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- Introduction
- Invited panel: Developing and Adapting to Research Data Policies in Libraries - panel chairs: Amy Nurnberger & Birgit Schmidt
- Facilitated group discussion
- RDA/Sloan Data Share Fellow update on study of organizational models for libraries providing data services, Cheryl Thompson
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Introduction to L4RD

- Wiki: [https://rd-alliance.org/node/1633/all-wiki-index-by-group](https://rd-alliance.org/node/1633/all-wiki-index-by-group)
- Subscribers: 148
- P2 first BoF meeting (D.C.)
- P3 BoF: Research Data Skills in Libraries (Dublin)
- P4 BoF: Research Data Solutions in Libraries (Amsterdam)
- P5 IG: Organizational Models for Data Services (San Diego)
- P6 IG: Developing and Adapting to Research Data Policies in Libraries

plus three joint meetings:
  - Challenges for rescue of historical data and consolidating efforts to address them
  - Repository use case matrix and identify RDM tools
  - Building connections between libraries, discipline repositories and data services
Developing and Adapting to Research Data Policies in Libraries

Panelists:

- Sarah Jones, @sjDCC, DCC, UK - Data policies at UK institutions and funder policies (European Commission, UK)
- Inna Kouper, @inkouper, University of Indiana - Survey of US library strategic plans for data
- Birgit Schmidt, @bschmid1, University of Göttingen - LIBER: Reviewing institutional data policies (workshop report)
Questions panelists will address

1. Looking at the spectrum of policies and mandates (funder, institutional, departmental, library, etc.), what have you found in terms of:
   a. alignments or synergies?
   b. gaps and barriers?
2. How have legal issues (intellectual property rights, data privacy etc.) been addressed in these policies (conflicts/alignments/complete absence)?
3. What recommendations do you have for:
   a. Librarians/policy makers
   b. RDA
Research data policy landscape

Sarah Jones
Digital Curation Centre, Glasgow
sarah.jones@glasgow.ac.uk
Twitter: @sjDCC

What is the Digital Curation Centre?

“a centre of expertise in digital information curation with a focus on building capacity, capability and skills for research data management across the UK's higher education research community”

www.dcc.ac.uk
A proliferation of policies...

There are an increasing number of policies or statements covering Research Data Management issues:

- Codes of good practice
- Statements and joint principles
- Research funder policies
- Publishers policies
- Institutional data policies
- Group guidelines
- ...
Codes, statements or joint principles

- OECD principles and guidelines for access to research data
- UKRIO code of practice for research
  http://ukrio.org/publications/code-of-practice-for-research
- RCUK common principles on data policy
  www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/datapolicy
- RCUK draft concordat on open research data
  www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/opendata
- G8 science ministers statement
- Narobi data sharing principles
- FAIR data publishing principles
  www.force11.org/group/fairgroup
- Panton principles for open data in science
  http://pantonprinciples.org
- ...
Move towards openness

Open science: a hot issue for OECD and non-OECD countries

Number of countries reporting that the situation has recently substantially changed in the policy area, compared with other STI policy areas or instruments

National STI strategy or plan
Open science

Note: Simple counts do not account for the magnitude and impact of policy changes.
Source: Country responses to the STI Outlook policy questionnaire 2014.
Policies driving service development

H2020 open data pilot is driving lots of national RDM pilots across Europe

Parallels the response to the EPSRC data policy in UK

More harmonisation
Research funder data policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Funders</th>
<th>Policy Coverage</th>
<th>Policy Stipulations</th>
<th>Support Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published outputs</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Time limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHRC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBSRC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUK</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSRC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STFC</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellcome Trust</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research data policy developments

How have requirements changed?

