



Mercian Copyright SubGroup

Minutes

Thu 14th July 2022, 10-11.30am

Present:

Emma Sansby (Meeting Chair/BGU), Guy Lavender (OU), Rob Melocha (Leicester), Caroline Lloyd (Nottingham), Helen Bond (Newman), Luke Fowler (Wolverhampton), Alex Fenton (Birmingham), Hazel Barham (Newman), Gaz J Johnson (Mercian Collaboration), Rohit Tailor (DMU)

Apologies: Mandy Padden (Wolverhampton), Charlotte Greasley (Loughborough), Chris Porter (Sponsor/Newman), Caroline Long (Aston)

Summary of Actions

ACTION: All to check for reusable copyright training and support materials and share with the group members

ACTION: Alex to set up shared spreadsheet for copyright training, resources and needs

ACTION: ALL to contribute to shared training spreadsheet with useful information

ACTION: Officer/Cover and Group Coordinators to set date for next meeting

ACTION: Coordinating Committee to poll the membership on insights and interest relating to transformative agreements

ACTION: ALL to encourage scholarly communications colleagues to join the group mailing list

ACTION: Updates on developments with Ukraine licensing and twinning arrangements to be briefly shared at next meeting

ACTION: All to read article on Creative Commons suggested by Rob and share any thoughts or insights via the mailing list

ACTION: Emma to represent Copyright Group at Steering Group meeting

ACTION: Coordinating group to agree next meeting Chair for the autumn meeting



22/06 Minutes & Matters Arising ([17th May 2022](#))

Emma acted as meeting chair on behalf of the organising committee. She noted that all actions from the previous meeting had been actioned.

22/07 Collaboration Update

GJJ updated everyone on Collaboration general activities which included:

- Recordings from many of the Mercian Staff Development Group (MSDG) events can now be found on the website. The hope is to keep doing this even as events pivot to a hybrid/blended delivery approach.
- The Marketing Group is also relaunched, and like the Copyright Group, keen to widen its membership to anyone with an interest in this area. Contact the organising committee for more details.
- There is a MSDG/Disability Forum joint working group looking at accessibility and inclusion for online and physical events. The hope is they will offer some best practice across the region.
- The Conference Group have selected the papers for this year's (6-7th September) conference on Redefining Engagement. This will be held online with no limit on attendance numbers, and no charge for attendance. The keynote speaker is Antony Brewerton (Oxford). Delegate booking will open very soon.
- GJJ is departing as the Officer next week, and while there will be interim cover some services will be reduced until the appointment of their successor.

Alex noted hearty thanks to Gareth on behalf of the group, and in particular for getting the group up and running again.

22/08 Discussions & Updates

a. In-House Training & Awareness Schemes

Emma introduced the discussion topic and invited comments.

Hazel began by noting how Newman hoped to develop more training now there was a greater return to 'normal' operations. This contrasted with the high-pandemic period, where with digitisation workloads, only some basic training could be offered. The hope is to expand what is offered to include support for academics more than the current ad hoc response approach. There was also a desire to cascade the training remit to include academic support colleagues, but this has yet to be implemented. The library also uses a 'Reading Strategy' to get people to think about what they want for their course and why they need it, rather than use simple reading lists.

Guy noted the OU had had a lot of staff turnover in recent months/years. Training has been delivered variably depending on whom was available to deliver it, and so there was a desire to move to a more formal, structured approach. They are developing a training video(s) as part of this, with a kick of redeveloping training in late 2022 as a project based exercise.



Emma noted there was no dedicated copyright officer at BGU, but that she had developed 7 short videos in house on the topic and placed them where academics would find them. These were broken down to allow people to skip directly to the right content within them. She had also facilitated online sessions covering all seven topics in one event. On top of that, BGU had two LibGuides – one for staff, the other for students – which covered rights related materials. There was also a long FAQ which complimented these various training approaches and resources. The hope is in future to continue exploring different delivery routes, and find the ways that work best for their user community.

