



Trustees' Meeting

UCL, Central House, 14 Upper Woburn Place, London
WC1H 0NN

13.30-16.30, 27 February 2018

Minutes

Attending

Gill Campbell (**GC**), Head of Environmental Studies, Historic England
Professor May Cassar (**MC**), Director Institute of Sustainable Heritage, UCL
Dr Christina Duffy (**CD**), Conservation Imaging Scientist, The British Library
John Jackson (**JJ**), Science Policy Adviser, Natural History Museum (from 15.10)
Alastair McCapra (**AM**), Chairman
Kostas Ntanos (**KN**), Head of Conservation Research and Development, The National Archives
Dr Paola Ricciardi (**PR**), Research Scientist, University of Cambridge Museums (until 15.00)
Alison Richmond (**AR**), Chief Executive, ICON
Jacqueline Ridge (**JR**), Keeper of Conservation, National Galleries Scotland (via Skype until 14.25)
Constantina Vlachou (**CV**), Historic Royal Palaces

Apologies

Daniel Bone (**DB**), Deputy Head of Conservation, Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford
Professor Carl Heron (**CH**), Director of Scientific Research, The British Museum
Dr Ewan Hyslop (**EH**), Head of Technical Research and Science, Historic Environment Scotland
Professor Pip Laurenson (**PL**), Head of Collection Care Research, Tate
Katy Lithgow (**KL**), Head Conservator, National Trust
Professor Mary Ryan (**MR**), Imperial College London
David Thickett (**DT**), Senior Conservation Scientist, English Heritage
Professor David Watkinson (**DW**), Professor (Conservation), Cardiff University

In attendance

Caroline Peach (**CP**), Preservation Matters Ltd

No.	Minutes of Meeting of 27 February 2018	Action
1.	Welcome and apologies	
1.1	The meeting started at 13.30. Alastair McCapra, chairing the meeting, welcomed everyone.	
1.2	Apologies were recorded as above.	
1.3	<p>It was reported that Kostas Ntanos is resigning as a trustee with effect from the end of the meeting. He is due to leave The National Archives at the end of March and Juergen Vervoort is considering a replacement to nominate as trustee. Kostas was thanked for his contribution to NHSF.</p> <p>Action: CP send AMcC Juergen's email address so that he can make contact.</p>	CP
2.	Minutes of 28 November 2017 and matters arising	
	<p>Papers circulated in advance: <i>2_2017 11 28 DraftMinutes_v2</i></p>	
2.1	The draft minutes were reviewed for accuracy. There were no amendments.	
2.2	Matters arising	
2.2.1	2.2.12 The National Heritage Science Strategy consultation has not yet gone live. It was agreed that the consultation should be live as long as possible to still enable a May launch date.	
2.2.2	<p>3.2.4 The action to contact the publisher of 'Heritage Science' about Gold Open Access fees (and commitment to payment required prior to possible NHSF award) is carried forward.</p> <p>Action: CP to contact Heritage Science publisher and to follow up outstanding action to alert Taylor & Francis to journals they publish (other than the Journal of the Institute of Conservation) that might receive articles eligible for NHSF support.</p>	CP
2.2.3	<p>6.1 Risk register - Performance monitoring of Consultant Development Director AMcC has discussed with the Executive Group and will follow up with CP.</p> <p>Action: AMcC to follow up performance monitoring with CP.</p>	AMcC
2.2.4	<p>6.1 Risk register – GDPR</p> <p>Action carried forward: AR to share Michael Nelles' knowledge of GDPR with CP</p>	AR
2.2.5	<p>14.1 Ivory total ban on sales consultation</p> <p>CP reported that she had reviewed the consultation document and considered that there was no specific point to be made by NHSF and so she had not submitted a response.</p>	
2.2.6	<p>14.2 REF nominations</p> <p>CP reported that she had emailed the REF nominations contact about the timescale for a potential call for specialist advisers. The response is that advisers may be drawn from those people who are nominated as potential panel members and that there may be no separate call.</p>	
2.2.7	14.3 Open Access conference	

