

Research Publications, Dissemination and Authorship Procedures

Section 1 - Purpose and Scope

Purpose

- (1) These Procedures give effect to the authorship and publications provisions of the [Research Quality, Standards and Integrity Policy](#).
- (2) These Procedures support compliance of research activities with the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#) (Code) and adopts the following:
 - a. [Authorship: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#).
 - b. [Publication and Dissemination of Research: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#)
- (3) These procedures should be read together with the following:
 - a. [Authorship: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#)
 - b. [Publication and Dissemination of Research: A guide supporting the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#)
 - c. [Guide to Managing and investigating potential breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#)
 - d. [Australian Research Council Research Integrity Policy](#)
 - e. [National Health and Medical Research Council Research Integrity and Misconduct Policy](#)
 - f. AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research 2020.
 - g. [National Health and Medical Research Council's Ethical Conduct in Research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and Communities: Guidelines for Researchers and Stakeholders](#)
 - h. [Research Quality, Standards and Integrity Policy](#)
 - i. [Research Integrity Procedures - Staff](#)
 - j. [Research Integrity Procedures - Higher Degree Researchers \(Students\)](#)
 - k. The University's [Code of Conduct](#).

Scope

- (4) These Procedures apply to all staff and students who carry out research under the auspices of the University. This includes research undertaken as part of coursework.
- (5) These Procedures encompass the responsible publication and dissemination of research in alignment with the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#). This includes traditional research publications/outputs, non-traditional research outputs, and other research-related documents such as research proposals, grant applications, reports for funding agencies, tenders, patents, and patent applications. The Procedures also cover web-based

publications and applications, including professional blogs and any form of authored research output that is made publicly available.

(6) These Procedures extend to the appropriate attribution of authorship of all forms of research publications/outputs, including but not limited to those summarised in Clause (5).

Section 2 - Definitions

(7) The following definitions apply to these Procedures:

- a. Appeal means an Appeal against the determination of the Designated Officer.
- b. ARC is the [Australian Research Council](#).
- c. Assessment Officer is a person or persons appointed by the Designated Officer to conduct a preliminary assessment of a complaint about research.
- d. Author means an individual who has made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to research and its output and who has agreed to be listed as an author.
- e. Balance of probabilities means the civil standard of proof, which requires that, on the weight of evidence, it is more probable than not that a breach has occurred.
- f. Breach means a failure to meet the principles and responsibilities of the Code and may refer to a single breach or multiple breaches.
- g. Code means the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018](#).
- h. Conflict of Interest exists in a situation where an independent observer might reasonably conclude that the professional actions of a person are or may be unduly influenced by other interests. This refers to a financial or non-financial interest which may be perceived, potential or actual conflict of interest.
- i. Corresponding author means the author who is, as agreed by all co-authors, responsible for communication with the publishers, managing communication between the co-authors and maintaining and storing of records of the authorship agreement.
- j. Decision Maker means the Designated Officer or Responsible Executive Officer.
- k. Designated Officer is the senior professional or academic University officer or officers appointed by the Responsible Executive Officer to receive allegations about the conduct of research or potential breaches of the Code and to oversee their management and investigation where required.
- l. Evidence means any document (hard copy or electronic, including email, images and data), information, tangible item (for example biological samples) or testimony offered or obtained that may be considered during the process of managing and investigating a potential breach of the Code.
- m. Higher Degree Researcher (HDR) means a higher degree by research student.
- n. Investigation describes the action of investigating an allegation of a breach of the Code by the Panel, following a preliminary assessment. The purpose of the Investigation is to determine whether a breach of the Code has occurred, and if so, the extent of that breach, and to make recommendations about further actions.
- o. NHMRC means the [National Health and Medical Research Council](#).
- p. Panel refers to the person or persons appointed by an institution to investigate a potential breach of the Code.
- q. Research - the concept of research is broad and includes the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies, inventions and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative. For the purposes of this procedure, research includes research training.
- r. Research outputs communicate or make available the findings of research that may be in hard copy, electronic or other form. Examples of research outputs include, but are not limited to journal articles, book chapters, books, conference papers, reports, open access repositories, datasets, patents and patent applications, performances, videos and exhibitions.

