

## Directors Board Meeting

Minutes, 26<sup>th</sup> March 2019, Birmingham City University

### 19/01 Apologies & Introductions

Page | 1

**Present:** Dave Parkes (**Chair**, DMU), Diane Job (**Vice-Chair**, Birmingham), Paul Reynolds (**Treasurer**, Keele), Emma Walton (**SG Member**, Loughborough), Fiona Parsons (**SG Member**, Wolverhampton), Robin Green (Warwick), Sue Ackermann (Nottingham), Sue Morrison (Derby), Caroline Taylor (Leicester), Laura Pilsel (Harper Adams), Chris Porter (Newman), Chris Powis (Northampton), Enid Pryce-Jones (BCU), Judith Keene (Worcester), Janet Weaver (Staffordshire), Gary Elliott-Cirigottis (OU), Simon Bevan (Cranfield), Angela Brady (Aston), Emma Sansby (BGU), Gaz J Johnson (**Development Officer**)

**Guests:** Stewart Sandilands (Marketing Group, BCU [PM]), Richard Birley (Metadata Group, BCU [PM]), Liam Earney (Jisc [AM]), Matt Gallon (Jisc, [AM])

**Apologies:** Mark Toole (NTU), Deborah Findley (UCB), Phil Brabban (Cov)

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially those attending the Board for the first time. He also noted thanks to Enid and team for hosting the meeting.

### 19/02 Guest Speaker: Liam Earney, Jisc: Plan S & Collections Update

The Chair introduced Liam Earney (Jisc, Director of Licensing) to the Board to talk about Plan S, and Jisc's activities. Liam spoke about how the open access (OA) environment was not as far along as many funders and scholars wished, and how Plan S was a response from 14 national funders along with the Wellcome Trust and Gates Foundation to try and force a greater rate of progression. Notably there is a strong UK representation within Plan S' organisers, but Germany due to odd constitutional laws is unable to participate. Plan S' principles represent a big shift, but ones which are likely to be implemented in various different ways, and while achieving a greater transition to OA 2020 is desired, given the ongoing contract negotiations 2024 is more realistic. However, OA publication costs will no longer be funded by Plan S compliant funders, which represents a big shift from previous policies. Liam outlined there are complications and complexities in such an approach, not least of which is a likely increase in expenditure on subscriptions and APC costs during the transition period, which may be borne more by the research-intensive institutions under a 'pay to publish' gold OA model. The lack of a global shift (Plan S is mostly EU) is also a concern. He noted all of Jisc's agreements are being re-negotiated to be compliant, meaning a flurry of activity was underway, alongside looking at how they operate themselves. He noted that subscription agents in particular are unhappy as they feel Jisc is centralising payments away from them, and there are major publishers who are reluctant to engage or adapt.

The Chair opened the floor to questions which included the impact of Brexit on costs, the reaction of the US and if REF2021 would align more with Plan S' goals. Liam highlighted Plan S (like much of OA's driving impetus) could be viewed as a STEM derived focus, although efforts were underway to embrace more of an AHSS take on it. He also spoke specifically about negotiations with Elsevier, noting with two years to run on their current deal, how this represented a current key focus for him, even without the clarity of intent which Plan S offered. When asked if public access to research was still a hot topic, he noted publishers saw this as no longer important. He added; its role had been to make it appear as though publishers were participating in OA to a far greater degree than they were. Certainly, publishers no longer mentioned it.

Liam asked what directors would benefit from Jisc, and the consensus was briefing material and information suitable for using with high level institutional decision makers. He noted they were in the process of recruiting someone to work on just such material from May 2019 onwards.

**ACTION: Liam to share Plan S slides with Directors following the meeting**

In broader discussions, the topic of the new textbook model arose, noting that none of it was configured around the way major HEIs wanted textbooks. The direction instead was drawn from analytic data. Certainly, it was noted that vendors do not seem to be in sync with HEI desires. Liam suggested someone to talk about textbooks from Jisc could contribute to a future meeting, and that a new university press toolkit was forthcoming.

