Transcript for Research Speaker Series: Creating and Managing Your Academic Profile (January 26, 2023)
BCcampus webinar hosted January 26, 2023
Hosts: Gwen Nguyen and Leva Lee
Presenter: Erin Fields

GWEN NGUYEN:
Good morning, everyone. Welcome. Welcome to our first talk of the Research Speaker Series 2023. Thank you very much for choosing to be here with us today. My name is Gwen and I'm a learning and teaching advisor with BCcampus. Prior to this position, I was working as a sessional instructor, a doctor or researcher, and then a learning experience designer at the University of Victoria. So today I'm joining you from my home office located in the traditional territories of the Lekwungen speaking people, including the Songhees Nation, the Esquimalt People, and W̱SÁNEĆ (Saanich) People whose historical relations with the land continued to this day. You are invited to share the introductions and territorial acknowledgment in the chat if you wish. But before the introduction of our topic, I would like to go over a few housekeeping items. This session will be recorded and you're welcome to keep your camera off and feel free to rename yourself to participant. Live captioning has also been enabled. You can also enter the question in the chat if you wish. But I know towards the end there should be a question and answer session. At the end of this session, we also would like to invite you to participate in a short anonymous survey. And I will pop the link in the chat. Your feedback will help us with planning more events to support research, teaching, and learning in the post-secondary institutions around BC. Joining with me today are other team members from BCcampus. And I would like to acknowledge the special presence of my project partner, Leva Lee and Kelsey from BC IT support in the back end. Thank you very much. So our topic today is Creating and Managing Your Academic Profile. As a scholar and researcher in the transformative digital age, your work does not only involve going into the Fields, collecting the data, analyzing the data, and then writing the papers, submitting the papers and done. Indeed, actually digitally literate scholars, we will need to intentionally and meaningfully use the digital technologies for our research process, including developing our research and then sharing our work. And in fact, the researchers are increasingly using academic profile websites, for example, like Google Scholars or ResearchGate. And you might have heard of other online platforms as well to organize and showcase their output. In some ways, I look at this as the doors of perception. If you have heard this phrase from the poet and painter William Blake, "If doors of perception were cleansed then everything would appear to man as it is, infinite." I myself still find the ways to navigate through all those doors of perception. In what way can we design the online identity that can showcase our expertise, including our research, teaching, and mentoring, or even leadership skills. So it is a delight to invite a wonderful speaker, Erin Fields, to this topic. So Eric is an open education scholar and also the scholarly communications librarian at the University of British Columbia with great experience in supporting academic publishing and developing academic profiles. I believe that Erin could help us understand more about this important topic. Why is it critical in research? Some of the benefits, as well as the risks of some technologies.

And in what way we can mindfully select the tools to establish our profile and enhance our research contribution, as well as open up our network. So here you go, Erin. Thank you.

ERIN FIELDS:
Thank you. Okay. Well, thank you all for coming today. To start, since I was already introduced, which is lovely. Let's talk a little bit about what we're talking about, what we mean by academic profile tools, and how those, what kind of experiences you can portray in those tools. So really an academic profile is a story, the fulsome story that you're able to tell about yourself as a researcher, as an academic. And it goes beyond a traditional CV, a curriculum vitae or resume, would portray about you because it's that fulsome perspective. So it's not just your research outputs, it's your academic, it is your academic outputs, but it's also your, your educational output. So your teaching, your professional relationships, the networks that you create and all of the different elements of your publishing. So not just the final results, but more whatever goes into the publishing processes can also be captured for a profile space. So really it's the ability to have a narrative about yourself that you manage. But to have a bigger narrative about yourself than maybe what's traditionally used in terms of the academy.