Hazel commented there were so many copyright grey areas, that in her experience having someone on hand to answer the direct queries was key. Luke noted capacity to support copyright was a recurring theme too. Where it was possible to deliver on tailored training this was well received, and at Wolverhampton the desire was to increase those relating to scholarly communications more. He highlighted how their Leganto Reading List system has copyright training built into it. Additionally, their academic librarians do deliver basic copyright training sessions but more complex issues are bounced to more specialised staff. He did note the desire for ‘train the trainer sessions’ though.

Wolverhampton did offer some longer copyright sessions a couple of times a year such as ‘Copyright for your Thesis’ and makes those available as recordings on the VLE, as well as delivering some live sessions too. There are hopes to offer shorter, bite-sized sessions on topics like Creative Commons, via online delivery as this had been a successful approach in terms of attendee numbers. There were hopes to raise the team’s visibility, alongside the support they offer, within their user community.

Caroline noted like others at Nottingham there was no one person with a copyright remit officially, but rather lots of people who contribute to it as part of their role. They do have fairly extensive webpages and a copyright enquiry email but lack any resource to do direct training. In terms of support, some months were busier than others, and some queries were more readily answered too: although repeat questions are common. New library staff can opt to be briefly training in copyright, but this isn’t standard across all teams. However, during staff training ‘Spotlight’ sessions, which are recorded, she had been able to raise more awareness across the library team.

From these discussions, Alex proposed that the group could explore producing a pool of training resources and shared templates, and then license through OER, which would be of use across the region and further afield. For example, he suggested topics might include: the CLA Licence, CC licenses, digitisation, 3rd party rights for theses etc. He noted the last of these would require tailoring for local rules and expectations.

It was agreed that this was a good idea to pursue, provided prior materials do not already exist. A timetable for rolling out these shared resources of September 2023 was proposed as a deadline, to provide a sufficient lead time to discuss, collate or develop them. Collating what each member already has created which could be drawn upon would also be invaluable, alongside a list of training interest areas. Alex agreed to draw-up a shareable spreadsheet which covered: existing local and external materials, training needs and desires. This would contribute to forming a gap analysis, benchmarking, horizon scanning and feed into the resource production stage.

ACTION: All to check for reusable copyright training and support materials and share with the group members

ACTION: Alex to set up shared spreadsheet for copyright training, resources and needs



ACTION: ALL to contribute to shared training spreadsheet with useful information

The information in the spreadsheet will be revisited for discussion and review at the next meeting.

[22/09 Institutional Updates: Hot topics, challenges, forthcoming priorities](#)

BGU: Emma noted no hot topics, but she remained very keen to learn about activities at other organisations.

Birmingham: Alex noted two issues, starting with RRS (rights retention strategy) and how as an institution they can adapt, adopt and adjust alongside exploring the institutional willingness. This is as well as issues associated with communicating and developing RRS with the university community. In part this is being driven by UKRI policy, but also local desires towards open provision of content. The second area relates to AI, big data, data mining etc, and the support for students and researchers stepping into this space. There is a hope to collate training from various areas and offer it as a coherent resource for users alongside some centralised support. However, the practicalities are still under discussion for now with an aim to launch the service within 12 months. Alex noted they had almost adapted Hudson paper's recommendations in full. While legal services had been too pressed to be able to give a ruling, the PVC Education supported this move in principle. There was no central IT support for this though and any work was carried out ad-hoc, in depts.

Leicester: Rob reported the Research Service team is keen to get RRS into the local IP & OA policies, but despite these both in need of refinement, progress in getting senior buy-in has been limited to date. He also noted that with a return to F2F training and blended teaching, there had been a need to change the advice on AV materials and how they were being used by academics. Previously, during the high-pandemic there were extenuating circumstances to bypass elements of the normal practice, but now the view is this must stop. Academics are reportedly less than happy about the more restrictive approach, and some are potentially bypassing the rules, despite the higher legal risks this creates.

Newman: Hazel reported RRS is also a key issue. They are updating their open access policy too, with a new draft to shortly presented which takes RRS into account. However, this will not be an institutional mandate for non-funded staff. It was noted Edinburgh, Sheffield Hallam and Cambridge are perhaps leading in this area, as Newman are interested in exploring how others are working in this space, especially in terms of the amount of labour required. Some concerns remained over the legality of enforcing this policy stance more widely in some respects which have yet to be fully addressed.

