BIC E4LIBRARIES ACCREDITATION TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP - Minutes
Conference call
Friday 9th January 2015, 10am

**Present**
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
Karen Carden, University of the Arts, London
Simon Edwards, BIC (Chair)
Kathryn Pattinson, Askews & Holts
Heather Sherman, Dawson / Bertram Group

**Apologies**
Andrew Coburn, Essex County Council Libraries
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries
Karina Luke, BIC

1. Welcome to the Call
SE welcomed the Group to the call and thanked them for phoning in at such an early stage in the New Year.

SE informed the Group that the documents being discussed throughout the call were circulated to them prior to the meeting. He noted the scale of the agenda but advised them that some items will be addressed as formalities and others due to their essential nature for the progression of the Project. SE commented that, since he could not make the call, AC left feedback on the documents prior to the meeting. He informed the Group that AC had not suggested any changes were necessary. SE asked the Group to send their feedback about these documents directly to him, should they have any. He also informed the Group that these documents will be circulated to the Libraries Committee for approval once this T&FWG has finalised them.

2. Deliverables and Progress so far

3.3 Comprehensive User Guide
SE commented that this guide will need to be written at a later stage in this Project’s lifetime.

3.4 Questionnaires
SE informed the Group that the Libraries questionnaire is almost completed and suggested that this questionnaire will be used to create a template for the online questionnaires which will be hosted on the new BIC website; once it has launched. SE noted that, since the last meeting of this Group, KP and HS have sent their feedback on the Library Stock Supplier questionnaire and this has since been amended. KP and HS noted that they are content with the scoring mechanism as it now stands but suggested that the questionnaire may need to be live in order to get other perspectives from other stock suppliers. The Group agreed, and noted that a glossary is not necessary for this questionnaire.

SE informed the Group that LMS providers and RFID providers etc. have been contacted, since the last meeting, requesting them to review and feedback on the vendor/service providers’ questionnaire. He noted that he is currently awaiting responses from those organisations.
3.5 Terms of Reference for the Accreditation Panel
SE noted that this document was circulated to the Group prior to the call. He noted that the panel members will need to possess a range of skills and that the Group will need to have representation from systems/service providers and stock suppliers as well as librarians. He noted that representation from a bibliographic organisation such as BDS would be beneficial too. Eric Green was suggested as a potential candidate for this panel; however, it was noted that BDS would need to be accredited first. The Group agreed bibliographic organisations should be approached to be on the new panel.
ACTION: AB to approach BDS about taking part in this accreditation panel.

3.6 Publicly available schedule of the accreditation cycle
SE informed the Group that the new panel for this scheme will meet on a regular basis. KC commented that the previous scheme’s cycle was unclear and this clarification will be a welcome change. The Group agreed that applications should be received two weeks before the panel meets, and all organisations whose applications are reviewed should hear the verdict of their accreditation within two weeks of the decision being made. They agreed that this panel should meet on a quarterly basis as per the cycle document circulated by SE; the exact months of the cycle to be confirmed at a later stage. They noted that the cycle will be outlined on the BIC website for all to see.

3.7 Agreed start date
The Group noted that February would be the initial month to receive applications for the current scheme. SE suggested that this new scheme will launch at the end of March or early April 2015. With this in mind, the Group agreed that the bulk of organisations who have previously applied for this type of accreditation should be accredited once more on the current scheme, but that any new applicant from April 2015 onwards will need to apply to the new scheme. They suggested that the old applicants should be sent the new questionnaire once it has been launched so that they can prepare for the following year’s application. HS suggested that these organisations should be free to apply for the new accreditation scheme any time after April 2015. She suggested that this would be a good way for the accredited organisations to test their application – and will reduce the issues they have with this new process. SE noted that this schedule is dependent on the new BIC website being live and the questionnaire functionality being implemented and full tested.

3.9 New scheme logo
SE noted that, prior to this meeting, he circulated the existing logo for this scheme. He questioned the Group about the requirements of the new logo, asking for a list of essentials. The Group agreed that a date / year should be present on the logo. SE questioned whether the logo should be more personalised by detailing what the organisation is commended for. The Group agreed that this isn’t necessary and would prove to be a challenge for the BIC team to organise; they suggested that they like the simplicity of the current logo. AB agreed, noting that organisations often use a copy of their accreditation logo in their email signatures, so the more simple the logo is the easier it will be to use for such purposes. The Group agreed that accredited organisations should be supplied a logo in a variety of sizes in light of this observation.
KC noted that having a year on the logo poses a problem for those who apply in the latter half of the year; especially the final quarter of the accreditation cycle. SE suggested that the final quarter should be supplied with the following year’s logo instead. They agreed to think this issue over and to discuss the matter again at the next meeting.

**ACTION:** ALL to consider how to resolve the issue of dates on the accreditation logo.

**ACTION:** AB to add this item to the agenda for the next e4Libraries T&FWG meeting.

The Group were relaxed about the design of the logo and suggested that this should be left to the designer. They reiterated that extra detail, such as “Highly Commended in...”, should only appear in the certificates for this scheme (which will contain the logo) not in the logo itself. They noted that successful applicants will receive a selection of logos in varying sizes (e.g. for printing, for website use etc.), and a certificate in the post. The Group agreed to leave the design of the certificates to the designer too.