So when we think about the publishing cycle, the process, which is the process by which researchers take their ideas and then put them in some viewable format like a journal article or a book. This system really has been around in academia for the 17th century. This process of writing and for prestige or promotional processes or hiring processes. That has been quite a traditional process and it's followed the creation through writing, through dissemination, and the reuse of that content for additional research. So quite traditional. But what has changed is social network technologies and processes have opened the cycle to be much more participatory. And the control of information has really moved into the hands of the individuals, and barriers around published work are starting to drop away. So like non-traditional publishing outputs, they are allowing you to showcase a greater understanding and engage with a greater group of people than what traditionally you are able to do when you're doing a traditional academic output. So this kind of engagement can be through dissemination processes that are like blogs or videos or podcasts. Even in the peer-review process, there's new things called open peer-review practices that make the peer-review process much more participatory. And there's also the re-creation process of your research for networking with your pre-published content, for example, rather than waiting until the end so that you release your content in the final version. So there's several ways inside of this cycle that you can actually showcase parts of yourself in new formats and in new avenues. So we're going to be talking about profile tools today for sure. And we're going to be talking about author IDs. And I'm going to touch a little bit about content creation as well as the open aspects such as open data and bibliographies and repositories so that we won't get into as much detail with those, because those require a bit more conscious effort on your part to think through. What can I share, how can it be shared, and then all of the workflows around that.

So for today we're going to be talking about developing a profile. We're also going to be talking about the risks and tensions that are involved in developing profiles, as there are some feelings

within the academy around engaging in this new way. We're also going to talk specifically about those tools as well as the content creation, curation, and open practices and profile development.

But before we get to that, each form of engagement, when you're doing this sort of academic engagement in this profile way, provides a different opportunity to communicate something about yourself, but also different levels of engagement with social media technologies and networks. So you need to make decisions on what you want to communicate and the time that you want to invest in that form of communication. Because it's not something that's already integrated into the publishing processes that you're engaging in right now. This is something added on top of that. There are some considerations that you have to go through before you do that engagement because we all have limited time and bandwidth. So when you're developing an online profile, it really requires you to make decisions on these sorts of questions here. So what do I want to communicate? So a good reason why that's important to think about is the type of format and process is going to communicate something very different about you. So for example, a conference paper will give information to people about your ideas, your knowledge on a topic to your colleagues in a very simple way, but a conference presentation video— so you presenting your conference paper, shows something very different. It communicates something different about yourself. So it communicates maybe your skills as a lecturer. The second thing you have to consider is what kind of engagement are you interested in developing? Now, when we talk about that, there's several different ways by which you can capture content in a variety of different formats. You can capture a conference paper before you continue editing it so that you can disseminate it out inside of a pre-published archive. Or you can engage in a broad discussion on the conference paper and do open peer-review processes. So each type of engagement is going to be different in terms of how you want to communicate to a given audience, and each audience is going to differ. An academic audience is very, very different from say, a public policy audience. Then finally, probably the one question that seems to be most taxing to consider is, what do I want to accomplish with the technology that you're using? With the time that you have, right? So how much time are you willing to invest into developing your profile? The worst thing that you can do is develop a profile space and then leave it to languish. You're trying to create an authoritative base and story about yourself. And you need to maintain that story, but time is a consideration. So when I go through the tools, I will talk about approximations of time that it takes to engage with them. But again, what you want to communicate about yourself and the kind of engagement you want with people should actually govern what tools that you will engage with. And some might have more time involvement than others depending upon those outputs you want to share.

So I'm not going to ask this right now for an open discussion. But if you want to put in the chat, feel free to think about what potential risks or tensions you might think there are or you feel there are in managing and creating an academic profile space. It is always rife with contention whenever we have to engage in new tools around our identities. And some risks are higher than others because of the types of tools we're engaging in. And then some tensions are just feelings of potential or feelings within the academy about profile tools and the potential uses for those.

