Goettingen University
Open Science Strategy Meeting

## Participants:

Sven Bradler (SB), Faculty of Biology and Psychology

Camille Couralet (CC), Coordinator Campus Strategy

Vinodh Ilangovan (VI), MPI for Piophysical Chemistry

Louisa Kulke (LK), Faculty of Biology and Psychology

Harald Kusch (HK), Medical Informatics

Jana Lasser (JL), MPI for Dynamics and Self-organization

Norbert Lossau (NL), University Vice-President for Infrastructures

Julika Mimkes (JM), SUB

Daniel Müller (DM), Consultant to the Presidential Board

Birgit Schmidt (BS), SUB

## Introduction

NL presents the context and framework for an Open Science Strategy in Goettingen. He is member of the EUA expert group on “Science 2.0 / Open Science” and of the Open Science Policy Platform which was implemented by and advises EU-Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation, Carlos Moedas.

He wants to follow a community-based, bottom-up approach. The immediate aims of the meeting are exchanging knowledge and discussing next steps towards Open Science.

## Open Discussion

BS observes that Goettingen has a number of guidelines on Open Science-related topics (Open Access, Research Data Management, Digitization of data concerning the University’s collections), but no action plan in place to further promote Open Science. She argues for activities in the fields of research integrity training, Open Science meetups, Open Science mentoring for young scientists and Open Science advocacy.

LK reports on her activities in workshops, teaching and exchange with colleagues. She argues that there is a need for public activities and refers to runs they have organized for promoting Open Science[[1]](#footnote-1) and “Frontiers for young minds”[[2]](#footnote-2).

CC agrees that community-driven activities are important for the implementation of Open Science on the campus, but argues that these should be supplemented by a more strategically directed approach (including top-down support). She suggests that it would be helpful to win well-established researchers as champions of Open Science.

VI acts as an OA ambassador for the Max Planck Society, organizes Open Science events (OpenCon) and is a member of the Early-Career Advisory Group of the OA journal eLife. He stresses the importance of advocacy and campaigns for OS practices.

HK reports on the special situation in the medical sciences, where “Open” science competes with the need for protecting the privacy of e.g. medical case histories. Communicating the FAIR-approach to research data management and sharing seems helpful to overcome this opposition. He points out that the digital transformation is still on-going, scientists are not very digital in many places.

JM refers to the discrepancy between the official support for Open Science and the missing consideration for Open Science-related activities in the context of scientific careers.

JL reports on the difficulties in addressing PhD-students and argues for an obligatory addition of Open Science in the graduate school programs. Likewise, guidelines would be more effective if they would make open publication of data and articles obligatory. She adds that there is demand for additional IT staff and data scientists.

SB stresses the importance of the open access fund. The motivation of researchers often seems unclear: the monetary incentive may be more important than placing publications in OA journals, and typically, high impact is more important than open. The funding for Open Access publications in DFG grant schemes is considerably too low to publish in top Open Access journals. He agrees that Open Science-related activities are not adequately considered in career-related decisions.

## Further course of action

The group agrees to organize follow-up meetings. NL asks the participants to name possible additional participants and to supply an overview over the Open Science-related activities and networks in which they are active.

A next meeting can take place on the 13.11.2017 in the context of the planned meeting on rewards for Open Science activities. NL considers adding “Open Science” to the agenda of the “Zukunftswerkstatt” on 02.11.2017 and asks CC to pursue the idea.

The next meeting should focus on identifying action strands and concrete actions. Possible action areas / target groups include journal boards, graduate schools, advocacy, consultation, hiring/recruiting committees, and infrastructures for sharing.

NL proposes an initiative in the context of U4. CC will discuss this during her visit to Groningen at the end of September. An “Open Science” award could be established at all U4 partner universities. NL refers to the consideration of Open Science-activities in the medical sciences at Utrecht University as a best practice example.

The research data policy should be updated to reflect the European discussion of the FAIR data principles.

Information on the activities in Open Science should be disseminated via colloquia and faculty symposia.

1. <https://twitter.com/Lou_Kulke/status/889883772644208643> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://kids.frontiersin.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)