The elephant in the (meeting) room: universities, data sharing and cultural change
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What brought us here?
What will happen in this session?

- What is cultural change?

- University of Sydney Seeding the Commons Project - experiences and key challenges

- Potential models for exploring, identifying and measuring change

- We’ll ask some questions to get discussion going
What is organisational culture?

› Tierney: “the culture of an organization is grounded in the shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization”

› Silver: “shared way of thinking and collective way of behaving”

› Culture = the way we do things around here
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Does a university have an organisational culture?
Does a university have an organisational culture?
“Clusters of professionals tending various bundles of knowledge…” (Clark)
“…the university is a constellation of conflicting interests.” (Shils)
“...for many academics their tribal bonds and disciplinary socialisation were so powerful that they defined their identity and became their primary affiliation.” (Zilwa)
“…If they could see a culture at all, it was change itself…”
(respondents from Silver’s study)
“Universities do not now have an organizational culture” (Silver)
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Identifying and measuring

Loxodonta africana
Kotter: 8 steps for creating change in organisations

Urgency
Coalition
Vision
Communicate
Empower
Create wins
Consolidate
Anchor change
1. Establish a sense of urgency
2. Form a coalition
2. Form a coalition
3. Create a vision for change
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- Consolidate
- Anchor change

Vision
4. Communicate, communicate, communicate!
5. Empower others to engage and participate
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6. Create and celebrate short term wins
7. Consolidate wins to build upon change
8. Anchor changes in organisational culture
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We’re still at the beginning…
…but we’re not alone
How do we know change has happened?
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Identifying and measuring
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Is it useful to talk about cultural change as a goal for project teams?
Is it useful to talk about cultural change as a goal for project teams?
What's your elephant?
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### ANDS capability maturity model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process is ad-hoc</th>
<th>Process is under development</th>
<th>Process is standardised and communicated</th>
<th>Process is managed and measured</th>
<th>Process refined to produce continuous improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional policies &amp; procedures</strong></td>
<td>Policies and procedures are underdeveloped, inconsistent or out of date</td>
<td>Policies and procedures are developed and harmonised/aligned</td>
<td>Policies and procedures are promulgated and absorbed into institutional behaviours and processes.</td>
<td>Policies and procedures accepted as part of the culture and are subject to audit/review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>ICT infrastructure provision is patchy, and poorly publicised</td>
<td>Funds are invested in tech and skills. Services identified. Documentation and training developed</td>
<td>Management shows active support for ICT infrastructure. Facilities defined, communicated, standardised, integrated.</td>
<td>Funding adapted to need/demand. Facilities are publicised. Management engaged. Documentation is kept up-to-date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support services</strong></td>
<td>Training ad-hoc; preservation, data management and other services are poorly organised/publicised</td>
<td>Skills investment. Services identified. Responsibilities defined. Documentation and training developed.</td>
<td>Active participation in training, widespread availability of support services</td>
<td>Widespread uptake of support services. Curation and preservation services and training perceived as valuable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metadata management</strong></td>
<td>Metadata management is chaotic and only understood by a few</td>
<td>Responsibilities defined, skills developed. Processes established. Metadata applied to key datasets and shared.</td>
<td>Processes standardised and integrated. Metadata applied to new datasets and shared externally.</td>
<td>Metadata quality metrics collected - impact can be measured. All datasets described and metadata is shared externally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What if everyone managed their research data really well?
What if everyone managed their research data **really well**?