Open Science Cafe

Brought to you by:

The projects mentioned have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme.

Want to talk Open Science?

Take a seat, shuffle the cards and choose one from the pack. After reading the statement out loud players can then share their ideas in an open discussion.

Together let's create a chain reaction!

The statements included in this deck of cards reflect the issues that are dealt with by the featured projects.The statements are intended only as 'food for thought' and are not official project positions.

I don’t mind my personal data being mined in the pursuit of curing a disease like Zika.

Where exceptions or limitations are introduced into copyright law to allow content mining, these should be mandatory and may not be overridden by contracts.

Researchers are better placed than institutions to design and update a suitable Open Data Policy.

By making CC BY (for papers) and CC0 (for data) obligatory, policy makers often achieve the opposite of what they intended because many researchers oppose it.

New students expect TDM to be everyday practice at their university.

Scientific publishing will always be dominated by commercial publishing houses.

Libraries should spend money on preserving software in order to keep data available for re-use.

Institutions should mandate sharing research data.

Researchers only think about RDM if it is imposed upon them.

Institutional repositories are essential to obtain full open access to all publications from the institution.

Open data should be a responsibility of the institution, not of the individual researcher.

Regardless of being commercial or not, TDM should be exempted from the scope of copyright and database law when carried out for research purposes.

TDM is only of value to the hard sciences, not to humanities.

Libraries have a central role in implementing TDM.

Every university, research organisation, research funder and commercial business should ensure that their policies recognise content mining as a research methodology.

When assessing quality of research, ‘openness’ should be as big a factor as journal prestige.

Data sharing is more important than Open Access to publications.

An ideal Open Access policy should support both self-archiving and open publishing.

Bottom-up initiatives like openaccessbutton.org have done more for Open Access than top-down policies.

In research projects, 5% of the budget should be kept in reserve to spend on making the outputs openly available.

All universities should make sharing lab notebooks in a shared and mineable space mandatory.

Open Peer Review enhances the status and recognition of reviewing scientific publications.

It should be easier for citizen scientists to publish their work in a scientific journal.

Research assessment systems need to evolve to recognise a variety of approaches and activities in Open Science. Reliance on the impact factor of journals should be reduced.

Open Science training should be mandatory for all PhD students.

Open Science supporters should spend more time on advocating Open Science at discipline specific conferences, instead of at Open Science events.

Quality research should be published in the most prestigious journals only, irrelevant of their Open Access policies.

Institutional repositories are important for your institution only. To be known you have to submit your papers in research networking services (eg. Research Gate).

Open Science is too much talk and not enough action. Tomorrow I will do something that actually contributes to making science more open.

Open Access helps science progress faster. Those who cannot afford to pay journal subscriptions benefit most from it.

There are many prestigious Open Access journals and researchers should help them by publishing quality research in them.