But I do think it's important we go through them so that in the end you can make good decisions about whether you want to invest your time in any given tool. So first and foremost is risk, is that there is the risk of dirty data. Every profile tool uses a different approach on how they gather metrics and information to populate onto your profile space. And each one of those tools will differ in terms of the kinds of data that are showcased. So your citation metrics. So how many times your works have been cited will differ across platforms because where people are pulling that data is different. So the data is a bit dirty. And you're going to have to deal with questions of validity of what you're reporting about yourself in these spaces. Another issue is, of course, the problem of silos and profile fatigue. There are a number of spaces where you can develop a profile and some of them are dependent upon particular publishers. So if you publish with Web of Science, you need a specific profile compared to maybe other spaces. So you can get multiple siloed spaces that don't interconnect easily with each other so it becomes a system of having to update multiple spaces. So choosing where you're going to do your work is really important. Lastly, I want to mention, although there are other risks, one of the bigger risks is around the idea of free academic profile tools and spaces. It's important to remember that you are not the customer when you're interacting with some of these companies that are, where you're creating your profile. Even though you may feel like one, instead you really much are, you very much are the product of these services who seek to monetize and offer up your profile for advertisers or they use the data to sell the data to others. Some examples of companies like that are like academia.edu, LinkedIn, or ResearchGate. You have to think about information security and what is important to you in terms of the types of interactions that you're engaging with in these online spaces and how they use your data, but also the data users that are using your profile. So I'm going to move on from risks and tensions. But if any, if you have any concerns, you're free to raise them in the chat as we move along.

And we're going to start off with talking about profile tools. Now, it's a very weird term because every single tool then I'm going to show you a particular profile about yourself in varying degrees of content that can be captured. But I do want to showcase a few of these tools, even though there are numerous more out there. So when we're looking at profile tools and we're looking at actual profile spaces, I'm going to focus on Google Scholar and Humanities Commons, and this is where that time component comes in. You notice when you see Humanities Commons here has three stars because it captures a much more Facebook-like feel to you, to your profile, more detail, more information can be captured, more networking can happen. Whereas Google Scholar is very much a flat space where you can locate some information about yourself. But primarily it is a space that can be automated in terms of gathering information about you. So quite different tools, but those are showcasing a certain profile about you. So first let's talk about Google Scholar. Google Scholar offers an easy way to create a profile that really showcases your research and your citation. So it's only showing the research aspect of your profile, of your identity. The benefits to creating a Google Scholar profile though, is when you're searching Google and Google Scholar, the profile is prioritized to appear at the top, making it easy for people to find information about you as an author and additional research that you've published and I'll show you what that looks like in a minute. Google will also automatically generate citations to your profile when it identifies your name as

an author. And you simply just need to agree that that work belongs to you. So there's an automated process of searching for citations that belong to you for it to populate your profile. So it's not manual. There's a lot of... It can be manual, but what it does do is it tries to do that interoperable piece of pulling that data automatically. Google Scholar also allows you to showcase non-traditional forms of publication outputs which many other platforms don't allow. So for example, if you want to capture a conference paper, presentations, curricula that you might have created, you can showcase it inside of your profile by manually adding those elements. Then finally, Google auto-generates citation metrics using, including an H-index. I'm not going to talk about what citation metrics are right now. There are several reasons why they're useful and several reasons why they're problematic. But it does capture that data about how your material is being used. Just to show you, here we are in Google Scholar. And if I say search for my name, Erin Fields, you'll notice two Erin Fields profiles appear at the top. And what this is doing is disambiguating between two people. There's Erin Fields and then there's Erin K Field. If I click on my name, it'll populate my profile. Oh, sorry. My phone is ringing. So what you see here are your citations that have been added. The citation counts around your work. What you can do here is you can add your articles either manually, as I've mentioned, or you can configure article updates. And what that does is it automatically will list articles to your profile if it finds your information, your name, It's important to make sure that you add a verified email so that when an article is published, it knows that it is actually you. So it's Erin Fields from UBC with that particular email address. And then finally, things that you can do is connect co-authors to your author profile space. So my other co-authors are listed here. You have all this ability to create this, but you see it's a very simple, basic profile. All you can do is pretty much add an image, this small amount of detail about yourself and then it auto populates citations for you. It's not showcasing grant applications, it's not showcasing. If you are doing peer review for other journals, it's not showcasing any of that work. And the only interconnection to a social network is really by connecting yourself to a co-author, but it's not like you can speak to them through this space. The reason why, though, I'd like to show the Google profile space, is because it is a fast tool and has a lot of benefits by virtue of we know that people are using Google Scholar in order to show details about their citations and about their work. So if anything you go away with from this session, Google Scholar is probably the biggest bang for your buck for the least amount of time in terms of developing that kind of online identity. And all you need to do is have a Google account. Once you have a Google account, you can go to Google Scholar and you can develop your profile just by following a form on the left side of the page. And it literally takes about 5 minutes to set up. So a very simple, very narrow perspective of a profile tool.