Nottingham: Rights retention is a big topic and there are OER being developed by colleagues related to this. With reference to Leicester's experiences (see below), Caroline pointed to Emily Hudson's interpretation of streaming legality. This suggested streaming was okay and provided a checklist of things to refer to. At Nottingham they were not planning to withdraw from the looser pandemic rules fully, as the risk seemed modest. Plus, with a lack of capacity to digitise media and provide access to fully licenced works, this was the practical option for now.

OU: Guy reported that they despite having a dedicated rights team for creating 3rd party teaching materials, that their time has been stretched very widely over last three years due to the demand for their services. There had been funding for new posts to enlarge the team, although a process of restructuring and rethinking was also being carried out to identify prime focusses over the coming months.



Wolverhampton: Luke noted that rights work was spread across a lot of teams/people, rather than being centralised. There were high hopes for increased productivity in the coming months too.

22/10 Next Meeting

a. Approximate date and format

It was agreed to aim for an October date, with the Officer (or cover) to make arrangements with the members for a suitable date later in the year. As no preference for a face-to-face meeting was given, this would probably be an online meeting once again.

ACTION: Officer/Cover and Group Coordinators to set date for next meeting

b. Topics for discussion

Rob noted he had been keeping an eye on Controlled Digital Lending/Licensing (CDL) and eBook lending for ILL. Luke noted there was a big cost for large numbers of students accessing works, with the costs of the system infrastructure being a further challenge.

It was agreed that RRS and CDL would make for good topics. There was some discussions around transformative agreements, and notably Alex's work at Jisc on these. It was agreed to postpone this to a later meeting, but to encourage more scholarly communications staffers to join the group and the subsequent discussions. It was noted some members' roles overlap with these areas but some other member institutions these are discrete and separate posts.

ACTION: Coordinating Committee to poll the membership on insights and interest relating to transformative agreements

ACTION: ALL to encourage scholarly communications colleagues to join the group mailing list

22/11 AOB

a. Ukraine Universities Twinning

Alex raised a question concerning Ukraine universities, twinning and e-licenses; noting that while Jisc and SCONUL had been discussing this, practical guidance or implementation seemed thin on the ground. It was agreed while this was of interest, for now this would only be a watching brief for the group. It was agreed to pick and review developments at the next meeting.

ACTION: Updates on developments with Ukraine licensing and twinning arrangements to be briefly shared at next meeting

b. Creative Commons

Rob mentioned an article concerning how Creative Commons feel about their licenses being used, and when their licenses can be applied (e.g. transfers to later versions).ⁱ He noted UKSCL disagrees with this interpretation and suggests each 'version' of a manuscript would possess fresh license terms. It was agreed that there seems to be a conflict between the interpretations of the licences. Alex suggests past guidance from Harnad and Oppenheim might offer insights, while Caroline highlighted without Share-Alike (SA) aspects of a license then it seemed less likely for license terms to follow an object. Alex added



all the labour goes into the AAMⁱⁱ, meaning there was little, other than typographic rights, left to 'claim' in the VORⁱⁱⁱ. It was agreed all should review the article and share further thoughts on the mailing list.

ACTION: All to read article on Creative Commons suggested by Rob and share any thoughts or insights via the mailing list

c. Steering Group attendance

It was agreed Emma would attend for the group and report back on today's meeting, and forthcoming group plans as discussed. She would share any outputs from the Steering Group meeting at the group meeting in the autumn.

ACTION: Emma to represent Copyright Group at Steering Group meeting

d. Chair of Next Meeting

It was agreed that as Emma had chaired this meeting, Luke, Caroline L or Guy would Chair the next one. This would be agreed via the coordinators' mailing list.

ACTION: Coordinating group to agree next meeting Chair for the autumn meeting

ⁱ <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2022/05/11/q-can-you-revoke-a-creative-commons-license-a-no-er-sort-of-maybe/>

ⁱⁱ Author Accepted Manuscript

ⁱⁱⁱ Version of Record