

# RDA-P19 SHARC ig session

## How Open Science activities are perceived and recognised in Research and the Research career

---

### Session slides here:

<https://www.rd-alliance.org/system/files/documents/RDA%20P19%20SHARC%20ig%20session%20slides%20-%202020jun22.pdf>

### Session organisers/contributors:

Hanna Shmagun, Florencia Grattarola, Laurence Mabile, Anne Cambon-Thomsen, Mogens Thomsen, Chris Erdman

### House keeping notes

- The session is being **recorded** and will be made available on the RDA website and on the conference website
- Please **mute** yourself when not talking
- We will communicate via the **chat function during the presentation. You will be welcome to talk by raising your hand in the second part of the session.**

### Open science SHARC survey:

Please participate in our survey.

The questionnaire is available in multiple languages through the links below:

<https://enquetes.univ-tlse3.fr/976622?lang=en> (in English)

<https://enquetes.univ-tlse3.fr/479674?lang=es> (in Spanish)

<https://enquetes.univ-tlse3.fr/976622?lang=ko> (in Korean)

### List of attendees

Name	Affiliation & Position	Email
Dimitri Szabo	INRAE	dimitri.szabo@inrae.fr
Alison Specht	TERN, University of Queensland and PARSEC	a.specht@uq.edu.au

Name	Affiliation & Position	Email
Juliane Röder	NFDI4Biodiversity   HeFDI   Service center e-research, Philipps-University Marburg, Germany	juliane.roeder@uni-marburg.de
M.L Dubernet	PSL University	marie-lise.dubernet@observatoiredeparis.psl.eu
Graham Smith	Springer Nature, Research Data Manager	graham.smith@springernature.com
Raphaëlle Bats	Co-head, URfist de Bordeaux, Université de Bordeaux	raphaelle.bats@u-bordeaux.fr
Anne Cambon-Thomsen	CNRS, Inserm, Toulouse University	anne.cambon-thomsen@univ-tlse3.fr
Mogens Thomsen	Inserm, University of Toulouse	mogens.thomsen@univ-tlse3.fr
Nina Weisweiler	Helmholtz Association	nina.weisweiler@os.helmholtz.de

Name	Affiliation & Position	Email

**Meeting agenda**

- Part 1.....45 min
  - Introduction, Laurence
  - Survey’s preliminary results presentation, Flo & Hanna
- Part 2.....45 min
  - Collective discussion, Anne

**Notes**

**Part 1**

**Discussion part:**

Dimitri Szabo (DS): OS awareness is dependent of context & communities. in some communities/organizations this is way higher and may be way lower among others.

OS policies do not mean that they are put in practise; 2 levels to consider, first the policy, second implementation

In some countries there may be some difficulties to evaluate OS activities as the taxonomy is not unified; there is a gap there

OS and evaluation services of organisations are not always well connected, issue there

**Zoom chat comments:**

the main driver of people will be money (we see it with funding), but the main driver should be « visibility/reputation»

It raises the question of should monetary-based rewards should be used at all

Raphaëlle Bats (RB): My idea is we need to make meet the ethical aspect of OS and the ethical aspect of reproducibility and integrity. I think that reproducibility/integrity is an intrinsic motivation that can be more direct than OS.

Alison Specht: I doubt that many people will be able to single one motivation out, and the balance will differ I suspect according to career stage. Ecologists and biodiversity people are often passionate about saving the world.

Graham Smith (GS): the State of Open Data annual survey also touches on these points e.g. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.13227875.v2> - where impact and visibility, citation, co-authorship are highest-rated motivators but public benefit also highly-rated

DS: The "support factor" is likely to be even more important as if there are these resources, they are more likely to learn about OS in the first place

Julian Röder (JR): open science is implemented top-down, not bottom-up. so policies are coming first, before open science is a day-to-day reality in institutions

DS: evaluations policies are also implemented top-down though

Molebelli Botlhole : Reward should not necessarily be in monetary terms to the researcher. Academic progression and recognition should be the top rewards. Monetary based rewards will come in the form of research funding to the researcher thus encouraging and enabling more open research to be conducted and shared.

GS: as well as looking at reward vs enforcement separately, the move to data sharing (and Open Science more generally) can be seen as a behaviour change issue. One of the most effective motivators is social proof, i.e. what others in your area are doing. So growing data uptake via communities is an important idea.

JR: which makes it had to implement open science/FAIR data standards in university curricula - the lecturers need to be trained and motivated to teach the next generations

RB: We have a program in France to train PHD students to OS and Research data to be trainers in their labs. The program is named FLSO and run by the Ur fist.

Hanna Shmagun (HS): The University of Utrecht in the Netherlands has a programme: <https://www.uu.nl/en/research/open-science/faq/recognition-and-rewards>

HS: As a rule the evaluation of programmes, teams and individuals will have to move away from the use of the prevailing (biblio)metrics. As we now know, aggregated measures such as the h-index and the IF provide – at best - a poor measure for (individual) performance. Used in isolation they are a poor and fundamentally skewed reflection of scientific quality.

However, it does not exclude the use of all quantitative measures for performance. But instead of using a limited set of flawed indicators, we will put qualitative measures, narrative and strategy first. Quantitative indicators will not be eliminated entirely, but they must be meaningful (as must the qualitative indicators).

RB: Sorry, it is about previous question, but I would add that quantitative indicators do not make coffee. I mean that qualitative indicators are a way to be more careful to people, links and vulnerabilities.

Yes, more subjectif, and also, if we take a care perspective, the continuum of vulnerability obliges us to make an evaluation with a very precise granularity.

–

Rewards towards a career or to make OS easier? Giving support is important, and this might change

Semantic comment, what do we consider a 'reward', that can mean different things in different languages.

Florenca Grattarola: top down effect has the advantage to let researchers think that it is supported by the institution/organisation/govt if they have concrete support

ML Dubernet : Additional Question to the IG (outside the chat) : I have noted in my field that the OS policy of EU/national funding encourages people to build additional on-line OS resources with the results of their research. They publish their data on-line independently of any standards/FAIR aspects. Would "rewards" (other than money) help to solve this issue ? Or any other aspects of OS policies ?

Anne Cambon-Thomsen: In conclusion,