

BIC E4LIBRARIES ACCREDITATION TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP - Minutes

Conference call

Monday 23rd March 2015, 10am

Present

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
Andrew Coburn, Essex County Council Libraries
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)
Kathryn Pattinson, Askews & Holts

Apologies

Karen Carden, University of the Arts, London
Karina Luke, BIC
Heather Sherman, Dawsons / Bertram Group

1. Apologies

SE welcomed the group to the call and read out the apologies for this meeting.

2. Welcome to the call

SE asked AB whether any progress has been made on the new BIC website. AB noted that some advancement has taken place but that progress is slow; a launch date for the site is not yet in place.

SE advised the Group that this call is to be the last meeting of this Group but noted that the Libraries Committee had suggested that further work is required for the promotion of this scheme before it can be fully signed off; they were, however, satisfied with the content of the scheme and signed this off during the Libraries Committee meeting on Wednesday 18th March 2015. SE suggested that any further work to this scheme – particularly to the promotion of the scheme – could be executed by the new accreditation panel members.

3. Feedback from the Libraries Committee

SE informed the Group that he had been surprised by the strength of the Libraries Committee's feedback about this new scheme. He noted that they have now suggested that the scheme should be renamed since 'e4Libraries' originated from the e4books Project that was set up by the library sector and this project no longer has any resonance within the industry. The Group agreed that it would be beneficial to rename the scheme, noting that the addition of 'Excellence' in the logo had been a revision of sorts. SE noted that BIC's Product Data Excellence Award (PDEA) is named concisely but commented that renaming this scheme in the same fashion, as the Library Excellence Award, would not be appropriate since the scheme incorporates all organisations within the library supply chain (not only libraries) and accredits for the technical excellence of the organisation in question. He suggested that prospective names for this accreditation scheme should be collated before the next meeting of the Libraries Committee for the Committee members to review.

CC noted that the Library Supply Chain Excellence Award would be entirely wrong but suggested that the Library Technology Excellence Award may be a more appropriate name for the new scheme. SE agreed this would be far more appropriate than 'Library Supply Chain'. CC suggested

Technology in Libraries Excellence, noting that it could be abbreviated to TILE. The Group liked this suggestion and the acronym proposed. KP agreed but warned the Group that 'technology' is a broad definition, which covers a vast array of intelligence, and as such they should be wary about its use. SE agreed, noting that the scheme's name will need to address / incorporate BIC's work in libraries; though he noted that he does like the positioning of 'Technology' at the forefront of the name. CC noted that 'technology' being a broad term will increase the longevity of the scheme's name since it will encompass any new technologies that may come along in future. KP agreed but noted that technology is not put 'in' libraries but rather takes place within the library. SE agreed but suggested that Library Technology Excellence Award does not have the same ring to it.

ACTION: ALL to forward any suggestions for the new name of this scheme to SE and AB by the end of May 2015 so that they can be discussed at the next meeting of the Libraries Committee.

ACTION: AB to send the list of suggested names to the Libraries Committee, alongside the agenda for the next meeting.

4. Deliverables and final progress

SE informed the Group that the Libraries Committee would like to see a marketing plan for this new scheme. He noted that, currently, only a checklist has been produced but suggested that a list of potential events (for promotional purposes) should be drawn up. He noted that any suggestions for these promotional events should be collated before the next meeting of the Libraries Committee to be added to agenda.

ACTION: ALL to send any suggestions for promotional events to CC and AB by the end of May 2015.

KP commented that promotional events may not be as useful as members of the newly formed Panel promoting the scheme to their clients. SE agreed, noting that this Group has many connections within the library community and, as such, much of the work to be undertaken will involve speaking with these organisations on a one-to-one basis. He suggested that a list of organisations to target should be drawn up and then allocated to the most appropriate member of the Panel. He noted that annual reviews with clients might be the best time to broach the subject but that the Panel will need marketing materials to be able to promote the scheme in this way. KP agreed, saying that members of the Panel can draw their clients' attention to the scheme and encourage them to apply by saying that the scheme is free to apply to and that their organisation would almost certainly pass. She noted that a document outlining the benefits of the scheme will also be required and an initiative for events throughout the year should be put in place.

AC questioned who will carry out this work. SE noted that the Panel will be able to put together any documents needed and that BIC will be able to send out email campaigns to its members about the scheme / events, whenever necessary. He noted that the Libraries Committee had been keen to involve the Society of Chief Librarians (SCL) and the National Acquisitions Group (NAG) in the promotion of this scheme; he also suggested including The Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL) to this list. AB informed the Group that BIC has a good relationship with both SCL and NAG. SE noted further that the promotional activities planned need to match the resources available to this Group, i.e. they need to be realistic.