But now we're going to move on to Humanities Commons, which is much more fulsome. Now, Humanities Commons is a non-profit network that is governed by an academy. The reason why that's important is it's academy-owned and governed project. So it's designed to serve the needs of scholars, writers, researchers, and students. It says in Humanities, Commons makes you think it's only for humanities, but there's everybody within this space. So we have computer scientists, we have everybody. Now, unlike other social and academic networks, online Humanities Commons is open access, open source. And again, it's non-profit, it's run by a

university. Why is that important? Well, your account will always remain free. And also the data privacy is airtight, meaning your data is not being captured and resold for any purposes nor the data of users. So it's very secure and lockdown. Now the benefit of Humanities Commons isn't necessarily that it is showcasing the citation details, which you can see right here on this individual, Dominic's profile. You can see the articles are there. Google Scholar does that. But what Humanities Commons does is it provides you a greater opportunity to interconnect and create a network. So you see the ability to actually write a bit of a profile about yourself. You can connect to academic interests that other people have. Inside of humanity. Humanities Commons, so for example, Dominic is interested in ancient religion. He's added that as an interest. So if you click on that, you're going to be provided with everybody who is interested in ancient religion. So you can create groups of people to connect with. Additionally, you can actually create groups. Now groups are really useful in a sense that if you are. Example, here is Hinduism. All of these people have joined this group who have an interest in this topic where they can discuss with each other. If they have events that are coming up, they can share files and documents. So you can create almost like a project space or just a social network space by which to talk to other scholars who are interested in your area. And for this example to Hinduism. Other things you can do is you can also create a microsite. A microsite will be run off of your profile site. That is similar to a blog, where you can blog about the research that you're doing or a project that you're working on to provide updates to people within this space to give them a better sense of the work that you do. So again, a great tool very similar to what you see with ResearchGate and academia.edu and Facebook. But again, this is run by a university, by an academy. So it's a different kind of perspective in terms of who the audience is for the content. Alright, so, sorry.

So now that we've talked about Humanities Commons, I do want to just mention a few others. We're not going to get into depth into these ones. Two of them, academia.edu and ResearchGate, I feel like people understand what those tools are, remembering that they are third-party tools outside of the academy. And you can see advertisements along your profile, et cetera. All those things to keep in mind. But SSRN and Loop. SSRN is a social science research network and you have the ability to create an online profile space if you've decided to list or upload your work to that network. So if you have working papers, conference papers, pre-published documents that are relevant to social science research, you can upload to their repository that information about those publications. And it allows you to create an online profile of yourself. So you see the reason why I'm not getting into this too much, because you have to load content, published research content, to SSRN in order to really make that profile space quite useful for you. Loop on the other hand, is another author profile space, but it's integrated into journal websites. It's interoperable with Frontiers, which is a leading open access publisher and the Open Science Platform and the Nature Publishing Group. So if you've published in those spaces, Loop might be a good space to develop your profile. But if you are not publishing within those spaces, that interoperable, integrated component to it is not helpful. But they do have the ability again to showcase your profile. It looks very much like the Humanities Commons profile. But it has again, that limited integration. So unless you're publishing in Frontiers, Open Science Platform, or Nature, it wouldn't be a tool necessarily that

you would choose. Whereas Google Scholar and Humanities Commons is a bit more like a journal or publishing house agnostic.