- s. Researcher means a person who conducts, or assists with the conduct of, research.
- t. Respondent means a person against whom an Allegation has been made.
- u. Responsible Executive Officer (REO) is the senior officer of the University who has final responsibility for receiving reports of the outcomes of processes of assessment or investigation of potential or found breaches of the Code. An REO will determine the outcome of allegations of breaches of the Code in the event that the Designated Officer is unable to do so.
- v. Research Integrity Advisor (RIA) is a person or persons with knowledge of the Code and institutional processes nominated by the University to promote the responsible conduct of research and provide advice to those with concerns or complaints about potential breaches of the Code.
- w. Significant intellectual or scholarly contribution means a contribution that must include one, and should contain a combination or two or more of the following:
 - i. Conception and design of the project or output,
 - ii. Acquisition of research data where the acquisition has required significant intellectual judgment, planning, design or input,
 - iii. Contribution of knowledge, where justified, including Indigenous knowledge,
 - iv. Analysis or interpretation of research data,
 - v. Drafting of significant parts of the research output or critically revising it so as to contribute to its interpretation.
- x. Staff (for the purpose of this Policy) means all persons who are academic or professional employees of Southern Cross University, including full time, part time, fixed term and casual and all adjunct, visiting, emeritus and conjoint appointees who are engaged in supervisory and other research roles on behalf of the University.
- y. Student means a person who is registered as a student of the University regardless of whether at the time of the Allegation, they are currently enrolled in a course of study conducted by or within the University.
- z. Support Person means a person who accompanies a party to a meeting.
- aa. Third Party means a person, or persons or institutions outside of Southern Cross University and includes industry partners, volunteers, former students, media/journalists, participants in human research and members of the public.
- ab. University Processes includes references to Rules, Policies, Procedures, Guidelines and Standards.

Section 3 - Statement

(8) The University is committed to promoting open and transparent research and encourages researchers to disseminate widely to all appropriate audiences.

(9) All those who have made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to a research output should be named as authors unless an individual is unwilling to be named as an author, and in these cases their contribution may not be included in the research output.

(10) Authorship must not be attributed when an individual has not made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to research output. Authorship should not be attributed solely on the basis of:

- a. The provision of funding, data, materials, infrastructure or access to equipment,
- b. The provision of routine technical support, advice or assistance,
- c. The position or profession of an individual, such as their role as the author's supervisor or work unit head (ie., 'gift authorship'),
- d. Whether the contribution was paid or voluntary,
- e. The status of the individual who has not made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution being such that

it would elevate the esteem of the research ('guest authorship').

(11) Junior researchers, HDRs and students are entitled to authorship where they have made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution, notwithstanding that they may have been more closely supervised than other potential authors.

(12) Where a person has made editorial contributions to significant collective works or anthologies of research papers analogous those of an author, similar criteria may apply to the attribution of editor, as to author. The term of 'editor' should only be applied to a person who has played a significant role in the intellectual shaping of a publication.

(13) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander contributions to research should be appropriately attributed, acknowledged and resourced, including through authorship and communication of findings. Attribution of authorship and acknowledgment in publications must be by consent, including culturally appropriate acknowledgment and comply with section 2.6 of the AIATSIS Code of Ethics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research 2020.

(14) Different authorship criteria may apply when collaborating with researchers located in other nations. In these cases, it is essential that authorship arrangements respect customs and cultural mores, and comply with that nation's requirements.

Section 4 - Responsibilities

University

(15) The University is responsible for providing ongoing training that promotes and assists all researchers, other relevant staff and HDRs to follow these Procedures.

(16) A Decision Maker must, in relation to determining an authorship dispute, act as quickly as is practicable, and without undue formality as is appropriate for the circumstances of the case and in accordance with the rules of procedural fairness.

(17) A Decision Maker has those powers conferred by these Procedures. Subject to these Procedures, they may act on their own initiative or in response to an Allegation.

(18) A Decision Maker must not delegate a function or a power conferred under these Procedures. However, a Decision Maker may seek assistance or advice for the purpose of exercising functions as such (for example, appointing an Assessment Officer to carry out an assessment of the authorship dispute and to provide a report).

Researchers

(19) The corresponding author has primary responsibility for ensuring all contributors to a research output are appropriately recognised through authorship or other forms of acknowledgment.

(20) The corresponding author is responsible for agreed authorship discussions, coordinating the completion of an Authorship Agreement, maintaining the agreement and retaining secure copies of the agreement.

(21) The corresponding author is responsible for all communications and record keeping of the research output, inclusive of requests for data, agreed authorship discussions and written agreements.

(22) The corresponding author is responsible for keeping written records that confirm that approval to submit a research output for publication and approval of the final version of the output has been obtained by all authors.

(23) All authors are responsible for alerting the corresponding author about any author or contributor, including Higher Degree Researchers or junior researchers or staff, who may have been inadvertently or deliberately omitted.

(24) All authors are accountable for the whole research output. The level of accountability will be dependent on the extent and contribution made.