**ACTION: Liam to share update with Board on textbooks and related toolkits, once available**

Liam finally spoke about the progress with the NBK, which has now launched as live. 165 library catalogues will be uploaded by the year end, with 200 HEIs having provided them in total. There is a lot of work going on around data rights and reuse, and a planned event in May 2019 looking at the data rights landscape with a diverse range of stakeholders invited to attend.

**ACTION: Liam to share update on NBK with Board following meeting**

The Chair thanked Liam for his contribution.

## 19/03 Strategic Direction & Plans

### a. Strategic Plan: Update on Progress

The Chair noted that while it had been hoped to bring the Strategic Plan to the Directors today, regrettably this remained under development and would be handed over to the incoming Chair and Steering Group to finalise. He noted that part of the delay had been due to wanting to more closely align elements of the Plan with the SCONUL Strategy 2019-2022, the draft of which had been shared ahead of the meeting. Once progress had been made it with the Collaboration's Plan, it would be shared with the Directors once more

**ACTION: Chair and Steering Group to revisit MC Strategic Plan at next meeting**

### b. SCONUL Strategy 2019-2022

Caroline had kindly shared the draft SCONUL Strategy with Directors ahead of the meeting, noting that the document was still with the SCONUL Board for comment. Sectoral challenges noted in the Strategy included budgetary constraints and rising costs, tensions from working in a hybrid world, content developments, evolving library infrastructures, future leadership and capitalising on new technologies. In particular, on the last point, she noted how AI technologies might play a part was under consideration. Caroline stressed that the Strategy also outlined how SCONUL supports members, with especially its contributions to supporting directors in decision making through information noted. Caroline explained there were a number of continuing work-stream themes, as well as new elements, which included areas such as: evidence to support library value, organisational development, leadership, skills, capabilities and barriers for adoption.

Caroline noted there were strong synergies and overlaps with the Collaboration's draft Strategic Plan and SCONUL's, especially around environment, agency, learning and teaching as well as workforce development. However, a lack of alignment around the areas of collections and user experience was highlighted. There was a clear benefit to all stakeholders from understanding where the strengths lay between both organisations' directions, she added. She invited further comment to the SCONUL Board on their Strategy, ahead of an anticipated launch at the summer SCONUL Conference. Directors made various comments on the Strategy which Caroline will feedback to the SCONUL Board for information, but she invited any further thoughts following the meeting.

**ACTION: All to provide feedback via Caroline on SCONUL's Draft Strategy**

SCONUL's current consultation on a name change was also raised. Caroline acknowledged that while this idea had not met with favour at the previous Directors Board ([Board, 18/10](#)), the national view was that a name change was desirable. However, at this point no indication of what this name would be was clear.

c. [Membership Value](#)

The Chair introduced this item, noting it had arisen from recent events and discussions including Steering Group participation, increasing activities, demands on the Officer and thoughts over future income routes. He noted that balancing the financial contribution and relationship with the Collaboration for members, against other such contributions, represented an important question in terms of its continued return on value to the membership. Diane highlighted how the Mercian Collaboration was one of Birmingham's three most important memberships, when the value it returned for her staff was appraised. Nevertheless, she acknowledged even this could be challenged in an era of fiscal tensions.

The Chair noted with the expansion of the Collaboration since its foundation five years ago, that member benefits had increased substantially against moderate increases in subscription rates. He also highlighted the benefits to SCONUL from the regional activity and the increased brand recognition now with library staff. In particular, he extolled the value to enhancing non-professional staff members' professional identities, skills, adaptability and confidence through attendance at Collaboration events. Tangibles, of which the annual report represented a handy summary, were increasingly clear, in marked contrast to the early years of the Collaboration. GJJ and the Treasurer both commented that in contrast to comparators, the Collaboration remained exceptional value for money. Notably, the grass-roots approach to establishing new SIGs and subsequent broadening of activities was felt to offer particularly responsive direct membership benefits.

