

Institutional Repository Project

Steering Group Meeting Minutes (confirmed)Thursday 22nd November 2007, 12 – 2 pm

Present Carole Goble (Chair, CG), Phil Butler (PB), Lorraine Beard (LB), Alan Dickson (AD), Nick Higham (NH), Richard Heeks (RH), Ivan Leudar (IL), Vic Lyte (VL), Andrew Walsh (AW), Steve Milner (SM), Pedro Mendes (PM)

Filename IRProject_SteeringGroupAgenda_Meeting2007-11-22

Enquiries Dr Phil Butler, Tel: x51514, Email: p.butler@manchester.ac.uk

1. Apologies

Andrew Murray and Paul Harness forwarded their apologies.

Paul Harness delegated to Allan Copley (Head of Application Support and Development, IT Services)

2. Introductions

CG introduced the Project and outlined the role of the Steering Group. She noted that the Steering Group was convened to govern and facilitate the Project, the Project would take a highly user-focused approach, the Project will not be technology-driven and the Steering Group members should be positive advocates of the Project.

Members of the Steering Group introduced themselves and their respective roles (see Steering Group Terms of Reference).

3. Discussion of Project Brief

PB outlined the Project Brief and indicated that this needed to be signed-off by the Steering Group for the Project to proceed to the next phase.

The group noted that the Project should consider one or more strategic early-adopters/developments. VL noted strategic developments existed to get the University's repository to interoperate with external systems such as PubMedCentralUK and Intute.

ACTION 1: PB to review proposed early adopters, prepare project briefs for each, consider their strategic value and identify other possible early adopters

The group noted that the Project Brief suffered from a lack of a statement on its strategic aims. This would help to place the Project in a strategic context.

ACTION 2: PB to revise the Project Brief to include a statement on its strategic aims

The group noted that the list of benefits outlined in the Project Brief required further scrutiny and some form of value assignment.

It was suggested that the Project should conduct a benefits analysis. CG noted that this should include consideration of the negative benefits i.e. the costs of not proceeding.

ACTION 3: PB to add an analysis of benefits to the Project's outline plan

The group discussed wider communication and advocacy efforts. It recognised that there were many misconceptions and much misunderstanding in the academic community about issues such as copyright, open access, preservation and repositories.

The group agreed that communication should be best done via small well focused groups of individuals with knowledge in interests in specific areas. Members of these groups would advocate the Project to others.

ACTION 4: PB to draw up a set of user focus groups

The group discussed what the Institutional Repository should be called. PB noted there was a tendency in the wider community to overuse acronyms. CG noted that the institutional repository should be transparent to end-users and as such does not necessarily require a particular label.

The group agreed that it needed further information to enable it to 'sign-off' the Project Brief and Terms of Reference documents. Additionally, individuals required further time to learn about wider issues related to the Project and enable them to confidently advocate the Project. The group requested a 'demonstration' of repository functions and what a University of Manchester repository might look like.

NH offered to demonstrate the MIMS repository service.

ACTION 5: PB to arrange demonstrations of repository functions for the next meeting

4. Steering Group Terms of Reference

The group discussed the terms of reference. It was suggested the document would benefit from a brief statement summarising the groups overall role.

ACTION 6: PB to update terms of reference with a statement summarising the Steering Group's role

It was noted that the group lacked representation from the University's marketing function and academic's who where practiced in publishing of scholarly work in the fields of engineering and performance arts. The group agreed to invite a member of the University's marketing function to future meetings as required.

The group recognised that publishing attitudes in the fields of engineering and performance arts are significantly different to other disciplines. As a result, the group agreed that individuals that are research active in these fields should be canvassed to sit on the steering group.

ACTION 7: PB to canvas for representatives from engineering and the performance arts

5. Structure of meetings

The group agreed that meetings should include the standing items, apologies, minutes and actions, highlight report and issues. Furthermore, meetings would consider specific topics.

PB suggested drawing up a list of future topics for discussion. These would need to fit with the outline project plan and milestones.

The group agreed the topics for discussion at the next should be "demonstrations of repository functions" and "early adopter priorities".

ACTION 8: PB to draw up a schedule of specific topics for discussion at future meetings

6. Schedule of meetings

The group agreed that meetings should be approximately monthly during the early stages of the Project. Meetings would be quarterly once the Project was well established.

Meetings should be scheduled as far in advance as was possible.

CG noted that 100% attendance at all Steering Group meetings was not expected, however it was important to have a degree of continuity within the group throughout the two year project. Hence, if any group member felt at this stage that they would have significant difficulties in attending future meetings due to other commitments, then this was the time to say and possibly step down.

ACTION 9: ALL group members to consider their future commitments and advise CG and PB accordingly

ACTION 10: ALL group members to advise PB on availability (or lack of) for future meetings during January through to March 2008

7. Date of next meeting

Date of next meeting was set provisionally to early January 2008.

PB would confirm date, venue and agenda once individuals had forwarded their availability.