Mercian Collaboration Directors Board

Minutes

19th March 2017, University of Nottingham

18/01 Apologies & Introductions

Present: Dave Parkes (Chair, DMU), Diane Job (Vice-Chair, Birmingham), Paul Reynolds (Treasurer), Emma Walton (SG, Loughborough), Fiona Parsons (SG, Wolverhampton), Simon Bevan (Cranfield), Caroline Taylor (Leicester), Caroline Williams (Nottingham), Mark Toole (NTU), Rosie Jones (OU), Maria Carnegie (Derby), Angela Brady (Aston), Enid Pryce-Jones (BCU), Chris Porter (Newman), Chris Powis (Northampton), Ian Snowley (Lincoln), Emma Sansby (BGU), Judith Keene (Worcester), Robin Green (Warwick), Keith Jenkins, Neil Grindley (Jisc), Sue Ackermann (Nottingham)

Apologies: Debora Findlay (UCB), Rosie Jones (OU), Kathryn Greaves (Harper Adams), Phil Brabban (Coventry), Kirsty Kift (MSDG)

18/02 National Bibliographic Knowledgebase (NBK)[1] & Jisc Matters

Neil Grindley (Jisc, Head of Resource Development) and Keith Jenkins (Jisc, Senior Account Manager) had been invited to attend the meeting to discuss the NBK and also update the Directors on Jisc related developments.

Neil presented on the NBK, noting he'd been working on it for a year. He was struck by the institutions within the Mercian, and realised he had not had a detailed discussion about the NBK with many of the organizations represented. Hence, today's talk was a kick off for a longer conversation about it. While the name may evolve, the aim is to bring library catalogue and holdings data in one place, and then link to other data sources, such as circulation. The hope is that it will inform collection management decisions but also help users to find print and digital sources. COPAC is optimised for print, while NBK aims for online and print.

Neil provided an overview as how the NBK sits within data and users, along with related Jisc systems. The BL is one of the strategic partners, along with RLUK and SCONUL, and they are thinking about more peer sharing and document delivery between libraries. When NBK overtakes COPAC's institutional contributors, this will be a key point, as it represents the achievement of a 'critical mass' for the project. Neil and colleagues have been making direct visit to libraries to talk with staff about the practical steps to becoming involved. This is followed with a questionnaire to provide an overview of readiness of involvement, and to identify if there are sensitive areas of information within the local catalogue to be considered. He noted that the project is out of scope with public and FE libraries (with a few exceptions) as well as non-UK libraries (Trinity College Dublin is an exception).

Another milestone was to make an interface available, although currently this is not a finished slick one[2]. The desire is for NBK to sit among the other Jisc services, but it is also an engagement programme, as much as a service itself. NBK represents a Jisc/OCLC partnership, because of OCLC's experience in globally delivering this sort of initiative, with Neil highlighting the international interest in this area. NBK is now in year two of the project, and it is very clear that NBK requires the data from university libraries to make the service work. However, they are also thinking about other data sources and how they bring them in as well (e.g. repositories, publishers, web sources). Interfaces are another growth area, with work also to be done on sustainability and participation.

---

[1] For slides see https://libraryservices.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2018/03/phase2/ or contact nbk-copac@jisc.ac.uk for more information

[2] See http://nbkbeta.copac.jisc.ac.uk

The *NBK Participant Framework* is key to this whole enterprise, as the intention is to retire COPAC and SUNCAT in July 2019, as NBK builds on and supersedes them. There is also a 'superuser' role for data contributors, which will let them do more with the NBK (e.g. benchmarking) than basic users, a function which may be chargeable for non-NBK contributors (e.g. overseas organisations). Neil stressed how NBK can add value by helping with collection management activities, NBK can also provide bespoke search functions (e.g. M25 are talking about this), although such a use would be a chargeable activity.

The Chair opened the floor to debate and comments. It was noted the time and effort to contribute could be a barrier in terms of local enhancements and staff workloads. Neil outlined this would be a conversation between NBK and local teams to scope. Another barrier were ICT priorities within some larger organisations. Here it was suggested that model business cases and a pitch on benefits/value proposition for organisations could be shared within the Mercian and other user communities, to help overcome this. Hence, this sort of support was something which Jisc could do to potentially aid libraries in taking up the participation offer and to address the practicalities of adding institutional holdings/catalogue/collections data. It was suggested there may be clusters of kinds of institutions and that regionality may not be the best match, in terms of shared implementation experiences, which Neil acknowledged. It has been proposed to share experiences from those institutions who have already shared their data with the NBK, which was agreed as desirable, with Caroline T noting how Leicester had been one institution which had successfully contributed their data.