Okay, so those are the actual profile tools. Now I'm going to talk about a different aspect of the profile tools, which is with persistent identifier and author IDs. Now, if you don't know what a persistent identifier is, all you have to think of is a web URL. It's an example of a persistent identifier. It's basically a code, a series of a string of numbers, a sequence of characters that are persistent in the sense that any object that gets that code will always be identified with that identifier, with that persistent identifier. A similar persistent identifier is a DOI, a Digital Object Identifier. You've probably seen those in journal articles that you've read. It will have a DOI. As long as you have that DOI, you will always be able to find that journal article because they are attached. Now what this means for authors is there are Author Identifiers and author Identifiers that can be scientists, artists, musicians, doesn't matter, anybody who's creating content. Basically what it does is it allows you to identify yourself with that numeric code, right? So again, if somebody has your author identifier, they can find information about you and find the content that you've published. The reason this is extremely useful is that there's a lot of disambiguation that happens. Good example is my name is Erin Fields. There are hundreds of Erin Fields out there. So how do you know it's my content that's being written and not a different Erin Fields from a different place in the world? Well, author IDs will do that. So as long as that number is attached to me and attached to the stuff I've written, you can find it.

Now, author identifiers are actually pretty quick to create. Just the identifier, just the number. But to maintain a profile, it takes a bit more time because again, that identifier about you is connected to a webspace that you then manage. Now there are two different profile tools: ORCID iD and there's ResearcherID, which is now called Publons. The reason why I would say ORCID iD takes a little less time is because it has more interoperability with databases to do automatic searches to find information and citations about you. Whereas ResearcherID, and Publons is prioritizing Web of Science because it is a Clarivate tool and that's where science comes from.

Let's talk about ORCID iDs now. ORCID iD is a persistent identifier for researchers who want to record their professional activity and disambiguate it from other researchers, from other people with similar names. The benefit to this is if you've researched and published before, but you've used different names for yourself, like you got married and changed her last name, or maybe you used your middle name at some point. You can make sure those are all interconnected into one identifier so it will find a full perspective of your publishing. Now, ORCID iDs can be created again by anybody who is creating content. And it does have the interoperability to populate the research by easily searching databases for that content. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to show you my ORCID iD. Here is my ORCID iD. You get the biographical information about yourself. Here is my identifying number. Nobody else gets that number but me. So whenever you see this ORCID iD, you will always be brought to this information about Erin Fields who does her research. You have the ability to add keywords about the kind of research that you do, the country you're in, websites, and social media links

that you might want to add. Then you get to capture details about yourself. So your employment history, you can do your education and it looks very much like a CV. If you have membership with associations or funding you received, you can also capture those. Those ones are all added manually primarily because that information is even easier to just capture. The ones where I'm talking about the interoperable piece, where it just automatically pulls the content in from databases is inside the works that have been published. So when you're in the works that have been published, you can add content by searching and link. What that means is, is all of the, sorry, it's going to take probably a minute to load. But basically ORCID has connected itself with a number of databases. And with that interconnection, what happens is it will automatically search those databases to try to find me, Erin Fields with my ORCID iD to automatically populate that research information into my profile. Now it's taking a while here, of course, because I'm presenting. But a good example of one is MLA bibliography. If you are a literature writer, you probably have heard of MLA database. And what it allows for is it will just search for Erin Fields. And if something new has been uploaded to the MLA database, it'll appear on my screen. I could just say, Yes, that's me. And it auto populates to ORCID. The benefit of ORCID is that sometimes you will find ORCID iDs inside of databases themselves. So if you're doing research on a given area and you see the title of the article, e.g. you might find open pedagogy and social gene and social justice means, you find it in a database, that particular article, and then it'll say my name and my ORCID iD will be linked. So that person can come automatically to my page and find the detailed correct information about myself that I wanted to showcase to the world. You also might find that grants, granting agencies like Tri-agency, are asking for IDs, author identifiers in order for you to even secure funding. Author IDs are becoming much more prominent. So that is one ID.

