” (Pages 26-27.)

The term “authorship” as commonly used has varying definitions among the disciplines represented at IIT. After substantial review and consideration by the faculty, it has been determined that an appropriate working definition of “authorship” at IIT is:

The author of a work is a creator or originator of an original literary (including scientific and scholarly), mathematical (including computer programming), musical, dramatic, choreographic, pictorial, graphic, sculptural, audiovisual, architectural, or mask work. It is recognized that this list is by no means exhaustive in the definition of possible areas of “authorship”.

II. Authorship Guidelines per Discipline

The definition of who is an author (a creator of a work), including co-authors, varies between fields. Although the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) provides guidelines for authorship and practice, which may be viewed at <http://ori.hhs.gov/Chapter-9-Authorship-and-Publication-Introduction>, these are generally oriented towards science and engineering disciplines. Even within different science and engineering fields, there exist different forms of common practice regarding authorship, which, in a dispute of authorship, would likely require representatives from that field to aid in the review of the dispute. The listings below reference bases for the current common practice per IIT discipline, as of March 16, 2014, concerning authorship (creator of work) considerations; however, to the extent any such referred to basis is modified or updated, it is expressly understood that such modified or updated version will automatically become the new basis.

Science and Engineering (including Food Science and Nutrition):

In addition to the aforementioned ORI guidelines, the National Science Foundation’s regulations on research misconduct, (45 C.F.R. §§ 689.1 – 689.10), the National Academy of Sciences’ (NAS) publication, *On Being a Scientist*, which includes the field of medicine and addresses misconduct proceedings, http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=4917&page=R2.

Mathematics

American Mathematical Society, <http://www.ams.org/about-us/governance/committees/cprof-home#culture>.

Behavioral and Social Sciences (with reference also to NAS and ORI)

American Psychological Association. Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct
<http://www.apa.org/ethics/code>

A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science,
<http://www.apsanet.org/Files/Publications/APSAEthicsGuide2012.pdf>

Code of Ethics and Policies and Procedures of the American Sociological Association (ASA)
Committee on Professional Ethics, <http://www.asanet.org/about/ethics.cfm>.

Architecture and the Visual Arts

American Institute of Architects:

Code of Ethics and Bylaws, http://www.aia.org/about/ethicsandbylaws/index.htm#P5_3869;
and

Guide to Copyright in Architectural Works, <http://www.aia.org/pdf/?dname=AIAP016582>.

College Art Association:

Committee on Intellectual Property, <http://www.collegeart.org/ip>.

Humanities, Business and Law

The humanities represent several fields, for instance some political and social science principles may apply (see above); the following resources may also apply:

The Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL) - Code of Ethics,
<http://www.rjelal.com/Ethical%20Guidelines.html>.

Plagiarism in Colleges in USA - Dr. R. Standler, which includes useful legal brief with case histories of authorship disputes of faculty, students, professionals and lawyers,
www.rbs2.com/plag.pdf.

Design

Outside of copyright and intellectual property laws, there is no core set of independent, formal or guiding principles routinely used in the design field to define authorship, creatorship or attribution. That said, design has common practices that, while not well-documented, are in evidence across journals, entry standards for competitions, and acceptance to peer-reviewed conferences. These include:

AIGA Guide to Copyright:
http://www.stopworkforhire.com/documents/aiga_6copyright_07.pdf.

IDSA Code of Ethics:
<http://www.idsa.org/content/content1/code-ethics>.

MIT Press Journals:
<http://www.mitpressjournals.org/page/copyright/overview>.

Further, and perhaps because it is a multidisciplinary field that is predicated on collaboration and team-driven processes, it is both common practice and an expectation in design to credit

all collaborators on a project. As a result, anyone who has made a direct and significant intellectual contribution to a work is typically accorded co-author status. The Institute of Design outlines such guidelines to students in their handbook. Additionally, because it is common for design work to be published in the journals of other disciplines, design institutions by default must adhere to standards set by partner fields, such as those of the Association for Computing Machinery's (ACM) Special Interest Group on Computer-Human Interaction (SIGCHI).

ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct:
<http://www.acm.org/about/code-of-ethics/#CONTENTS>.

III. Author Attribution

Failure to attribute, consistent with a discipline's relevant standards, guidelines and practices, an author may breach academic integrity, and it could possibly constitute research misconduct depending on the specific discipline and the particular facts and circumstances. When an apparent failure to attribute an author has occurred, the parties should first attempt to reconcile confidentially.

