Notes from the 3/18/12 meeting (Ben)

Present: Gerry, Sheila, Sacha, Anthony, Steve, Allen, Jenny, Excalibur, Dillon, Colin, Liz, Ben

Initial discussion was not recorded. Anthony asked people what interested them in open science and what they wanted to do in the program. The focused discussion was a lot like a scheduled strategic discussion in the business portion of a meeting (there only were two minor announcements on the agenda this past week).

Some questions led to brief discussion of the Open Science Framework project spearheaded by Brian Nosek and Jeffrey Spies.

Jeff has mentioned that researchers in psychology are hostile to it and he has been told that the reproducibility project could hurt his career. Brian has the established reputation to advance the project.

People are worried about getting their insights scooped before they publish them and losing patents, but “some say” it may be as likely as having a child kidnapped.

Steve: as soon as you publish information it is patentable

Quora was dissed as a “dopy facebook for science” (you aren’t looking in the right places, imo – follow the brilliant people, like Mark Frazier of Open World)

Research methods were mentioned as a major interest, e.g. subconscious priming effects.

Open journals were discussed, including PLoS (Public Library of Science). Article selectivity in open journals was touched on.

The rest of the room stated their backgrounds and main open science interests.

Anthony was complemented on an impromptu 300 seconds of fame (5 minute) speech he gave.

Anthony mentioned an interest in opening educational opportunities, e.g. a Stanford professor preferred teaching a larger audience online to classroom teaching, and many of his classroom students decided to take the course online.

Silver nanoink was discussed, which includes acetate and ammonia, and is reduced by formic acid

Ideal educational project conditions were suggested as being direct, with a good reason as to why it is important, focusing on a small enough subject to assess a problem in a limited amount of time; lessons should be quick, accessible, and ideally interactive (e.g. tests, peer tutoring)

Recommended online education sources were: GetHub, Instructables, and Hack A Day

Youtube also was mentioned, as was “Nerd Rage” for chemistry

Steve mentioned that the Chicago Botanical Garden has a hierarchical tutoring program where more educated people teach less educated people, e.g. - I think this was said but my notes are incomplete - PhDs tutoring grad students, who tutor college students, who tutor high school students

The need for credentials from degree or certificate granting authorities was mentioned and Sacha and others quickly replied that PS:One does certify and authorize people to use equipment, that it is known and respected in the Midwest hackerspace scene and beyond, and that it may start issuing badges as part of P2PU at some point, with the instructor’s name on the badge so that if a person demonstrates poor knowledge the instructor is assessed as well – open certification system

Open sources of education cited enabled people to learn in all styles, by writing, reading, and listening, offered homework, recommended books, tests, and peer tutoring opportunities

At some point open source credentials related to the content might be referred to in a job interview

Groups continually review and upgrade their videos

Ideally you want to the credentials to be based on more than a cult of personality – standardized certification requirements and accepted teaching materials and evaluation methods

Pycon – someone talked about that

Open source badges are quasi-guild in nature, but so is academia, e.g. intellectual lineage of who ones advisor was and who their advisor’s advisor was

Linux and Wikipedia opened closed systems of programming and encyclopedias based mostly on reputation and a sense of contribution

Some processes should be automated and routinized – “chain of authority” exists and not necessarily opposed, but it should be clarified so we can understand it

Sacha: national labs are more like academic ones than commercial labs (he has worked at Los Alamos and another national lab).

In academia, schools have to take a position on some issues. Open source facilitators like Wikipedia can take a neutral stance and let material speak for itself – the ultimate basis for a reputational system. If someone involved in PS:One wanted to argue for the existence of cold fusion, the presenter’s reputation would be shot but space would not need to take a position on it

We should encourage and try to facilitate opportunities for open science researchers to create and share educational materials in the process of pursuing their investigations and hacking/development efforts.

Andrew: We should consider starting an open journal and creating events for people who submit articles to describe their research and present their findings.

Ben: We might not have much material for that initially, but the process does not need to occur on a regular monthly cycle. We can just slowly collect articles and offer a venue for writers to give presentations over time. The Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies’ (IEET) open access Journal of Evolution and Technology (JET) has operated like that since the late 1990s.

Andrew mentioned that a lot of useful astronomy research can be conducted by amateurs in “dry labs”

Ben: Trae, who will be helping to promote our group when he returns to Chicago in a month or two, has offered us use of part of an artists’ space for a dry lab.

Journal idea: we still might be able to host another meeting once a week, order a pizza, and focus on a topic of interest

Ben now: if people have time for that, it might complement more development-focused ChiOpenSci meetings that have a business portion

After the meeting someone mentioned a book called “Quiet: The Power of Introverts” and Sheila asked if the information was well-researched

Other topics: Delusions of Gender, Threat Stereotypes

Allen, Sheila, and someone else (forgive me for forgetting) explained the difference between programming “objects” and “procedures.”

I obtained contact information from Anthony, Colin, and Jenny, as all expressed interest in helping to lead the program in some way.