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Some practical information

Please,

- Open our collaborative notes for the session:
  Google doc link available in the chat or in the programme session page (on top of the agenda)

- Include there your name in the attendees list and any information you wish

- Questions or short comments are welcome during the presentation, please use the chat box; Specific moments will be dedicated to verbal discussion in the 2nd part of the session

- Keep muted during the session when not talking

- Session slides & notes will be made available by RDA and on the SHARC group’s page (RDA website)
Meeting agenda

Part 1.................................................................45 min
- Introduction, Laurence Mabile
- Survey’s preliminary results presentation,
  Florencia Grattarola & Hanna Shmagun

Part 2.................................................................45 min
- Collective discussion, Anne
Introduction

SHARC ig

- Interdisciplinary group set up to unpack and improve crediting and rewarding mechanisms in the data/resource sharing process.

- Main goal: to provide recommendations to foster the implementation of rewarding paths and encourage the adoption of data sharing/OS activities-related criteria in the research evaluation process at the institutional, national and European/international levels.

SHARC ig co-chairs:

Hanna Shmagun, Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information/KISTI, South Korea;
Christopher Erdmann, AGU, USA;
Romain David, ERINHA, FR;
Laurence Mabile, University of Toulouse III-Inserm, FR;
Anne Cambon-Thomsen & Mogens Thomsen, University of Toulouse III-Inserm, FR.
Introduction

SHARC ig is being a part of a global multi-stakeholder coalition on reforming research assessment coordinated by the European Commission.

Session objectives

→ To discuss with you the necessity of rewarding Open Science activities.

→ The discussion will be based on the preliminary results of a survey conducted by a sub-group of members of the RDA-SHARC IG.

→ To help fuel the discussion conducted as part of the EC’s Coalition on reforming research assessment.

→ To help feed future SHARC recommendations.
About the survey

**Aim:**
To identify perceptions and expectations of various research communities regarding how Open Science activities, such as research data sharing, are (or should be) taken into consideration and rewarded

Launched in April 2022
113 complete responses at the time of extraction
Ongoing survey until end of September
Preliminary results
presented by:

Florence Grattarola
Biodiversidata, Uy | CULS Prague, Cz

Hanna Shmagun,
KISTI, University of Science and Technology, Kr
Respondents’ gender

- Female: 46
- Male: 47
- No response: 20
Respondents by country

Which country do you work in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Rep.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 22 countries
Top countries

Which country do you work in?

- Other countries: 27
- Uruguay: 12
- France: 16
- United States: 19
- Korea, Rep.: 39
Geographic distribution of respondents
Job titles of respondents

- Software engineer: 1
- Policy officer: 7
- Postdoc: 13
- Data specialist: 13
- Graduate student (Master, PhD): 14
- Professor: 47
- Researcher: 0

Other job titles:
- Project Chief and senior scientist at federal government agency
- Retired educator
- Retired researcher/professor
- Staff science technician
- Librarian (scholarly communications)
- Research support
- Biostatistician
- Open Access Programme Manager
- Research engineer in DM
- Project Manager
- GBIF National Node Administrator
- Open access/open science advisor
- Librarian
Main affiliated organisations

Type of organisation
- International organisation
- NGO / NPO
- Government agency
- University
- Research institute

Other types of organisations
- European research infrastructure (ERIC)
- Family
- Small business
- Private company
- Hospital
- International organism
Main disciplinary fields
Open Science awareness

Are you familiar with Open Science?

- Red: No
- Blue: Yes

100

13
Involved in Open science activities?

- Publishing a paper or monograph/book as Open Access
  - Yes: 60%
  - No: 40%

- Open or FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) data management and sharing: for research data, software, models, algorithms, workflows etc.
  - Yes: 47%
  - No: 53%

- Participation in public engagement, including citizen (or community) science
  - Yes: 46%
  - No: 54%

- Sharing a research manuscript as a preprint
  - Yes: 42%
  - No: 58%

- Participation in open peer review (being reviewed or the reviewer)
  - Yes: 34%
  - No: 66%

- Collaboration via virtual research environments/virtual laboratories
  - Yes: 24%
  - No: 76%

- Pre-registration of the study design, methods, hypothesis, etc. prior to commencing the research
  - Yes: 19%
  - No: 81%
Other suggested Open Science activities

“I coordinate a national system of open repositories of S&T publications”

“I am a member of the advisory committee on open science”

“Institutional guidance on open science in the position of Head of Research”

“I collaborate with faculty and labs at my university to build best practices around PID implementations, and data sharing”

“I teach FAIR and Open Science as part of an introductory course on research data management for science department graduate students at my university”

“Introducing the Open Science concept, policy establishment, public lectures, business promotion”

“Proposing a DMP model to specific communities in Life Sciences”

“Development of standardised reporting formats for specialist data types”

SUPPORT
Familiarity with FAIR principles

Are you familiar with the FAIR principles?
- No
- Yes

FAIR principles:
https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/
Involvement in FAIRification steps

FAIRification process:
https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/fairification-process/
About institutional policies

Does your institute/organisation have policies on various Open Science activities?