- Increasing emphasis on data sharing & reuse
- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities
- Introduced notions of value to select data
- Money to meet costs associated with RDM

More pragmatic and enabling
Publishers data policies

Journals are increasingly asking for associated data to be deposited. Some lists of these are emerging:

• Journal Research Data Policies (JRDPR)
  https://www.jisc.ac.uk/rd/projects/journal-research-data-policy-registry-pilot

• Journal of open data policies
  http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Journal_open-data_policies
# Institutional research data policy

Big trend in UK universities since 2011 to develop RDM policies.

There are now over 35


Also new paper on US position

_Do You Have an Institutional Data Policy? A Review of the Current Landscape of Library Data Services and Institutional Data Policies_

Kristin Briney, Abigail Goben, Lisa Zilinski


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Policy name</th>
<th>Date released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>16 May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northampton</td>
<td>Research Data Policy</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Data Management Policy (see s.7 on research data</td>
<td>1 Sept 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Warwick</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>7 Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyndwr University</td>
<td>Policy on the Management of and Access to</td>
<td>20 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southampton</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East London</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy for UEL</td>
<td>15 March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunel University</td>
<td>Research Data Management Vision</td>
<td>20 March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Essex</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mary, University of London</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>7 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sheffield</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Leeds</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Arts London</td>
<td>Research Data Management policy</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths University</td>
<td>Research Data Management policy</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lancaster</td>
<td>Research Data Management policy</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University for the Creative Arts</td>
<td>Research Governance</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brooks University</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Durham</td>
<td>Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Hill University</td>
<td>Code of Practice for the Conduct of Research</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see section 14 on Research Data</td>
<td>Management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
<td>Open Access Research and Research Data Management Policy</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's College London</td>
<td>Policy on Research Data Management</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of what policies cover

Laurence Horton did an analysis of the 31 policies listed in 2014

- 74% specify a requirement for data to be open where possible
- 74% of unis require a DMP and a further 19% point to funder requirements. Only 2 don’t mention DMPs at all.
- 55% specify a length of time for which data should be retained / preserved
- 45% give a full definition of research data
- Only 23% contain a statement on institutional ownership of research data
- Again, only 23% (7 out of 31) mention RDM costs

How to develop a policy

Guidance from the DCC to help institutions get started:

• Research data policy briefing

• Five steps to developing a research data policy
  www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/policy-and-legal/five-steps-developing-research-data-policy
Implementing research data policy

Edinburgh RDM roadmap example shows how to break work down into sections and allocate out tasks across divisions

www.ed.ac.uk/information-services/about/strategy-planning/rdm-roadmap
Move from high-level to coal-face

Need to get beyond high-level statements and institutional policies. Key part of implementation should be developing procedures and guidelines at group level.
Trends and recommendations

Proliferation of policies
• Make the landscape easier for researchers to navigate
• More harmonisation needed
• Clarifications needed when requirements conflict

Growth in open data policies
• Should push open science agenda but not at expense of RDM

Research data policies often ‘aspirational’ and high-level
• Need for more group guidelines and practical procedures
• More researcher input when developing services & infrastructure
Thanks for listening

DCC policy resources:
www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/policy-and-legal

Follow us on twitter:
@digitalcuration and #ukdcc
Data-related policies: A North American Perspective

Inna Kouper, Indiana University
Kathleen Fear, University of Rochester
Mayu Ishida, University of Manitoba
Christine Kollen, University of Arizona
Sarah Williams, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
Study

Visions and Implementations of Research Data Services in North American Libraries

bit.ly/1G4f1DR

• Web pages of libraries – members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL, 123 libraries)

• Semi-structured interviews with library administrators (45 contacted, 25 interviewed)
• 88 libraries (72%) have a main web page dedicated to research data services
• 59 libraries (48%) have other RDS-related pages
The Current State of RDS Policies

- DMP assistance and mandate support: 24%
- Consultations and instruction: 21%
- Data deposit and repositories: 11%
- Storage: 8%
- Sharing and re-use: 6%
- Best practices and information dissemination: 6%
- Archiving and preservation: 5%
- Data processing and analysis: 4%
- Metadata: 3%
Does your institution have any data-related policies? What do they cover?
• Yes, many!

