# CONTINUING RESOLUTION REGARDING SHARED AUTHORSHIP PURSUANT TO THE MEMORANDUM OF **UNDERSTANDING FOR** THE JET EXPERIMENTS IN NUCLEAR STRUCTURE AND ASTROPHYSICS (JENSA) COLLABORATION



WHEREAS, the members of the Jet Experiments in Nuclear Structure and Astrophysics (hereinafter referred to as "JENSA") Collaboration, comprising of individual scientists from several institutions, desire to cooperate in research activities in the operation and continued upgrade of a supersonic gas jet target for nuclear physics studies, and to act with one accord in the pursuit and publication of these studies.

THEREFORE, the members of the JENSA Collaboration (herein "Parties") do hereby agree as follows:

# I. Purpose of this Document

With the successful completion of the JENSA gas jet target commissioning phase at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and its subsequent long-term loan (Cf. DOE JENSA loan agreement tacking this onto the end. This document is meant documentation) to Michigan State University, an to lay out the "rules" regarding who is listed on update to the original JENSA MoU of 29 March what type of publication. This makes sure credit is 2011 is required. This Continuing Resolution, given where credit is due. which extends but does not nullify the JENSA MoU, is intended to protect and ratify the individual and institutional contributions, be they intellectual,

*The Collaboration agrees to the following:* 

The MoU is somewhat outdated and so we're

Resolution also recognizes Kelly Chipps as the has designated Kelly Chipps as the new Project new Project Lead for the JENSA project.

financial or otherwise, to the JENSA project. This *Uwe Greife*, previous PI on the JENSA project, Lead to DOE.

#### II. Representative Parties

## A. Definition and Purpose

organized leadership within the Collaboration, the following structure is adopted. A "core" of five Representative Parties, one from each of the Institutions which has contributed heavily during the design, construction, and/or commissioning phases of the JENSA gas jet target, will act as leadership for the Collaboration in matters pertaining to the provisions of this document.

In order to maintain an Defining the Collaboration's leadership.

## B. Representative Parties at the time of this Resolution

- i. Currently, the Institutions Colorado School Mines, Oak National Michigan University, Louisiana State University, and the of Notre University Dame.
- five CSM, ORNL, MSU, LSU and ND have each are: contributed significant intellectual input, financial of support and manpower/effort to make JENSA a Ridge reality, so the JENSA Collaboration accepts that Laboratory, these five institutions should be higher on the State totem pole than other institutions.
- five ii. Currently, the Representative Institutions (Oak Ridge National Laboratory), Hendrik Schatz (Michigan State University), Jeff Blackmon (Louisiana State University), and Bardayan Dan (University of Notre Dame).
  - One person from each of those five big Parties institutions is being named into a leadership role from the aforementioned in the collaboration. These five people were Uwe chosen because they are essentially the project Greife (Colorado School lead for their given institution. They are now of Mines), Kelly Chipps referred to as "Representatives."

Regulations C. pertaining to Representative Parties

- i. A new Representative may be chosen by the Institution's existing Representative, or else the Institution may choose to nominate and elect a new Representative. The rules for such elections are not given in this Resolution.
- ii. Each Institution has only one Representative.
- iii. Representatives are directed to act in the best interest of their home Institutions and the JENSA Collaboration, above their own personal interests.
- vote to allow additional *gain* granted Representative, Institution. In this context of Resolution, "demonstrated contribution" from an Institution wishing to gain a Representative is a stricter requirement than that necessary for an individual researcher to join the Parties, as described in the MoU. The contribution must be of a fundamental and long-term nature. supermajority is required for such changes to the Representative Parties.

A new Representative *This document doesn't specify how new* may be chosen by the *Representatives should be chosen, though it offers* Institution's existing *some suggestions*.

iv. The Representatives can New institutions that want to get involved can vote to allow additional gain a Representative if the current contributing Institutions Representatives vote 4/5 for it. The current to be granted a Representatives have to decide whether the new Representative, based institution has contributed enough to JENSA. An upon the demonstrated institution getting a Representative requires more contribution from that contribution than if a person wants to join the Institution. In the Collaboration.

## A. Use of the JENSA gas jet target

specifically on the SECAR beamline in the ReA3 *with us.* target in collaboration with the Parties, given that information the measurement is feasible as determined by the *whether such a measurement is doable*. relevant Parties and, as necessary, by the PAC. The Parties, to the extent that is reasonable, shall assist said researcher in attaining the relevant information regarding specifications and operation of the JENSA target, in order to determine feasibility of the proposed measurement; the researcher shall not proceed with any proposal or measurement which is determined to be potentially damaging to the JENSA system. Any researcher which conflicts directly with a proposal already to participate in our measurement. generated within the Collaboration shall be notified of the fact, and invited to participate in the previously generated proposal if it is in the best interest of all. Only Parties with sufficient knowledge of the JENSA system will be allowed Really, only Antonios and Kelly should run it! to operate it during any measurement. Any researcher who wishes to use the JENSA gas jet target acknowledges and accepts the additional *authorship* as specified in this document. provisions regarding authorship described herein.