I am going to also show you Publons. And here we are inside of my Publons author ID. Now, the reason why I would say that Publons is potentially useful but potentially not useful is that the researchers' unique identifiers is connected to their works from Web of Science publishing ecosystem. They're interoperable from Web of Science content only. The rest of the material you would have to actually upload manually. So unlike inside of ORCID, where there's a list of, I think about 20 databases that it searches across. So it's agnostic to who is publishing. This one is very much run by Thompson Reuters, so they focus on Web of Science publications only. Now, the benefit of Publons, of this ResearcherID, other than it does have some interoperability with Web of Science, is it allows you to showcase much more about yourself than maybe what you can showcase on ORCID. For example, you'll notice there's a peer-review section. You can add content to yourself that if you are a pure reviewer, you can actually add peer-review content. Give me, sorry, one minute. Finding things is a bit straggly at the moment internet wise. So I'm just going to talk about it rather than showing you. But you can add, of course again, documents that you've published. So here there's a few that have been loaded, but also peer review. So if you are a peer reviewer for a conference, or for an association, or for a journal, you can showcase your peer review outputs here as well. You can say that I am a peer reviewer for KULA journal. So it's showcasing a different aspect of yourself that isn't showcased easily in other places. You can also showcase the funding that you've acquired. And if you are a scientist, you can even showcase your lab and the equipment from the lab that you have that

are connected to you. So you notice here there is an ORCID iD that is attached to me. What they have done is Web of Science, Publons, the ResearcherID and ORCID have now made it interoperable between each other. So what that does is ORCID will push out to ResearcherID, any new publications that have appeared on my profile and vice versa. So they actually talk to each other. So even if you do have to have a ResearcherID because you've published with inside Web of Science and it's a requirement, you can just update your ORCID and just interconnect to them so they automatically update all your content instead of having to do it manually.

So you see how it, sorry, give me one minute. I'm going to take a drink of water and we'll continue. You can see how profile tools and author ID profile tools do similar things, but they have different added benefits. Like with the author IDs, you get an actual identifier connected to yourself. Whereas the other tools or more just where they appear inside of a social network. You can see how choosing which tool becomes really important because you can have so many different profiles, you need to make a decision on which ones are best for you, for your time, for what you want to convey, but also who is in those networks. So if you want to be associated with other humanities scholars and religion, you might want to take a look at these different profiles to see who is there. Is my audience inside of Humanities Commons? Then maybe I should build in Humanities Commons. So different decisions to make in terms of developing out your profile.

Now we're going to move on to the last few aspects of profile making which are much more involved. They have their own workshops attached to them. But I think it's important to talk about because primarily what we focused on with those first tools, is your academic outputs primarily, although you can add a little bit of information about maybe your conference, a conference paper, yes, but your teaching material can be in Google Scholar profile. But I'm talking about this whole other aspect of creating content specifically to showcase things about yourself as an academic. And first, we're going to talk about podcasts, vlogs, and blogs, which are very popular in academia. The reason why I'm only talking about this a little bit is because you can see the amount of time to do this is a lot of time. This is going to take a lot of effort if you want to engage in this kind of discussion in this output. Now, how our blogs, videos, podcasts being used in academia? I think we know a lot of academics are using blogs as a way to showcase their research and their pre-published works. So, for example, at UBC, there's our research blog that's from Rosie Redfield. And she showcases the activity that's happening in her lab. Things that she's published, the way that she's engaging with other publications. So she uses it as a dialogue space. So it's really showcasing information about her research, but also how she interacts with research. With podcasts and videocasts, it's an additional example of sharing and ways that are digestible potentially to non-academic communities. A published article is very much meant for academic level engagement. A podcast or a videocast. Some of them are for academic engagement, but a lot of the times it's parsed down information for others out there who might want to engage. A good example of here is Law Bytes. Law Bytes is information about Canadian law from Michael Geist, but it's meant to be used by anybody who wants to know about copyright law in Canada, who might not have upper level degrees in order to be able to parse that information. So it's, it's kind of engaging with a different audience than