Neil noted there is thinking in public libraries along similar lines, so Jisc is monitoring where there is overlap or 'touch points' between academic and public libraries for these sort of online collection collating resources. A question was raised about ebooks and who this data is valuable to, libraries or end users. Neil commented that the NBK was more targeted at researchers looking for rare or unusual material. Another comment concerned NBK as representing a managed withdrawal from inter-library loans, which raised questions about the target market (since COPAC/SUNCAT are used heavily by document supply teams). Neil said there were different messages to different community, with a Jisc focus for NBK as a foundational tool for collection management. However, increasingly though, ideas around efficient access to print and digital had climbed up the agenda.

The Chair broadened the discussions to include Keith, asking how Jisc Account Managers work with HEIs, and given, for example, how NBK is a highly complex piece of work, to what extent conversations they were having with HEIs could sufficiently encompass this? Keith noted this was a fair comment, and an issue which had been raised at stakeholder forums. There was an acknowledged need for account managers to meet more often with HEI to discuss needs, especially about NBK and consider where better support could be provided. Given NBK is a Jisc priory, Neil and Keith noted a need to work more closely with institutions, essentially when trying to reach project targets.

It was noted by some Directors that IT directors seem to be main point of Jisc contact, and this represents a major issue, as they may not always be the most appropriate contact for many service aspects. The Chair highlighted how this IT perspective can skew conversations, and ideally libraries need to be 'in the room' at the same time. Keith agreed Jisc needed to engage more with libraries, although it was highlighted that unlike IT, Jisc currently lacked a flagship library centric event. Keith noted this was a development Jisc are looking at and conversations with David Prosser and Ann Rossiter (RLUK and SCONUL) are ongoing in this respect.

Keith moved on to note that conversations about subscriptions lay ahead, and more information post-Easter will be forthcoming. The Chair noted again, this underscored the importance of libraries being

involved with account managers. Keith highlighted how the FE sector now had a voluntary Jisc subscription scheme, due to funding cuts. He also noted his expectation that Jisc subscriptions would remain the same, in line with inflation as this year, assuming funding remains the same. He admitted that some of the connections with the HE sector may have become severed with the Jisc reorganisations, meaning conversations have been not happening with the sane efficacy or regularity as might have been expected previously, and his presence today was a step towards addressing this. Keith also noted he was keen to work more closely with the MC to aid in these ongoing conversations.

Keith and Neil noted there was the potential for Jisc to return to talk about AI with the Collaboration, if it was desired. The Chair thanked Neil and Keith for their contributions.

ACTION: Neil to supply slides of talk for distribution to Directors' list

18/03 Preparations for GDPR

The Chair introduced an open discussion on GDPR and invited comments. It was suggested that where organisations were DPA compliant, then they would be largely okay, although no organisation is 100% DPA compliant. Considerable FUD (fear, uncertainty & doubt) relating to data protection (DP) was highlighted in parts of many represented organisations. I.e. while libraries had largely been able to abide by DP regulations with no major disasters, GDPR compliance had caused some organisations considerable operational concerns. The meeting agreed an aim of 'broad compliance', typified as a 'journey' was the most desirable and realistic outcome, as perfection was unlikely to be achieved.

Some Directors highlighted issues including research data and non-centrally hosted or 'unstructured' data held by individual faculties or departments, as areas of concern or potential risk. Fund raising activities were also highlighted as a problem, along with addressing issues of using consent or legitimate interest to provide a legal basis for personal data processing. The Chair, and others, noted the risks which email auto-complete addresses proffered in terms of potential DP incidents. Third party exchange of information was also noted as a key area, especially in terms of security, as overcoming risks often required highly specialised technical work. Notably, many Directors highlighted organisational concerns that addressing GDPR was difficult, given the legislation was not yet complete. Consequently, resistance to implementing any changes to DP practices until a greater clarity arrived, had been observed in some quarters. However, the Chair stressed that the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) had indicated 'Doing nothing, is no excuse for non-compliance'.

