Recent Emory University Policy Updates

Research Misconduct;
Responsible Conduct of Scholarship and Research;
and Authorship

Emory University Office of Compliance

Policy Updates

* A committee of leadership faculty and administrators created by the Provost's Office, with participation from the School of Medicine, Emory College of Arts and Sciences, School of Public Health, and School of Law was tasked with reviewing and updating Emory policies relating to research misconduct, responsible conduct of scholarship and research, and authorship.

* Reasoning:
    * Interest in updating authorship dispute resolution procedure with more specific tailoring to the needs of those disputes
    * Desire for greater detail regarding authorship principles
    * Desire for greater detail regarding responsibility for and disposition of research data and materials
    * Resolution of procedural issues encountered in practice

Structural Changes

* Policy changes went into effect in November 2015 that impacted existing policies and resulted in the creation of a new policy specific to authorship issues.

Policies Prior to November 2015	Current Policies
7.8 Policy on Research Misconduct	7.8 Policy on Research Misconduct
7.9 The Guidelines for Responsible Conduct of Scholarship and Research	7.9 The Guidelines for Responsible Conduct of Scholarship and Research
	7.30 Policy on Authorship Guidelines and Dispute Resolution

Changes to Policy 7.8
The Policy on Research Misconduct

* Removal of Procedures for handling "Other Allegations"
  * Authorship disputes handled under new 7.30
  * Other Regulatory/Policy violations handled by appropriate operational unit (IACUC, IRB, IBC, COI, etc.)

* Clarification of research misconduct procedural specifics
  * Record keeping requirements
  * Protection of parties; restoration of reputations
  * Consultation with subject matter experts
  * Costs for investigation-related services (e.g., court reporters, translators, IT-related services)
  * Communication with other offices for multi-faceted investigations
  * Distinction between plagiarism and authorship/credit disputes

* http://policies.emory.edu/7.8

Changes to Policy 7.9
The Guidelines for Responsible Conduct of Scholarship and Research

* Removal of authorship principles to new 7.30

* Recitation of University ownership of research data samples and materials

* Clarification that all research data, sample, and material transfers must:
    * Be in compliance with applicable laws, contractual obligations, and Emory policies
    * Be facilitated by a material or data transfer agreement as appropriate

* Alleged violations of Policy 7.9 are resolved locally by the department, program, etc. in consultation with the relevant Dean or unit director.

* http://policies.emory.edu/7.9

New Policy: 7.30
The Policy on Authorship Guidelines and Dispute Resolution

* Authorship Principles
    * Hierarchy of which standards apply
    * Qualifications for authorship under the "default" standard
    * Unacceptable authorship practices, regardless of standard chosen

* Authorship Dispute Resolution Procedures
    * Initial resolution procedures
    * Authorship Dispute Committee

* http://policies.emory.edu/7.30

7.30 – Authorship Principles

* Standard that applies:
    1. Written standard for the relevant journal
    2. Written standard agreed to by the contributors that is widely regarded as acceptable in the relevant field
        1. Relevant schools/departments may determine this standard for their researchers in their written policies and procedures
    3. Default standard in 7.30 based upon International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) recommendations

7.30 – Authorship Principles

* Default standard:
  * To qualify for authorship an contributor must meet all of the following criteria:
    * Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work, or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; and
    * Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and
    * Final approval of the version to be published; and
    * Agreement to be fully accountable for his or her contribution to the content

  * The following contributions alone do not qualify for authorship
    * Acquisition of funding
    * Collection of data
    * Provision of research material
    * General supervision of a research group
    * Editing/assembly of text or illustrations

7.30 – Authorship Principles

* Unacceptable practices (regardless of standard)
  * Honorary, prestige and courtesy authorships
  * Ghost authorships
  * Coercive authorships
  * Intentional or knowing denial of deserved authorships

7.30 - Authorship Dispute Resolution

* Initial Resolution Procedures:
    1. Discussion amongst the contributors
    2. Mediation by relevant chair or head of department
    3. Faculty Peer Mediation Program

Faculty Peer Mediation

* Alternative to initial dispute resolution procedures for disputes between faculty

* Standing Committee on Faculty Peer Mediation of the University Council provides:

    * Mediation services;

    * Training in mediation and conflict management

* http://provost.emory.edu/faculty/governance/mediation/index.html

7.30 – Authorship Dispute Resolution

If initial attempts to resolve the authorship disputes prove unsuccessful:

* Elevation to Authorship Dispute Committee
    * Written request from disputing party to relevant dean's office or unit director after local resolution attempts have been exhausted; or
    * Mediating chair or department head believes the dispute involves one of the unacceptable authorship practices

* Composition of the Authorship Dispute Committee
    * Three faculty members from the school(s) of the disputing parties, chosen by the relevant dean's or unit director's office
        * No conflicts of interest
        * Procedures/provisions in place to account for multiple schools/units at Emory and outside of Emory

7.30 – Authorship Dispute Resolution

* Review by the Authorship Dispute Committee
    * Interviews the disputing parties
    * May interview others and consider additional evidence at its discretion
    * Determines applicable authorship standard
        1. Relevant journal's written standard
        2. Apply parties' or 7.30 default standard, OR apply a written standard widely accepted in the relevant field at its discretion
    * Recommends a written resolution to the dean/unit director (or his/her designee)

7.30 Authorship Dispute Resolution

* Administrative Determination
  * Dean/unit director decides whether to accept and enforce the recommendations of the Authorship Dispute Committee
    * If alters or rejects recommendations, provides reasons for doing so
  * The Administrative Determination is provided in writing to the disputing parties

* Appeal
  * Disputing parties may appeal the administrative determination within 10 days, but only on the grounds of procedural error or substantive new evidence
  * If a qualifying appeal request is received, the dean/unit director shall appoint an Appeals Committee
  * Appeals Committee shall:
    * Consider the grounds of appeal and determine whether
      * The Administrative Determination stands, or
      * Review by a new Authorship Dispute Committee is justified

7.30 – Relationships Between Policies

* 7.30 only has jurisdiction over authorship disputes
* To the extent that a matter involves allegations of research misconduct, those allegations are reviewed under Policy 7.8 and a separate committee empaneled under that policy
  * There can be a joint "fact-finding" process for situations when both policies are implicated
* Other alleged violations shall also be referred to appropriate departments (IRB, IACUC, COI, IBC, etc.)

Next Steps for Schools

* Schools can decide whether to implement a school-specific standard for authorship

* Schools should review policy changes, new standards and processes and prepare accordingly

* Educate faculty, staff and students about policy changes, new standards and processes