

**SHED Programme Board meeting,
HES, John Sinclair House, Edinburgh – 11 April 2016**

Present: Robin Turner (RT – *Chair*), Karen Allison (KA – *Notes*), Mike Middleton (MM), Stephanie Leith (SL), Alan Leslie (AL), Eila McQueen (EM), Jo Robertson (JR), Dave Sutton (DS), Katinka Dalglish (KD), Jane Brown (JB).

<p>1.</p>	<p>Apologies and note of the last Programme Board meeting (RT)</p> <p>Apologies: Trevor Cowie (TC), Susan Hamilton (SH), Kirsty Lingstadt (KL), Laura Mitchell (LM) – with Jane Brown attending as alternate, Bruce Mann (BM), Matt Ritchie (MR).</p> <p>The notes of the November SHED Programme Board and note of the March Management Group meeting were accepted.</p> <p>RT welcomed the group and each attendee provided a brief introduction about themselves.</p> <p>Board membership was reviewed –</p> <p>RT noted that BM and MR have had to leave the Board due to other pressures and requested that the minutes reflect the Board's sincere thanks for their valuable contributions.</p> <p>RT welcomed Katinka Dalglish (and Irene O'Brien, who was unable to make the meeting) to the Board as new members.</p> <p>RT noted that Trevor Cowie plans to retire and it was agreed that RT/KL will discuss possible replacements with the new NMS Keeper.</p> <p>RT agreed to invite Stefan Sagrott to join the Board</p> <p>It was noted that KL's Action AP10Nov 01, re SMA, remains on-going.</p> <p>AL requested an update on Board Member Jeremy Huggett. RT agreed to get in touch with Jeremy, and if required will look into options for new Board member with University Background.</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 01</p> <p>AP 11Apr16 02</p> <p>AP 11Apr16 03</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Draft Implementation Plan Following Stakeholder Meeting and Survey - (RT/SH/Jo Robertson(BEFS))</p> <p>RT reviewed the Implementation Plan spread-sheet alongside several additional working documents designed to summarise the Plan and provide various useful views of the overall Plan.</p> <p>RT invited members review the spreadsheet and highlight any points for</p>	

<p>change, inclusion or deletion, and a number of points were noted.</p> <p>DS noted his concern re the polygonisation of listed buildings. Mike Middleton provided some explanation on the polygons produced by HES. MM agreed to take an action to speak with Heritage Management to review this point (1.4)</p> <p>AL noted that he did not feel well qualified to assess the resources needed or prioritization of these tasks. RT noted that he expects this will be reviewed by the specific owners of tasks.</p> <p>EM echoed AL's observations and asked for more information re the potential audiences for the Plan. AL suggested that a draft Corporate plan/KPI's might help to identify these audiences.</p> <p>RT noted that the HES Corporate Plan is to be launched on 24thMay.</p> <p>AL registered concern regarding the extra expectations the Plan might place on local authorities and noted that this is why he has suggested inclusion of university resources.</p> <p>RT noted that the Plan has to be prioritized realistically and acknowledged that the timescale could be extended and that the Plan will change as required.</p> <p>DS noted that BIM will have some effect and RT mentioned the HES Rae project which is going on currently. RT noted that BIMs raise the question, out of the information generated, what should be saved for the future. He noted that HES Survey & Recording and Collections are looking into this.</p> <p>EM raised the subject of training and RT noted that this was a theme that came out of the workshop.</p> <p>JB asked who the intended users are and RT responded saying that it is hoped that anyone will be able to use the technology and it is important to ensure delivery in multiple ways. RT noted the increasing use of mobile devices as a means of enabling a wider user base.</p> <p>RT directed the group towards the tabled SHED Implementation Plan Summary Document - Condensed Stakeholder Scores. He reviewed the most popular objectives as highlighted by column 2.</p> <p>RT noted the potential value of crowd-sourcing techniques and advised that he and KL have been looking into this as a potential tool. MM noted that KL is now using the term 'structured volunteering'.</p> <p>RT asked if, having looked at the report, anyone had any final comments –</p> <p>AL commented that the workshop captured valuable information from specific users (our closest audiences) but we are missing feedback knowledge from the wider group we are trying to reach. RT noted that we are gleaning some such information from activities such as Scotland's Urban Past.</p> <p>JB re-iterated the importance of providing the wider range of users with what they need in order to achieve long term strategic aims.</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 04</p>
---	----------------------

