### "The road to data sharing is paved with good intentions": Looking at Institutional Research Data Policies

Laurence Horton, London School of Economics and Political Science

Astrid Recker, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences Chloe Dumas, Enssib

#### (cc) BY

"The road to data sharing is paved with good intentions": Looking at Institutional Research Data Policies by Laurence Horton, Astrid Recker, Chloe Dumas is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



#### Contact

Laurence Horton

- E: L.Horton@lse.ac.uk
- Tw: <u>@laurencedata</u>

Orcid: orcid.org/0000-0003-2742-6434



#### Prevalence of Institutional Research Data Polices



#### Number of Research Data Policies by country



### Explaining differences between UK and Germany



Strong centralised public funding regime for research and universities



Federal state with a strong tradition of independence for professors and universities



### Share of UK HEI's with a Data Policy by Russell Group membership



## Cohort group in which the UK HEI with Research Data Policy was established





#### UK HEI Research Data Policies word count





#### Overview



- **Recommend:** The policy is a document to provide weight for RDM and data sharing. To that end, a policy should
  - Raise awareness in institutions of RDM and re-use
  - Raise awareness and clarify issues of data ownership
    - Outline broad institutional responsibilities for RDM.



#### Framework

- Digital Curation Centre. 2014. Five Steps to Developing a Research Data Management Policy [PDF]. Edinburgh: Digital Curation Centre. <u>http://www.dcc.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/p</u> <u>ublications/DCC-</u> <u>FiveStepsToDevelopingAnRDMpolicy.pdf</u>
- Erway, Ricky. 2013. Starting the Conversation: University-wide Research Data Management Policy.
  Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research.
  http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publication/ ns/library/2013/2013-08.pdf



### Research Data Policy definitions of key RDM terms by year adopted





## Length of definition of "Data/Research Data" in selected Research UK HEI Research Data Policies





### UK HEI Research data policies definition of key RDM terms by Russell Group membership

Definition	Russell Group	Not Russell Group	Total		
Yes	7	9	16		
(Row %)	(43%)	(56%)	(52%)		
No	6	9	15		
(Row %)	(40%)	(60%)	(48%)		
TOTAL	13	18	31		
(Column %)	(42%)	(58%)	(100%)		



#### Definitions



- **Recommend:** State that data is an asset in its own right and include a phrase about it being recognised as such.
- Definitions of what "data" best left to supporting documentation to define on a devolved basis.



Policy broadly defines the role institution plays in supporting RDM and outlines RDM responsibility of researchers



#### Support



- **Recommend:** Policies should define a level of responsibility for the institution, not just the researchers.
- Exact responsibilities could be left to supporting documentation but state who is involved in RDM.



### Requirement to complete a DMP



### Data Management Plans



- **Recommend:** suggest a DMP is recommended in a way that highlights how it underpins good RDM practice.
- A DMP requirement brings in resource questions so consider that.



#### Research Data Policy specifies who it covers



#### Scope



- Recommend: Communities of research activity need to know if this policy applies to them.
- To whom does the policy apply:
  - Staff (including or excluding visiting staff?)
  - PhD students?
  - all postgraduates
    - Undergraduates



### Policy contains a statement on institutional ownership of research data



#### Ownership



#### Recommend: Ownership of intellectual property is usually covered by employment and funding contracts. Therefore, this point is more one of awareness, but it can provide cover when necessary.



### Policy contains a statement on the primacy of external funding requirements



#### External arrangement



**Recommend:** Agreements between researchers, institutions, and funders cover this area. However, it is useful to contain a policy statement on the primacy of these agreements for the sake of clarity.



Policy specifies criteria on what data and documentation is required to be retained



## UK HEI Policy specifies criteria on what data and documentation is required to be retained

	Russell Group	Not Russell Group	Total
No	4	5	9
(Row %)	(44%)	(56%)	(29%)
Non-specified reference, or criteria specified in supporting document (Row %)	4 (29%)	10 (71%)	14 (45%)
Yes, specified	5	3	8
(Row %)	(63%)	(38%)	(26%)
TOTAL	13	18	31
(Column %)	(42%)	(58%)	(100%)



#### **Retention criteria**



**Recommendation:** The question of what to keep can be better addressed by a support service in conjunction with the researchers and archives/repositories.