Paul continued, explaining how this increase in activity came at a cost, partly through supporting external speakers at events, but also in terms of the workload on the Officer, who now supported the Board, Steering Group<sup>1</sup> and five SIGs (with two more proposed); in contrast to 2015 when he supported the Board, Steering Group<sup>2</sup> and one SIG. Hence, to continue supporting such a portfolio of activities and any future increases would mean an increased requirement for staffing and financial support. He outlined for example how roughly tripling subscription rates would be required to cover the costs of a full-time Officer, although acknowledging presently this was not being proposed.

---

<sup>1</sup> 6 members

<sup>2</sup> 3 members

Following discussions, it was generally acknowledged by the Directors that the Collaboration continued to offer value to its membership and staff. However, the Chair stressed membership brought responsibilities with it. To better understand these membership values, and provide a basis for revisiting membership subscriptions, resources and staffing support, it was agreed to establish some tangible critical success factors for Collaboration, alongside clarifying the activities and outputs it supported (e.g. an advocacy statement).

**ACTION: SG and GJJ to draw together tangible benefits and critical success factor documentation for the Collaboration**

## 19/04 Governance

### a. Steering Group Elections 2019

As returning officer, GJJ reported that the following people had been nominated and elected, unopposed, to the Steering Group and would serve from March 2019 to March 2021.

- **Chair: Diane Job** (progression from Vice)
- **Vice Chair: Chris Porter** (nominated: Robin Green)
- **SG Member: Simon Bevan** (nominated: Judith Keane)
- **SG Member: Emma Walton** (nominated: David Parkes)

He noted this left the Treasurer officer, and one SG Member, roles vacant, despite an extended nomination period. Paul outlined the role of the treasurer to the meeting and the degree of work commitment, commenting beyond handling expenses, reporting to committee and setting annual subscription rates that the role was relatively low impact. He stressed the MoU discussions of the past 18-months had taken up more time than anticipated, but that this was a hopefully rare occurrence.

The Chair opened the floor to self-nominations, but no one was prepared to take on the roles.

A discussion followed on how to proceed, and the anything which would make it easier for the rest of the Directors to consider taking on one of the roles. No clear consensus in this latter regard was reached.

As at the recent Steering Group ([SG, 19/02](#)), a discussion followed about recruiting to the Steering Group from the senior staff/deputy director strata as a potential approach to resolve these vacancies, and provide a development opportunity. However, points were made as to how far down the organisational structures such an approach would need to go before resolving this issue, if no volunteers from the senior staff strata could be found. It was also noted that the dearth of volunteers from among the remaining Directors who had not recently served, represented a potentially concerning existential question for the Collaboration's future.

It was agreed the Chair and Steering Group would approach the Directors individually, to explore potential recruitment to the SG. The Chair also encouraged all Directors to reconsider their willingness to stand for office, noting how enriching he had found the experience.

**ACTION: Chair to approach Directors and discuss their willingness to fill Steering Group vacancies**

**ACTION: All Directors to re-explore their ability to serve on the Steering Group**

### b. Minutes of Previous Meeting & Matters Arising

The minutes were accepted as an accurate record, with no matters arising not on today's agenda.

#### c. Annual Report 2018

GJJ had circulated this prior to the meeting and would make it publicly available following today's meeting. He thanked all contributors, especially those from the membership libraries. A number of highlights from the report were noted by the Directors.

#### d. Treasurer's Update

Paul had tabled a snapshot of finances at the end of Feb (see [SG, 19/02\(c\)](#)), which was looking very healthy, with reserves in advance of the minimum. He noted if conference sponsorship came in as per 2018, then the Collaboration would be on a firm footing. He however highlighted some outstanding costs from 2018, notably the conference venue which had not been invoiced, which Diane agreed to chase. He also mentioned there remained no contingency budget.