	<p>EM noted that she has been receiving feedback regarding the ‘home fronts legacy’ App and users are very clear that they should be consulted before apps are developed (e.g. users do not have connectivity in the field).</p> <p>It was generally agreed that linking resources effectively is the ‘holy grail’ and JB also thought it worth discussing SHED linking to archival material.</p> <p>SL asked if this was reflected in the current Implementation Plan. It was suggested that more of this might be incorporated, and RT referred the group to point 3.5 of today’s agenda.</p> <p>DS/RT and MM noted the need to ‘blow our own trumpet’ more to ensure people are more aware of the services available.</p> <p>Jo Robertson (BEFS) JR explained that she is working with multiple Workstreams and substreams that are feeding into <i>OPiT</i> (all having their own action plans). JR is trying to develop some kind of <i>OPiT</i>-wide Implementation Plan for all these groups to feed into.</p> <p>JR ran a brief session to review key outcomes from the Benefits section (section 7) of the SHED Strategy. An attempt was made to identify 2-3 methods of measuring each outcome as listed in section 7.2 (see Annex 1, below). JR noted the importance of having more than one method of measurement for each outcome (thus providing a measure of the reliability of each method of measurements).</p> <p>It was agreed that the SHED Management Group should tease out some baseline measures, including a review of those already in the Implementation Plan.</p> <p>It was also noted that many potential measurement methods have the potential to not reflect what is happening accurately e.g. with the Buildings at Risk Register, once a building is demolished it effectively disappears. A reduction of sites on the BARR, for instance, could be misinterpreted as a success if there isn’t a supporting KPI that records the nature of the loss.</p> <p>RT suggested that members should feel free to add to the final column of the SHED Implementation Plan spreadsheet (Measuring Success).</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 05</p> <p>AP11Apr16 06</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Workstream Updates</p> <p>3.1 SHED Management Group (RT)</p> <p>The meeting notes had been pre-circulated, and an update was provided by RT.</p> <p>3.2 Workstream 1; PastMap</p> <p>MM provided an update, noting the move to Open Layers and the extra functionality this gave PastMap, especially the addition of historic mapping and of added functionality making the site accessible to different devices.</p>	

<p>3.3 Workstream 2; SMR Forum Technical Working Group (SL)</p> <p>SL provided an update on the progress of the SMR Forum Technical working group (she attended their last meeting in March).</p> <p>Further to re-branding MM took an action to provide SL with a copy of the new HES logo once it has been released.</p> <p>SL has compiled a list of data standards and has added this to the SHED website. SL asked that members feed any omissions on the list to her.</p> <p>SL discussed data security and succession planning for HER's. There is some facility for this in England but no equivalent in Scotland.</p> <p>With regard to disaster planning, there is a question of what happens if a LA closes down an HER. MM noted that HES currently acts as an archive of last resort to the HERs.</p> <p>An action was agreed for SL, JB and KL to discuss the issue of disaster planning separately.</p> <p>SL noted her preference for a separate line on the SHED Implementation Plan for this (separate to 4.5.1).</p> <p>MM noted that he feels other organizations will benefit greatly from disaster standards and that today's discussion have highlighted that many are too small or new to have disaster planning in place.</p> <p>Following a previous Action Point, SL agreed to scope what a Data Enhancement Workstream might look like.</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 07</p> <p>AP 11Apr16 08</p> <p>AP 11Apr16 09</p> <p>AP 11Apr16 10</p>
<p>3.4 Comms – Annual Update (RT)</p> <p>RT provided an update. He noted that the Management Group plan to revise the Comms plan but have not done so yet.</p> <p>EM has asked for a copy but feels that she is unable to action effectively herself. She does feel that this needs to be addressed. It was noted that the Dig It! Comms team may be able to help. An action was taken by EM to ask Julianne McGraw to look into this and report back.</p> <p>MM suggested the possibility of delivering lectures to students on relevant courses. It was noted by RT and others that this tends to be very hard to achieve.</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 11</p>
<p>3.5 working Group to address small working Group for 'Museums and Archives'.</p> <p>JB noted that she was willing to assist with the development of this Workstream idea, and Laura Mitchell, Irene O'Brien and Kirsty Lingstadt will also be involved. Other who might join the group were discussed. Katinka Dalglish will join and hopefully someone from the SMR Forum.</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 12</p>

