



Archive Service Accreditation Committee

Annual Meeting 2017

Venue: Huntley Room, London Metropolitan Archives, 11 May 2017

Bruce Jackson	Committee Chair
David Brown	Committee Member
Susan Edwards	Committee Member
Mary Ellis	Committee Member
Rachel Hart	Committee Member
Valerie Johnson	Committee Member
Ruth MacLeod	Committee Member
Elizabeth Oxborrow-Cowan	Committee Member
Caroline Peach	Committee Member
Liz Rees	Committee Member
Caroline Sampson	Committee Member
Stephen Scarth	Committee Member
Philippa Smith	Committee Member
Vicky Stretch	Committee Member
Annette French	Accreditation Manager, Arts Council England (Observer)
Melinda Haunton	Programme Manager, The National Archives
Jane Shillaker	Programme Officer, The National Archives

Item	
1	Welcome and apologies
	No apologies had been received and BJ welcomed the full Committee, officers and observers.
2	Minutes and matters arising from 2016 meeting
	The minutes were approved for accuracy.
	MH noted that there had been no update on the status of Crown dependencies issue and this would be carried forward. Reaching out to specific parts of the sector would be covered under the refresh work.
3	Programme manager's update 2016-17
	MH reported on the programme's progress in areas not otherwise on the agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Applicant numbers</i> were significantly up, with the largest Panels to date. This was increasing the need for assessors in England, which was being met from core TNA staffing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Training</i>: had been delivered on 6 in-person occasions in 2016-17 thanks largely to ARA regional arrangements. A range of telephone and in-person surgeries had also been offered to support applicants. • <i>Communications</i> had focused on the developing digital pathway, and on planning for the complex messaging for 2017-18 where the range of elements to communicate would be increasing significantly. • <i>Peer review</i>: ARA had successfully recruited and trained an additional 10 peer reviewers in November 2016 and planning was advanced for a further training session in July 2017.
4	Policy and precedent issues from 2016-17 Panels
	Three policy issues or precedents were noted from the preceding year's panels:
4.1	<i>First successful re-application after initial non-award</i> . The Committee welcomed this evidence of the positive developmental impact of Accreditation on services which were at first unsuccessful in their applications.
4.2	<i>Award to a service excluded from Museum Accreditation</i> . ACE had been informed, and would be kept informed in any future similar situations.
4.3	<i>Policy decision on services undergoing significant change in planned premises moves</i> . The awarding Panel had suggested as a matter of policy that services in major positive premises change from currently unsatisfactory spaces should receive a provisional award until the change is delivered. The Committee agreed that this was an essential approach. They noted that in some cases the move might take more than the maximum two years for a provisional award, and that an extension might be offered in these circumstances.
5	Annual report
5.1	<p><i>Annual statistical report</i></p> <p>JS introduced the annual statistical report. Key headlines included increasing application numbers, implementing the review stage, and a summary of key areas of sector weakness demonstrated against requirements and actions.</p> <p>The Committee noted that trend data is starting to emerge, with the collections module remaining the major area of weakness. This applied to both capital and revenue areas, and in some cases to expertise and skills. These trends would be shared with strategic bodies.</p>
5.2	<p><i>Changes made by Panels</i></p> <p>The November 2016 Panel had requested a listing of all assessment changes made by Panels to date, which was provided. The Committee asked the Accreditation team to report at headline level on this annually.</p>
5.3	<p><i>Peer reviewers</i></p> <p>The Committee minuted their thanks to peer reviewers who had contributed to the success of the programme 2016-17:</p> <p>Thomas Barnes, Pamela Birch, Louisa Blight, Fiona Bourne, Sue Breakell, Maria Castrillo, Emily Chen, Alison Cullingford, Claire Mayoh, Heidi McIntosh, Louise Ray, Gillian Sheldrick, Adrian Steel, Mari Takayanagi, Charlene Taylor, Tamara Thornhill, Matti Watton</p>