**ACTION: Diane to resolve lack of invoice for conference 2018 venue**

### 19/05 Operations

#### a. Deputy Directors Group

The Chair and GJJ outlined earlier discussions ([SG, 19/06\(a\)](#)) concerning the networking, succession planning, efficiency and developmental benefits which could arise from a Collaboration Deputy Directors<sup>3</sup> Group. It was noted that NoWAL had been running such a group ([Senior Staff Group](#)) for some time for considerable benefit to their collaboration and membership.

A key issue was the overlap with extant SCONUL deputy groups, although it was highlighted that not all members had staff considered eligible for membership in these. Hence, potentially a value from organising such a regional group existed. It was discussed how a group could serve as a sounding board or be tasked with specific projects by the Directors Board, to give form and purpose to their gatherings. However, some concerns were raised that this might be seen as subtending the agency of such a group and reducing the attractiveness of participation for some. A number of issues with such a group were identified which included: tangible outputs and benefits, time demands to attend, identifying suitable members. However, providing the group with relative autonomy, empowerment and self-determined direction could serve to enhance the tangible value through participation, as well as providing a resource for future Collaboration development. The regionality and relative locality of members could also serve to differentiate the group from SCONUL ones.

Generally, however, Directors agreed that there was value in exploring the degree of interest and suitability of such a group within the Mercian Collaboration region. As such, it was agreed that the Steering Group would identify a corpus of deputies to gather initially, with support from GJJ and the SG, to explore the propose how such a group might operate. It was noted that basic operational boundaries and perhaps an outline terms of reference would need to be agreed, alongside testing any regional appetite. It was acknowledged that such a group may also not be entirely representative of the Collaboration's membership at each meeting.

**ACTION: Chair to create initial deputy directors group outline proposal and call for participation**

---

<sup>3</sup> While 'deputy directors' is used here, the eligible membership of any such 'senior staff' group would be left to individual Directors' discretion, noting the flatter and smaller staffing structures employed by some member organisations.

**ACTION: SG to identify and sponsor initial deputy directors group meeting, and report back to Directors**

**ACTION: All to facilitate participants for initial discussion/meeting**

b. Conference Sponsorship Policy

Emma W confirmed as had been agreed with Steering Group, that the conference was shifting to a two-tier sponsorship arrangement: [Gold and Silver](#). Gold provided attendance for company representatives, while Silver only offered representation in the programme. She noted there had been major and unexpected time demands on the Conference Group in terms of negotiating with sponsors in 2018. The lesson learned had been to underline what the policy offered were the only available options, without modification. She noted that she planned to bring the issue of funding the conference and delegate fees back to the Board in the autumn, as part of the post-event review. If this year's approach was unsuccessful, Emma W highlighted the sponsorship policy would likely undergo further review and revision.

Page | 6

Emma W noted that she would report on progress on Conference 2019 later in the meeting.

c. Development Officer Report

GJJ noted he had tabled and distributed his [general report on activities](#) prior to the meeting, and it was available on the web. He had no particular matters to bring to the Board's attention, beyond those on the agenda or under discussion by the Steering Group.

The Board noted however, the demands on GJJ's time clearly had continued to increase beyond an acceptable or reasonable level, as a consequence of the Collaboration's rising activities. The potential to buy in additional time was discussed, noting as had been previously discussed today how this would likely impact on subscriptions. However, the value and benefits in terms of facilitating the Collaboration's continued evolution strongly suggested this was a matter to be addressed with some urgency. The potential to offset or absorb some activities within SIG committees was also suggested as a low cost, if questionably practical, option.

**ACTION: Chair and SG to discuss Officer's workloads and employment arrangements against fiscal impact and Collaboration benefits**

d. CILIP Ongoing Discussions

Dave reported he had some follow-on discussions with Jo Cornish, although some misunderstandings on the Collaboration's remit remained evident. However, these had been useful conversations in terms of raising an awareness of the Collaboration with CILIP, although he was unsure what the eventual outcome for these would be. It was suggested inviting the CEO and/or President of CILIP to address a future meeting might be beneficial. It was noted that the MSDG had invited Jo to address their June meeting, to explore potential synergies or promotional opportunities.