(25) Each author is responsible for ensuring the accuracy and integrity of their direct contribution to the research output, consistent with the Code.

(26) All authors are responsible for taking reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the contributions made by all other co-authors.

(27) All authors should be able to identify which co-authors are responsible for specific parts of the work, and for raising any concerns about the accuracy and integrity of the research prior to submission or publication of the research output.

(28) If a person does not agree to being accountable for their contribution to the research, the contribution of this individual should not be included in the research output.

(29) All authors must ensure any concerns raised about the accuracy or integrity of any part of a research output are responded to appropriately, and the public record is corrected, where the accuracy or integrity of the research is found to be compromised.

(30) In the case of a deceased author, it should be noted in the research output that the author is deceased and all authors must be confident that the deceased author's contribution was accurate and complied with required levels of integrity.

(31) All authors must approve the research output prior to submitting it for publication and the final version prior to publication.

Section 5 - Authorship agreements

(32) Authorship agreements should be discussed at the commencement of a research project, formalised at an early stage in the research project and put in place prior to the commencement of preparation of a research project. Authorship agreements must be in place prior to submitting the research output for publication.

(33) The corresponding author is responsible for obtaining, maintaining and securely storing records of written authorship agreement. Other authors should keep their own records of authorship.

(34) All authors of a research output must sign the authorship agreement to confirm their acceptance of authorship and order of authors.

(35) The Authorship Agreement should continue to be discussed as a project evolves, and should be amended where there are any changes, such as if new people become involved and make a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution. All authors must sign any amended versions of an authorship agreement.

(36) Researchers are encouraged to use the University's [Authorship Agreement template](#) for their authorship agreements.

(37) The accepted practice for the order of authors' names appearing on a research output varies between disciplines. Authors must be able to justify the order in which authors are listed in research outputs in accordance with discipline norms.

(38) The [Authorship Weighting Schema](#) is an optional tool that may be used by authors to assist in confirming all authors have made a significant intellectual or scholarly contribution to research outputs, and determining their level of contribution for order of authorship.

Authorship affiliation statement

(39) Correct affiliation of Southern Cross University in research outputs is important for benchmarking research performance and government reporting.

(40) Southern Cross University authors should include an [author affiliation statement](#) on all research outputs. [Author affiliation statements](#) must be compliant to ensure that all Southern Cross University publications are correctly and consistently attributed.

Section 6 - Dispute Resolution

(41) Concerns, disputes or complaints regarding the attribution of authorship must be resolved in accordance with these procedures.

(42) A concern, dispute or complaint regarding authorship of a research output may arise at any time pre or post publication, and may be related to the inclusion, exclusion or order of authorship.

(43) Authors (and excluded authors) should first attempt to resolve authorship matters between the individuals concerned.

(44) Authors, preferably via the corresponding author, are encouraged to consult with a Research Integrity Advisor who is independent of the research output to seek guidance to resolve the matter and provide advice regarding the interpretation of these Procedures, the Code and Authorship Guide.

(45) Resolution of concerns, disputes, or complaints should also take into account practice within the discipline(s) and the requirements of the publisher.

(46) All authors must ensure that any concerns about the accuracy or integrity of any part of the output are appropriately responded to. This includes providing all necessary evidence to demonstrate the accuracy and integrity of their contribution, or seeking such evidence from other co-authors.

(47) If an author is deceased, or cannot be contacted within a reasonable time frame, all co- authors must have confidence in the accuracy and integrity of that individual's contribution.

(48) All parties to the dispute should maintain records of agreements reached through the dispute resolution process.

(49) In cases where the concern, dispute, or complaint cannot be resolved between authors (and excluded authors), and the corresponding author is a Southern Cross University staff member, Higher Degree Researcher, Honours or coursework student, the author (and excluded author) must make a request in writing for their concern, dispute or complaint to be resolved. The request should be addressed to the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research Infrastructure) who is the Southern Cross University Designated Officer. The request must be supported by Authorship Concern, Complaint or Dispute documentation and will be managed as follows:

Author Work/Study Unit	Assessment Officer with responsibility to resolve dispute:
Corresponding Author is Faculty-based	Executive Dean
Corresponding Author is a Higher Degree Researcher, Honours Student or Coursework Student	Executive Dean or College Dean
Corresponding Author is College-based	College Dean
Corresponding Author is not based in a Faculty or College	Head of Work Unit

(50) The review of the concern forms the preliminary assessment phase of an investigation as outlined in Section 6 of the [NHMRC Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Code](#).

(51) The Assessment Officer will review the concern, dispute or complaint and attempt to resolve the matter in a timely manner.