what you would traditionally think of your academic work would engage with. Now the benefits of curating content for these particular audiences is that it allows you to build collaborations. People can find your work that may not traditionally have been using your work before. So they can bring research to a new audience and that provides a broader level of dissemination. So a good example is Peter Matthews, who's from Heriot-Watt University, has a social policy blog. And the whole purpose for that social policy blog is he wants people in policy networks, people who are creating policy to read his work. And the fact is his academic outputs are meant for academic communities, he wants to parse that down so that those who are not in academic communities but are actually doing the work in the field, can engage with his work in new ways. So you can see that potentially policies will get impacted by his work because he took the time to make it readable, usable for a broader audience. So it provides also an opportunity for people to find you and allow you to publish in non-traditional spaces. So often what will happen is people will see a blog post and then they will be contacted for interviews to write an article for maybe a non-traditional academic journal, but maybe for a magazine. These things have translated into additional opportunities and greater audiences. The only downside of this, of course, is going to be the time. This is editing heavy, this is understanding technology heavy. So if you're going to engage in this, you have to have a very clear perspective of how much work you can put into it and who can assist you in getting there.

Now, lastly, I'm going to end on open practices and open practices. We're going to talk a bit about open education, but open data repositories and workflows as well, because these are becoming the new language of research and scholarship within the academy. And it's very much less about the final product but more about all the steps in the process to create that product and capturing that in some way.

So I'm going to just start off with open education. So open education are resources that have been freely, I'm sorry. Open resources that are freely accessible, openly licensed so that people can use it with inside their teaching and learning environments. So you create content like PowerPoint, slides, reading lists, syllabi, videos that you use inside of your courses and a lot of the time it resides in your courses or resides in your Canvas shell or in your Moodle shell, and doesn't really go anywhere. What open education does for an academic profile side of things is it allows you to leverage the time you spend developing teaching resources and publishing your material online for others to use for their own instruction. And it starts to showcase a side of you that is the education teaching side of your portfolio. So you have the ability to upload your content to repository networks like the ones listed here. And that interconnects you with other people who might be teaching the same thing. Or it also allows you to get a whole bunch of alternative metrics, which are those metrics that are not citation based, but are just based on the space that it's located, the number of people who viewed it, the number of people who have downloaded. It shows another aspect of your output and its engagement.

We also have open bibliographies and open peer review. Whenever you do a research project, you are inevitably creating a bibliography. And sometimes those bibliographies are really esoteric, which means it's a very narrow field and you're gathering all the details about that

area of study into one bibliographic space. Open bibliographies are extremely useful in the sense that it's not only you just pulling your content together, your research together into one space with the citations, but you're allowing other people to use that content as well. So the likelihood that somebody else is doing research in an area that you are doing research on and you've already leveraged and done all of that research work to collate all the content together. You can support other people using that work. They find you, they know you're doing, what research you're doing. They know the expertise that you're trying to build and the potential for collaboration exists in that space. There's the possibility. Open peer review is really, we know what traditional peer review is. Traditional peer review is when we give our article, it's usually a blind or double-blind process where the person reviewing it and giving comments. You don't know who they are, but they mark up your research and they send it back for edits. That's the traditional process for peer review, but that's now changing. Open peer review is much more transparent. The purpose for open peer review is putting your content online for anybody to openly make comments upon it, edit it, and give additional ideas. So you know who these people are, they know who you are, and they're engaging in your work in an open environment. Now, there are potential concerns people have with open peer review saying that potentially it's not actually useful. Or they think that the anonymity isn't helping anything—or the anonymity is necessary in order for there to be honesty. But there are several benefits for emerging academics engaging in open peer review, both as a reviewer and as a reviewee, that the traditional peer-review model really can't do. Traditional peer review has been challenging for a lack of accountability and also there's possible abuse by reviewers who are maybe too flippant with their reviews. The open peer-review process eliminates that because you know who is reviewing your work. Additionally, though open, peer review also allows individuals who are developing their academic profile to become a part of a debate process. So a process by which is not happening in a closed peer-review environment. So you can again build in that narrative with people. Places that are doing open peer review. You can see on the side here the life sciences journals, social sciences journals, arts and humanities journals are all engaging in open peer-review practices. So you have those options if you are going to publish, say, in Sage, to do open peer review and build a network in that space.

