

ACADEMIC SENATE

Resolution 10/11-01

Procedure:

1. A motion should be typed or hand-printed.
2. A motion should first be offered to the Executive Board for review and advice on editing and parliamentary implication.
3. If changes are necessary, the motion should be recopied on another form. Amendments may be indicated in the margin or on the reverse of this form.

ACADEMIC COLLABORATION AND SCHOLARLY ATTRIBUTION

WHEREAS, during the past two academic years, the University Research Committee (UCR) has considered issues of collaborative research and the proper attribution of credit for scholarly and creative products generated jointly by several collaborators and has provided thoughtful reports to the Academic Senate and to the University administration;

WHEREAS, scholarly collaboration in research and artistic creation has emerged as an important approach across all disciplines, including those that have not had a strong tradition of this form of research and creative work;

WHEREAS, USC is among the leading centers for interdisciplinary research, which also typically entails collaboration;

WHEREAS, when collaborative research products and creative works are disseminated, it is essential that the list of authors and creators accurately assigns credit among the collaborators for their intellectual and creative contributions (based on the standards and customs applicable to the field and/or the publication), and that appropriate means are also used to acknowledge others who have contributed to or supported the research or creative process; and

WHEREAS, the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Manual* of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure (UCAPT) should reflect UCR's recommendations on the evaluation of faculty who engage in collaborative work and on the distribution of credit among collaborators;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the USC academic community supports and encourages collaborative efforts in research and scholarship;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, the Provost and Deans should provide administrative and financial support for faculty seeking to develop worthwhile collaborative research programs and grant proposals;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the USC academic community expects faculty, when publishing or otherwise disseminating their work, to ensure fair and accurate attribution of credit among all those who have made a substantial, direct intellectual contribution as well as to acknowledge all those who have supported the work;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Academic Senate encourages all academic units to establish and implement fair and consistent standards and processes to evaluate individual contributions to collaborations, for use when they assess research and creative activity for the purposes of promotion, tenure, and merit review;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Academic Senate thanks the URC for its [“Recommendations on Collaboration and Scholarship at USC”](#) (approved, 24 November 2010) [Attachment A], and suggests that unit’s development of standards be guided by the URC report, especially its conclusion that insisting on intellectual independence—which is sometimes mistakenly equated with the “single-scholar model”—should not stand in the way of recognizing the originality and creativity that are the hallmarks of meritorious research undertaken by faculty members when they work collaboratively as well as when they work alone;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Academic Senate thanks the URC for its [Guidelines for Attributing Contributions to Research Products and Creative Works \(April 2011\)](#) and asks the Handbook Committee to recommend necessary revisions in *The Faculty Handbook* in light of this report as well as its report on collaboration and scholarship [Attachment A] and in particular to consider replacing the sixth sentence of *Handbook* Section 4-F (1) [“The Dossier”], which now reads, “Although some of the reviewers may be selected from a list of names provided by the candidate, most should neither be from that list nor have a close personal or professional relation with the candidate,” with something along the following lines: “Although some of the reviewers may be selected from a list of names provided by the candidate, most should not be from that list. Care should be taken to avoid soliciting letters from scholars whose close personal or professional relation with the candidate could bias their evaluations. However, when a dossier includes collaborative research products or creative works, care should also be taken to include letters from scholars with whom the candidate has collaborated, even though they necessarily have a close professional relationship to the candidate. Co-authoring referees should be asked to address the significance of the collaboration in terms of impact on the disciplinary fields involved, and to describe the creative contributions of the candidate as a research collaborator and/or co-author”; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Academic Senate thanks UCAPT for its review of its *Manual* in light of the recommendations and conclusions of both UCR reports and encourages the ongoing effort to ensure the *Manual* is fully consistent with UCR’s recommendations regarding collaboration and attribution.

Resolution Number: 10/11-01
Date: April 14, 2011

Motion by: Executive Board
(No second required when moved by committee)

To be presented at Senate meeting held: April 20, 2011
Action taken: Approved