

Responses cannot be edited

OpenConCam 2016 group discussion

This is the form you'll use to report back from your discussion group. Please submit it by the end of the discussion session. After the conference, we will share all notes under a CC-BY license.

Title of your discussion topic *

How do we encourage the doubtful to try Open Research?
.....

Group members (please identify the chair and scribe) *

Clair Castle (Chair), Matthias Ammon, Peter Sutton Long, Claire Sewell (Scribe),
Mark Dunning, Adam Kilmont, Ben Webb, Charlotte Whicher
.....

Summary of your discussion *

Time is a massive issue. People just don't have time to do all Hesse things.
Training is needed but you also need to get people interested in training. Don't
expect people to come to you, you need to go to them. Need to find personal
incentives to encourage people, whatever their career stage. Need evidence base
- document the benefits. Train people in how to cite data
.....

Five take-away points (positive or negative) *

Need for training - but need to get people interested in it. Personal incentives to
encourage people to get involved in open research. It's really hard! Be aware of
the differences in your audience - people are motivated by different things at
different stages of their career. Need increased monitoring from funders - they
need to work harder to encourage people to get involved. Integration of systems
to make open research one click easy!
.....

Suggested follow-up action (you won't need to act, just suggest) *

Make systems easier to use, encourage training, more funder intervention,
document impact of open research and success stories

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Responses cannot be edited

OpenConCam 2016 group discussion

This is the form you'll use to report back from your discussion group. Please submit it by the end of the discussion session. After the conference, we will share all notes under a CC-BY license.

Title of your discussion topic *

What is the power of the reviewer in shifting to OA?
.....

Group members (please identify the chair and scribe) *

Dom Cram, Lauren Gonnella, Rosie Higman (scribe), Penny Down
.....

Summary of your discussion *

Low-cost way of making a big impact, fewer consequences of where to review for the individual so can exert power through this choice. Can make a positive statement to editors by saying that the reason will review for a particular journal is because they are OA etc.
.....

Five take-away points (positive or negative) *

1. Reviews can be a way for ECRs to have an impact with little negative side-effects. 2. Making ethical choices about where you review based on OA policy, not for profit status etc can help engender change. 3. It's possible to make much more nuanced decisions in reviews than you often can with publishing (open, signed, etc.). 4. Signing your name can be a form of openness and transparency in research which creates accountability and quality. 5. The ownership of reviews is often unclear reducing the power of the reviewer to publish it etc. and the lack of transparency around this should be addressed.

Suggested follow-up action (you won't need to act, just suggest) *

Reviewers can sign reviews and make their own ethical framework for deciding who to review for.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Responses cannot be edited

OpenConCam 2016 group discussion

This is the form you'll use to report back from your discussion group. Please submit it by the end of the discussion session. After the conference, we will share all notes under a CC-BY license.

Title of your discussion topic *

What is stopping ECRs from being more open?
.....

Group members (please identify the chair and scribe) *

LauraJ (scribe), sarah middle (chair), ed emmot, naomi penfold, Elena, jeremiah spillane
.....

Summary of your discussion *

ECRs are busy, pressured, don't know what open is all about, or indeed what data management is all about, or how the publication system works and why it is how it is
.....

Five take-away points (positive or negative) *

- 1) Peer review process needs checklist around data, and maybe a (cheaper!) nonacademic checking papers, to ensure that non-publication citations and links are right and appropriate
 - 2) a resource for ECRs showing WHAT they need to do to research openly and WHY that matters (why the system is how it is). Market this so they can find it even if their PIs aren't into open. Make it discoverable, relevant, fit into busy pressured lives (eg don't call it "data management" because humanities may not recognise the term; don't call it 'open' because they may not understand; show real value to real ECR careers)
 - 3) case studies and role models of ECRs/mid career where open working practices have been successful. In a place for everyone (not just institutional)
 - 4) do we need more evidence of blockers to being open? does someone already have data we don't know about? :)
 - 5) can we move from papers being the currency unit of academic careers, to something more, eg datasets etc as well?
-

Suggested follow-up action (you won't need to act, just suggest) *

We need to find ways to support our peers - advocacy

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Responses cannot be edited

OpenConCam 2016 group discussion

This is the form you'll use to report back from your discussion group. Please submit it by the end of the discussion session. After the conference, we will share all notes under a CC-BY license.

Title of your discussion topic *

How to stop early career researchers being bullied to publish against their ethics

Group members (please identify the chair and scribe) *

Bethany Coates (Chair), Ross Mounce, Corina Logan, Jennifer Wright (scribe)

Summary of your discussion *

We discussed limited power EC researchers have esp on short contracts where money comes from PI.