Emma W noted that Loughborough was planning to bring in a Data Coordinator role for each of their schools, to oversee ongoing compliance activities. Some concerns were expressed over the position of HEIs as public bodies and commercial organisations, led to some blurred lines in terms of DP activities. Most institutions noted they had instigated a training programme in preparation for the change in legislation, although staff engagement varied. Steps to move personal data more onto central systems with documented procedures, were also seen as a further key area for ensuring effective compliance. Some institutions were proactively reducing the physical personal data they held through increased confidential shredding. One institution noted they had encountered issues over lecture capture, and were seeking to resolve this contractually with new staff members, but were not addressing the issue with staff already employed, where consent would continue to be used.

Caroline T highlighted the *OneTrust* privacy management software, which enables the creation of a central asset register and records of processing, along with dealing with data privacy impact assessments, incident reporting etc as well. Jisc was asked if a national deal for this could be considered, which Keith agreed to investigate. The question of guidance from Jisc on DP matters was raised, noting that some engagement had been useful, although the Jisc DP distribution list had been

the primary source of support. Keith noted he was keen to hear of areas where the MC thought Jisc could lend particular DP support in the future.

ACTION: Keith Jenkins to investigate potential for a Jisc deal for OneTrust software

It was suggested libraries could compare what they were doing with within the Mercian region, and potentially further afield, to benchmark themselves in DP activities. It was noted while some HEIs have legal services leading on GDPR, this was not true for others where responsibility often fell on IT or library services. Some concerns about the level of post-May 25th subject access requests were noted.

The Chair summarised how it seemed everyone was on a similar journey towards compliance and achieving the desired cultural change was always going to be a challenge.

The preparations for the MC and GDPR were noted as being likely small-scale, although GJJ was still seeking clarity from the SG and SCONUL as to where the responsibly lay.

ACTION: GJJ and SG to coordinate over MC GDPR preparations

18/04 Governance
a) Minutes of the Previous Meeting, Actions and Matters arising
Mark noted that there was an error referring to the Learning Spaces Toolkit, which had been attributed to SCONUL when it was actually UCISA who had produced it. Beyond this correction, the minutes were accepted as an accurate record.

17/12(d) CT (Leicester) to take thoughts on inter-regional collaboration back to the SCONUL Board to consider
Caroline noted there had been a brief conversation, but this had provided an opportunity to feed comments into SCONUL's strategic thinking. The Board recognised there is an opportunity for SCONUL and regional groups to engage more, assuming questions of reasonability and value can be clarified. Caroline noted the incoming SCONUL Deputy Director would lead on an intended increased engagement with regional groups, feeding into discussions about what SCONUL membership wanted. Hence, some form of SCONUL/MC engagement would be attempted later this year.

17/13(a) GJJ to gather perceptions from Directors towards adopting a regional digital preservation training endeavour.
GJJ reported about half of the Directors had responded, and he had tabled a report[3] on the comments he had received. It appeared digital preservation activities were not a current priority for Mercian members, but this may increase in the future. Notably, a skills gap in terms of digital preservation skills was recognised, and there were desires to address this workforce development need. However, presently little interest in the MC expending financial resource in alleviating this skills gap centrally had been evidenced. It was proposed this was a matter which the MC SIGs could explore further and bring their conclusions back to the Steering Group (SG)

ACTION: GJJ to feed DP development issues to the MSDG Chair for consideration

---

[3] Johnson, G.J., 2018. *Potentialities for Collaborative Enabled Digital Preservation Training within the Mercian Region*. Mercian Collaboration. Available at:
https://merciancollaboration.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Digital%20Preservation-March-2018.pdf

17/13(d) All Directors to speak with local HR reps to discuss practicalities of staff exchanges within the Mercian region
This was noted by the Chair and Directors present as an ongoing action.

17/13(d) ACTION: DP and GJJ to draw up 'enabling statement' for talent management for the Website
This was in progress, and a statement would go live on the website shortly.

b) SCONUL Subgroup: Working relationship

Paul, who had been leading on this for the MC, reported back on discussions around the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and revised SCONUL relationship. After a considerable hiatus the revised MoU was received back in Nov 2017, just prior to the previous Directors Board meeting (see 17/12(b)). The SG has since then considered, revised and provided feedback to SCONUL on its terms, and requested clarification on various issues. A process of feedback is still in progress, and currently the SG is waiting on final reactions to our suggested revisions.

Paul illustrated to the Directors issues of concern had included:
- Representation on the SCONUL Board for regional groups (envisaged as one individual for all three SCONUL regional groups)
- Return of MC money if it folded. Originally given as 'equally', now revised to accommodate subscription bands
- Proposed independent mediation of MC/SCONUL difficulties arrangements
- Employment and grievance mediation arrangements for the MCDO
- Notice period to wind up the MC (increased from 3 to 6 months)

Notably, this has been a very slow process, due to communication lags, to which SCONUL staffing issues likely contributed. The SG has also been talking to other regional library collaborations, notably the Northern Collaboration, to ensure we are all on the same page. It was noted we do not as of yet have a final MoU document. Additionally, in some areas we have been unable to achieve resolution to our full satisfaction, which has given the SG concerns. However, it was hoped that discussions would be concluded soon, as Paul assumed there was a desire to finalise this revised relationship arrangement as soon as possible to stave off potential VAT charges.

CT fed back on discussions behalf of the SCONUL Board. On the issue of the regional representation, the Board had initially thought the request was for one for each collaboration, rather than a single figure. She noted that the latter option was seen as a more workable option, although this had not yet been agreed. She noted further discussions were needed with other collaborations, especially relating to how SCONUL's strategy is manifested in these relationships, and noting the importance of the regional collaborations being able to input into these.

While the SG has been handling negotiations on behalf of the MC, it was agreed that the final document would be shared with all Directors for final comments, before the SG signed off on it.

ACTION: SG to continue and satisfactorily conclude discussions and revisions to MoU with SCONUL
ACTION: Chair to distribute finalised MoU for Directors review and approval
ACTION: ALL to feedback to Chair comments on MoU before it is signed off by the SG

5

Last updated GJJ 1st May 2018

c) Treasurer's Update

Paul reported on the MC's finances. He noted all membership subscription invoices had been agreed and paid, with no issues arising. Our current projections for 2018 appear to be on track, leaving the MC with around ~£5k in reserve by the year's end. This accounts for funds set aside for the MSDG, other SIGs and conference costs (£2k, £1k and £7k respectively). Paul has been investigating the SCONUL admin charge made on the MC, and how this figure is arrived at, as it does not appear obvious. However, it was noted that requesting a breakdown would in itself increase the administration charge, which had proved problematic. Caroline T offered to assist in further clarifications.

ACTION: Paul and Caroline T to follow up with SCONUL on admin charge cost breakdown

A question was raised regarding the reserve and its relationship to the officer's salary, in the event of the MC closing down, but the Treasurer noted that was not felt to be an issue.

d) Proposed Changes to SIG Event Funding Procedures

Paul and GJJ noted that they had been exploring with SIGs the use of limited windows of application for event funding. While the outgoing MSDG Chair had expressed concerns, this did not dovetail with their own planning cycle, no comments were received from the other SIG Chairs. It was agreed, to revisit this issue at the next SG meeting for clarification, but it seemed a reasonably viable approach.

As part of this exploration, the recently closed funding request window had yielded two applications for event funding. No applications against the MSDG budget were submitted during this period.

- **RDMSG**: GDPR & Research Data, 25th April 2018: £239.96 (Speaker Dr Scott Summers, travel and day rate, VAT exempt)
- **MDF**: Inclusion: Back to Basics, 26th June 2018: £550 (Speaker Alistair McNaught & AbilityNet Demo, +VAT for some elements). An alternative schedule was also submitted.

SIG sponsors (Fiona and Phil) noted their support for these bids. After a brief discussion it was agreed to fund both of these SIG events, noting this effectively concluded the MC event funding for SIG events in 2018, with the exception of the Conference and the MSDG.

ACTION: GJJ to notify SIG Chairs of their funding bid success and help coordinate event delivery

A point was raised that reviewing these bids was more operational than strategic, and hence should be dealt with by the SG. It was agreed that in future all SIG funding requests would go to the SG for review, rather than coming to the Directors Board. This had been the case with applications prior to this procedural revision, and clearly was the preferred option.

18/05 Priorities & Action Plan

a) Conference 2018

As MCG Chair Emma W reported on preparations. She noted new organising committee members had been recruited to replace outgoing ones, and that the team was keen to move forward on the Conference preparations, despite issues with meeting during the recent snowy weather. She noted the conference date and venue is set at 11th Sept 2019, University of Birmingham. There is space for 100 delegates, and also for sponsor exhibitors. The theme, 'New to You!', is intended to encourage papers on activities which may not be 'trailblazing', but were still novel within their locality and worthy of dissemination. It is a broad theme, and the intention is to attract a broad array of speakers at all seniority levels. Following feedback comments and committee review, more networking time would be built into the programme this time. In terms of a keynote speaker, Emma invited suggestions from Directors, but noted a hope to draw on staff from within our institutions rather than satisfy this externally.

ACTION: All to pass suggestions of keynote speakers from within own institutions to Emma W and Conference Group members

As previously agreed by Directors (17/14(a)), sponsorship rather than delegate fees would be used to support costs, alongside funding from the MC itself. As #Mercian17 benefited from DMU's generosity in providing a free venue, Emma noted the overall costs for #Mercian18 were likely to be considerably higher. However, she thanked Diane for allowing the Conference to be charged at an 'internal delegate rate', which had diminished costs. Emma was however hopeful sponsorship would yield income to support covering event costs.

GJJ and Emma had revised the sponsorship policy, after support from the SG and consultation with the Conference Group members, and would go live shortly. She noted, one sponsor has already been in talks with the MC, and a second was potentially very interested. She underlined as sponsors would be present, that it was crucial for a good turnout of Directors to be present on the day, as access to senior staff was seen as a major ROI for sponsoring organisations.

ACTION: All Directors to strongly consider attending the Mercian Conference

Space for SIGs to have a presence on the day was possible, although preference would be given to sponsoring organisations. Emma encouraged those SIGs who wished to do something, to contact the CG to discuss their options.

ACTION: SIG Chairs to liaise with Emma W and CG members over representation

b) SDG Buddying Scheme

GJJ reported on this on behalf of the SDG, who had discussed this the preceding week at their own meeting. It was noted while there had been a decrease in 2018 from applicants to the scheme, there was a positive response from those who had already engaged with it. Evaluation of these experiences was an ongoing task for the SDG Committee. It had been noted that the scheme needed some more promotion, and that GJJ and the SDG Chair would be taking this matter forward. The Chair noted his thanks to GJJ and the SDG for their efforts, noting he was very happy with progress and the clear benefits emerging from the scheme. It was suggested working in mention of the buddying scheme to new staff member's probation or performance reviews, as a way of increasing awareness and engagement. Ideally re-promoting it at the conference would also be a powerful way to draw in new participants.

Last updated GJJ 1st May 2018

ACTION: GJJ and MSDG Chair to re-promote Buddying Scheme in Q22018
ACTION: MSDG to consider promoting Buddying Scheme at the 2018 Conference
ACTION: Directors to consider promoting the Buddying Scheme within their own staff performance review procedures

c) Mercian Annual Report 2017

GJJ noted the draft report had been circulated, and bar a few minor typos which had been corrected, was now complete as a record of the MC's activities. The report was received by the Chair on behalf of Directors, commenting how great it was to see such a breadth of activity. The Chair also noted the report itself had a value in creating such an accessible summation, and thanked all contributors. GJJ noted he was keen for more, and perhaps more diverse, content for the 2018 report, which would be developed to align activities with SCONUL's Charitable Objectives. It was agreed that the report should be promoted and distributed further.

ACTION: GJJ to submit the 2017 Annual Report to the SCONUL Director
ACTION: GJJ to promote the 2017 Annual Report via web, email lists and social media
ACTION: All Group Chairs and MC Officers to begin considering their submissions for the 2018 Annual Report

d) Collaboration Development Officer (MCDO) Report

GJJ highlighted a few items from his previously submitted written report on activities[4], including preparations for GDPR, the website and launch of the mercian-collaboration@jiscmail discussion list. The MCDO also briefly referred to his report on digital preservation (18/04(a). It was noted once again by Directors, how the increasing activity within the Mercian Collaboration was likely impacting on the time available to the MCDO. The Chair and SG agreed to keep this under regular review.

