**Open Science Student Support Group – meeting agendas and notes**

November 13, 2020 – Sixth meeting

Action items:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What?** | **By when?** | **Who?** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Agenda:

* **Check-in**
* **Action items from last meeting**
* **Approving agenda/meeting structure**
* **Debrief of last two sessions**
  + **Smaller groups in breakout rooms**
* **Last session of this semester – troubleshooting open science**
  + **Alternative session structure?**
* **Upcoming session on preregistration**
* Prep for next semester
  + Survey on role experiences and descriptions
  + Topics
* Check-out

Meeting notes:

October 14, 2020 – Fifth meeting

Action items:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What?** | **By when?** | **Who?** |
| Update session structure |  |  |
| Facilitators for session 2 | ASAP | Everyone - let Emiko know |
| Create Multiple and different discussion questions for each session  Working out the intro and share the check-ins and land acknowledgement | Personal deadline | Emiko and Chelsea |
| Put out feelers for time, should it be shorted? Poll to everyone in first session? | Personal deadline | Feedback community group |
| Shorten time to 1 hr, 40 minutes ish? | Personal deadline | Emiko |
| Challenge facilitator  Polls on slack   * 1. check ins from participations | personal deadline | Jassleen with Jenelle support?  Absorb into feedback community group |
| Buddy system | End of semester | Think about this |
| Check out “bot” to save time for everyone | Personal deadline | Matt? |
| Resource collector   * extract from Slack * Figure out how to organize it | Personal deadline, ongoing | Matt & Michael |
| Think about name/acronym/logo |  | Everyone |

Agenda:

* Check-ins
* Today’s meeting: meeting format & agenda
* Action items
* Debrief: how was the first session? What did you like/what do you think we could do differently?

Meeting notes:

**Pros/Likes:**

* Breakout rooms, well done, well facilitated
* Breakouts generally well – different groups for each of the two groups was good
* Likes the overview presentation and then the discussion
* Enjoyed session, was engaged all the way through – good sign (x2)
* Different groups helped keep attention, sharing with the group, sort of forced to stay engaged (in a good way)
* Liked presentation, breakout rooms
* Like the indigenous acknowledgement, maybe incorporate more
  + Active and not just generic
* Things they didn’t know, discussions,
* Still thinking about it now (which is good)
* Newcomers introduce
  + Maybe incorporate indigenous ways of knowing for this?
* Liked acknowledging everyone’s presence

**Cons/Dislikes:**

* Volume issues with mic – better screen/audio software (UCalgary offers one I think, Snag it?)
* Felt in some ways, round 2 and 3 were pretty similar, so differentiate between the two a bit differently
* 2 hours might be too much, shorter time, longer break?
* Couple more discussion questions (maybe so people could choose the ones they are interested in?) or fill out time period if people are fast
* Introduction was too long (maybe not every session, shorten those things)
* Discussion questions
* Slack discussion wasn’t plentiful
* **Second session update**
  + Session is confirmed with presenter
  + OSF used a lot for collaboration, introduction to smaller and bigger things through this
  + Updated registration to include information from the participants
  + Putting together resources, including videos, keynote presentation, open-source guides with different topics around project workflow
  + Facilitators for this session?