AC went on to discuss the launch of the scheme, suggesting that it might be preferable to have a soft launch on the current BIC website (without the ability to fill in the application form online) if the scheme cannot be launched on the new website in time. AB noted her personal view that it would be better to wait for the new website to launch before the subsequent launch of this scheme. She noted that this would have far more of an impact than a soft launch might. SE agreed, noting that the launch of the scheme can afford to wait for the BIC website to be unveiled.

SE informed the Group that the marketing plan for this scheme was supposed to be finalised by the end of March 2015 but noted that this document cannot be signed off until the dates for all deliverables have been agreed upon; many of which are reliant on the launch of the new BIC website. He noted, however, that the document can be written provisionally, detailing what actions are needed and who to target / contact (including all names and relevant contact information). AC agreed, noting that actions should be prioritised, i.e. gaining endorsement, then assigning Panel members to each action, then writing a press release, etc. All of which can be written without assigning dates to the deliverables for the time being.

AC informed the Group that SCL have a monthly bulletin in which they might be willing to advertise this scheme. He noted that he has a contact at SCL whom he could discuss this matter with. The Group agreed that this would be highly beneficial to the promotion of this scheme. CC commented that CILIP also has a weekly bulletin though AB informed the Group that BIC has not succeeded in including information in this bulletin previously. AC suggested speaking to Rob Green of CILIP to see if he would be willing to write an article on this scheme for the CILIP Update magazine.

ACTION: AC to approach SCL and Rob Green of CILIP to see if they would be willing to include information about this scheme in their monthly bulletin once it has been launched.

ACTION: SE to compile provisional marketing plan and send to AB ahead of the next Libraries Committee meeting.

ACTION: SE to compile statement of benefits document asap. This should be done before the next Libraries Committee meeting and sent to AB.

SE noted that he has suggested that applications to this scheme could be included as a part of Continuing Professional Development (CPD); this was discussed at the last meeting of the Libraries Committee. He suggested that promoting this scheme as a learning process for corporate development will encourage organisations' involvement in the scheme and increase their awareness of the scheme at large. The Group fully agreed. SE noted that applying to the scheme as a CPD would be an act of self-discovery – notifying organisations about what they are particularly good at and what may require further work – and could be marketed as such. He noted that he was uncertain how to go about contacting CPD about this matter.

Post-Meeting update from KL: This needs further discussion at BIC Operational Board level before any action is taken.

A collaborative seminar was suggested by the Group to show organisations how to apply, what the process involves, and the benefits of applying. SE commented that this may not be necessary since the interactive application form, which will be available on the new BIC website, will have 'question

mark links' which provide definitions and examples of the answers required by the application process; a glossary of terms will also be available separately.

SE noted that he will begin to work on the marketing plan again, taking into account the above discussion of this Group. He commented that any feedback or suggestions for this marketing plan should be sent to him directly and that, if no feedback is received, he will have to assume that the content and suggestions from previous meetings still stand. He reiterated that the Libraries Committee have signed off the work that has been done so far for this scheme.

New scheme's logo & certificates

AB informed the Group that – since the last meeting of this Group – BIC has made a decision to include a date range on the new accreditation logo, i.e. 2015-2016 / 2016-2017. AB reminded the Group that an email which outlined the reasons for this decision had been circulated to the Group on 9th March 2015. In this email she had stated that: a date range being present on the logo will ensure that organisations are clearly accredited for the entire timespan of their accreditation period, without needing to send two separate logos for each accreditation period. It will also diminish any likelihood of accredited organisations not having the correct logo that they deserve, will reduce admin work for the organisation (meaning they only have to replace their logo on their website / email signature once a year), and will also reduce the admin workload of BIC. The Group agreed with this decision.

ACTION: AB to include a date range in the design of the new logo.

SE reminded the Group that name of this accreditation scheme will need to be decided upon before further progress can be made on the new logo and certificates for this scheme. However, AB noted that the following two logos have proved to be the most popular with both this Group and the Libraries Committee:



SE noted that the certificates for this scheme will be worked on once the logo has been finalised. He noted that the design process will prove to be too expensive if there are multiple changes.

