

**Mercian Copyright Group Meeting, Aston University, Monday 10<sup>th</sup> June 2019**

**HEI Delegates:** Yvonne Budden (C) (Warwick), Luke Fowler (S) (Aston), Chris Porter (Newman), Scott McGowan (Keele), George Dimmock (Northampton), Charlotte Greasley (Loughborough), Rohit Taylor (DeMontfort), Alex Fenlon (VC) (Birmingham), Caroline Long (Aston), Mandy Padden (Wolverhampton), Tania Rowlett (Leicester), Julie Baldwin (Nottingham), Donya Rowan (Derby), Funmike Ipie (Loughborough), Rob Melocha (Leicester)

**Apologies:** The chair noted a number of apologies had been received.

**Additional attendees:** Gaz Johnson (Development Officer)

Agenda item	Detail/Discussion	Action by:
<b>1. Welcome / Housekeeping</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yvonne opened meeting, shared apologies, welcomed new members Donya, Rob and Funmike</li> <li>• Caroline Ball (Derby) now longer attending group due to job change</li> <li>• Caroline welcomed and housekeeping for Aston venue</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Confirm previous minutes</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No queries from previous minutes – confirmed as accurate</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Actions arising from previous meeting</b>		
<b>3a. Brexit &amp; Copyright discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No substantive update due to the deadlock on Brexit, some guiding information came out of CILIP copyright conference (below) but largely still speculative.</li> </ul>	
<b>3b. Feedback from CILIP copyright conference</b>	<p><b>Brexit keynote:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No definitive update on what will happen; not clear what will be transposed or not</li> <li>• Copyright not likely to be high priority for change so immediate impact unclear</li> <li>• Case law will still refer to UK cases judged under EU terms so may be slow to see real terms change</li> <li>• Photography of public domain works will not create new copyright in the photograph</li> </ul> <p><b>Elsevier:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that deals with Elsevier are being cut in some EU members as well as US, due to conflict where Elsevier don't align with OA requirements</li> </ul> <p><b>Overseas licensing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation on licensing of material for overseas campuses/partners</li> <li>• Highlighted the challenge/possibilities of negotiating access with existing contracts</li> <li>• Underlined importance of libraries being included in the development of overseas programmes early on as it requires negotiating resource access and increases costs</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights importance of trying to ensure equal student experience of overseas students – e.g. if students overseas can only access material specific to their study, and not the whole resource of the library, are they having parity of experience with UK based students?</li> </ul> <p><b>Art UK:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation on use of orphan Works exception</li> <li>Reported posting of 200,000+ images on public site, many of which are used under orphan works</li> <li>Case study in their 'diligent search' practice</li> <li>Highlighted they have never received any legal action and very small number of takedowns</li> <li>Reported they would continue the practice even if Orphan Works exceptions change/are lost as they are so confident their searches establish that the risk of action is so low. Applicable to uni archives/special colls.</li> </ul> <p><b>Charles O:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wishlist for copyright which overall encouraged libraries, especially HE, to actively pursue better copyright and licensing terms.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3c. Recent Audit feedback</b></p>	<p><b>Rohit and Charlotte shared recent experience of copyright audits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shared feedback from recent audits</li> <li>CLA looked at 7-10 modules, including archived content</li> <li>Looked at both RL and VLE material (however focus not consistent across both HEIs)</li> <li>Also looked at related content e.g. IP policies, training offer, training materials</li> <li>Picked up on use of images and lack of acknowledgements, suggested more training for lecturers</li> <li>Viewed powerpoints and attachments in one case but not both</li> <li>Provided a report at the end of process with a grading – e.g. 'Exceptional'</li> <li>Both reported it was not a punitive/negative experience</li> </ul> <p><b>CLA ceasing programme of compliance audits in favour of account management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not sure what this model will be in real terms</li> <li>CLA will still have obligations to ensure compliance but not sure how they will achieve this</li> <li>May mean more frequent contact with focus on content and practice</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. Update from Mercian Collaboration</b></p>		
<p>From Gaz Johnson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Steering Group:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Chair (Diane Job, Birmingham) and Steering Group in place following elections. Noted that Chris Porter was elected as Vice-Chair and hence will serve as Chair in 2021. Vacancy still for one more member on SG remains.</li> <li>Sponsors for most SIGs have changed, with Chris (Porter) now the Copyright Group's sponsor. There's updated information about the roles of sponsors on the website, but essentially they exist to help facilitate 'communication, advocacy and representation' between SG and SIGs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A forthcoming strategy planning &amp; group chairs day (14th August 2019, Birmingham) is to be held, and Yvonne or another group representative is invited to attend.</li> <li>• <b>SIGs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Two new SIGs have been created: Marketing and Communications, and Metadata. The groups presented to the Directors Board, with their activities arising from earlier regional meetings. Expected both will organise initial meetings or events later in the year. Neither is representative yet but lists of those involved and further information are on the website.</li> <li>○ Discussions around 'senior staff' group are ongoing, with a survey sent to all Directors to distribute to establish degree of any interest from the membership.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Conference:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Theme Building Bridges (10th Sept 2019, Nottingham Uni) - and as noted, anticipated next year will return to Birmingham.</li> <li>○ 17th June review meeting to agree the papers. Submissions around the same level as last year - more workshops though.</li> <li>○ Some sponsors gained, although not (yet) as much as last year.</li> <li>○ Could be the final year running under the current 'free attendance' model, as a detailed review will be held afterwards to see if the event remains practical and effective in its current formulation.</li> <li>○ Hope to see some people in attendance from the Copyright group as speakers and delegates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Website</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Groups can have access to the website if wished to edit their pages, with guidance from Gareth, although very limited support beyond that.</li> <li>○ More news items, especially from group events, are wanted for the website. Currently, not all events are written up, which doesn't demonstrate the full scope of the Collaboration's activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Webinars:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RDMSG interested in webinars so looking for more information (and especially experience and platforms) which could be used within the Collaboration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Reports</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Annual report 2018 is live for Information.</li> <li>○ Following Board discussions, a <i>Tangible Outputs of Collaboration</i> document is now in development. In many ways a companion piece to Annual report</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Board</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Next Board is 10th October, speaker is Nick Poole of CILIP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