### Policy contains a statement on length of time data should be kept



### UK HEI Policy contains a statement on length of time data should be kept



#### Length of retention



Recommendation: Funder policies will vary, may change, and will take precedence. It is arguably better to define retention as "long-term" with specific details addressed by the institutional repository using guidance from funder policies and disciplinary norms.



Policy contains a statement on the ethical use/reuse of data, particularly how it affects potential reuse



#### **Ethics**



Recommendation: Include a statement about requiring data be "shared to the fullest extent possible". The policy should recognise commercial, contractual, legal, and ethical restrictions that prevent open data being possible, but still allow for data sharing.



### Policy contains a statement on how data will be accessed



#### Access



Recommendation: that the policy include a requirement for all generated research data – even if deposited elsewhere - to have a catalogue reference in publications repository, or Library catalogue.



#### Policy contains a statement on data availability



#### Open



Recommendation: Better to not mention specific types of licences for data.



#### Policy contains a statement on costing of RDM



#### Costs



Recommendation: given the difficulty in identifying costs and variation in how different researchers see this as their responsibility, it would be better not to mention costing. Supporting advice can be given either through the RDM service or Research Office.



### UK HEI period policies state they are subject to review



# UK HEI Policy states it is subject to periodic review by year of adoption

	No year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	TOTAL
None (Row %)	1 (9%)			2 (18%)	4 (36%)	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	11
Non-specified (Row %)				1 (14%)	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	7
One year (Row %)		1 (13%)		1 (13%)	1 (13%)	4 (50%)	1 (13%)	8
Two years (Row %)					1 (50%)	1 (50%)		2
Three years (Row %)				1 (33%)		1 (33%)	1 (33%)	3
TOTAL	1	1		5	9	11	4	31



#### Review



Recommendation: It is recommended the policy states it is subject to review at regular defined periods and by whom it is reviewed.