***CHANGES to sessions***

* Multiple and different discussion questions for each session
* Working out the intro and share the check-ins and land acknowledgement
* Maybe giving the general schedule for participants at the beginning?
* Time?
  + 1.5 hours? 1 hr 40/45 minutes?
    - Can leave the last 15 minutes for just wrap up and questions?
  + Maybe guard the 2 hours but try to aim for 90 minutes?
    - That way people are happy if it ends early for 2 hrs instead of mad if it ends late on 1.5 hours.
  + It is hard to get everything in less time, especially presentations and two rounds of breakout room
  + Some people are okay with the 2 hours
  + Feedback and community group – feelers to see if participants like the time should be shorted.
  + The 4-6 is late – people might be hungry and tired by the end of the week
  + Chunks split things up (20 minutes at a time)
* Breakout times (20 minutes):
  + 30 minutes was good for the second time, could have awkward silence, pressure for facilitators
  + Didn’t feel too long but also felt like we were running out of things to talk about
  + Either approach is good
  + Maybe 25 each? 20 was too short, 30 was too long.
  + Go back to the main room if they are done and the conversation is dying (x2)
  + If you are going to have a longer one, maybe make it the first one (x2)
    - More things to say at the start
* **Challenge facilitator**
  + Like the idea, help increase engagement and sense of community
  + Specific day to check in?
  + Jassleen offered to help out, Jenelle could help
  + Maybe two people
    - One for challenge check in and one for Slack convo starters?
    - 1-on-1 outreach
    - Maybe make polls?
  + Forgot buddy system last time
    - Like the idea of this, different experience and engagement levels
    - Maybe after the semester, during term break, when they know more about what they can do
    - Pairing was very successful in another club
    - Quasi lottery based, randomized,
      * Partners with people similar to them (animals vs human)
  + Maybe reaching out email/personal instead of Slack since we aren’t getting a lot of Slack participation
  + Lot of views and not a lot of engagement
  + Put polls in – see other people engaging
  + Slack
    - Can we have a bot that spits out questions?
    - Save time for us
  + Take task into community feedback group
* One other role to propose: resource collector
  + Organize resources in a google doc or something
  + Have different folders to organize things
  + Ongoing list with categories to find what they are looking for
  + Important vs. not important
  + People can search key terms?
* Check-out ^^

Agenda:

* Check-ins
* Today’s meeting: meeting format & agenda
* Action items
* Debrief: how was the first session? What did you like/what do you think we could do differently?
* Second session update
* Challenge facilitator/resource collector
* Check-out ^^

October 2, 2020 – Fourth meeting

Meeting notes:

**Action items:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What?** | **By when?** | **Who?** |
| **Call for facilitators for the first session once we have numbers** | **Personal deadline** | **Emiko and Chelsea** |
| **Point person for technical issues – divide responsibilities** | **Soon** | **Matt and Michael** |
| **Update challenges and incorporate feedback** | **Personal deadline** | **Gwen & Emiko (maybe Brittany)**  **Get input from others** |
| **Put the Introduction post on Slack** | **Today-Monday** | **Chelsea** |
| **Post on Chelsea’s post on Slack** | **Throughout the week** | **All of us 😊** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Agenda:

* Check-ins
* Today’s meeting: meeting format & agenda
* Updates on action items
* Session topics for the Fall – Emiko & Chelsea
  + PROPOSED SESSIONS FOR THIS SEMESTER
    - Intro to Open Science
    - Project Workflow
    - Data Sharing/Ethics
      * If you are using data from other people, do you need to do ethics
    - Pre-registration
    - Troubleshooting Open Science – more positive than the “dark side”, how to talk to your supervisor, things like that

\*Maybe weave in “talking to your supervisor” as part of the other ones (including part of the challenges)