In the event such private attempt at reconciliation fails, a member of the IIT community (faculty, student or staff) who feels that he or she has not been attributed his or her rightful authorship by another faculty member, student or staff member of IIT may elect to pursue mediation as outlined below and/or one of the other two processes available under the Faculty Handbook.

A. Mediation

1. A faculty member should inform the respective unit head/s or deans and attempt to reconcile confidentially with the mediation of one or more of these academic administrators with the accused. The parties should agree as to which administrators are involved with the mediation.
2. A faculty member who can reasonably demonstrate to the Provost that a conflict of interest may exist for either the department head or the Dean to conduct the mediation may ask the Provost to confidentially mediate the dispute.
3. A faculty member who can reasonably demonstrate to the UFC that a conflict of interest may also exist for the Provost to conduct the mediation may ask the UFC to oversee mediation of the dispute. In the event that a mediation request relating to authorship is to be handled by the UFC, the UFC will appoint a committee of faculty members, each without conflict of interests, that is well represented by the discipline (or field, such as Biology or Physics rather than simply science) of the disputed work will convene, to confidentially mediate the dispute.

B. Post-Mediation Options

In the event that mediation is unsuccessful,

1. A faculty member may file an academic grievance in accordance with the procedures set forth in Appendix I of the Faculty Handbook; or
2. A faculty member may file an allegation of research misconduct in accordance with the procedures set forth in Appendix L of the Faculty Handbook.¹

¹ Under certain circumstances, an authorship dispute could constitute "research misconduct" as such term is defined in Appendix L. Though a claim of research misconduct predicated on an authorship dispute would be subject to and handled in accordance with the provisions of Appendix L, in such a situation, the provisions of this Appendix S may be relevant to the investigation and resolution of the matter. Accordingly, after the review, inquiry and/or investigation appropriate to the particular situation, it is acknowledged that with respect to an authorship dispute the following outcomes are possible: (a) a finding that no further action is warranted; (b) a finding that an ethical violation, such as denial of authorship, may have occurred but the facts do not support a determination that possible research misconduct may have occurred; (c) a finding that the facts are sufficient to support a determination that plagiarism and/ misappropriation may have occurred, thereby warranting further investigation into whether research misconduct has occurred; and (d) a finding that plagiarism and/or misappropriation has occurred sufficient to constitute research misconduct.

IV. Student Theses

Student theses are a special case of authorship, and how the issue of authorship relates to a student and his or her supervisor depends greatly upon the field in question. (See guidelines listed above). As a general matter, there should be continuing discussion between supervisor and student so that all parties understand the discipline norms. It is the responsibility of both the student and his or her supervisor to prepare a cover page or foreword that describes (a) the discipline norm between supervisor and student and (b) any agreements as to authorship, if any, and to submit such cover sheet or foreword with the student thesis so as to clarify future authorship.

Concerning the possible claim that the copyright of a student to his or her thesis may allow him or her to claim sole authorship to all works presented therein, or that a supervisor's supervision automatically grants the supervisor authorship rights, the following provisions shall guide:

1. A student's thesis should be an original work entitled to copyright as the work in the thesis should be substantially that of the student; however, the thesis may (i) contain not yet separately published work jointly authored with their supervisor (and possibly other parties), inventions or other intellectual property (see Appendix K), or (ii) describe the student's sole work, or (iii) be related to no other unpublished work or inventions except for the citation of other published work and patented inventions.
2. In the case that the thesis contains joint work, this should be clearly indicated in the thesis, either at each instance it occurs or by a statement that clearly indicates that some of the work was joint work with a supervisor, a research team or others. It is the responsibility of the student to avoid plagiarism, and the student should not be allowed to claim the work of others as their work in a thesis. It is the responsibility of those signing a thesis to attest to the fact that they are not aware of any plagiarism within the thesis. It is the duty of the examining committee to decide if the work in a thesis is substantially that of the student.
3. If the above recommendations are followed, while authorship may neither be affirmed nor negated by an advisor's signature on a thesis or research project examination certification, the chances of an authorship dispute should be significantly reduced and the resolution of authorship disputes should be clearer. Copyright and inventorship are defined by U.S. law, and authorship issues are to be decided with reference to this Appendix and the guidance documents referred herein.