

VT 2014 Library Committee Minutes

***Monday, October 20, 2014. 12PM
Library Boardroom (Library, 6th floor)***

Attendees:

Pang Du, Mary Finn, Philip Young, Julie Speer, Godmar Back, Brian Nocek, Tyler Walters, Leon Roberto, Hannah Thomas, Martina Svyantek, Mark Steen, Katie Boes, Alan Wang,

1. Leon introduced new members Martina Svyantek and Pang Du.
2. Leon indicated that a set of draft minutes for the September 22 meeting had been sent. **Action:** Leon asked that any changes/corrections be sent to him by October 26, 2014.
3. Leon noted that committee minutes have not been posted to the committee web site since 2010 and asked for a volunteer to help take notes to ensure clear and consistent minutes and communication. **Action:** Nathan Hall appointed secretary. **Action:** all committee members to send Leon copies of meeting minutes from past years that can be posted.
4. Presentation and discussion by Dr. Brian Nosek on openness and reproducibility of research: The presentation reviewed concepts of open access (OA) in science and how research becomes knowledge. Historically, OA has been about final product. Nosek's group is about how to bring transparency and openness to whole research cycle. There has been some research in the last 10 years about whether science is actually reproducible Results show that in some areas of research only 10-15% reproducible. Researchers are behaving responsibly and according to incentives. There are incentives to make positive, novel, clean contributions, but most of what we do is messier. Accuracy is secondary criterion and there are few consequences for inaccuracy. There are no incentives to replicate prior work. Nosek recommends that:
 - Promotion and Tenure committees and hiring committees need prioritize to quality of research in addition to quantity.
 - a shared standard rating service to give research a grade, rather than submitting to top tier journals, and then lower tier journals, and getting rejected again and again until it is published.
 - one use open review as a possibility, but isn't accepted among faculty members yet. Are double blind reviews better? Dr. Nosek thinks transparency would be more fruitful. Real names should be used which would increase the probability of people behaving well and not giving negative reviews as retribution for perceived wrongs. Blind review isn't very blind anyway in a narrow field where all the experts know each others work. There is a vulnerability aspect to open review. Science is a learning process and open review is more helpful to scientific inquiry.

There was further discussion of using Sympletics in order to make Open Access a part of the workflow. The research environment is changing.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10PM