	<p>RT suggested a meeting and behind the scenes tour of JSH to start this group off. It was suggested that Peter McKeague be involved (for input on spatial data).</p> <p>RT also suggested that suitable datasets would need to be found and a number of small projects run to demonstrate success of linking with Canmore/HERs.</p> <p>MM suggested that semi-automation and structured/virtual volunteering is a way forwards for this work.</p> <p>KL is producing guidelines for gathering the data for archival records.</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 13</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Polygonisation Project Update (KL)</p> <p>MM provided an update.</p> <p>Some HERs only have point location data. However, the HERs hold spatial data that can be mapped and connected to these points. The Defining Scotland's Places methodology uses historical mapping, aerial survey, etc. to do create mapped extents based on an identified source of data. To date 25% of the relevant records in Canmore have been mapped using this methodology, including the entire NTS and Forestry Commission estates.</p> <p>The aspiration is to have polygonised records for the whole of Scotland, and two LA's have successfully gained funding from the HES Archaeology Programme.</p> <p>Scottish Borders, Stirling and Clackmannanshire (managed by Scottish Borders): 2 years funding.</p> <p>Shetland: 1 years funding.</p> <p>MM stressed that the aim is for national consistency of data. SL noted that improved concordance is important.</p> <p>It was noted that polygonisation is primarily archaeological but could include architecture.</p> <p>AL was enthusiastic but asked regarding long term potential and opportunities for funding in future years.</p> <p>SL noted that there were no indications regarding future funding but noted that City of Edinburgh is keen to polygonise. SL stressed that momentum for further polygonisation will need to be maintained.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Risk Register – Update (RT)</p> <p>RT explained the updated (and reduced) risks and asked if there were any queries or comments. RT asked that the group highlight any problems they identified in the risk Register.</p>	

	<p>For the risk related to local authority it was noted that there were some known losses of resource but some additional people have also been employed.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Matters arising from previous meetings (see action point list, below)</p> <p>Actions were updated and a number of points recorded below.</p> <p>ACTION 29SEP15 09 This action remains on-going after being specifically delayed.</p> <p>ACTION 07MAY15 17 This relates to quality of data and needs a base-line to measure against. It has been re-assigned to the Technical Working Group.</p> <p>ACTION 10Nov15 16 The new Workstream for Museums, Archives and Libraries will take over this action.</p> <p>RT took a new (Management Group Action) to provide an update on the SHED Strategy over the past year.</p>	<p>AP 11Apr16 14</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>AOCB</p> <p>7.1 Links with Archaeology Strategy RT provided a brief update.</p> <p>7.2 Links with HES Corporate Plan The HES Corporate Plan went to the Board in March. It is now in the final design stage but will not be finalized until after the Parliamentary Election. The Corporate Plan may not specifically mention SHED but will align with SHED.</p>	
	<p>Date of next meeting – tbc - ?Nov 2016</p>	
	<p>CLOSE</p>	

ACTION REGISTER

Action Point	Who	Details	By when	Status
		SHED Management Group, 29 September 2015		
29Sep15 09	RJ	Circulate comments from Archaeology Strategy re: SHED round the group	ASAP	Ongoing
		SHED Programme Board, 10 November 2015		
10Nov15 01	KL	Offer corresponding member option to SMA	May 2016	Ongoing
10Nov15 04	RT	When timing appropriate, invite someone from HES Designations to speak to the group	In due course	Ongoing
10Nov15 06	SL	Investigate links to planning data	May 2016	Ongoing
10Nov15 07	SH/BM	Reformat Implementation Plan in order that it is sortable by priorities.	ASAP	Completed
10Nov15 11	SH	Remove completed tasks from implementation plan	ASAP	Completed
10Nov15 13	SL	Add <i>Glorious Gardens</i> to project list	May 2016	Completed
10Nov15 14	Management Group	Revisit Comms Plan	March 2016	Ongoing
10Nov15 15	KL/SH	KL/SH Revisit the SHED PID re: Open Data	May 2016	Ongoing
		SHED Management Group, 8th March 2016		
08Mar16 02	BM	BM to add extra points from workshop to Implementation Plan	Before Prog Board	Completed
08Mar16 03	SH	SH to explore color-coding and assigning owners	Before Prog Board	Completed
08Mar16 04	ALL	ALL to revisit assigned priorities	Before Prog Board	Completed
08Mar16 05	RT	RT to discuss avoiding conflicts of interest with Archaeology Programme.	Before Prog Board	Ongoing
08Mar16 06	RT	RT to draft statement for Comms	ASAP	Ongoing
08Mar16 08	TWG	Look at lessons learned from major community-based data collection projects and draft guidelines for data creation.	End 2016	Ongoing
08Mar16 09	ALL	Review risk register and provide feedback to RT	End March 16	Ongoing
		SHED Programme Board 11th April 2016		
11Apr16 01	RT/KL	To discuss possible replacement for Trevor Cowie upon his retirement.	Next PB meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16 02	RT	RT to invite Stefan Sagrott to join the Board.	Next PB meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16 03	RT	RT to contact Jeremy, or to look into options for a new Board member with a university background.	Next PB meeting	Ongoing