3. **Panel for the newly revised scheme**

SE asked whether members of this T&FWG would also like to be members of the e4Libraries Accreditation Panel. The attendees of the call confirmed that they would like to be on this panel. KC noted that the University of the Arts, London is in the process of starting a new LMS project – which may result in limited spare time for KC – but she noted that she would like to be involved with the panel wherever possible.

**ACTION:** ALL to contact AB if they wish to be included on the panel for this new scheme – especially those who were not present on the call.

4. **Promotional ideas**

SE noted that he has found it difficult to stand back and see the Project from another perspective in order to see the benefits and disadvantages of the scheme. He noted that a marketing plan will need to be devised for promotional purposes. KC noted that the main selling-point of the scheme is bringing about efficiency but acknowledged that this would be hard to word appropriately to inspire the industry into applying. SE suggested that it should be straightforward to encourage vendors to get involved since accreditation will directly benefit them by specifying their achievements to their potential customers.

KC commented that ExLibris are not BIC members but noted that they have become far more engaged within the industry of late. She suggested that their involvement would be beneficial in promoting this scheme on a wide scale. SE noted that the aim is to also encourage suppliers to get on board too. HS suggested that this T&FWG should encourage vendors to look for customers who are accredited and should therefore question any organisation as to why they are not accredited, if that is the case. SE suggested that BIC should approach ExLibris to become BIC members and to encourage their involvement in the Library Technical Implementation Clinic. He noted that they would benefit from the process and from embracing industry standards.
Benefits Statement
SE noted that it was far easier to write the reasons why it would be bad for organisations to remain unaccredited but suggested that the benefits were more difficult to put into words. HS commented that many libraries do have a slick supply chain in place but often do not advertise this fact since they presume everyone works in the same way. She suggested that we need to be more pro-active in approaching libraries and encouraging their engagement with this scheme. She noted that this would facilitate ascertaining whether there are issues with their systems and whether each one does what it should be doing / was built to do. KP agreed, but suggested that this Group may need to take on a more informative role – telling libraries what to ask for in their system and letting them know the possible options available to them.

SE noted that, by writing the Benefits Statement, he wanted to get into the mind-frame of applicants to see what persuaded them to apply, or not to apply, and see why an organisation might choose not to be accredited. The Group agreed that more will need to be done to inform applicants that this scheme is available and that many of them already do enough to be accredited but have not yet applied/been accredited. HS noted her belief that it is harder to track the progress of academic libraries as opposed to public libraries. SE noted that BIC cannot specifically endorse a system but could instead list suppliers, systems and capabilities/functionality. He suggested that libraries could talk to other users of their systems to see what they do. He noted that the accreditation scheme cannot easily evaluate usability of a system and it is up to users to share this information with one another, e.g. with their user groups.

SE commented that gaining senior level endorsement would be hugely beneficial to the scheme’s progress and adoption. He noted that, with this in mind, he will reword some of the Benefits Statement, toning down the negative-sounding aspects. SE suggested that this document might be used internally by BIC or else may be distributed more widely for promotional purposes.

SE informed the Group that 45 organisations are currently accredited on this scheme at the moment (including some university libraries) but noted that this is a relatively small percentage of all those who could be accredited. He noted that the problem will be to get libraries to apply initially. KC suggested that systems suppliers should encourage their customers to get accredited. She noted their importance in this process. SE agreed, noting that a few have already agreed to work with BIC to promote the scheme. He noted that being able to say that “your supplier says you’re capable of getting accredited” would have more of an impact on organisations that are doubtful about applying.

Training, Events & Communications (TEC) Committee Brief
SE informed the Group that this document will give the TEC Committee the low down on this accreditation scheme, providing them with the background information required to be able to promote the scheme in its best light. He noted that this document was written with a view to creating a market plan.
SE noted that this T&FWG will also need to recruit people and organisations to promote the scheme to their contacts; not just the members of this Group. He suggested that support from senior management would help organisations with applying for accreditation, and noted that staff will need to gain backing from management in order to apply.

SE noted the importance of contacting BIC Non-Members to encourage them to apply, as well as BIC Members. He questioned how this Group might be able to contact BIC Non-Members en masse. HS suggested approaching acquisitions managers, many of whom are members of NAG. KC suggested that systems suppliers and stock suppliers would be able to draw up a list of potential candidates for accreditation but noted that they wouldn’t have a ready-made list and would require the time to draw up their list. SE noted that the TEC Committee will need to know who to target and that information will be informed by this Group. KC noted that all the larger academic libraries in Wales are now signed up to ExLibris; making it essential to contact them and encourage their support of this scheme. HS commented that many of the vendors are based outside the UK and if they don’t have informed local representation they may not apply for accreditation nor support the scheme with their library customers.

**ACTION:** ALL to consider how to go about approaching suppliers, etc. and who to enlist.

SE suggested that this Group’s main priority now should be collating a list of libraries to approach. KC noted that gaining the support of large systems suppliers is also important to the success of this scheme.

5. **A.O.B.**
   None.

6. **Date of the next meeting**
   SE commented that he envisages two further calls for this Project – one in February and one in March. The agreed dates are as follows:
   - Penultimate call: Friday 27th February 2015.
   - Final call: Monday 23rd March 2015.

   SE added that the T&FWG is planned to finish at the end of March so these two calls need to be very productive and any issues raised need to be resolved by the end of the March call. All deliverables will need to be written and approved by then.