Now the last thing I will talk about is open data and open workflows. This is where you have to have a thoughtful process at the beginning of your research if you want to engage in publishing aspects of your work in pieces. So open data is when we collect data, whether that is quantitative or qualitative data, we often think of it only in terms of its immediate use. So the use for your research output only. However, data has the potential to really expand upon itself, but also by other—you can expand upon it yourself. Of course, you can reuse your data, but you also allow with open peer review, others to build upon your work so they can build additional research outputs, have different questions and engage in the data that you've pulled together to move forward with that research in that area of focus. The open data can be shared inside of data repositories. The example here is Abacus, although there's several others. And really the purpose of sharing that open data is it shares an aspect of your research work. It gives another publishing source of your work. It allows others to build upon your research and connect with you about your research. And again, it gives you information, those details about

who is using your work, how many times has it been downloaded, all of those metrics that show interaction with your labour. Then lastly is workflows or research workflow is really a series of steps and processes taken in the process of doing research. These processes and steps are repeatable or understandable by others. And in STEM fields, we're talking about being reproducible. And that reproducibility is an expectation in STEM that research done can be done again with the same results. Now in the humanities and social sciences, a research workflow may be more individual and less reliant on reproducibility by others. But you can still talk about the argument you're making, the sources you've consulted, and the workflows involved in doing your research and display that openly for people to see. Now an open workflow is when each of the research processes is just openly shared, clearly documented, and it makes the research project transparent and hopefully reproducible when it's in the sciences. So clear documentation can be using best practices for file naming conventions, project metadata, file formats all curated into one space for longevity of your work, but also reaching, so people can find your project and see exactly what was done and how you came to a finished product. You might have heard of OSF, which used to be called the Open Science Framework. But this is a workflow management web application. It's just one example of it where it gives you a central landing place for all the project components of the research that you're doing. And it allows you to share all of those components. So again, not that final product, but all of the content, all of the work that it took to get to that final product. So it has many different digital workspaces. There's wikis, there's project files. You can track versions, all of that information and again, open, so people can find your work and see the details of your project to a minute level. That takes again, a considered time. You have to think about these workflows and processes before you engage in your research. But it is something to consider because it does provide a certain aspect of yourself because people see how you formulate your research and how you engage in it, not just the final written product. So it's a whole different identity aspect of your academic identity.

That was a lot. We whipped through quite a bit of information there. And I will, all these slides, of course, will be shared and you will have the video. But I just wanted to thank you for listening to me and I can open it up for any questions that anybody might have. I don't know if there were any questions in the chat early on. I don't think there are. Somebody already provided the links to the Humanities Commons. And I'll also be sharing these slides so you will have all of these, all the links, all the details available to you. Well, thank you for attending, Maryanne.

GWEN:
Feel free to unmute yourself and ask a question. Yeah, if you wish, everyone. Such an engaging and very informative session. Thanks, Erin.

ERIN:
No problem.

GWEN:
It looks like there's not there's no questions except for just thank you's, the comments in the chat. Yeah. I know it's a lot to take in, but it's such a critical topic, right? And just before you leave everybody, I would like to pop the links in the chat to our survey. As I mentioned at the beginning of this session, please help us with some of the feedback so that we can develop some more fruitful professional development events for teaching and learning. But yeah, again, it's such a meaningful talk. And I found myself actually starting on the Google Scholar, creating my research profile there, and I find it very helpful in understanding more about how to navigate through all those doors and perceptions. And maybe open some more doors and close some doors. But yeah. Thank you very much again. And please stay tuned with us for the next talk on February 16th with arts-based research with Bruno. And thank you very much for staying with us till the very end. Okay. Thank you.