

Mercian Copyright Group meeting Nov 29th 2023

Apols: Hazel Barham (Newman), Helen Bond (Newman), S.Dar (Wolverhampton), Georgina Dimmock (Northampton), Emma Sansby (Bishop Grosseteste), Inga Jones (Open)

Present: Stuart Bentley (Wolverhampton), Lisa Bird (Birmingham), Sophie Bishop (Keele), Luke Fowler (Wolverhampton) (chair), Yvette Howley (Open), Louise Jakes (Open), Ruth Jenkins (Mercian), Shaun Kennedy (Bishop Grosseteste), Guy Lavender (Open) (notes), Caroline Lloyd (Nottingham), Caroline Long (Aston), Rob Melocha (Leicester), Amanda Padden (Wolverhampton), Donya Rowan (Derby), Tania Rowlett (Leicester), Tom Rowley (Birmingham City), Cristina Rusu (Loughborough), Rohit Tailor (de Montfort)

For Reference: Mercian Copyright Group webpage link (with thanks to Ruth):

<https://merciancollaboration.org.uk/mercian-copyright-group>

Meeting Notes:

1. Chair welcomed all members and new members. Quick introductions from all
2. Chair went through previous actions.
3. Arising from previous actions, discussion about group identity and support from Mercian Group.
 - 3.1. Ruth asked whether this group would prefer to be a Special Interest Group (SIG) or Community of Practice (COP). Group needs to advise Mercian Directors by 14th December of preference, and Directors will then decide. If SIG, will be expected to have some limited outputs (such as reports, events, training, conference presentations) and group/chair and office bearers would be accountable for delivery. If COP, informal support group to share information and practice about copyright. **[Action: All. To respond to questionnaire when circulated]**
 - 3.2. Ruth did ask about contribution to Mercian Conference. Proposal in Spring and conference in September. Not automatic that will have slot. Mercian don't contribute to expenses for travelling, conference attendance etc.
 - 3.3. Luke felt a community of practice seemed preferable. Caroline, Donya, Stuart and Guy all expressed broad agreed.
 - 3.4. Ruth: request for group to check they are on JISC mailing list. **[Action: All. To check that on email list and can subscribe/unsubscribe using this link: <https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/wa-jisc.exe?AO=MERCIAN-COPYRIGHT>**

4. **Storage area and resources for copyright training and advocacy.** Aim was to have a space for sharing resources and pooling tools. Ruth said that Mercian don't have any obvious solutions, Google is becoming increasingly difficult through institutional controls, but SCOUNL might be an option as soon as they have contracted their new IT provider and hosting service. Academic Libraries North (ALN) have a file sharing set up on this page: [Copyright Community of Practice | Academic Libraries North](#) **[Action: ALL. Please check that you can access the Mercian Copyright Group link at start of this note, and the minutes etc. listed].**
5. **Ukraine Partner Scheme** – nothing significant to update. Guy reported international restrictions on copyright remained a barrier for online partnering.
6. **Sensus Access Stats** - Lisa updated on the challenge with usage data. Use has increased in response to making service more widely known e.g. amongst dyslexic users, but historic data is deleted as required by Data Protection Act, so difficult to interrogate as regards user specific detail. Caroline reported that also using Brickfield Accessibility Toolkit for Moodle <https://www.brickfield.ie/brickfield-accessibility-toolkit/> with promising results, and able to differentiate requests from staff and students. Lisa mentioned concerns about people creating content without due permissions since Sensus Access seems not to prioritise potential breaches of copyright. Caroline noted Kate Vasili wrote a risk management note on this issue, and will circulate. Some discussion about authentication and access. **[Action: Caroline. To try and find and circulate Kate's note].**
7. **Resources Spreadsheet.** **[Action: All. Attempt to access resources]**
8. **Rights Retention.** Donya spoke about how Derby have rolled out their Rights Retention Strategy and related policies. As a result of the Rights Retention Policy, more copyright information was added to the IP Policy, informed by policies from a number of other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Aim is for a perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, non-exclusive licence in any academic outputs to be granted to the institution. Derby also created a Rights Retention Statement for publishing and a comprehensive FAQ doc. But they do have an opt out to comply with any funding requirements that might have different licensing requirements. Implementation began in August and required significant discussion with academic colleagues. Derby also created a LibGuide about rights retention and sent policies to various institutional committees. It was felt this empowered people and encouraged researchers, especially where they had little knowledge about Open Access. Key next step is to analyse publisher contracts in light of the new policies. Sophie – Keele are earlier in the process, but exploring similar approach. Also finding some lack of clarity about who owns IP and a slightly different position from other HEIs. Question about long from outputs. Donya mentioned UKRI are putting out some guidance which might lead to a revision of their guidance. Lisa said similar experiences, and Alex doing work with scholarly comms team, and leading to a timely review of IP policies. Draft policy was being reviewed by solicitors. One issue was that academics and PGRs don't really know much about Creative Commons licences, so thinking about training to address this. Also mentioned a JISC file store with Rights Retention information and a good template letter from Sheffield-Hallam
9. **Artificial Intelligence.** Donya – have guidance on their site regarding AI. Expectation that it is used transparently. Supporting responsible use since think it difficult to stop students and staff from using it. Need to consider new ways of assessment since AI and danger with

“hallucinations” – AI falsifying references in support of academic writing. Luke mentioned people putting copyright content into LLMs and the challenge with who is responsible for this. Guy mentioned that some organisations are “opting out” of having their content scraped, but risks with not enabling staff and students to use AI responsibly. Ruth mentioned that AI was already high on the list of topics for the conference (as is the impact of AI on EDI). Lisa – noted publishers may have to engage with AI to facilitate discovery of their content and companies like Ex Libris might need to think how we use AI to search across publishers. Cristina noted that there is an unwillingness to engage with the issues around AI. Lisa felt digital literacy has never been more important. Shaun mentioned how things like Grammarly impact on current activities.

10. Music Licences and PMLL. Tom shared his recent experience with PMLL which saw very little take up, despite regular promotions, with self-reporting being a significant blocker. Difficulty with monitoring use. Tom felt guidance was needed to fill the gap between CDPA and MPA Code of Practice. They devised a QI code to guidance for prominent posting in the Library. Tom wondered if a change of more active policing of activity was warranted. Some thinking about value from PMLL. Caroline noted they had asked their music department to pay for PMLL from the outset, but did wonder if anyone would complete the forms. Tom agreed to circulate his summary. **[Action: Tom. To circulate notes to this group].**

11. AOB – Luke asked if anyone else would like to be on the co-ordinating group.