6	Assessor matters arising
	<p>The annual assessor meeting minutes were circulated. The assessors had discussed the digital pathway and review stages, which were elsewhere on the agenda. Assessor contributions had been essential in shaping the digital pathway post-pilot and the Committee expressed thanks to all the assessors for their contributions.</p> <p>Assessors had discussed the introduction of knowledge from beyond the application content into the assessment process. They noted that this could be essential in shaping a validation visit but that services needed an opportunity to respond to this additional content.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the assessors' note that workshopping definitions of 'significant change' would be helpful and agreed.</p>
7	Implementation of review stage for Accredited Archive Services
7.1	<p><i>Report on first review</i></p> <p>JS had circulated a report on initial implementation of the review stage, which had functioned as a live pilot. Feedback from applicants suggested the review was appropriately light touch where limited change had occurred but gave scope to report major service updates and to discuss these.</p> <p>A number of practical amendments emerging from implementation were agreed.</p>
7.2	<p><i>Request for steer on review dates</i></p> <p>MH requested a formal steer on the option to alter review dates if the Accredited Archive Service presented a compelling reason to do so, e.g. to allow for current premises changes to be completed rather than reviewing in the midst of change.</p> <p>It was agreed that the general 3-year review timetable should be followed but that services could request a review date extension where required and justified.</p>
8	Digital accreditation pathway development
8.1	<p><i>Update on pilot</i></p> <p>MH had circulated a report on the digital pathway pilot, for which 6 full and several limited returns had been received. This had been an essential test of the approach and showed that it was largely effective, with some specific changes as outlined in the report. The Committee suggested some minor changes to questions.</p> <p>The Accreditation team were asked to feed back thanks to the pilot services, including a copy of the updated pathway and specific feedback on their application where possible.</p> <p>The Committee noted that they would also welcome introductory training on assessing digital applications, as well as the assessor plans for this.</p> <p>The Committee discussed their approach to archive services failing to deliver for digital records once the updates are live in 2018. It was noted that the approach had to be about risk to digital records, including those within collecting remits but</p>

	<p>uncollected due to lack of capacity. Services which did not actively pursue the preservation of collections within their remit were not managing risks effectively, although it was recognised that most services would be on a development pathway rather than confidently managing digital preservation from the outset.</p>
8.2	<p><i>Consideration of recommendations</i></p> <p>The amended digital pathway was approved for incorporation into programme updates in 2018. This would be widely communicated, with the message that services needed to be planning and managing risk, rather than being expected to have a full system operational immediately.</p> <p>It was agreed that a question regarding digital records risks should be added to review stage from 2021 to complete mainstreaming the digital pathway.</p>
9	Refresh of Archive Service Accreditation 2017-18
9.1	<p><i>Invitation to Tender</i></p> <p>MH had circulated a draft Invitation to Tender for the refresh of Archive Service Accreditation. NRS, SCA and MALD were all able to support this piece of work financially, which would allow a two-stage process of review and development of any additional guidance products.</p> <p>EOC left the meeting for this item due to a possible conflict of interest.</p>
9.2	<p><i>Involvement of Committee and partners in oversight and contract management</i></p> <p>It was agreed that financially-contributing partners needed to be part of the oversight of the review, and that a reference group would be helpful to ensure the work had the intended impact.</p>
10	Timetable for 2017-18
	A timetable of key events had been circulated for information.
11	Update from Museum Accreditation
	<p>AF updated the Committee on current light-touch review of Museum Accreditation, timed to meet the completion of the roll-out of 2011 standard, and the museums review from DCMS.</p> <p>This review would ensure getting back to core focus and impact of the programme, and would address a number of discrete work-packages. A project manager was now in post till spring 2018 to deliver this.</p> <p>The project structure would include both internal steering and working groups and a reference group of key stakeholders, which might inform the Archive Service Accreditation review. AF was happy to share this.</p> <p>It was noted that connections across the two programmes and reviews were in place to ensure open awareness across the development.</p>
12	Suggested updates to guidance
	Updates to URLs and a short statement under 2.4.1 to cover the replacements of

	PD5454:2012 were approved.
13	Date of next meeting
	It was agreed that the next Committee would be in London, April 2018, exact date and location tbc.
	The next meetings of Accreditation Panels are 6 July in Cardiff and 9 November in Kew. It was agreed that Panels will start business from 11am in future given increasing levels of work.