## 5. Copyright Games

### New version of publishing trap:

- Chris/Jane unable to attend today, extended an invite to a future meeting – group agree needs full meeting of its own.
- Speculatively in Nov 19, at Warwick, **Action: Yvonne to find their availability and then Doodle poll the group**

YB

### Discussed group experience of using game-based learning:

- Group broke out to look at some sample copyright games (inc publishing trap)

### Other experience/Game models shared:

- Card games
- Board games (snakes and ladders, monopoly, publishing trap etc)
- Escape rooms
- Mystery box (treasure hunt)
- Gameshow formats

### General play-based learning discussion:

- Generally group have experience of using games based learning with library colleagues and it is seen as effective for that audience
- Limited experience of using games with academic staff/students
- YB: recently shared concept with colleagues in uni 'Open Research Group' as part of library offer; got good response from there but mixed with 'some of my colleagues wouldn't buy it'
- Group discussed general difficulty in marketing copyright training to academic staff, particularly teaching staff
- Part of challenge is the time taken to run the games (average 1+ hours) – hard to get academic to commit
- Shared various experience of successfully marketing the training as VLE training, 'using resources', tagging into other sessions etc, so it is not a matter of getting academics to buy into purely copyright
- Some success found through creating eLearning modules, however challenges around accessibility and user access. **Action: YB agreed to share Warwick's eLearning course.** Also free materials available via Glasgow uni
- LF: shared experience that internal VLE audit project drove interest in copyright training – not clear how well this would translate to game based sessions though.

YB

### Gaz/Chris – info from steering group level:

- Shared that there is interest from the Mercian Steering Group for events with play-based learning, and an appetite for events that combine elements of two or more interest groups
- **Action: Group to consider if we wanted to deliver a game based learning event for the wider collaboration?**