- **No**: 53
- **Yes**: 57
- **N/A**: 3
Examples of institutional Open Science policies in respondents’ affiliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>KISTI Open Access policy [the only OA mandate in Korea]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Inserm Open Science policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>CNRS Open Science policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Research data management strategy of CERCA (Research Centers of Catalonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Research data policy of INGV (National Institute of Geophysics and Volcanology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>OA policies at MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>NASA’s Transform to Open Science (TOPS) initiative for 2022-2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>OA policy of the National Agency for Research and Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What to reward and Should we?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Definitely Not</th>
<th>Probably Not</th>
<th>Possibly</th>
<th>Very Probably</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publishing a paper or monograph/book as Open Access</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open or FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) data management and sharing: for research data, software, models, algorithms, workflows etc.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in open peer review (being reviewed or the reviewer)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in public engagement, including citizen (or community) science</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-registration of the study design, methods, hypothesis, etc. prior to commencing the research</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing a research manuscript as a preprint</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration via virtual research environments/virtual laboratories</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates cumulative percentage of positive responses.

Indicates cumulative percentage of negative responses.
Any institutional rewarding initiative?

Does your institute/organisation have any initiative or tool which gives credits/rewards for Open Science activities?
Mentioned initiatives which give credits or rewards for Open Science activities, arranged by country.
Examples of institutional initiatives rewarding Open Science

**Netherlands**
Utrecht University Open Science initiative - "Utrecht University Recognition and Rewards Vision"

**France**
CNRS Open Science policy: OS activities are included in the annual activity report of researchers; only publications available in the national open repository (HAL) can be taken into account in the evaluation

**Finland**
Open Science Award (University of Helsinki or Tampere University)

**USA**
Minor recognition through individual year-end achievement reports (research institute)
The most desired rewards for Open Science activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHARC Rewards Terminology</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS indicators in research evaluation processes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding/grants for OS activities</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career progression</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awards/bonuses</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research visibility</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorship/contribution</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal status with traditional research outputs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research reputation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration (e.g., joint research, co-authorship)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledgement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘good science’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provision of IT resources/infrastructures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>championships/contests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRedit taxonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS certification for researchers (e.g., TOPS Guidelines)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paid peer review in OA journals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support through regulations and policy mandates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion
Chair: Anne Cambon-Thomsen
Don’t miss your chance to participate in our survey

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


The survey is open until October 1, 2022
Let’s talk about:

- Do you think that the proportion of people who are aware of OS or FAIR principles (according to our data) reflects the reality, in general?
Let’s talk about:

- Does the diversity of OS activities make the researcher evaluation easier or more complicated?
Let’s talk about:

- Do you think the responses about the institutional OS policies reflect the reality, in general? In your context?
Let’s talk about:

- Some respondents said:
  * « OS should be an ethical principle for an ethical researcher, the way to do it is one's own reward,
  * ... do not use monetary incentives as it perverts the system. »

- Do you think scientists can be motivated by “Good Science”, by « reputation/visibility » aspects or the tangible, monetary-based rewards should be the main driver for OS adoption?
Let’s talk about:

- The responses show that the existence of OS policies was more frequently present than a reward policy for such activities,

- What are the reasons for this situation according to you?
  Example of reasons:
  - You first have to implement something and then evaluate/reward it
  - You need more education on OS before rewarding it (both for scientists and for their evaluators)?
Let’s talk about:

- Do we need quantitative criteria/metrics or just qualitative ones to assess research?
  - in general
  - for OS activities
Let's talk about:

- Respondents had different number of years of experience

- Do you think rewarding OS activities has to be the same all along the career or should such activities be particularly promoted through rewards at certain steps of the career to foster OS adoption?
Let’s talk about:

- Research is often international, multi-institutional and multidisciplinary.

Do you think that the rewarding systems for OS activities should be organised on institutional / disciplinary levels or be more harmonised? And is the later possible in your view?
Thank you for your participation!

RDA-SHARC “Reco subgroup”:

Laurence Mabile <laurence.mabile@univ-tlse3.fr>
Florenca Grattarola <grattarola@fzp.czu.cz>
Shmagun Hanna <hanna.shmagun@kisti.re.kr>
Anne Cambon-thomsen <anne.cambon-thomsen@univ-tlse3.fr>
Mogens Thomsen <mogens.thomsen@univ-tlse3.fr>
Christopher Erdmann <CErdmann@agu.org>