Obtaining Recognition for Participating in Team Science

Daniel Lackland
Manuscript Authorship for Team Research
D. V-D - Criteria Matrix Ranks and Tracks

R=Required    S=Suggested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COM FACULTY RANKS CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under exceptional circumstances, promotions may be recommended when the candidate does not meet all of the basic criteria. These will be unusual cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Academic Investigator</th>
<th>Academic Inv/Ed</th>
<th>Academic Clinician</th>
<th>Clinician Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continues to meet all the criteria for Associate Professor with major accomplishments in research, teaching, and/or clinical service</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished career exemplifying scholarship. Excellence &amp; productivity in research, outstanding success as a teacher, and/or outstanding service contributions are required. Involved in teaching activities, including formal lectures, grand rounds, and/or continuing medical education. (Leadership in interprofessional teaching and interdisciplinary research encouraged)*</td>
<td>R*</td>
<td>R*</td>
<td>R*</td>
<td>R*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal investigator on significant research grants</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-investigator on research grants.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct involvement in research.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key individual in training of students, post-graduates and mentorship of junior faculty</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves as Course Director for one or more major courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continues to carry a heavy clinical or teaching load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued publication of reviews, chapters, textbooks, peer reviewed papers, and/or innovative teaching materials (new curricula, educational programs, syllabi, video materials, computer programs, etc.) that influence the science and practice of medicine at the regional and national levels</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued publication of important and original clinical and/or laboratory investigations with significant authorship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications with significant authorship since promotion to Associate Professor (line 1), and in total (line 2)</td>
<td>≥10</td>
<td>≥10</td>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>≥30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications with authorship since promotion to Associate Professor (line 1), and in total (line 2)</td>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>≥30</td>
<td>≥5</td>
<td>≥5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National recognition, as evidenced by election to generalist or specialty societies, service on national committees, study sections, editorial boards, visiting professorships, and/or invitations to speak in CME courses</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership roles in appropriate department, hospital and college</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is “significant authorship”? 
The “sequence-determines-credit” approach

• The sequence of authors reflects the declining importance of their contribution
• Authorship order only reflects relative contribution, whereas evaluation committees often need quantitative measures.
• First author should get credit for the whole impact (impact factor), the second author half, the third a third, and so forth, up to rank ten.
• When papers have more than ten authors, the contribution of each author from the tenth position onwards is then valuated just 5%.
The “equal contribution” norm

• Authors use alphabetical sequence to acknowledge similar contributions or to avoid disharmony in collaborating groups.

• Contribution of each author is valuated as an equal proportion (impact divided by the number of all authors, but a minimum of 5%).
The “first-last-author-emphasis” norm

• In many labs, the great importance of last authorship is well established.

• First author should get credit of the whole impact, the last author half, and the credit of the other authors is the impact divided by the number of all authors.
The “percent-contribution-indicated” approach

- There is a trend to detail each author’s contribution
- This should also be used to establish the quantified credit.
B. I have given final approval of the submitted manuscript.
   _____ Yes    _____ No

C. I have, or a coauthor has, had sufficient access to the data to verify the manuscript’s scientific integrity.
   _____ Yes    _____ No

D. I have participated sufficiently in the manuscript to take public responsibility for (check only one)
   part of the content    the whole content.
E. To qualify for authorship, you must have made substantial contributions to the intellectual content of the paper. Please indicate your contribution(s) to this manuscript. Check all that apply.

_____ conceived and designed the research
_____ acquired the data
_____ analyzed and interpreted the data
_____ performed statistical analysis
_____ handled funding and supervision
_____ drafted the manuscript
_____ made critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content
_____ other (specify) ________________________________
Significant Contribution to Science as a ‘Team’ Member

Team Science
A. Personal Statement

• Briefly describe why you are well-suited for your role in the project described in this application. The relevant factors may include aspects of your training; your previous experimental work on this specific topic or related topics; your technical expertise; your collaborators or scientific environment; and your past performance in this or related fields (you may mention specific contributions to science that are not included in Section C).
A. Personal Statement

I have the expertise, leadership, training, expertise and motivation necessary to successfully carry out the proposed research project and coordinate the team. I have a broad background in psychology, with specific training and expertise in ethnographic and survey research and secondary data analysis on psychological aspects of drug addiction. My research includes neuropsychological changes associated with addiction. As PI or co-Investigator on several university- and NIH-funded grants, I laid the groundwork for the proposed research by developing effective measures of disability, depression, and other psychosocial factors relevant to the aging substance abuser, and by establishing strong ties with community providers that will make it possible to recruit and track participants over time as documented in the following publications. In addition, I successfully administered the projects (e.g. staffing, research protections, budget), collaborated with other researchers, and produced several multi-author peer-reviewed publications from each project. As a result of these previous experiences, I am aware of the importance of frequent communication among project members and of constructing a realistic team-based research plan, timeline, and budget. The current application builds logically on my prior work. During 2005-2006 my career was disrupted due to family obligations. However, upon returning to the field I immediately resumed my research projects and collaborations and successfully competed for NIH support.

C. Contribution to Science

- Briefly describe **up to five** of your most significant contributions to science.
- For each contribution, indicate the historical background that frames the scientific problem; the central finding(s); the influence of the finding(s) on the progress of science or the application of those finding(s) to health or technology; and your specific role in the described work.
- For each of these contributions, reference up to four peer-reviewed publications or other non-publication research products (can include audio or video products; patents; data and research materials; databases; educational aids or curricula; instruments or equipment; models; protocols; and software or netware) that are relevant to the described contribution.
- The description of each contribution should be no longer than one half page including figures and citations. Also provide a URL to a full list of your published work as found in a publicly available digital database such as SciENcv or My Bibliography, which are maintained by the US National Library of Medicine.
C. Contribution to Science

1. My early publications directly addressed the fact that substance abuse is often overlooked in older adults. However, because many older adults were raised during an era of increased drug and alcohol use, there are reasons to believe that this will become an increasing issue as the population ages. These publications found that older adults appear in a variety of primary care settings or seek mental health providers to deal with emerging addiction problems. These publications document this emerging problem but guide primary care providers and geriatric mental health providers to recognize symptoms, assess the nature of the problem and apply the necessary interventions. By providing evidence and simple clinical approaches, this body of work has changed the standards of care for addicted older adults and will continue to provide assistance in relevant medical settings well into the future. I served as the primary investigator or co-investigator or team member in all of these studies.


C. Contribution to Science

2. In addition to the contributions described above, with a team of collaborators, I directly documented the effectiveness of various intervention models for older substance abusers and demonstrated the importance of social support networks. These studies emphasized contextual factors in the etiology and maintenance of addictive disorders and the disruptive potential of networks in substance abuse treatment. This body of work also discusses the prevalence of alcohol, amphetamine, and opioid abuse in older adults and how networking approaches can be used to mitigate the effects of these disorders.


Summary

• ‘Team Science’ contributions can be identified as “significant” with appropriate justification and detail.

• The ‘Team Science” contribution will be continue to be important and recognized.