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Background

- Directive 2010/63/EU
  - The (animal welfare) body should ...... foster a **climate of care** and provide tools for the practical application and timely implementation of recent technical and scientific developments in relation to the principles of replacement, reduction and refinement ........

- The Novo Nordisk perspective
  - Culture of Care is not a goal in it self.
  - However, - a proactive Culture of Care which empowers employees is an effective and efficient enabler to enhance animal welfare.
What is culture?

- From dictionaries:
  - *Culture is a notoriously difficult term to define*
  - Two common denominators are behaviour and mindset – what we **do** and what we **think**

- It can be described as the result of
  - *top level decisions*
  - *choices*
  - *strategy (direction)*
  - *value commitment (policies, statements)*
  - *Leadership*
  - *Visible role models*

- It also has structural supportive components – e.g. an animal welfare body, a scientific review board, a refinement focus group etc.
Why measure? – and how to measure

- A measurement of current state is essential when deciding
  - Where to start from?
  - Where to go?
  - How to get there?

- Measurement is necessary to see if your plan has worked

How to measure?
- surrogate markers!
What matters?

- Value based characteristics
  - **Collaboration**
  - **Trust**
  - **Integrity**

- Operational topics:
  - Influence
  - Meaning
  - Predictability
  - Social support
  - Rewards/recognition
  - Resources
How to look?

The I-G-L-O

Four levels:

Individual employee
- the individual employee, e.g. a care-taker, a scientist, a veterinarian

Group
- the single groups working with the animals

Leadership
- Leadership and management’s role

Organisation
- organisational structures e.g. Animal Welfare Body, topic-groups for enrichment, the scientific review process
Pilot study methodology

- **Questions**
  - On-line survey
    - Anonymous
    - Quantitative scale: Strongly Disagree-Disagree-Agree-Strongly Agree-N/A or don’t know
    - Free text fields
  - **Subgroups**
    - Individual-Group-Leadership-Organisation. The IGLO model
  - **Number of questions**
    - $(I)16 + (G)10 + (L)6 + (O)8 = 40$

- **Target groups**
  - Lab animal techs
  - Licence holders
  - Lab animal vets
  - Scientists
  - Managers
  - Potential dual roles for license holders/scientists and license holders/managers
Data from a pilot study

- 65 people invited to reply
- 46 replies received = response-rate > 70

- 16 lab animal techs
- 11 license holders
- 7 scientists
- 6 managers
- 4 lab animal veterinarians
- 2 ‘others’
**Data – example 1**

- IGLO – the Individual
  - “I contribute to animal welfare”

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement “I contribute to animal welfare”](chart.png)

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Don’t know/not relevant
Data – example 2

- **IGLO – the Group**
  - “Our group can influence animal welfare, e.g. by socialising and training animals”
**Data – example 3**

- **IGLO – the Group**
  - “As a group we agree on how much of our working hours should be used on dedicated animal welfare”

![Diagram showing percentage distribution across different levels of agreement.]
Data – further break-down of example 3

- **IGLO – the Group**
  - “As a group we agree on how much of our working hours should be used on dedicated animal welfare”
Main conclusions – what does this tool provide

• With relatively few questions this tool enables you to identify
  • Matters on different organisational levels (I-G-L-O)
  • Matters related to different professional groups
  • Matters related to values and operational issues (the surrogate markers)

- and it gives you directions on where and how to initiate potential actions
What does this tool provide - examples

- With relatively few questions this tool enables you to identify
  - Matters on different organisational levels (I-G-L-O)
    - e.g. example 1: no issues on the *Individual* level
  - Matters related to different professional groups
    - e.g. example 3: lab animal techs seem to have issues on the *Group* level, whereas lab animal vets do not
  - Matters related to values and operational issues (the surrogate markers)
    - e.g. example 3: the results suggest an issue with *Collaboration* and potentially with *Influence* and/or *Resources* for lab animal techs

- and it gives you directions on where and how to initiate potential actions
Conclusion

• Measuring or assessing Culture of Care is relevant for
  • Understanding where to start from
  • Deciding where to go
  • Planning how to get there

• With relatively few questions this tool gives you valuable insight in the three items above