The JENSA gas jet target We need to work with people who want to use the during its tenure at Michigan State University, JENSA system at ReA3, and they need to work *If* someone from outside hall but without regard to driver accelerator, shall Collaboration contacts us and says "I want to use be available to any researcher who wishes to JENSA to measure such-and-such," we should propose and run an experiment using the gas jet help that person to find the relevant technical and determine collaboratively

*If the person wants to do something that we're* who wishes to propose and run an experiment already planning on doing, we should invite them

Outside users don't operate the JENSA system.

Outside users of JENSA have to agree to list

i.

- For the purposes of any refereed publication, PAC proposal, or other official document, the following Parties must be listed as acknowledge authors to contributions the to design, construction and/or commissioning of the JENSA gas jet target: K.A. (ORNL/UTK. Chipps Bardayan (ND, formerly ORNL), crucial to making JENSA a reality. J.C. Blackmon (LSU), A. Kontos (MSU/NSCL/JINA), L.E. Linhardt (LSU), M. Matos (IAEA, formerly ORNL/UTK), S.D. Pain (ORNL), S.T. Pittman (LSU, formerly UTK), H.Schatz (MSU/NSCL), Schmitt (ORTEC, formerly UTK), Smith (ORNL). Ιf may be updated at the end of the *long* as this document is valid. Period of Validity (Section III).
  - ii. Other Parties may be additional upon their contribution to the specific work being described, including undergraduate students.
  - iii. If the formatting allows, reference "JENSA Collaboration" should also be included in the author list or acknowledgements.
  - Exception: review-style articles, without regard to number of authors or if authorship is from

These people must be listed in the author list of formerly any refereed publication for the next three years CSM), U. Greife (CSM), D.W. at a minimum, because their contribution was

publication discusses work done at In addition, these people should be listed if the MSU, the following Parties must be work described was at MSU. This ensures that listed in addition: F. Montes (MSU/ people who did not contribute to something do not NSCL), J.Browne (MSU/NSCL), get credit for it, and that people who did Z.Meisel (MSU/NSCL). This list contribute are not forgotten. This list is valid as

> Anyone else who contributed to a given added as authors based *measurement* or sub-project should also be listed.

> > List "JENSA Collaboration" at the end of the the author list or in the acknowledgements, for solidarity.

inside or outside the Collaboration. Review articles may only use previously published material, and must cite the source of that material appropriately. If a review article is to use previously unpublished information, two criteria must be met. First, the new material must not be publishable on its own; second, the must material be approved, on a timely basis, bv a supermajority of the Representatives.

#### C. Theses

doctorate based wholly or in part on JENSA-related experiments design/fabrication work should reference the list of authors listed in II.B.i the Acknowledgements somewhere similarly appropriate within the text, and should also reference the "JENSA Collaboration" in similar place.

below under II.I also apply to theses; however, explicit acceptance of the document by the authorship list of II.B.i

is not required for

Any thesis submitted as *Students who do thesis work with JENSA need to* part of the requirements *include the authors listed above in their* for a bachelors, masters *acknowledgements. A thesis is not an island.* 

ii. The provisions listed *However*, that list of authors doesn't have a say in below under II.I also whether the student graduates. That is up to the apply to theses; student's committee.

successful completion of the degree.

## D. Grant proposals

- i. The concepts and/or independent authorship, be discussed manner Representative Parties.
- Basically, if anyone inside or outside the ideas described in any Collaboration - is writing a proposal for funding grant proposal which that includes the use of JENSA, provides utilizes or intends to manpower for JENSA, refurbishes JENSA, buys modify or add to the new stuff for JENSA, alters JENSA, etc etc etc, JENSA gas jet target, they need to run the idea past the five of Representatives first, to make sure that it doesn't while conflict with anything. We want to have people get encouraged, must first involved, and we love to have people with money and get involved, but people should not get involved approved in a timely without some discussion about their plan to do so a with the rest of us. If 4/5 of the Representatives supermajority of the are ok with your plan, then proceed. The purpose here is to prevent any potential conflict between what someone wants to do and what the Collaboration is already doing. It is much harder to prevent such conflict when someone already has money in hand (and promises to their funding manager to keep).
- ii. Grant proposals which Institutions of the Representatives (see 2.B.i) somewhere in the text.
- iii. Grant proposals which intend to modify or add to the JENSA system must explicitly reference "JENSA the Collaboration" somewhere in the text.