"damage limitation" rather than ideal

role of societies

avenues for change:

- review choices? always people keen to review, so hard to make a splash, and decision why you don't review isn't public

Where an EC researcher makes a first submission to an OA journal its often assumed it has been rejected elsewhere

Five take-away points (positive or negative) *

pre-prints a big solution?

Advocating to supervisor or to team v dependent on department and individual situation

Senior researchers often don't understand technical reasons (typesetting, speed etc), let alone ethical considerations. Publishers should be better at their jobs, that might help convince

The role of funders - what about funders having Wellcome Open Research style platforms? Is there a conflict of interest? Or does it solve the problem of deciding where to publish/problems of ethics.

Should ethics about OA be viewed in same way as diversity, religion, beliefs in science - should be respected.

Suggested follow-up action (you won't need to act, just suggest) *

Ross to send round the interesting blogs he mentioned!

Incorporate discussions around ethics and publishing choices into departmental discussions or line management training/reviews

Encourage top down mandates from departments about hiring and good scientific practice.

Explore new models where journals "bid" for preprints? ...but then would PIs just "wait for Nature to call?"

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Responses cannot be edited

OpenConCam 2016 group discussion

This is the form you'll use to report back from your discussion group. Please submit it by the end of the discussion session. After the conference, we will share all notes under a CC-BY license.

Title of your discussion topic *

Making a paper OA is not necessarily sharing it -perhaps we should be writing in a more understandable way.

Group members (please identify the chair and scribe) *

Chair -

Scribe - Alex Morley

Peter Murray-Rust

Dieter Lukas

Marta Teperek

Anne Pajon

Emma Pewsey

Helena Lyhme

Keren Limor-Waisbery

Summary of your discussion *

Making a story of your research is super important, and a skill that we should all aim to acquire!

Five take-away points (positive or negative) *

Understand-ability of your research has to come at the beginning of your research (prospective not retrospective).

There needs to be good support infrastructure - involve journalists, artists, librarians and others.

Open doesn't stop at Open Access. We then have to move beyond the paper and share data, and the story behind how the data was collected.

If you are publicly funded you should be prepared to make your work understandable to the public.

Look, and share, at the human side of the research. Research is still done by people. Makes your story more accessible.

Suggested follow-up action (you won't need to act, just suggest) *

Everyone could try and write a blog post for each research output that you make.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Responses cannot be edited

OpenConCam 2016 group discussion

This is the form you'll use to report back from your discussion group. Please submit it by the end of the discussion session. After the conference, we will share all notes under a CC-BY license.

Title of your discussion topic *

How should early career researchers be evaluated for grants and tenure

Group members (please identify the chair and scribe) *

Catriona, Erin, Constance, Lauren, Shiqing, Andrew, Talal, Hannah

Summary of your discussion *

Erin/OpenCon: Analysing tenure forms from different universities (USA & Canada) to dev best practice guidelines

-article level metrics, statement about values of other outputs and ability to detail that information

Constance: feel publications hiding a huge amount of learning & skill set – opportunity to document skillset. Evaluated as individual but science is team effort therefore behaviour and collaboration important.

Lauren: Skills/publications evaluated in the context the of the research area and research environment – providing the context that you're working in.

Me: Funder expanding range of outputs that people can reference and showcase

Doctor: The difference between basic science and clinical – “wow you have a paper”. Yearly appraisal – generate portfolio that is committee reviewed with advice and feedback. [vitae]. Measuring readership

Erin: Percentile ranking of publications within your field/discipline

Publons: Tensions between need to standardise across masses and the need of individuals to tell story. Additional tension between skills and outputs.

Crowdsourcing of opinions to give review –

Shiqing: IF is king because of simplicity. Projects in addition to papers or in lieu

Catriona: Need infrastructure to allow citation and recognition of different outputs and to join all of them up. Badging/Crediting within papers/projects – links to ORCID profiles.

Five take-away points (positive or negative) *

Publications hides a whole suite of activity that researchers do, need to provide space to showcase this.

The context of research area and environment can determine scale of outputs and also impact - need to ensure metrics provide this context.

All outputs are equal - publications need to stop being first class citizen when it comes to evaluation.

Tension exists between institute/funder need to standardise and individuals needs. Will always exist, need to provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate individuals.

Suggested follow-up action (you won't need to act, just suggest) *

Best practice guidance for universities in evaluating researchers & showcase adopters

Develop infrastructure that allows the citation and referencing of a variety of inputs and links all of this together to a central point.

Institutional ranking of openness

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms