

Summary of Q&A from RIEG Webinar -- 26 May 2020

Who were the respondents for both surveys?

- The [Institutional Strategy](#) survey was distributed via numerous listservs (e.g. CANLIB-DATA, Forum-DataQC, Portage-Members, RDC VPRs). We encouraged either coordinated (i.e. single) or uncoordinated (i.e. multiple) responses from within a single institution, as we were not sure what the response rate would be or how institutions are organizing this work. Responses were received in almost equal proportion from library and research office affiliations.
- The [Institutional Capacity](#) survey was also distributed via the same listservs listed above, as well as directly with contacts made from the Institutional Strategy survey effort. This survey encouraged a single coordinated response from each institution. The following departments/offices are represented in the responses: Library (50); Research Office (39); CIO (8); Ethics Board (9); Researchers (11); IT (10); and Other (7).

In support services listed, what does “specific financial support for RDM” refer to?

- Financial support refers to financial support for researchers; for example, supporting researchers to use publishers’ data management services.

Has either survey been inspired by the [UK DCC's RISE \(Research Infrastructure Self Evaluation\) Framework](#)?

- Yes. The Capacity Survey references several studies, including RISE framework (See footnotes 6-8 of Capacity Survey: Executive Summary):
Morais, R., & Borrell-Damian, L. (2019). Data of European University Association (EUA) Open Access Survey 2017-2018 (Version 1) [Data set]. Zenodo.
<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3267182>
Australian National Data Service (ANDS). (2018). Creating a Data Management Framework. Retrieved from:
<https://www.ands.org.au/guides/creating-a-data-management-framework>
Cox, A. M., Kennan, M. A., Lyon, E., Pinfield, S., & Saffi, L. (2019). Maturing research data services and the transformation of academic libraries. *Journal of Documentation*, 75(6), 1432–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-12-2018-0211>
Lyon, L., Ball A., Duke M., & Day, M. (2012). Community Capability Model for Data Intensive Research. Retrieved from
<https://communitymodel.sharepoint.com/Documents/CCMDIRWhitepaper-v1-0.pdf>
Rans, J., & Whyte, A. (2017). Using RISE the Research Infrastructure Self-Evaluation Framework. Retrieved from
http://www.dcc.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/publications/UsingRISE_v1_1.pdf
Humphrey, C., Shearer, K., & Whitehead, M. (2016). Towards a Collaborative National Research Data Management Network. *International Journal of Digital Curation*, 11(1), 195. <https://doi.org/10.2218/ijdc.v11i1.411>

Were you able to see if there was any association between size of institutions and creation of new positions/reassignment, etc.?

- The upcoming RIEG Insights series of reports will delve into more detailed analyses. While the Capacity Survey included a question surveying institutions for the number of affiliated researchers, it had a low response rate so we were not able to examine its relationship to other survey variables. However, one of the upcoming Insights reports will break out analyses with universities categorized according to the Macleans rankings categories (Medical/Doctoral, Comprehensive, Primarily Undergraduate), which could serve as a loose approximation for size.

How do you imagine that institutions might be able to use this survey to advance their own institutional strategies or RDM service offerings?

- We hope that responding to the surveys helped bring together stakeholders. The survey questions also provide an outline of various components that should be taken into consideration when planning strategies or service/capacity development. Also, by providing a snapshot of where Canadian institutions are nationally, we hope that this information may be useful in helping institutions envision their trajectory.

One challenge in supporting researchers to store and share their data is that they did not always ask for consent from participants. How can we support changing this practice?

- Regarding the Tri-Agency draft policy, a requirement for data deposit will only apply to funded projects going forwards and includes exceptions for sensitive data that cannot be shared. More generally, this is an issue that must be tackled in coordination with Research Ethics Boards. In creating RDM strategies, developing lines of communication between campus stakeholders and increasing awareness among both researchers and support providers about upfront decisions that must be taken in order to share data at the conclusion of a project (e.g. informed consent) should be considered.

Will you be making the data from these surveys available to other researchers?

- To encourage forthcoming responses from institutions, we promised respondents that individual responses would be kept confidential. We have shared in the Executive Summary a full breakdown of responses in the data dictionary, and are willing to run additional analyses on request.

Is RIEG investigating current departmental review, promotion, and tenure guidelines for language valuing data management?

- This is a great suggestion and will be taken into consideration!

Based on the data from both surveys, would you think institutions in Canada are ready assuming the Tri-Agency policy was published today or shortly?

- Our survey data show that there is a high level of awareness of this policy among institutions and stakeholders. Our understanding is that once the Tri-Agency announces

their policy, there will be time given to institutions for implementation. Based on this, we think institutions are ready to respond.

For institutions that completed their institutional strategies/policy on RDM, does Portage have any plan to track progress on implementation? It would be good to have success stories in Canada.

- RIEG is planning to compile strategies and policies in order to develop a framework for comparison. Based on that subset of institutions, we could consider further contact to track implementation. Thanks for the suggestion!

Why isn't the rationale behind RDM better understood by the community, besides publishers and funders asking for it? Why isn't it embedded in responsible conduct of research in a broader view?

- The Tri-Agency's [Statement of Principles on Digital Data Management](#) takes that standpoint, rather than focusing on requirements.
- As well, researchers themselves are pushing for this culture change from the ground up as part of the open science movement, which is another angle not necessarily covered by specific policies or requirements.

What are some strategies for institutions who are recently stalled on this work?

- Many people who are involved in the development of RDM strategies/policies are also involved in responding to the COVID-19 crisis. So it is understandably a situation many are facing. The current crisis has brought attention to the need for data access and sharing, so the two are not mutually exclusive.