The Chair thanked the MCDO for their continued efforts in managing the Collaboration's portfolio of activities.

ACTION: SG to continue monitoring of MCDO's efforts against available time resource

18/06 Special Interest Group (SIG) Reports

a) Mercian Copyright Group (MCG)

The MCG has formed, and revised their outline Terms of Reference as requested. Elections for committee members were held with Yvonne Budden (Warwick) now formally acting as the group's chair. The MCG has representation on the website, and will be recruiting committee members from those institutions not yet represented within the group.

b) Mercian Disability Forum (MDF)

As noted earlier, they have a planned event on 'Inclusion: Back to Basics' for June. They have met once as a group to begin planning, and will be meeting again in early May to finalise event plans. They seem to have a positive plan for their way forward, and have been speaking with their sponsor (Phil) for advice and support. Like the MCG, they aim to recruit a more representative committee from MC members.

---

[4] Available on the website, under Key Documents

Last updated GJJ 1st May 2018

c) RDM Support Group (RDMSG)

An event is planned on RDM and GDPR at Nottingham in April, which is part-funded by the DPC to reduce costs. Their discussion list while relatively low traffic, has proved to be of use, and as with other SIGs, more representatives would be welcomed to participate. They too have been in discussion with their sponsor (Fiona), who reported positively on their progress.

d) Staff Development Group (MSDG)

Their most recent committee meeting was held 13th March, and Diane and GJJ were present. Kirsty Kift, outgoing chair, could not attend today but had sent a written report providing an overview of planned events for 2018/19. On behalf of the new MSDG Chair (Matt Cunningham, Loughborough) Kirsty invited comments and input from Directors on the programme, which will be finalised at the MSDG's June meeting.

Diane reported positively on discussions and planning at the MSDG meeting, noting the group's enthusiasm, and encouraged other Directors to provide their insight to the events programme through their own local reps. Robin proposed for the measuring impact event, that a session could be run using 'the learning game'. It was noted in 2019 there was a strong possibility for such an event, with an external speaker to facilitate this, which would make a valuable addition to the programme. It was noted following GJJ's report on digital preservation, perhaps something along these lines could be beneficial. It was agreed expert seeking input on this from both the MSDG and the RDMSG would be crucial.

ACTION: MSDG and RDMSG to consider digital preservation training events/training

With respect to the event on digital literacy, it was asked if this would tie into the work Jisc was doing? It was proposed this would be advisable to incorporate into the event plan. Operationally, it was noted the MSDG had raised a number of considerations regarding shifting from the free to the paid-for EventBrite platform, as this offered a number of advantages. The MSDG Committee were investigating costs, but were also considering issues around GDPR compliance. As this platform (and account) were currently used by all MC SIGs, this information was considered especially important.

ACTION: MSDG to report on EventBrite costs and DP compliance to GJJ

Regarding the event on the changing role of the library assistant, it was noted this suggested that there was a need for greater Director involvement in terms of specifying the kinds of input and direction such workforce developmental training like this should take. Hence, it was advised that all Directors should talk to their MSDG representative, and work together to consider what areas of local institutional workforce development were key. In this way, these interests could be more strongly represented within the future programme of events, better empowering and informing the MSDG about a greater range of workforce developmental needs.

ACTION: All Directors to feedback and discuss the proposed training programme with their institutional MSDG representative[5]

---

[5] See https://merciancollaboration.org.uk/sdg/representatives

Last updated GJJ 1st May 2018

e) SCONUL: To receive an update on activities

Caroline T spoke on behalf of the SCONUL Board which had held an away-day, agreeing an outline process for developing SCONUL's strategy. The current one runs to end of 2018, and a new one is required for 2019 onwards. The plan is during Feb-June to engage with regional groups, although as of yet the MC has not been approached in this respect. Members will be surveyed in April for views on the current strategy and its effects, and what remains to be addressed. At the summer conference, workshops will be held to further feed into these plans. In July SCONUL Officers will collate and review this information, with a mind to a draft strategy in September, and a finalised one in Nov-Dec 2018. Caroline noted the board has been conducting a SWOT analysis, and reviewing what it was thought members wanted or expected, in preparation. The outcome of the strategy is not fixed, and wide-ranging discussions are hoped for. The Chair noted it was important that MC Directors should take every opportunity to feed into these discussions, on behalf of their own HEIs and as members of the MC. The SG would seek to represent the MC's position on strategic Direction within these also.