**ACTION: SG to consider taking conversations and engagement with CILIP forward**

## 19/06 SIG Matters & Reports

### a. SIG Proposal: Marketing & Communications Group

Stewart Sandilands (BCU) was welcomed to the meeting, to present the previously distributed group proposal. He noted how the group had been drawn together through two earlier meetings, attended by numerous self-selected member representatives, initially as a community of practice. While interest had been spurred by a marketing conference earlier in the year, by the end of 2019 a meeting at Aston University (attended by GJJ) had instigated formal proceedings to form a new SIG. In keeping with other SIGs, this new group would help enable specialist practitioners collective learning, sharing of practice and professional networking. It was suggested too that the SIG would want to draw on external expertise to support training and development ambitions and needs. He also explained thoughts towards an initial SIG committee and terms of reference.

Page | 7

The Chair thanked Stewart and opened the floor to discussions. Issues which arose included the interface with corporate communications at member institutions (e.g. Marketing Departments), the diversity of library marketing staff members portfolios of responsibilities and work schedules, marketing within and without the organisation, and how the group might contribute to enhancing the visibility of the Collaboration itself. The treasurer noted the potential costs of external trainers, and with reference to discussions on subscriptions, noted how this might be a driver for increasing subscriptions.

It was agreed to approve and support the new group, and for Stewart and his small team to instigate a further meeting of interested parties to formally launch their activities. GJJ would provide support for this meeting, organisation and the website as with other groups.

**ACTION: Stewart and core Marketing SIG group to refine TOR in light of discussions and present to SG for information**

**ACTION: Stewart and core Marketing SIG group to facilitate first formal meeting to agree finalised TOR and take next steps**

### b. SIG Proposal: Metadata Group

The Chair welcomed Richard Birley (BCU) to the meeting on behalf of the proposed group and noted the previously circulated SIG proposal. GJJ noted he had met with Richard and William Peaden (Aston) a few weeks previously to provide advice for their proposal.

Richard introduced the SIG proposal, which had arisen from discussions at the Cataloguing and Indexing Group Conference in 2018. It was seen that value to metadata practitioners within the regional context could be valuable, especially with developments in cataloguing for example increasing the importance of good metadata practice within the library sector. He noted this was not a group for cataloguers, but rather a more holistic one, which would seek involvement from anyone with a strong professional interest in metadata practice. For example, they had noted the RDMSG as potentially people with whom they'd seek close contact. He also noted an expectation that in terms of professional development events, it was anticipated the group would work with the MSDG to offer events. He also noted likely beneficial external facing relationships with CILIP C&IG and RDA (resource description and access) related people.

Given the strong (15 institutions represented at their discussion meeting) interest at their inaugural meeting, he explained there was considerable support from across the Collaboration towards establishing the group. They would hope to hold one event annually as a study or training day, with committee meetings outside of this. A core committee of chair, vice and secretary had been identified who could take a lead on initial formation, and then formal process of office nominations would be made more widely available to the group's members.

The Chair thanked Richard and opened the floor to a robust discussion, which threw up some concerns over the group. Directors noted in the proposal a crossover and overlap with the MSDG's programme of events, which raised questions of the proposed Metadata group's outputs. In this respect the Board requested that Richard and collaborators revise their proposal to outline more clear tangible benefits from the SIG, before full approval could be given. Richard noted work on a shared RDA template, for example, might provide such a tangible output.

**ACTION: Richard and core Metadata SIG group to revise TOR in light of discussions and present to SG for approval**

It was agreed, provided the prior caveats were addressed, that the Board would approve the formation of the new Metadata SIG. It would then charge Richard and his core group to instigate the next steps in formal progression and organisation. As with the prior group, GJJ would provide support for this meeting, organisation and the website as with other groups.