* + Second presenter
    - Overall stuff:
      * Ford for most of this stuff could be
      * Post-doc in Kines – STORKES? Exec on open science like committee, knows a lot about the advocacy pieces, maybe trouble shooting?
      * Focus on student led, so might not want to set a precedent in the second session for having faculty present
      * Reach out to members on Slack to see if they want to do anything
        + Advertise – sharepoint
    - Project Workflow – Michael maybe, Simon Spanswick (doesn’t supervise students – show up to present but then leave for the discussion side of things to help with confidentiality)
    - Data Sharing/Ethics – Elaine maybe – personal experience with issues (Cara MacInnis)
    - Pre-registration – Harrison or Elena (Cara’s students) because Cara has been on the pre-registration train for a while
      * Maybe Brittany and Emiko because we did different styles for our masters
    - Troubleshooting Open Science – Chelsea if needed, Matt (if someone wants to co-present) – neuro – trying to work with each other but don’t want to scoop from each other
* Facilitators for first session
  + Put out a call once we know how many are in
  + Emiko and Chelsea
* Point persons for specific issues
  + Technical issues (Matt/Michael)
  + Conflict/complaints (Jenelle)
  + Want to present (Emiko/Chelsea)
  + Getting involved (Gwen)
* Teams/sharepoint
* Challenge criteria
  + Easy – take a couple of hours, checking resources, talk with it
  + Medium – identify less risky and easier practices (e.g., having pre registration intend but maybe not full)
  + Difficult – more risky or effortful (e.g., committing to fully pre registering all research)
  + Other things that might not be in specific challenges
  + Maybe scaling back these so that they are a bit more feasible, e.g., make easy one easier,
    - Easier – what can I do right now, cognitive exercise, thinking about things, look up one article and save it to you desktop, post to slack (get them to engage)
      * Making is easier so people are encouraged to engage outside of the session, make it easy for them to achieve something
    - Medium – facilitate some discussion, but many not implementing fully
    - Difficult – partially or fully implementing these practices
  + Notes
    - these might differ depending on where you are
      * preregistration for social psych might be easier for cognitive
      * talking to your super
    - Risk is important
      * Supervisor questions might be riskier for some
    - Could maybe make a table with like outlining the risk (none, low, medium), time, involvement, etc. outlining the differences between challenges
      * Brittany can help with visuals on this
    - Something that someone can do in the two-week time frame and then take on a bigger challenge after December to
    - Maybe we could ask people to also think about a longer-term goal, so that even if the challenges are a shorter time frame, they can think about how they build towards a practice
    - Maybe changing the names of the categories? – people seem to like this for sure
      * Agreeance there
      * Maybe quick little phrases for it
        + Learn a bit more
        + Try it out
        + Talk about it
        + Make a commitment

Maybe more long term goals

Little contract to themselves

* + - Maybe provide a minimum number of hours before the meeting, but no max

Challenge facilitator:

* + - Someone who checks in with students who are working on challenges
      * Assign buddies
      * Following up with the sessions and reminding them of what they are going to do
    - Mentor or buddy system on this whole thing?
    - Check in at the beginning of each session?
    - Buddy system is good but maybe also facilitating bigger group discussion
      * In Slack too, especially for those that drop in?
    - Maybe at the end of the session, having them to take a moment to decide what they want to do,
      * A little commitment to them
      * Reflection on what they just learned
      * More a thought, how can this be incorporated
  + Don’t force but say if it will enrich their learning
    - Buddy might keep people accountable though
    - Don’t want negative feelings toward the group because it is mandatory homework
* Maybe drop-ins but if you are a “formal” member, you might work on the exercises and assign a buddy
  + Can put on their CV if they are members
* Distribution of responsibilities
  + Everyone seems good
  + Foundations might need some clarification
  + Feedback group – introduce themselves on Slack (introduce, what they want to learn from the group in general)
    - Maybe consider Monday instead so it is part of people’s week
      * Maybe weekend and then the non-weekenders can do Monday?
    - Have us do it so others feel more comfortable
  + Challenges
    - Gwen to Emiko to solidify things a bit more
    - Maybe ask for difference challenge examples from the bigger group?
* Tips for moderation
* Promotion tips?

Happy weekend! ☺

Agenda:

* Check-ins
* Today’s meeting: meeting format & agenda
* Updates on action items
* Session topics for the Fall – Emiko & Chelsea
  + Second presenter
* Facilitators for first session
* Point persons for specific issues
  + Technical issues (Matt/Michael)
  + Conflict/complaints (Jenelle)
  + Want to present (Emiko/Chelsea)
  + Getting involved (Gwen)
* Teams/sharepoint
* Challenge criteria
* Distribution of responsibilities
* Tips for moderation
* Promotion tips?
* Happy weekend! ☺

September 21, 2020 – Third meeting

Meeting notes:

