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University of Sheffield: 2013 quick facts

• Founded in 1879
• Russell Group research-intensive
• 50 academic departments in 5 faculties
• 82 research centres and institutes
• 11 services for industry and commerce
• Substantial research portfolio
University of Sheffield - 2013 RDM maturity

• **Internal** RDM pathfinder project (2011/2012)
• Institutional **RDM policy** in place (2012)
• **DCC** Institutional Engagement (2013)
• Jisc funding for **RDMRose** (2013)
• Appointment of **Research Data Manager** (2013)
• Member of **N8 RDM Directors’ Group** (2013 – 2015)
Value of an organisational survey

• Vital information about what researchers think and are doing
  – How much data they have; how often they back things up
  – Awareness of policy
  – Attitudes to data sharing; training
• Identify people and groups who are pathfinders or problem areas
• First step in raising awareness and making contacts
• Valuable material for advocacy at a strategic level: research leaders do not know about the practices in their areas
• Benchmark against comparable institutions
FINDINGS
The survey at Sheffield

• Conducted January 2014, using limesurvey

• Targeted outreach plan (research community and professional services key stakeholders)

• c430 completed responses

• Patchy response rate
  – 8% overall
  – 20% staff in FMDH
Volume of research data respondents were expecting to create during their current research activities: 10% for <1 GB, 29% for 1-50 GB, 24% for 50-100 GB, 13% for 100-500 GB, 9% for 500 GB - 1 TB, 6% for 1-50 TB, 8% for 50-100 TB, 6% for >100 TB, 1% for I don't know.
Awareness of data policy

• Sheffield RDM policy published July 2012
• Survey in January 2014 found 33% were aware

• 38% of all respondents said they were aware of their Funders’ requirements; 47% said they were not aware.
## Attitudes to data sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>All those agreeing</th>
<th>All those actively disagreeing</th>
<th>Tenopir et al. (2010) – strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would use other researchers' datasets if their datasets were easily accessible.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to place at least some of my data into a central data repository with no restrictions.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to place all of my data into a central data repository with no restrictions.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to share data across a broad group of researchers.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that my data is cited when used by other researchers</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Training needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training subject area</th>
<th>Might be interested</th>
<th>Definitely interested</th>
<th>Total with any interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storing your research data</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a research data management plan</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright and Intellectual Property</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting your research</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing your research data</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing your research data</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders requirements and RDM</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>68% (after rounding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating metadata for research data</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and consent</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey results – a valuable engagement tool

Examples of user engagement as a result of survey implementation and results:

• Bite-size learning (ScHARR)
• Researcher writing groups (A&H)
• Doctoral Development Programme sessions
• Research ethics event
• Data interviews and Data Management Plan reviews
• Big data and HPC research groups and activities
Survey results – a valuable engagement tool

Examples of professional services engagement

• Presentations to PVC-Research and Faculty Directors of Research & Innovation
• Presentations to research groups and research committees
• Information and research data security collaboration
• Co-delivery of training with research staff development
PROBLEMS OF COMPARISON
A comment on DAF surveys: Read with caution

• Obstacles to comparability across surveys
  – Usual provisos about survey data: e.g. representativeness of those responding of the total population

  – Variations in questions asked

  – Many previous surveys have not published their data
  – None have published response rates, by seniority/faculty

  – Institutional differences