

Objectives of the project



peningUP new methods, indicators and tools for

- peer review
- dissemination of research results
- impact measurement

within the Open Science ecosystem

Partners and duration



Start: June 2016End: December 2018Total cost: 2.225.000 EuroEU contribution: 1.950.000 Euro

| No | Participant full organization name | Short | Coun |
|----|---|-----------|------|
| | | name | try |
| 1 | Public Policy and Management Institute (Coordinator) | PPMI | LT |
| 2 | Georg-August-Universitaet Stiftung Oeffentlichen Rechts | UGOE | DE |
| 3 | National and Kapodistrian University of Athens | UoA | EL |
| 4 | Universiteit van Amsterdam | UvA | NL |
| 5 | Graz Kompetenzzentrum fur Wissensbasierte Anwendun- | KNOW | AT |
| | gen und Systeme Forschungs- und Entwicklungs GMBH | | |
| 6 | Austrian Institute of Technology | AIT | AT |
| 7 | Institut für Forschungsinformation und Qualitätssicherung | IFQ | DE |
| 8 | Frontiers Media SA | Frontiers | СН |
| 9 | Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche | CNR | IT |

Project pillars and methodology SpenUP



OpenUP WPs





OpenUP workplan





WP6 - Overview Pilot Studies

@penUP



WP7 – Policy framework



- **Overview of policies** from different European settings and research communities;
- Identification of possible collaboration patterns between researchers, peer reviewers, publishers and policymakers;
- Produce concrete **recommendations** and guidelines to be used by policy makers in different settings.
- To validate the proposed OpenUP framework (via focus groups, one dedicated to gender issues);

Results so far



- Defined research methodology;
- **Sources** of literature and related projects identified;
- Stakeholders and experts on gender issues identified and mapped and some already contacted for the interview programme;
- **Open Science landscape** in Europe;
- Overview of policy developments in Open Peer Review, Innovative Dissemination and Altmetrics broadly, and more specifically in eight countries.

WP3 – Peer review: Objectives SpenUP

- Assessing currently existing tools and methodologies and developing a framework for alternative peer review.
- Examining peer review in different context and different disciplines.
- Developing an evidence-based research framework for peer review analysis.
- Prepare policy recommendations to advance the uptake of various peer review tools.



Peer reviewing the Research flow <a>SpenUP





| Innovative Peer Review | | Pilot Study No 1: Open Peer Review for Conferences [AIT] |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | Туре | Pilot implementation |
| | Areas | Life sciences, Engineering, Conferences, Peer Review |
| | Goal | Test an open peer review workflow in a conference setting |
| | <i>Approach</i> | Adapt and evaluate an existing CMS, and apply it to a conference. Included features: <u>open report</u>: the review report is published alongside the publication, <u>open identity</u>: authors and/or reviewers are aware of each other's identity, or <u>open pre-review</u>: early versions of material are public before the review. |
| | Expected results | Conference organizers, authors and reviewers get hands-on experience and guidance for open peer review. |
| | Involved community | 2nd European Machine Vision Forum; eHealth 2018 Student Competition |



| Innovative Peer Review | | Pilot Study No 2: Open Peer Review for Research Data [CNR] | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Туре | Design study | | | |
| | Areas | Social Sciences, Data, Peer Review | | | |
| | Goal | Investigate the applicability of (open) peer review to research data in Social Sciences | | | |
| | <i>Approach</i> | Gain insight into the general context of dataset lifecycle management in the Social Sciences (in particular data sharing and validation) through: Analysis of current data management and diffusion practices; Interviews and survey with stakeholders taking into account both perspectives by data providers/journal publishers and data users. | | | |
| Expe | cted results | Identification of best practices in the validation of datasets in Social Sciences and trends and needs of the different stakeholders. | | | |
| | Involved community | Human mortality database (HMD) | | | |



| Innovative Peer Review | Pilot study No 3: A data journal for the Arts and Humanities [UGOE] | | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | Туре | Design study | | |
| | Areas | Arts and Humanities, Data, Data Journal | | |
| | Goal | Define a framework for a data journal in the Humanities and provide a related action plan | | |
| | Approach | Analyse current practices and requirements of the Humanities data community, and map the Humanities data field. Interview stakeholders from the research community and data journal publishers. Special attention will be put on infrastructure and technological requirements as well as on scholarly communication processes involved. | | |
| Expe | cted results | Provide a framework and action plan for developing a data journal catered primarily towards the DARIAH network of Humanities researchers. | | |
| | Involved community | DARIAH network (DARIAH DE, DARIAH EU) | | |

WP4 - Dissemination: Objectives SpenUP

- Understand the landscape
- Identify good practices, tools and methods
- Develop a framework for innovative dissemination
- Provide OpenUP stakeholders with an entry point to innovative dissemination
- Develop recommendations and guidelines