SHED Programme Board meeting, 11 April 2016 (cont.)

Action Point	Who	Details	By when	Status
11Apr16 04	MM	MM to speak with Heritage Management regarding point 1.4 on the Strategic Plan (in relation to legal perspective)	ASAP	Ongoing
11Apr16 05	Management Group	Group to tease out base-line measures for key outcomes of the Strategy.	Next MG meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16 06	RT & JR	To produce note for inclusion in Appendix 1 of minutes of SHED Board Meeting 11th April 2016	ASAP	Completed
11Apr16 07	MM	MM to provide SL with copy if new HES logo.	End May	Ongoing
11Apr16 08	ALL	Members to feed in standards of data samples to SL's list of data standards.	End May-	Ongoing
11Apr16 09	SL/JB & KL	To hold a separate meeting to review disaster planning.	Next MG meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16- 10	SL (TWG)	To scope what a Data Enhancement Workstream might look like. (moved from SHED Programme Board of 07 May 2015)	Next PB meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16 11	EM	EM to ask Julianne McGraw to review the Comms plan and report back.	Next PB meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16- 12	KL	Take forward idea of SHED /MGS workshop. (moved from SHED Programme Board, 10 Nov 2015 16)	Before next PB meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16 13	KL	At start of meeting for the Working Group for 'Museums and Archives'. KL to arrange meeting and JSH tour including Peter McKeague.	WG4 development meeting	Ongoing
11Apr16 - 14	RT	RT to provide update of Strategy over the past year.	End May 2015	Ongoing
11Apr16- 10	SL (TWG)	To scope what a data enhancement work stream might look like. (moved from SHED Programme Board of 07 May 2015)	Next PB meeting	Ongoing

Annex

SHED Programme Board, 11th April 2016

Measures related to the asserted benefits of the SHED Strategy

Workshop exercise results

NOTE: Benefits, in blue, derived from [SHED Strategy 2014](#), p. 15:

The meeting was split into two groups, each asked to consider how we might measure whether we are achieving the expected benefits of the SHED Strategy. Responses are in black writing, below.

Ease of access: More information will be put online and therefore more widely available.

Measures: % HERS online (ALGAO already collates?). Number of technical specifications (this is necessary before data can be made more accessible online– a first step).

Ease of use: Better joining up of information will make data more consistent and easier to navigate.

Measures: [Not discussed]

Accessibility: Better training resources will be created and more widely available, removing barriers to people's ability or willingness to engage with the data.

Measures: Number of talks given to students to increase awareness of the data that is available.

Efficiency: More efficient and effective use of available resources – digital, financial and human.

Measures: [Not discussed]

Collaboration and co-operation: More joined-up thinking between organisations with data about or related to the historic environment.

Measures: Number of talks, engagement with community groups re use of records (to increase awareness of the data that is available). A measure of press mentions – raising profile of use of records in valuing the historic environment.

Participation: More opportunities for User-Generated Content will stimulate contributions from special interest groups as well as local communities and individuals.

Measures: More user-generated content.

Quality of content: Improvements in content can be identified and prioritised, and mechanisms devised and implemented to enrich the available information.

Measures: Minimum standards being achieved.

Quality data: Improving data standards and reducing duplication will make using the data more efficient and less confusing.

Measures: Data standards being achieved; more linking of data rather than duplications.

Security: A focus on long-term security of the data will help safeguard it for the future.

Measures: Demonstrating achievement of security standards; No. of security breaches; Amount of lost data.

Legacy: A strong, well-resourced world-leading resource for research, protection and advice that creates a long term benefit for the people of Scotland.

Measures: Trends in resources available; No. of times SHED is cited; Survey of awareness of the data; Survey of usability of the data; Survey of views on whether the available data is 'improving'.