Give credit where credit is due. This isn't intend to modify or add required if you're just listing JENSA as one thing to the JENSA system among many that you'd like to "do," or if you're must explicitly list the sending a postdoc or something.

# E. Unrefereed publications

The provisions for authorship and acknowledgement for unrefereed don't have to include the author list above. publications such as some conference proceedings or internal institutional reports are the same as those specified for refereed publications (II.B).

Just because it isn't refereed doesn't mean you

#### F. Posters, presentations, etc

- i. Official posters/presentations/si intended conferences. wider community, shall fall under the same provisions for as refereed publications The (II.B). required author list may presented anvwhere during the presentation, and may be separated based upon subtopic so long as all authors are included. This provision also covers CEU posters and any presentations to PACs or funding bodies.
- Conference posters, conference talks, seminars, and anything else you can think of that will be milar, such as those presented to the scientific community or the for funding bodies of the scientific community, needs seminars, to list the authors above. You can put them on the colloquia, or generally first slide or the last, or one per slide, doesn't scientific matter. Just make sure they're listed.

ii. Unofficial posters/presentations/si milar, such as those intended for tours. Science Cafes, or other non-scientific audiences, shall fall under the same provisions as for grant proposals (II.D.ii and II.D.iii), with the exception that official logos representing the Institutions be substituted for text.

Posters for tours, wall candy, outreach, etc etc – basically anything else – needs to list the five big institutions, or at least show their logos.

#### G. Abstracts

- In the case of long specialized conferences, the same provisions as for refereed publications apply (II.B).
- ii. In the case of short inside the

Abstracts with enough space should list the abstracts, such as for authors just like a publication.

Abstracts without enough space (please stay red box!) can list "JENSA abstracts where space is Collaboration" instead of individual authors, but severely limited, such as the individual authors still need to be listed in the APS style abstracts, it is presentation or whatever it is the abstract is for.

sufficient to reference only the "JENSA Collaboration" provided that the provisions for the poster/presentation/etc described by the abstract are followed (II.F).

#### H. Other documents

Any other type of document, explicitly listed in this Resolution, shall fall under *If you're not sure*, *e-mail the five Representatives*. the same provisions as grant proposals (II.D), with the exception that official logos representing the Institutions may be substituted for text.

We should let each other know when we're such as one-page progress reports or news presenting/publishing/etc some kind of document, bulletins, or any other type of document not so that the correct authorship can be figured out.

## I. General provisions for authorship

etc described where explicit authorship of Parties is listed, all of the Parties included in the author list must be given sufficient notice provide input to said document.

any If you list people individually, they all have to be publication/presentation/ given the chance to give input on the thing their herein *name* is on.

- ii. For any where authorship is limited to "JENSA Collaboration" and/or the contributing Institutions. **Parties** Representative must be given sufficient notice to provide input to said document.
- In the case where individuals aren't listed, the publication/presentation/ Representatives have to be given a chance to described herein provide input to the document, on behalf of the explicit Collaboration as a whole.

bodies should be given as required by those funding bodies.

iii. Reference to funding *Always appease your source of money*.

#### III. Period of Validity

intended to memorialize the understanding of the Parties to encourage and promote cooperation in JENSA Collaboration research activities. The Parties agree that this Memorandum is not intended to be legally binding and that if the Parties desire to create specific, legally-binding obligations with respect to performance of activities as part of such collaboration and/or cooperation, such binding obligations shall be set forth in a separate written agreement signed by duly authorized representatives of those Parties.

Continuing Resolution is *All the usual non-legally binding legalese*.

effective on the date it is ratified by a majority of three years, and potentially longer depending on the Representative Parties and be valid for a when the JENSA system gets to a point where the period, of a minimum of three (3) years, operation is somehow standardized. Picture determined by the demonstrable establishment of Gammasphere. Not everyone who helped build the JENSA gas jet target as a regular, reliable User *Gammasphere* is Device, the operation of which does not require *measurement*. That's what we're going for, but the input of the entirety of the original Parties. If until then, you have to abide by these rules. this period extends past the dates of validity of the original Memorandum of Understanding, it shall remain valid unless or until a new MoU is ratified by a majority of the Parties contradicting the terms set herein.

This Memorandum shall become We intend this document to be valid for at least still involved in every

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have executed this Memorandum and represent that they approve, accept and agree to the terms contained herein.

By:

Kelly Chipps, ORNL/UTK,

for the JENSA Collaboration

Date ratified:

December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013