Main Insights



- Even the most innovative dissemination efforts may not provide CC-licensed materials
- On the other end of the spectrum: projects where all project outputs are CC BY- or CCO-licensed
- Researchers need guidance in terms of choosing the right license for their materials
- Dissemination in an open science context starts in the earlier stages of a research project → becomes an integral part of the research cycle
- Dissemination becomes more interactive → dissemination = participation
- There is an avantgarde of researchers successfully employing an immense variety of innovative dissemination methods
- ...but the majority of researchers are not using them, even though they see the need to engage with the general public



Innovative Dissemination

Pilot study No 4: Transferring the research lifecycle to the web [UvA]

| Туре | Pilot implementation |
|--------------------|---|
| Areas | Social Sciences, Open Science, Collaborative Research |
| Goal | Investigate whether qualitative research can be transferred to open online groups. |
| Approach | To enable researchers and citizens to gather and analyse data online in a collaborative and open way, we Further develop an existing open online research software prototype, which enables collaborative online data analysis and collection; Engage citizens through a Massive Open Online Research (MOOR) on Coursera. |
| Expected results | The communities will collaboratively investigate sadness medicalisation in everyday life. Mechanisms to engage citizens in qualitative research processes will be explored. |
| Involved community | Researchers from UvA and interested citizens |



Innovative Dissemination

Pilot No 5: Reaching businesses and the public with research output [AIT]

| Туре | Pilot implementation | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Areas | Energy, Dissemination | | | |
| Goal | Analyse and test how disseminated research results from the Energy area can be made more interesting, appealing, and usable for businesses and the general public. | | | |
| Approach | Produce recommendations and guidelines for targeted communication of research contents to businesses and the public. Test the identified communication channels and strategies in a partnering smart city project. Explore if Altmetrics can be used as a meaningful indicator for assessing impact in specific stakeholder groups. | | | |
| Expected results | Strategy for dissemination of Energy research content via alternative channels for reaching audiences beyond the research community. | | | |
| Involved community | <u>SmarterTogether</u> | | | |

WP5 - Impact



- The objectives of this WP are
- ... to generate a validated taxonomy of channels of scientific knowledge dissemination and altmetrics indicators
- ... and to suggest indicators enabling assessing impact and quality of the underlying research

Taxonomy tree of Dissemination Channels based on OpenUp survey



The current landscape of research impact



- The market is dominated by a small number of metrics providers.
- Scientific communities do not own the production process.
- The available impact factors present a limited view to the science communities.
- Metrics are easily gamed.
- Metrics create distorted market incentives.
- Current metrics do not give proper credit for scientific outputs other than publications.



| Measuring Impact | Pilot N | Pilot No 6: Reflexivity of metrics on medical research & dissemination [DZHW] | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Туре | Pilot implementation | | | |
| | Areas | Life Sciences, Altmetrics, Dissemination | | | |
| | Goal | Analyse if the use of new dissemination practices and channels depends on established cultures of appreciation that reward usage of these channels. | | | |
| | <i>Approach</i> | Trace concrete practices of dissemination and use of metrics in Translational Research communities through Interviews and meetings with community contacts; Daily reports on their social media and Altmetrics activities. | | | |
| Ехре | ected results | Evaluate applicability of Altmetrics in this specific context, and evaluate if this approach can be used to inform about suitability of specific metrics for these communities. | | | |
| | Involved community | Researchers from the Berlin Institute of Health | | | |



| Measuring Impact | Pi | Pilot No 7: Piratical distribution as one form of impact indicator [UvA] | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Туре | Statistical analysis | | | |
| | Areas | Library and Information Science, Alternative Metrics, Impact | | | |
| | Goal | Quantitative analysis of data on supply of and demand for scholarly works on various illegal platforms (e.g. Sci-Hub, Library Genesis). | | | |
| | Approach | Model which works-specific factors may explain the availability and illegal demand for individual works (e.g. price, legal availability). The data will be analysed using advanced statistical modelling methods and geospatial models. | | | |
| | Expected results | Shed light on any potential shortcomings of the legal access channels (markets and libraries) that drive people to use the black markets. Findings may be used to assess how important the illegal traffic of scientific works is. | | | |
| | Involved community | Data from Sci-Hub, Library Genesis | | | |



| Ref # | Exploitation & Sustainability Activity | Lead | Year | Start | Year | End |
|--------|--|-----------|------|---------|------|-----------|
| ESP1.0 | Setup and planning for development | Frontiers | 2016 | July | 2016 | October 🗸 |
| ESP1.1 | Develop the plan to come up with an Exploitation and Sustainability Plan | Frontiers | 2016 | July | 2016 | October 🧹 |
| ESP1.2 | Release D2.3 Exploitation and Sustainability Plan | Frontiers | 2016 | October | 2016 | October 🧹 |

OpenUP Hub





Open Hub





Open Hub