(52) The determination will be made consistent with the principles of procedural fairness.

(53) The Assessment Officer will provide a written response on the determination of their review to all authors (and excluded authors), including reasons for the decision.

(54) A determination made prior to the publication of a research output may include one or more of the following:

- a. Dismiss the matter,
- b. Removing authors who do not meet authorship criteria,
- c. Adding authors who met the authorship criteria but had been excluded as an author,
- d. Acknowledging the contribution(s) of individuals,
- e. Changing the authorship order on the publication,
- f. Refer the matter to be handled through another University process, such as Code breach processes under the Research Integrity Procedures or the [Enterprise Agreement](#).

(55) A determination made following publication may include one or more of the following:

- a. Dismiss the matter,
- b. Direct the corresponding author to have the authorship corrected on the publication,
- c. Direct the corresponding author to correct the public record by way of erratum or retraction,
- d. Refer the matter to be handled through another University process, such as Code breach processes under the Research Integrity Procedures or the [Enterprise Agreement](#).

(56) If the dispute cannot be resolved by the Assessment Officer as set out in clause (49), the matter must be referred back to the Designated Officer for determination. At Southern Cross University, this is the Pro Vice Chancellor (Research Infrastructure).

(57) The Designated Officer will provide a written response on the determination of their review, including reasons for the decision, to all relevant individuals in a timely manner.

(58) A determination made by the Designated Officer may include one or more of the options listed in Clauses (54) and (55).

Request for review of authorship dispute determination

(59) An individual may request a review of an authorship determination. Only requests for a review of a determination on the grounds of procedural fairness will be considered.

(60) A request for review of a determination must be made in writing within 20 business days of the date of the written determination. A request for review of a determination must provide evidence that procedural fairness was not observed in making the determination, a copy of the determination and include all documentation provided as part of the determination.

(61) A request for a review of a determination made by an Assessment Officer must be made to the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Academic Capability). The decision of the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor is final within the University.

(62) Individuals will be notified of the outcome of the review in writing, and if dissatisfied have the right to access an external review process through the [NSW Ombudsman Office](#).

Disputes involving collaborators

(63) In cases where the concern, dispute or complaint has not been resolved between authors (and excluded authors), and there is collaboration with other institutions or organisations, the matter will be managed by the institution of the corresponding author, or by a process agreed by all authors (and excluded authors).

(64) The Designated Officer must be advised by the lead Southern Cross University author if an authorship concern, dispute or complaint is being managed outside of the University and be provided with details of its progress and resolution.

Section 7 - Procedural fairness

(65) All Staff, including adjunct, conjoint and emeritus appointees and visiting researchers and Higher Degree Researchers are entitled to procedural fairness in the assessment and determination of any authorship dispute.

(66) Procedural fairness includes:

- a. The Staff member or Higher Degree Researcher being informed of the dispute and all relevant particulars relating to the dispute;
- b. The Staff member or Higher Degree Researcher being given a reasonable opportunity to respond to a dispute;
- c. The Staff member or Higher Degree Researcher having the choice to be accompanied by a Support Person but not a legal representative, at any meeting to answer any Allegation;
- d. Absence of actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest on the part of the Decision Maker;
- e. The Decision Maker acting in accordance with University policy and procedures;
- f. The Decision Maker basing their determination on the evidence before them at the time that determination is made; and on the balance of probabilities;
- g. The Decision Maker giving a statement of reasons for their determination.

(67) Staff, HDRs and students are expected to conduct themselves in a proper manner at all times and not disrupt or prejudice the deciding of an authorship dispute. They are to observe the processes in place (including those about confidentiality) and to behave in a courteous and reasonable manner towards University Staff who assess or decide those Allegations.

(68) The University recognises that dispute resolution can be stressful for parties involved. Staff and students are encouraged to access the range of mental health support services provided by Southern Cross University if the need arises.

Section 8 - Conflict of Interest or Bias

(69) A Decision Maker under these Procedures shall be disqualified from making a determination or exercising any other power conferred to them if there is any actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest. A conflict of interest includes but is not limited to:

- a. Any personal relationship of a social or intimate nature between:
 - i. The Decision Maker or Panel member and the Respondent concerned; or
 - ii. Any other person who gives evidence in respect of the dispute; or

- b. Financial or non-financial interest that may be perceived, potential or actual conflict of interest.

(70) The Decision Maker must be independent from the Allegations.

(71) If a Decision Maker has a conflict of interest or there is a reasonable perception of bias, then another person must be appointed to replace the Decision Maker or member.