Action items:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What?** | **By when?** | **Who?** |
| **Share inequality paper to Slack** | **Personal deadline** | **Emiko – check** |
| **Updating session structure**  **Including:**  **Presentation time range (10-20minutes)**  **2nd round:**  **10 minutes - in big group (questions)**  **20 minute – smaller group**  **Define criteria for challenges** | **Personal deadline** | **Gwen** |
| **Copywrite issues figured out**   * **Presenters can be given options** * **UCalgary policy for graduate students** | **Personal deadline** | **Matt and Michael** |
| **Slides for first session** | **Personal deadline** | **Gwen** |
| **Blurb for first session promotion created** | **Wednesday 23rd if we want Monday memo this week (if not the next Wed!)** | **Gwen** |
| **Get blurb out**   * **Monday memo (Lisa)** * **GPPP Facebook page post** * **PGSA Facebook post and email list (send to Brad)** * **Honours class (Send to Mel)** | **Monday memo Thursday 24th**   * **Tell her for two weeks** * **Rest by Monday 28th** * **Reminders Monday 5th** | **Brittany (and Jenelle maybe)** |
| **Connect**  **Session Organization Group** | **Personal deadline** | **Emiko and Chelsea** |
| **Create PowerPoint template with suggestions** | **Personal deadline** | **Organization team** |
| **Investigate capabilities of Microsoft Teams** | **Personal deadline (when you get access)** | **Gwen** |
|  |  |  |

Agenda:

* **Introductions/check-in**
* **Meeting structure: rounds, decision based on consent**
* **Purpose of sessions**
  + **Introduce students to topics and provide practical steps and ideas (further reading if interested), why important, and how they can start using it, but lots of time for discussion. They may have heard about it, but it is difficult to make yourself stick to it, space to be circle of support, share experiences and difficulties. Topics: ethics and data sharing, subtopic for each topic we discuss**
  + **Likes how interactive, peer support, structure and community guidelines still need to be fleshed out (subgroup can tackle). Session itself, point for each session, what could be potential risks (easy to get excited, move forward, fully adopt everything) but there may be things that don’t necessarily work. Good paper in American Scientist – open science might reinforce inequality in STEM**
  + **Biggest part is information/knowledge dissemination, learn more about it, inequality worth keeping in the back of our heads**
  + **Discussion can be good or bad, monitor that, likes hands on things, something practical – more workshop (maybe an addition to biweekly sessions, after sessions). Discussion can get off topic**
  + **Like outline, intro then interaction, Emiko agree – highlighting risks, technology that is out there, privacy (of participants – good point with ethics),**
  + **Like the idea of learning outcomes/objectives at the beginning, balance info dissemination and discussion,**
* **Session structure**
  + **Would all the risks, pros, be in the 15 minutes? Yes, so maybe the presentation might be a bit too short 🡪 not deep dive, but still want enough info**
  + **Cite things, risk then citation so people can go into it more, see how it works and adjust from there**
  + **Idea of the challenges are good, criteria for what the three challenges are, might throw off time if one goes faster or slower than expected.**
  + **Like format, range for presentation might be good (10-20 minutes)**
  + **2nd round: large group might be good there, so questions aren’t being repeated inside breakout rooms, presenter might know the answer.** 
    - **Go back to question model? If staying in one group.**
    - **Maybe break this section up so ask questions to the big group/presenter (10 minutes maybe?) and then thoughts/questions in breakout rooms after that (20 minutes)**
  + **3rd round: grouping people by challenge level, more in common to talk about, do see the benefit of mixing up too** 
    - **Challenges break up could work,**
    - **Try out different ones and see which one works better, if one method falls apart we could try another sort of thing**
    - **If grouping by challenge, we will have to schedule in time for facilitator to do that**
  + **Prerequisites for sessions?**
    - **Having enough knowledge for each one, have them have to attend previous sessions so that they can understand, don’t want to repeat info, the end ones might be more complicated and need the previous knowledge**
    - **This could discourage folks to attend later sessions if they missed earlier ones, prefer stand alone, still like the idea,**
    - **Still agree there needs to be a holistic approach, but maybe that can wait until Winter? Keep it silo for now, concerns about accessibility**
      * **This allows to test the water, compounded might be tough if attendance is strange**
      * **Could monitor if the same people are coming each time, or if different,**
      * **Record?**
    - **Lots of people have heard about this, they might be at a level without attending our sessions, keep it welcoming by not forcing people to have done other things,** 
      * **Record idea is good (privacy though– privacy with labs and supervisors might be tricky)** 
        + **Privacy concerns, possible to only do an audio**
        + **Maybe recording only on your computer and not through Zoom, help increase quality**
        + **Recording issue could be more, they may not want to share an experience because it might make their lab or supervisor look bad? And even if their face isn’t shown, people could probably figure it out pretty quick**
        + **First session might be important to record so people know what open science is.**
      * **Making sure names don’t show up**
        + **Consider intellectual property of presenters, they have copywrite over their materials**
        + **Online platforms have licenses?**
        + **Licensing things? Could be a topic**
      * **Presenters not going to repeat each other – organizers can check in with this.**
    - **e.g., if they need R knowledge?** 
      * **Disclaimer in workshops: If you don’t know how to code, this won’t be helpful**