**ACTION: Richard and core Metadata SIG group to facilitate first formal meeting to agree finalised TOR and take next steps**

Following these new two new SIG discussions a question about the Collaboration's ultimate carrying capacity for SIGs was noted as a matter for the SG to keep under review. It was also highlighted the importance of SIG activities tying in to the Collaboration and SCONUL's strategic aims, in terms of adding value to the sector. It was also noted that Directors may need prompting from SIG Chairs of vacancies on group committees when vacancies arose. GJJ agreed to highlight this to all SIG Chairs.

**ACTION: GJJ to remind SIG chairs to notify himself and Directors when vacancies on committees arose**

In general discussions, it was acknowledged that due to staff sizes and work portfolios, it was not always possible for all SIGs to be fully representative of the membership. However, the benefits from SIGs in terms of 'thinking collaboratively', where a single HEI lacked the ability to draw on such diverse expertise, was noted.

#### c. Conference Group

The CG had met 4<sup>th</sup> February at Birmingham (Emma W, but not GJJ, in attendance, [minutes available](#)). As group Chair and Sponsor Emma W reported that the preliminary evaluation reported to the Board in October, has now been formally included in the Annual Report 2018. She noted that the committee had changed membership, as planned, and that hopes were high for this year's conference. The theme was anticipated to focus on collaboration, partnerships and community. Emma also noted she was hoping to embrace diversity in terms of the choice of keynote speaker and welcomed suggestions from the Directors. Emma noted that with her (planned, but regrettable) absence at the 2018 conference, she was delighted by how well all members of the CG committee had worked to deliver the event and wished to minute her particular thanks to all involved.

**ACTION: All Directors to suggest keynote conference speakers to Emma W**



Emma noted that considerations around delegate charging had come up during informal discussions once more, given anticipated costs and programme development. She expressed her opinion that the current non-charged-for places should continue for 2019 but be reviewed by the Collaboration at the October 2019 meeting. This would be informed by the degree of success with sponsorship this year. It was noted that different payment models could be explored (e.g. the M25 1 free member place, additional delegates charged), and additionally external delegates could also attend more readily under a charged-for model. The potential for shifting the conference to a more income generating stance could offer benefits going forward for the Collaboration's other funded activities (e.g. SIG events, Development Officer support etc). The Chair noted thanks to Emma and the committee for their efforts.

**ACTION: Conference charging models to be revisited at the October 2019 meeting**

d. [MCG \(Mercian Copyright Group\)](#)

The MCG had met 8<sup>th</sup> February at DMU (GJJ & Dave in attendance), where it was noted that group was growing in membership and hence representation across the Collaboration ([minutes available](#)). Alongside discussions around pending CLA audits and developments in copyright matters, the group is planning to host a training workshop as part of their June meeting (Aston, 10<sup>th</sup> June 2019). They are also looking to open discussions with scholarly communication colleagues at a proposed September event (Loughborough, 5<sup>th</sup> Sept 2019).

Comments, stemming from the Metadata group discussions, noted once again the need to align training plans from SIGs with the Collaboration's strategic direction.

e. [MDF \(Mercian Disability Forum\)](#)

This had met 8<sup>th</sup> January 2019 at Nottingham (GJJ in attendance), where Laura Waller (Warwick) had been elected the new group Chair, as Beck Maguire had stood down from the position, although was still very involved ([minutes available](#)). Discussions at the meeting had included noting how varied members' job roles were, and how a SEN and disability support portfolio was often bundled alongside other responsibilities, rarely being a sole focus. The MDF were planning an event for later in 2019, which they were seeking to coordinate through the MSDG, aimed at developing the SEN and disability support knowledge of non-specialist staff. To this end, Laura had attended the MSDG meeting in March to explore this idea further. GJJ commented that while Phil (SIG sponsor) was not present today, the MDF had noted their thanks for his support and interest in their work.

f. [RDMSG \(Research Data Management Support Group\)](#)