#### Summary

#### Table 2 Overview and analysis table courtesy of Laurence Horton. Downloaded by clicking on the image below.

	Date	Definitions	Support	DMP	Scope	Ownership	External	Criteria	Retain	Ethics	Access	Open	Costs	Review
			Broadly defines the role institution plays in supporting RDM and							Contains a statement on				
		Offers definitions of key	outlines RDM	Specifies a requirement to		Contains a statement on	Contains a statement on	Specifies criteria on what	Contains a statement on	the ethical use/reuse of				
	Date the policy was	RDM terms, i.e. "data",	responsibility of		Policy specifies who it	institutional ownership of	the primacy of external	data and documentation is	length of time data should	data, particularly how it	Contains a statement on	Contains a statement on	Contains a statement on	States it is subject to
stitution in chronological order	adopted	"documentation"	researchers	institutional or funder)	covers	research data	funding requirements	required to be retained	be kept	affects potential reuse.	how data will be accessed	data availability	the costs of RDM	periodic review
rsity of Birmingham	2009 October	0	0	0	•	•	0	0	•	•	•	•	0	•
arsity of Edinburgh	2011 May	0			<u> </u>	0	ő		0		<u> </u>		ō	0
rsity of Northampton	2011 June			ě		0		0		0	ě		õ	ő
arsity of Hertfordshire	2011 September						0	Ö					õ	ě
ersity of Warwick	2011 November	Ö		à		0					à		õ	à
dwr University	2011 December	ő	0	ă	ě	õ	0	0	0		ě	0	õ	
ersity of Southampton	2012 February	ě	õ	0					ě			ě	ŏ	
ersity of East London	2012 March			ě		ŏ	à	ò					õ	
el University	2012 March	0				ŏ		0					0	
	2012 April	0				0	0	0	0				0	
ersity of Essex en Mary, University of London	2012 April 2012 June		-						0					
		-				0		0	•		•	0	0	0
ersity of Sheffield	2012 July	•	•	•	•	•	•	0		•	0	0	•	0
ersity of Leeds	2012 July	0	•	•	0	0	•	0	0	•	•	•	0	0
ersity of Oxford	2012 July	•	•	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	0	0	0
ersity of the Arts London	2012 October	•	•	0	0	0	0	•	0	0	•	•	•	0
smiths University	2013 January	0	•	•	0	0	•	0	•	•	•	•	0	0
Iniversity of Lancaster	2013 February	•	•	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	•	0	•
ersity for the Creative Arts	2013 February	0	•	•	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	•	0	•
rd Brooks University	2013 February	•	•	•	•	•	0	0	•	0	•	•	0	•
ersity of Durham	2013 March	0	•	•	0	0	0	•	•	•	0	0	0	•
Hill University	2013 May	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	0	0
ersity of Exeter*	2013 June	0	•	•	•*	0	•	0	0	•	0	•	0	0
ersity of Nottingham	2013	•	0	•	0	0	0	•	0	•	•	•	0	0
ersity of Manchester	c2013	0	0	•	•	•	•	0	0	•	0	•	0	0
's College London	2013 June	0	•	•	•	0	•	0	0	0	•	•	0	•
ersity of Lincoln	2013 June	0	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	•	•
ersity of Liverpool	2014 January	•	0	0	•	•	0	0	•	•	0	0	•	•
ersity of Bath	2014 April	0	0	•	•	0	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	0
on School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	2014 June	•	•	•	•	0	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
ersity College London	2014 August	•	•	•	•	0	•	0	•	0	•	0	•	•
ersity of Dundee	7	0	•	•	0		•	ŏ	0	i i	•	•	0	0
0		None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
		Partialy defined terms or	Institutional support	Funder required or	Staff		Mention of	Non-specified reference,	Mentioned but not	Mentions of relevant	External archive or	Non-specified expectation		Review mentioned
0		reference to supporting documentation	mentioned	optional			contractual/funding requirements	or criteria specified in supporting document	specified	legislation on data protection/Fol	repository with details available through university			
•		Full definitions	Institutional support mentioned and specified	Institutional requirement	Staff and postgraduate students	Yes	Specifies where funder policies take priority	Yes, specified	Specified length	Yes	University repository and/or external	Specified requirement for data to be open (subject to funders/ethics)		Specified period and responsibility
er has similar but separate policies for P														
d at UK HEI adopted data policies rough									d adapted suggested Rese	arch Data Management F	olicy from DCC (2014) and	Erway (2013)		
Curation Centre. 2014. Five Steps to De Ricky. 2013. Starting the Conversation:								elopingAnRDMpolicy.pdf						

Please cite as Horton, L and DCC (2014) 'Overview of UK Institution RDM Policies', Digital Curation Centre. Available at: http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/policy-and-legal/institutional-data-policies



#### Data availability

#### http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-851566

UK Higher Education Institution Research Data Management Policies, 2009-2014

Horton, Laurence 2015. UK Higher Education Institution Research Data Management Policies, 2009-2014. [Data Collection]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive. <u>10.5255/UKDA-SN-851566</u>

This dataset compares existing research data policies at UK higher education institutions. It consists of 31 cases. Polices were compared on a range of variables. Variables included policy length in words, whether the policy offers definitions, defines institutional support, requires data management plans, states scope of staff and student coverage, specifies ownership of research outputs, details where external funder rights take precedent, guides on what data and documentation is required to be retained, how long it needs to be retained, reinforces where research ethics prevent open data, finalises where data can be accessed, speaks about open data requirements, includes a statement on funding the costs of Research Data Management, and specifies a review period for the policy. Hyperlinks to policies are also included. Institutions and policies are coded in line with ISO 3166-1/2 to enable regional comparison and allow for future international comparisons to take place. Data also includes the institution's year of foundation and a categorical variable grouping institutions by year of foundation allowing comparison across cohort groups of universities. A further two variables allow for identification of research based universities.

	Creators:	Creator Name	Email	Affiliation	ORCID				
		Horton, Laurence	l.horton@lse.ac.uk	London School of Economics and Political Science	http://orcid.org/0000- 0003-2742-6434				
*	Research funders:	Economic and Social Research Council							
	Subjects:	Education							
		Reference and instructional resources							
	Keywords:	Higher Education, Research Data Management, policy							



#### Contact

Laurence Horton

- E: L.Horton@lse.ac.uk
- Tw: <u>@laurencedata</u>

Orcid: orcid.org/0000-0003-2742-6434