• No

• Maybe?
Yes!

• Ownership (5)
• Security (5)
• Sensitive data (5)
• Retention (4)
• Management (3)
• Deposit and preservation (3)
• Institutional data (2)
• Open access (1)

+ funders policies
No

• No library policies
or
• No institutional policies
or
• No to both
Maybe?

• Early work
  • Collaborations with offices of research and technology
  • “Some guidelines...”

• External guidelines (e.g., ICPSR)
“We don’t, there is a research office on campus that works with faculty individually, there are guidelines in colleges. ... As a library we have some guidelines and how to deal with that too.
“... in the federal funding ... we let the federal funding agencies pretty much determine what our data management plans have to look like and what our policies are. ... I don't think [we are] in a place right now [to] mandate anything. Except compliance with funded research requirements.
“From the libraries not so much, but ... THEY have a data ownership policy ... we heard about it secondhand. ... they bundled in a lot of stuff that makes it really complicated for the work we're trying to develop here. ... But this doesn’t address anything about the actual effective management of data.
• Data policies – many interpretations, many approaches, lack of direction

• Institutional data policies -> liability and duties

• Library policies -> reaction to funders and other pressures

How / whether to be proactive?
Do current data policies encourage quality and creativity in research / learning?
Do You Have an Institutional Data Policy? A Review of the Current Landscape of Library Data Services and Institutional Data Policies

“[becoming well versed on research data policies] puts academic libraries in a unique position to provide insight and guidance in the development and revisions of institutional data policies.”

Libraries and RDM Policies: Experiences from a LIBER2015 workshop

Workshop on institutional data policies, issues addressed:

- How to link strategy, policies and partnerships for data support?
- What do institutional and disciplinary policies on RDM entail?
- What forms of support can be derived from these policies?
- What do research funders expect and how can researchers be supported?
- Which department is responsible for which forms of support?

Method: Presentations and hands-on session on data policies – review of examples, based on a short questionnaire

A similar exercise was done for the review of data management plans.
Hands-on: Translating policy into support

Participants work in groups and use an institutional or policy from different research areas to set up a support model. Tasks for each group:

- Agree on a rapporteur.
- Read the policy individually.
- Answer the following questions:
  - Which policy measures ask for further support?
  - What is generic, what is community or discipline-specific?
  - Which forms of support (group training, face-to-face instruction, website, lunch meetings, etc.) are suitable for a particular policy measure?
  - Which university unit/department should take care of these elements of support (library, ICT, research administration, etc.)?

Discuss your ideas and findings and provide a summary.

In addition, please come up with one recommendation on how LIBER could help to strengthen the role of libraries in this activity area.
Policies used

1. Global Food at Georg-August-University of Göttingen
2. Humboldt University Berlin
3. Monash University
4. University of Northampton
5. University of Southampton
6. University of Edinburgh
7. Oxford University

Outcomes: Policy areas that need improvement

- **Benefits for the researcher** are sometimes poorly described.
- No reference to the **publication of data** is given.
- **Deletion of data** is not covered. What is the retention period before data might be destroyed?
- **Legal advice** is often missing. Ownership, IPR and data privacy need to be more specific. The library could perform an informing role.
- **Access regulations** should be mentioned (has to be specified by the group of involved researchers).
- **Responsibilities: What will the institution cover?**
- **Long-term preservation**: if the term is used, explain what it means.
- Provide **references to related documents** that specify further, e.g. storage policy, intellectual property policy - but don’t overdo it.
- **Terms & responsibilities**: What does “adequate descriptive metadata” mean? The library can give a lot of general advice, when it gets specific only the researcher can create adequate descriptive metadata.
Outcomes: Wishlist

- More training events like this.
- Facilitate the sharing of practices, exchange programs, shadowing, graduate programs.
- Provide a model policy template.
- Provide indicators on how effective a policy is.
- More emphasis on templates for specific policies.
- The library could play role in the bigger picture, e.g. training, templates, it could proactively offer the big picture.
- An example service catalogue for RDM, example implementations. Provide a short use case template.
A checklist for data policies: Structural Elements

**Purpose:** A purpose statement explains the rationale/goal for the policy.

**Scope**
- Who is creating the policy? e.g., Library, Institution (department, school, etc.), funder, research community, etc.
- Who is subject to this policy?
- What data does this cover? Which data are subject to this policy?

