Breakout session on “A Possible Future of Dream-Come-True Identifiers and Disambiguation"

Team Members:
Mackenzie Smith (lead), John Corson-Rikert, Fabio Batalha C. Santos, Katy Borner, Colleen Coyne, Katy Borner

Scenarios

Researcher: writing a new grant proposal. Identify new funding programs that match my expertise, key research trends, identify possible collaborators (including expertise, publications, collaborators, current/prior projects).

Available data includes full-text of awarded proposals that are searchable and text-minable.

Researcher responding to a new call for a new program. Need expertise from other fields (statistics, computational biology, business expertise, legal/policy expertise, evaluation, information visualization, project management, content providers, domain experts, libraries/archives, diversity (geography, ethnicity, gender). How productive were they, how busy they, psychological profile (how many prima donnas can you have, have they collaborated before or how remote are they (six degrees of separation). Rising stars, mentoring plans.

Expressions of interest in the profile – craigslist model where you list your interests, time. Matching system like google summer of code or the national medical residency program. Funding opportunities too. Also time/interest in reviewing (and maybe where you’ll be when).

Want to pick potential people and bring them into a tool that lets you model the project with these people. Add in researcher speed dating (live but virtual).

Would also serve the needs of research administrators & funders.

Also useful for agencies doing reviewer selection (doesn’t know the people involved in the proposals). Network analysis tool that shows who’s disconnected from the involved people. Standard visualization of all the people eligible, filterable by conflict criteria (e.g. prior collaboration, personal conflict of interest).

Also useful for funding agencies to identify new program officiers, and for institutions to select job candidates.

Implies that both institutions and agencies are participating in the same system.

Goals: strongest possible proposal, and excellent, detailed reviews. Better accountability for agencies and institutions, better provenance for how decisions were made (i.e. why someone was on a panel).