**Registering participants**

* **Get info to participants**
* **Keep track**
* **Get a general idea**
* **Microsoft Teams**
  + **Something that everyone has – use it as an email list**
  + **Sign up**
  + **One drive connected**
  + **Figure out how to promote with that**

**Template**

* **Optional but a resource for them**
* **Land acknowledgment**
* **First session details**
  + **First session date & time: Friday Oct 9, 4-6pm**
    - **Not perfect but fine**
  + **Topic: Introduction to open science**
    - **Nothing obligatory – supplementary/optional**
    - **Simple for people**
    - **Maybe videos over readings, shorter readings,**
  + **Presenter**
* **Organization of sessions**
* **Facilitators**
  + **Things that facilitators should be aware of, take note of**
  + **1 facilitator that opens the meeting and introduces,** 
    - **For smaller breakout sessions (one group member in each to help keep structure)**
  + **Forecasting amount of people, Eventbrite can help gauge numbers (or can Teams do that?)**
  + **Having chat facilitator too**
  + **For breakout rooms, can provide discussion question pools they can pick from**
  + **Also when we can move on, when topic is exhaustive,**
  + **Book end facilitation – same person to start meeting and close out,** 
    - **Introduce topic for next week at end**
* **Vote: topics for the next 4 sessions (open for 24 hours after meeting)**
  + **Vote for 4 topics**
  + **Think about what students need now, early in their projects if they are just sorting out**
* **Anything else?**

Agenda:

* **Introductions/check-in**
* **Meeting structure: rounds, decision based on consent**
* **Purpose of sessions**
* **Session structure**
* **First session details**
  + **First session date & time: Friday Oct 9, 4-6pm**
  + **Topic: Introduction to open science**
  + **Presenter**
* **Organization of sessions**
* **Facilitators**
* **Vote: topics for the next 4 sessions (open for 24 hours after meeting)**
* **Anything else?**

September 16, 2020 – Second meeting

Meeting notes:

Action items:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What?** | **By when?** | **Who?** |
| Go to Honours’ class to present | Day: Monday Sept 21st | Brittany to connect Gwen and Mel via email today  Gwen to talk & Matt |
| Reach out to GPPP | Asap? | Emiko |
| Reach out to I/O (Janelle) | Asap? | Emiko |
| Slide for 615 class | Friday | Brittany, can send slide to Gwen to adjust for honours students |
| Twitter advertisement |  | ? Chelsea |
| Plan a planning session for session 1 | Next week? | Gwen to set up  All to attend if possible |
| Slack convo about topics | Asap | Michael |

Agenda:

* **Introductions/check-in**
* **Meeting structure: rounds, decision based on consent**
  + **Consent instead of consensus (good enough)**
  + **Won’t take forever (hope)**
  + **Proposal 🡪 Questions/comments 🡪 Respond & Adjust 🡪 Major Objections**
* **Representation in organizational group – who else to include**
  + **Matt – basement peeps want to know more**
  + **I/O is busy – keep reaching out**
  + **Reach out to GPPP – Brittany did one student but she was too busy**
  + **615**
  + **Twitter – clinical students follow this a lot**
* **Organizational structure**
  + **Core organizers & contributors**
    - **Contributors are interested but only participate when they can (core go to these people when we need help, get feedback etc.**
  + **Core organizational roles** 
    - **Independent units**
    - **End responsible & autonomous, but able to get support/delegate**
  + **Meetings as needed**
* **Core organizational roles: (Poll about this)**
  + **Sessions – talk about next meeting!**
  + **Promotion – Brittany**
  + **Online platforms – Michael and Matt**
  + **Feedback & community – Jasleen, Chelsea, Gwen**
  + **Temporary: creation/set up of group foundations – Emiko, Jasleen, Matt, Gwen**
* **Vision/purpose/motivations**
* Topics
  + **Slack convo about it, ask people what they want to see**
* Community guidelines
* Anything else?

