

5-8-2015

Data Management Plan Example and Feedback

DeeAnn Allison

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, dallison1@unl.edu

Kiyomi D. Deards

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, kdeards2@unl.edu

Jennifer L. Thoegersen

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Jennifer.Thoegersen@oslomet.no

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/library_talks



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), [Information Literacy Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Allison, DeeAnn; Deards, Kiyomi D.; and Thoegersen, Jennifer L., "Data Management Plan Example and Feedback" (2015). *Library Conference Presentations and Speeches*. 114.

https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/library_talks/114

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Conference Presentations and Speeches by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

DMP Example Feedback

Created by Deeann Allison, Kiyomi Deards, and Jennifer Thoegersen
A University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries Self-Evaluation and Training Document
First Published May 8, 2015

A good DMP plan was concise and easy to follow. Writers should not be afraid to take up the maximum allowed space when necessary to explain things so that the reviewers don't have to think hard/look something up. Below are examples of feedback a consultant might give when reviewing a data management plan. These examples may be used and altered as necessary to fit a variety of situations. The feedback has been divided into three categories: Defining Terms, Details, Data, and Human Research Subject Data.

Defining Terms:

<p>Great job:</p> <p>We especially appreciated how you took the time to define terms which reviewers might not be familiar with.</p>	<p>Pro tip:</p> <p>When you are starting a new section of a proposal it is a good idea to define terms which a review may not be familiar with. They may or may not remember your definition from 30 pages ago. In addition there is often one or more non-experts on a review panel.</p>
--	---

Details:

<p>Great job:</p> <p>It provides all knowledge necessary to understand what is going on but does not provide needless explanations. It is straightforward and to the point, which is a major challenge for many people when writing a DMP.</p>	<p>Pro Tips:</p> <p>You could refer back to the ___ section and eliminate much of the text in this section.</p> <p>Most of what you needed was already in the DMP, a little rearrangement of the information could make it clearer.</p> <p>Librarians should be included in grant staffing requirements and the library may need to require the PI to buy out the librarian's time if they are managing a long term project's data.</p> <p>It was not apparent how outputs from the projects such as articles, outreach, and educational materials would be made available. Even if there will be none you should state this because people assume the production of articles or some sort of tangible publication as a result of research, although that may not be the case.</p> <p>Who is the output/data sharing directed towards?(Other researchers, general public?)</p>
--	--

Data:

<p>Great Job:</p> <p>Addressing derivative materials and obeying the three copy rule really stood out to us as many people forget to that in a first draft even after being reminded.</p> <p>You addressed all the points, and specifying exact file formats are often details that people miss when first writing a DMP. It was also good that you specified what metadata standards you would be used.</p> <p>The addition of the creative commons license for sharing was nice, for the convenience of the reviewers we would state which specific license is being used and what it means in terms of data reuse.</p> <p>You did a good job about specifying the software requirements, many plans fall short in addressing non-standard software and related hardware. It was also good that you specified why the data was being kept together and that you identified the XYZ repository as a good place to deposit data.</p> <p>You did a great job describing the metadata that would be collected/provided with the data and relating that to the requirements in the proposed repository.</p>	<p>Pro Tips:</p> <p>We would include a statement that addresses sustainability for a proprietary format and address ability to convert to a non-proprietary format such as .txt, .png, or .csv. Most specialized scientific file formats can be converted into one or more open formats.</p> <p>What are the specific multimedia formats? Throughout the research projects there should be an attempt to have 3 copies at all times, with at least one copy as an off-site backup for disaster recovery purposes. (ex. Secure cloud storage, or university backup if available, or removable hard drive(s) or good old fashion photocopies or photographic prints stored in a lockbox if need be.)</p> <p>You might want to cite the XYZ repository as a possible domain repository to deposit data, phrasing could be something like data will also be deposited in appropriate domain repository such as the XYZ repository. Include arrangements for securing sensitive data.</p> <p>What happens if the PI switches institutions next year or the year after? We have seen many faculty website disappear because someone retired, moved, or passed away. A way around this would be for the PI to get the university to agree to host their website for a minimum number of years regardless of their status after the data has been uploaded to their website. Then they could write about that minimum guaranteed time in their grant, remember you never have to indicate how you would dispose of non-sensitive data, only the minimum length of time that you would keep it. At the end of that time the data could be reassessed and kept or discarded.</p> <p>What happens if a researcher passes away? Who owns their research data, how can it be shared/published?</p>
---	--

	<p>More information on the repository's practices for back-up and data recovery for disaster preparedness would strengthen this DMP.</p> <p>What format will the data be stored in when placed in the repository? What metadata will be provided to describe the data you will be depositing?</p> <p>More information needs to be provided on the institutional repository. We would include more information about the repository's, cost, practices and policies. Is there a DR policy, what is the facility like (secure environment, even to include type of server and backup practices.) If there is a cost it needs to be specified here and in the budget, if not that should still be specified here. Remember reviewers don't want to have to look stuff up and may consider the plan incomplete if depository policies for preservation and sharing are not spelled out. This is different from referring to possible publishers policies because there is no guarantee who will publish the research.</p>
--	---

Human Research Subject Data Pro Tips:

What happens to the original documents with identifying information? Is the data being stored securely? Will they be destroyed?

Regarding the interviews, will they be taped? If so what happens to the audio or video files? What are the specific multimedia formats?

We would include a statement that addresses sustainability for a proprietary format and address ability to convert to a non-proprietary format such as .txt, .png, or .csv. Most specialized scientific file formats can be converted into one or more open formats.

If there are only written notes to be transcribed those would need to be treated as data and what happens to them would need to be described including disposing of the files and/or written notes in a secure manner if they are not being preserved for privacy reasons.

How is the data going to be transcribed? You will need to address privacy/CITI Training/IRB issues for the transcriber if not part of the research team.

You should specify not only what metadata standards you will be using but where the metadata will be recorded, a notebook, .txt file, in the file names, or another section of the grant which you refer back to (ex. Section 3, A) etc.

The security of any physical recordings (tapes) or notebooks from interviews would also need to be addressed. A pretty standard way of handling these issues is for the PI to have a secure locked cabinet or safe to which they(or other authorized collaborators) have the only key/combination.

If any of the data deals with human subjects you need to specify which parts of the data will be archived and the security of the archive. i.e. is it a trusted repository, HIPAA compliant etc. Even if the data is considered to pose no risk you still need to address these issues if only to say that they do not apply and why.

Provide more data on how identifying information will be removed. Will there be coding used, will the aggregate data be recorded at all? How will they be anonymized (total removal of data, change of names, etc.)!

Standards etc. – links to metadata and other standards will enhance the proposal.