Group

6. Plan S – updated implementation guidelines		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation date has been pushed back by a year</li> <li>• Policy announcements may not be til March 2020</li> <li>• Intention remains for HE/author to retain the copyright for AAM etc (move IP to institutions and researchers)</li> <li>• Discussed possible effect this could have on university IP policies (i.e. where unis take copyright but routinely pass it back to authors)</li> <li>• Discussed possible effects on student research – i.e. who owns the data of PhD research?</li> <li>• Sill a preference for CC-BY license (but grantee may be able to justify CC-BY-ND or CC-BY-SA)</li> <li>• Question of grantee justification; how will they know if they need alternate licence? How will they know how to request it?</li> <li>• So far only Plan S guidance – still awaiting UKRI consultation on guidelines for UK implementation of Plan S</li> <li>• No statement from UKRI on harmonisation with Plan S</li> <li>• No clear statements from publishers around Plan S – i.e. no detailed agreement to offer compliance</li> <li>• Research Libraries UK are undertaking work to assess cost of moving to Open Access (working with JISC collections to run varying models). Cost implications seem substantial.</li> <li>• Potentially facing a scenario of moving from one set of “big deals” to another</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion around future meeting re: schol comms &amp; training material re: research copyright:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next meeting originally planned to focus on copyright within Plan S/UKSCL</li> <li>• Originally aimed for this group to produce training material around this</li> <li>• Discussion held about “are we the right group to lead this?”</li> <li>• Levels of involvement delegates to this group have with research copyright very variable</li> <li>• Research Support group exists outside of Mercian framework – potentially best to touch base with them first, group agree that would potentially be good as a joint project</li> <li>• <b>Action: Yvonne to contact the research group and feedback if there is appetite for collaboration</b></li> </ul>	YB
7. Digital accessibility regulations		
	<p><b>Discussion on new requirements for accessibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New guidance from government puts timeline on content accessibility/statements – sept for new content, 2020 for old content</li> <li>• Library websites a concern (although in many instances IT or uni wide web teams will be leading this)</li> <li>• Discussion about challenges to libraries as we use so much third-party content (i.e. documentation and platforms from publishers and suppliers) feeling is this needs to be negotiated with suppliers. Preferably as SUPC element.</li> <li>• Not sure “how deep” requirement goes – i.e. do we need to retrospectively amend scans, repository content etc or can we use one statement across the whole service area?</li> <li>• Lack of clarity on rolled over content such as scans – are they old or new content?</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be useful to test cortex reader for legacy scans to see if sufficient</li> <li>• Some guidance includes 2-3 checks per resource and running screen reader software on at least one page per document</li> <li>• JISC Aspire project assessed accessibility of supplier content – might be useful reference</li> <li>• OU ran similar project of assessing accessibility of supplier content on a RAG system</li> <li>• Discussed that some provisions will need a statement because the specialist nature makes it untenable to improve access across the whole resource in the short term, e.g. such as EEBO, but can be provided on an as-need basis when identified (e.g. by student services liaison)</li> <li>• Shared awareness that accessibility is made more challenging by digital and information literacy levels, e.g. there are instances where users are either underconfident with the access software, or underconfident with the content itself – this is why its important to work alongside access support staff to meet bespoke needs and ability levels (as per every user)</li> </ul>	
<b>8. AOB</b>		
<b>Issues with mailing list</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yvonne had feedback from a few people around issues sending/receiving mail from the MCG jiscmail</li> <li>• Anyone who has/does encounter issues please email Yvonne direct to let her know so she can resolve</li> </ul>	<b>Group</b>
<b>Secretary role</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Luke has change in employment – not in copyright remit (but has identified replacement for BCU)</li> <li>• Needs to handover secretary role – <b>Action: any volunteers please contact directly or via list</b></li> <li>• Not an onerous role – producing minutes, agendas and liaising with host institutions</li> </ul>	<b>Group</b>
<b>Learning on screen</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning on screen offer ‘copyright and creative reuse in education’ as a training session</li> <li>• Generally, only available in London</li> <li>• Learning on screen willing to come to Birmingham or other venue to deliver training in collaboration with us</li> <li>• Either open session (i.e. bookable) or a closed session for the MCG</li> <li>• Group expressed interest in this – would like to know the definitive cost model/availability before deciding audience</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: Alex to follow up with LOS and come back to group via MCG mailing list</b></p>	<b>AF</b>
<b>BL accessibility pilot</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RT asked if group have experience or have signed up to BL accessibility pilot, but none aware their HEI had</li> <li>• Queried over the claim they could/would supply access copies of works that a university did not own a copy of</li> <li>• BL statement is that its cleared under 31B</li> <li>• Group also considered it may be under Library Privilege</li> <li>• More commonly use RNIB Bookshare/College and consensus was this is best checked before looking to BL</li> </ul>	
<b>Date of next meeting: Thursday September 5<sup>th</sup> 10:00-12:00, Loughborough University</b>		