Agenda:

* **Introductions/check-in**
* **Meeting structure: rounds, decision based on consent**
* **Representation in organizational group – who else to include**
* **Organizational structure**
  + **Core organizers & contributors**
  + **Core organizational roles** 
    - **Independent units**
    - **End responsible & autonomous, but able to get support/delegate**
  + **Meetings as needed**
* **Core organizational roles:**
  + **Sessions (2)**
  + **Promotion (1)**
  + **Online platforms (2)**
  + **Feedback & community (2)**
  + **Temporary: creation/set up of group foundations (2-3)**
* **Vision/purpose/motivations**
* Topics
* Community guidelines
* Anything else?

September 9, 2020 – First meeting

Agenda:

* **Introductions**
* **Meeting structure: rounds, decision based on consent**
* **Basic structure of group:**
  + **Biweekly online sessions (~2 hours) – check**
  + **Online communication platform(s) -** 
    - **Private first: Slack?**
  + **First session: First week of October**
  + **5/6 sessions in the Fall 2020 semester**
* **Promotion:**
  + **Blurb sent through department mailing list**
  + **Email-to-email: supervisors/students**
  + **PGSA facebook group/email**
* **Organizer structure/communication channels**
* Topics for Fall 2020
  + Translational science
* Structure of online sessions
* Community guidelines
* Anything else?

Meeting notes:

* Introductions
* Meeting structure: rounds, decision based on consent
* Basic structure of group:
  + Biweekly online sessions (~2 hours)
    - Sounds good.
  + First session: Week of Sept. 28 (but hits holid
    - Maybe the 21st, or Week of October 5th?
    - Doing another Doodle poll now that everyone has availability more clear
      * Gwen will send out ASAP
  + 5/6 sessions in the Fall 2020 semester
  + Online communication platform(s)
    - Private first: Slack
  + Export each month so we don’t loose anything
  + Someone to look after Slack
  + Download and keep running list of links
  + Zotero? For references
* Promotion:
  + Blurb sent through department mailing list (link to Slack?)
  + Monday memo – email Lisa, work two weeks in advance
  + Honours – reach out to Melissa (Brittany can)
  + Email-to-email: supervisors/students, including honours students?
  + PGSA Facebook group – email sent out
  + GPPP – Emiko to reach out to Lorraine
* Organizer structure/communication channels
* Primary Organization – Matt, Emiko (for Fall, Winter is busier)
* Jassleen – get back by the end of the week
* Michael – more interested in making things and presenting, active with content of sessions, maybe expanding to public presence
* Maybe have representative from all areas –
  + Jaimie from Clinical (Brittany to reach out)
  + Lorena from I/O
* KEEP REACHING OUT VIA EMAIL AND GET CONTACT TO GWEN FOR DOODLE POLL
* Topics for Fall 2020
* Structure of online sessions
* Community guidelines
* Anything else?

Summary/Action Plan:

* Starting the week of October 5th?
* Reach out more broadly in the department, try to have representation from all area
* Members: email anyone that might be interested and send any names to Gwen who might be.
* Gwen: invitation to department sent out, doodle poll with most popular choices
* Work on promotion once things are confirmed.

Action items:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What?** | **By when?** | **Who?** |
| Reach out to people from Clinical Psychology and I/O |  | Emiko & Brittany |
| Write promotional blurb |  | Gwen |
| Create doodle poll with time points when there are no departmental classes |  | Gwen |
|  |  |  |