ACTION: All Directors to engage proactively with SCONUL strategy discussions
ACTION: SG to represent MC interests within SCONUL strategy discussions

Caroline noted the MoU with regional groups had already been discussed, and thanked the SG for their participation. She also highlighted that SCONUL's leadership group was establishing a mentoring scheme. This had received a lot of interest, but it was difficult to get enough mentors onboard to launch publicity. She encouraged Directors to become involved as mentors. She also reported that the Workforce Development task and finish group has started work by setting up three subgroups (1) professional pipeline (where people enter) (2) workforce diversity and (3) staff development (leadership, training operations, development budgets etc)

Caroline highlighted the Content Forum and the Brighton SCONUL conference, and noted that Ruth Stubbins has started work as SCONUL's Deputy Director. Ruth's focus is on services, and particularly on the relationship with members and regional groups. Caroline finished by noting the SCONUL Design Award is on the horizon, and recommended Directors consider making a submission.

Jisc Report

While Keith had spoken earlier, the Chair invited any additional comments or thoughts.
Keith highlighted the Jisc Digital Resources Report, the eText licensing pilot, Jisc's new geospatial services (from Airbus, requires marketing), and their Library support and analytics programme. He also noted Jisc's support for OA policy compliance (including Sherpa/RoMEO's international licence), the National Archives Framework, FE skills and ebooks and My Jisc Portal. This latter item is useful, as it demonstrates all Jisc services your HEI is using and those available which they are not. The Chair thanked Keith for his input, and noted he may well be invited back to address future meetings.

ACTION: Keith to share reports and notes to Directors following the meeting

18/07 AOB

a) Wiley Representation

Emma S noted a visit from a Wiley Rep, who had asked if there was any appetite for publishers to present to the MC Directors. It was noted the rep had suggested this had also happened for the Northern Collaboration, and hence it would be helpful to know how the NC responded to the approach. While Emma noted the rep had stressed such a visit would not be a sales pitch, the agreement in the room was that there was little interest at this point for such an arrangement.

ACTION: GJJ to liaise with NC Officer regarding Wiley approach and report back to SG on outcome

Last updated GJJ 1st May 2018

b) SIG Chair Attendance at Directors Board

A question regarding SIG Chair's attendance at MC Directors' Board meetings was raised. While, historically, the MSDG Chair had attended both annual meetings, attendance from other, non-Director, SIG Chairs was unclear. It was agreed given the scale of the meeting already (23 Directors plus guest speakers) it was not desirable for SIG Chairs to routinely attend, but rather they would be invited to attend where they were requested to present a matter of substance. In this respect, a standing invite was made to the MSDG Chair to attend the spring (March) Directors' Board meeting, to present the proposed event programme. It was also noted that SIG sponsors should endeavour to attend one SIG committee meeting annually.

ACTION: GJJ to inform SIG Chairs of the policy on Directors' Board attendance
ACTION: SG SIG Sponsors to attend SIG meetings annually

c) MC Strategic Plans and Actions

GJJ highlighted from earlier discussions, ongoing engagement with other SCONUL regional collaborations, and SCONUL's own strategic direction, there appeared a need to revisit the MC's own strategic direction and action plan. Having now evolved into a mature organisation, and met its initial goals, it was agreed by the Chair and Directors the time was indeed ripe to initiate discussions along these lines. The SG would take the initial lead, and would report back to the Autumn Directors Board, for further exploration.

ACTION: SG to discuss strategic direction and future operations of the MC

d) Dates, Venue & Items for Future Meetings

The Chair noted the next meeting ideally would be held in the West Midlands. Enid offered BCU, and was gratefully accepted by the Chair. In the light of feeding back comments on the SCONUL strategy, an earlier (October) date rather than later (November) was preferred. It was agreed to avoid Monday for the next meeting, if possible.

ACTION: GJJ, the Chair and Enid to coordinate on date for the next Directors' Board meeting

GJJ noted to the Chair, the Steering Group would also need to set a date for their May telcon meeting.

ACTION: GJJ and Dave to arrange date for next Steering Group meeting

The Chair closed by thanking attendees, along with Caroline W for hosting the meeting.

Last updated GJJ 1st May 2018