The core committee had met 10<sup>th</sup> December at Loughborough ([minutes available](#), GJJ not in attendance), and was hosting an event today (26/3/19) at the University of Birmingham focussing on RDM skills and professional development. The RDMSG was planning to host a further event in late Sept 2019 on Successful and Mature RDM services and had also expressed an interest in exploring the MSDG buddying scheme further within their community. Fiona noted she had not been able to attend any group events or meetings, for which she was regretful, although had periodically communicated with the core committee. It was noted the group continued to strength in terms of operations and purpose. Some ongoing concerns with their operational configuration were noted, which had been communicated for consideration.

It was noted with respect to this, and earlier discussions, that there was a growing question on the alignment of all SIGs and the Collaboration's overall workforce development programme. The potential for a more coordinated approach from all groups was desirable, for reasons of economy,

efficiency and coherency of activities. It was proposed the SG would seek to host a meeting with all SIG Chairs to consider this issues.

**ACTION: Steering Group to outline Group Chair meeting for the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 2019**

g. MSDG (Staff Development Group)

The MSDG committee had met 19<sup>th</sup> March 2019 (GJJ, but not Diane, in attendance, [minutes available](#)). It was reported that an extensive outline programme for academic year 19/20 had been proposed. However, the MSDG representatives were conducting a sense check by bringing the programme back to staff at their respective institutions for review and input. Directors were strongly encouraged to seek out their MSDG representative and provide guidance and input to the programme. It was noted the MSDG had not as of yet supplied this list, and GJJ would distribute in the near future once it was received, to the *Lis-MidlandsLibraries* distribution list.

**ACTION: MSDG Chair to supply event programme to GJJ for distribution to Directors ASAP**

h. SIG Steering Group Sponsors

It was noted with the change in Steering Group membership, that the Sponsors of each SIG would change. The one exception is the Conference Group, due to Emma W's continued involvement with the Steering Group. It was also noted that it had been proposed that the Vice-Chair role would continue to be associated with the MSDG, given their extensive programme of efforts. Chris P indicated general agreement to this point. However, the new group sponsor arrangements would be formally agreed by the new Steering Group at their first meeting.

**ACTION: Steering Group to agree new SIG Sponsors at their earliest convenience**

**ACTION: GJJ to notify all SIG Chairs of change in Sponsor arrangements**

19/07 AOB

No attentional items of AOB were raised, beyond the following.

a. SCONUL Update

Caroline Taylor gave a report, in her capacity as Vice-Chair of the SCONUL Board, with contributions from Judith. There is a group looking at AI, with a programme to run for two years with a national and international focus. The Transformation Group was looking at digital preservation, and the Library Usage one was looking at why people entered libraries. It was noted there was considerable general interest in working internationally more. Additionally, the SCONUL Board had been reflecting on its own effectiveness, operationally, strategically and in terms of communications. They had also noted other library representational groups, to whom they were considering engaging.

*Note this item was presented earlier in the meeting, as part of item 19/03(ii)*

b. Dates, Venue & Items for Future Meetings

The Chair noted that an East-Midlands venue was preferred for the October meeting. Emma S offered BGU as the primary location, with Dave proffering DMU as a backup, noting neither venues had hosted a Board meeting.

**ACTION: Emma S, GJJ and Diane to coordinate on October 2019 Board date & venue details ASAP**

**ACTION: GJJ to update all once date has been agreed**



c. Handover to new Chair & Steering Group

The Chair closed the meeting by thanking Enid and Melissa for hosting once again, and everyone who attended and contributed to discussions. He also thanked the outgoing Steering Group members and closed by wished the incoming Chair and Steering Group members well. He noted his pleasure and professional satisfaction from leading the Collaboration, expressing his personal thanks and extreme gratitude to GJJ for his extensive operational efforts and support. The occasion was marked by the presentation of some original artwork to the outgoing Chair<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Provided by the Development Officer, at no charge