**Responsibility/Roles**
- Who is responsible for what: What are their roles and what is expected from them?
  - Researcher
    - Expectations
      - Access, stewardship, retention, transfer
    - Consequences for violation of policy
  - Institution:
    - Support: What support is offered (for the implementation), by whom?
    - Enforcement: Who is responsible? What does enforcement look like?
    - Consequences for violation of policy
  - Other

**Definitions & Resources**
- Key terms are defined: Which terms are necessary?
A checklist for data policies: Areas of attention

Related requirements/policies: The policy is consistent with other requirements, policies and law (and references them when necessary).

Language: The policy uses enforceable language (i.e. shall, will, must, etc.).

Expectations: Reference to data sharing and publication is given. Access regulations are mentioned (has to be further specified by the group of involved researchers).

Responsibilities: Deletion of data is covered. What is the retention period before data might be destroyed?

Responsibilities: Mention that regulations must be respected and followed (e.g., Ownership, IPR and data privacy must be addressed in the institutional context.)

Responsibilities: What will the institution cover?

Definitions: Terms which need explanation: long-term preservation, adequate descriptive metadata, etc.

Resources: Provide references to related documents that specify further, e.g. storage policy, intellectual property policy - but don’t overdo it.
- discussion -
RDA/Sloan DataShare Fellow - Cheryl Thompson

● Project Goals:
  ○ Identify archetypes of data services and libraries with such services to sample
  ○ Understand organizational approaches of academic libraries in the sample

● Ethnographic study (2015-2016)
  ○ Literature review
  ○ Artifact collection (org charts, website)
  ○ Interviews

Mentors: Michael Witt & Chuck Humphrey
Preliminary Archetypes

Nascent Initiative
- Unclear, still emerging
- Limited staff and resources dedicated to these efforts

Solo Librarian
- Single position dedicated
- No additional designated staff

Dedicated Working Group
- Staff from library and campus units
- No formal designation within library org.

Multifunctional team
- Existing team absorbs RDMS function
- Staff with RDMS duties
- Formal designation within library organization

Specialized Team
- Team with RDMS function
- Dedicated RDMS staff
- Formal designation within library org.

Is Your Archetype Missing?

Justice League

X-Men

Fantastic Four
Preliminary Archetypes

Nascent Initiative
- Unclear, still emerging
- Limited staff and resources dedicated to these efforts

Solo Librarian
- Single position dedicated
- No additional designated staff

Dedicated Working Group
- Staff from library and campus units
- No formal designation within library org.

Specialized Team
- Team with RDMS function
- Dedicated RDMS staff
- Formal designation within library org.

Want to participate? cathmps2@illinois.edu

Is Your Archetype Missing?
Closing / Summary

- ‘How to Maximize Research Data Skills in Libraries’ briefing paper
- ‘How to Establish Research Data Solutions in Libraries’ briefing paper
- RDA engagement with library community, e.g., open call, IFLA, LIBER, IASSIST, ASIST RDAP, others?
- Joint RDA-IFLA program at 81st IFLA World Library and Information Congress
- ‘23 Things: Libraries for Research Data’ resource and prezi
- RDA Sloan DataShare internship ‘Exploring Organizational Approaches to Research Data in Academic Libraries’ (see the poster!)
- Upcoming special issue on research data management and libraries in IFLA Journal (International Federation of Library Associations)
- Subscribe and find more at website: https://rd-alliance.org/groups/libraries-research-data.html