

*This material is part of a collection that documents the harassment, discrimination, and retaliation perpetrated against Alaska's women research scientists by their supervisor, with full knowledge (and arguably, "tacit approval") of their federal employer, the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS)*

### Justification for Co-Authorship

This document provides justification for my technician, Katie Hietala, to serve as a co-author on a research abstract entitled Enhancing the Strength of Fish-Skin Gelatin without Additives. I have discussed this issue with Ms. Hietala and she agreed that for this specific instance, a simple acknowledgment would not be sufficient to reflect her contribution to the project.

- 1) Ms. Hietala has met all the criteria for co-authorship (according to P&P 152.2 Section 1, page 3) by:
  - a. Participating sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for the content of the abstract, (above and beyond merely collecting or summarizing data);
  - b. Designing portions of the methodology and interpreting experimental data;
  - c. Being offered the opportunity to draft sections of the manuscript that will be emerging from the current abstract;
  - d. Being offered the opportunity to approve the final version of the future manuscript before it is published;
  - e. Having her role in the research established early (in a 12 November 2009 email) in accordance with P&P 152.2
- 2) Co-authorship does not violate either Ms. Hietala's Position Description (PD) or my own Performance Plan, as shown by:
  - a. Section A (Major Duties) of Ms. Hietala's PD, which includes the disclaimer that the PD contains "typical, but not all-inclusive, duties..." (thereby not precluding authorship by the technician), and also describes major duties consistent with criteria for authorship (e.g. contributes ideas towards planning of the technical aspects of the research, develops new techniques to satisfy the needs of the project, evaluates samples, performs statistical analysis, etc...);
  - b. Section B (Evaluation Factors) in the Scope and Effect of Ms. Hietala's PD, which states that the technician "is involved in almost all phases of the scientist's study, and has responsibility for selected phases...";
  - c. Element 3 (a "critical" element) of my own performance plan, which requires that an ARS scientist "Facilitates training and development of supervised employees".
- 3) Authorship is fundamentally an issue of scientific ethics, since:
  - a. I am required to offer co-authorship to Ms. Hietala to avoid a direct violation of ARS's Code of Scientific Ethics (P&P 129.0), which prohibits me from accepting unwarranted credit for the accomplishment of others;

- b. ARS scientists must abide by the authorship requirements of the journals in which they publish, such as the Journal of Food Science (<http://members.ift.org/IFT/Pubs/JournalofFoodSci/jfsauthorinfo/jfsstyleguide.htm>), which confers author status on those who contribute to the conception, planning, execution, writing, interpretation, or statistical analysis of the work;
- c. We (as Federal workers) are required to “provide the maximum feasible opportunity to employees to enhance their skills through on-the-job training, work-study programs and other training measures so that they may perform at their highest potential and advance in accordance with their abilities” [29 CFR 1614.102(a)(11)].

According to Dr. Maureen Whalen (PWA Assistant Area Director), “anyone who fulfills the authorship criteria (P&P 152.2 section 1) must be offered authorship”. I believe I have offered sufficient justification for allowing Ms. Hietala to serve as a co-author on this abstract (and its corresponding manuscript).

Thank you for considering my request.

Cindy Bower  
USDA Agricultural Research Service  
PO Box 757200  
Fairbanks, AK 99775-7200  
Phone: (907) 474-6732