Accreditation Cycle

SE informed the Group that new applications will be accepted throughout the year and each will subsequently be renewed on an annual basis. The Group went on to discuss whether to review all applications at a select time of each calendar year or whether applications should be reviewed on a quarterly basis, as the PDEA accreditation scheme does. AB noted that – if an applicant applies in April 2015, and renewals are to be reviewed in February of every calendar year – applicants would

need to supply a new application form within ten months of applying to the scheme; which could prove to be confusing to that organisation. The Group agreed that, if this is to be the process, this would need to be clearly outlined to the organisation(s) to avoid confusion or organisations not reapplying to the scheme in time. CC commented that the launch of this scheme could bring with it a deluge of applications throughout the year. She suggested that, for this reason, it would be easier to manage the new applications if they were reviewed on a quarterly basis (with the accreditation being renewed on an annual basis at the same time of year as the initial application). She noted that this will provide organisations with 4 chances to apply throughout the year (and re-apply if they fail), and will allow BIC to provide individual responses to each organisation's application. She also noted that reviewing applications on a quarterly basis will facilitate ascertaining how successful individual marketing schemes have been since the Panel will be able to see how many organisations have applied as a result of that marketing campaign within that quarter of the year.

KP questioned what would happen to an organisation who does not re-apply within the timeframe of their renewal period. SE noted that previously these organisations would have been re-accredited for a further year without needing to provide further information. AB noted that this will not be acceptable for the new scheme. She noted that applicants will be made aware that their accreditation is being reviewed both two months and one month previous to the Panel meeting, therefore – if an organisation should not respond to these emails – they will not be accredited again until they have reapplied (which will be possible from 3 months after missed Panel meeting). As such, their organisation will be removed from the accredited organisations listing on the BIC website. CC noted that organisations can feature their old accreditation logo on their website but it will be up to them to ensure that it is kept up-to-date. AB noted that, by having Panel meetings on a quarterly basis, organisations will have more chances to apply should they miss their deadline.

SE informed the Group that currently accredited organisations on the current e4Libraries accreditation scheme will be asked to apply on the new scheme as soon as it is launched. They will be able to do so anytime from the launch date up until their annual review period, as such responses will be staggered which will help to make the process more manageable.

5. Formal conference call sign off of all deliverables

The Group agreed that it would not be possible to sign off on this scheme as a whole at this time. They noted that the marketing plan is not complete, and the start date and dates for deliverables have not been agreed upon. AB commented that this Group should do as the Libraries Committee have done and sign off on the content of the scheme, with the intention of signing off on all other details in the near future. AC agreed but noted that deliverables that do not require further work should also be signed off during this meeting. The Group agreed that the following deliverables are now signed off:

- Overview report
- Questionnaires
- Scoring mechanisms
- Glossary

- Accreditation cycle
- Terms of reference for the accreditation panel

The following deliverables still need to be addressed and as such are not signed off at this time:

- Start date of the new scheme
- Marketing plan
- Clear statement of benefits
- Comprehensive user guide
- Logo and certificates

SE noted that the user guide will be the final deliverable to be signed off.

6. Update from Panel members for the newly revised scheme

AB ran through the current list of Panel members for the new scheme; these include:

- Karen Carden, University of the Arts, London
- Andrew Coburn, Essex County Council Libraries
- Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries
- Simon Edwards, Consultant
- Eric Green, Bibliographic Data Services
- Karina Luke, BIC
- Kathryn Pattinson, Askews & Holts
- Heather Sherman, Dawsons / Bertram Group
- David Thomas, SirsiDynix

SE informed the Group that some members of the Panel will leave the panel meeting for a short period of time, where necessary, so that they do not see their competitors' applications. He noted that there is a good range of professionals on this panel from stock suppliers (KP + HS), public libraries (CC + AC), academic libraries (KC), data aggregators (EG), and library systems providers (DT). He also noted that David Brett of 3M and Fiona Petherick of Ingram Content Group have been approached to be on this Panel. The Group suggested that Ian Manson of Infor and Gwyneth Morgan of Nielsen Book may also be interested in being on this Panel and should be approached. SE noted that it shouldn't be hard to find another willing data aggregator and RFID professional to be on the Panel.

It was noted that all panel members must come from accredited organisations.

ACTION: AB to contact IM and GM with regards to being on the new Panel for this scheme.

7. Promotional ideas

SE noted that this topic has been discussed under point 4 of this agenda. He asked whether the Group has any further comments or suggestions for the promotion of this scheme. None were forthcoming.

8. A.O.B.



LIBRARIES

@BIC1UK

www.bic.org.uk

info@bic.org.uk

AB asked whether a decision had been made regarding the inclusion of LCF in this new scheme. SE informed AB that this discussion had been put to rest. The new scheme will include a question about LCF – namely whether each organisation has implemented LCF or not. He noted that this question will be answered with a simple ‘yes’ or ‘no’ since a detailed answer would be too complex to score at this time.

9. Thanks for your participation in this T&FWG

SE thanked the members of this Group for their participation on this project, for volunteering their time, and for all their hard work. He also thanked them for agreeing to be on the Panel henceforth.