Section 9 - Reporting research outputs

(72) Researchers must be mindful of their obligations under the Code, ensuring that research findings are disseminated responsibly and accurately, and taking prompt action to correct the record when necessary.

(73) When preparing to publish and disseminate their findings, researchers should consider:

- a. Timely communication to the widest appropriate audience in accessible formats.
- b. Independent peer review and the appropriateness of preprints pending peer review.
- c. Adherence to any confidentiality, privacy, ethical, contractual, or funding restrictions, including those related to intellectual property.
- d. Identification and management of potential misuse or unintended consequences of research findings or outcomes.

(74) Researchers must ensure that publications and disseminated research outputs:

- a. Accurately report methodology, data, and findings, consistent with international guidelines and conventions relevant to their discipline(s).
- b. Present conclusions justified by the results and appropriately acknowledge any limitations in their findings.
- c. Cite and acknowledge other relevant work appropriately and accurately.
- d. Disclose any potential, perceived, or actual conflicts of interest.
- e. Acknowledge host institutions, funding bodies, partner institutions, collaborators, and sponsors.
- f. Identify all sources of financial and in-kind support for the research.

(75) Researchers will disseminate and publish research outcomes, including relevant negative results and findings contrary to any stated hypothesis, widely and to all appropriate audiences.

(76) Researchers must carefully consider the most effective way to communicate research findings in a public forum by:

- a. Only discussing research findings that have been peer-reviewed, except when presenting research in progress or before publication on a public server as a preprint, at professional conferences, in submissions to public or parliamentary inquiries, or other forums to inform public policy, to comply with contractual obligations, and when it is in the national interest or during a public health crisis. In these cases, the status of the project should be explained when discussing the findings.
- b. Complying with any communication restrictions agreed upon with the research sponsor.
- c. Where applicable, presenting research findings with commercial elements, contractual obligations, and patent requirements to a stock exchange, financial body, sponsor, or investors before public release.
- d. Complying with the University's [Advertising and Marketing Policy](#).

(77) Fragmented publication, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, and under-reporting of research are prohibited.

(78) Researchers must not distribute multiple research outputs that are largely identical unless they disclose this to

the publisher at the time of submission and provide proper citations to avoid presenting previously presented ideas or data as new.

(79) Before republishing their own or others' research outputs, researchers must make every reasonable effort to obtain permission from the original publisher or copyright holder, considering any applicable legal agreements.

(80) The corresponding author must register the research output with the publications team.

(81) In cases where the corresponding author is not a Southern Cross University staff member, Higher Degree Researcher, Honours or coursework student, the first named Southern Cross University author must register the research output with the publications team (Registering publications).

(82) Southern Cross University is committed to making SCU-authored research materials, data, and outputs as open as possible via the University's repository, Cross Connect, and relevant data repositories.

(83) The corresponding author is responsible for depositing an eligible Open Access version of their output to Cross Connect at the time of publication.

(84) Eligible Open Access versions include Submitted, Accepted and Published Versions, depending on the rights retained by the authors at the time of publication.

(85) Southern Cross University authors and researchers must ensure their research outputs meet with the University's obligations under the Open Access policies of the [Australian Research Council](#), [National Health and Medical Research Council](#) or other public and private research funding agencies, including international funders where applicable.

(86) Southern Cross University authors are encouraged to align their research outputs with the Sustainable Development Goals and to use keywords, titles and abstracts which explicitly identify their outputs with relevant goals.

Section 10 - Associated Documents

(87) [Schedule A](#)

(88) [Authorship Agreement template](#)

(89) [Optional Authorship weighting schema](#)

(90) [Authorship Affiliation Statement](#)

(91) [Authorship Concern, Complaint or Dispute document requirements](#).

Section 11 - Transitional arrangements

(92) If, before these Procedures come into effect, a person has commenced the consideration of an authorship dispute or a review of an authorship dispute determination, but has not yet made a determination in relation to that matter, that person:

- a. Is taken to be appointed as a Decision Maker for the purpose of these Procedures; and
- b. Shall continue to hear or consider and determine that matter in accordance with these Procedures as if the initial proceedings had been commenced under or conducted pursuant to these Procedures.

(93) Any act, matter or instrument that immediately before these Procedures came into effect pursuant to any by-law,

Policy, resolution or other instrument of the University is taken to have effect under these Procedures.

Status and Details

Status	Current
Effective Date	22nd July 2024
Review Date	18th July 2027
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Approval Date	18th July 2024
Expiry Date	Not Applicable
Responsible Executive	Mary Spongberg Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor +61 7 55893361
Head of Work Unit	Mary Spongberg Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor +61 7 55893361
Enquiries Contact	Brenda Gradwell Executive Officer