	CP reported that she had not circulated information about the Open Access conference. She queried what value to NHSF should be derived from attendance at conferences. Trustees agreed that attendees funded by NHSF should write a piece for the newsletter summarising key points and/or (as appropriate) suggested actions for NHSF – to be reported to the Board.	
3.	Declarations of interest and monitoring private benefits to non charitable organisations or individuals	
3.1	AMcC declared that he is a past board member and current volunteer with Wikimedia UK.	
4.	Report of Executive Group meeting (2 February 2018)	
	Paper circulated in advance: <i>4a_ExecutiveGroupMeeting 2018 02 02</i> The actions in the draft minutes were reviewed for matters arising	
4.1	Matters arising from Executive Group meeting of 2 February 2018	
4.1.1	2.1.1 AR reported on a conversation with a member that had not renewed membership for 2017-18. The member is keen to re-engage but was not able to renew in 2017-18 due to financial pressures. It was agreed that a representative of the organisation should be invited to attend the May meeting as an observer to gain a current picture of NHSF activity. Action: CP to contact and invite to attend the May meeting.	CP
4.1.2	2.1.2 Outstanding membership fees for 2017-18 There is one membership fee that is still outstanding. Trustees discussed actions that could be taken to prompt payment. It was agreed that CP should write a letter to the Director but notify the institution in advance that the letter is to be sent. Action: CP to write to Director of institution with outstanding membership fees for 2017-18	CP
4.1.3	Trustees discussed the provision of certificates of membership as an incentive to retain membership. It was agreed that CP should seek a quote for their design. Action: CP to ask for quote of annual membership certificate.	CP
4.1.4	2.2 Partnerships group activity A telephone call between CP and MR had been scheduled but did not go ahead. Action: CP to follow up meeting to discuss the future of the Partnerships group	CP,MR
4.1.5	3.2.2 Trustee role description Future action for CP to schedule updating of trustee role description for after May 2018. Action: CP schedule updating of trustee role description for after May 2018 board meeting.	CP
4.1.6	3.7.3 Anti-bribery policy Action carried forward: CD to share copy of British Library anti-bribery policy for information. CP to draft policy to sit alongside conflicts of interest policy.	CD
4.1.7	4.4 GDPR action plan CP reported that she had checked newsletter subscription terms and that although a dual consent process has always been in place, there is a need for greater clarity (under GDPR) about newsletter content and a wider privacy policy. As a result, subscribers will	

	<p>be asked to re-subscribe to the NHSF newsletter. Action: CP to continue to implement GDPR action plan</p>	CP
4.1.8	<p>5.4 National Heritage Science Strategy The timescale of the forthcoming NHSS consultation was discussed. It was agreed that a month of consultation should be sufficient to gain wide input. It was agreed that it would be valuable to communicate the status of work to update/deliver the National Heritage Science Strategy at the same time as members are approached to renew their membership. Action: CP to make reference to NHSS work as part of membership renewals.</p>	CP
4.1.9	<p>5.5 Presentation on BIM CP reported that she had followed up with Paul Bryan about his availability to give a presentation on GDPR to the NHSF Board. He is still willing to provide a presentation although the September date is not possible. It was agreed that his availability for dates of future Resources Group meetings should be investigated. Action: CP to investigate Paul Bryan's availability to give BIM presentation at a future Resources group meeting (opened up to other interested trustees).</p>	CP
4.2	<p>Progress against budget to 31.12.17 Paper circulated in advance: <i>4b_NHSF_Budget2017-18_Reconciliation to 2017 12 31</i></p>	
4.2.1	<p>CP reported that expenditure in the region of £20,000 had occurred since the reconciliation of 31.12.17 (i.e. current expenditure is closer to budget than at the time figures were last presented to the Executive Group). CP reported two agreed items of expenditure that have/are due to take place in 2017-18 that were not in the reforecast budget (legal fees for contract template, scoping of translational research hub).</p>	
4.3	<p>2018-19 Membership fee level and Associate member category</p>	
4.3.1	<p>The Executive Group agreed at its meeting of 2nd February that the Board should consider fee levels for 2018-19 in the light of anticipated financial hardship of members (existing and potential); it should also review the Associate membership category which has not been used to date.</p>	
4.3.2	<p>The Board discussed the need to be clear about NHSF's distinctive membership offer, particularly alongside what might be perceived as similar, though less expensive, 'offers' from other membership organisations.</p>	
4.3.3	<p>The Chair asked the Board whether membership fees should be increased for 2018-19 and there was unanimous agreement that fees should not be increased.</p>	
4.3.4	<p>The Chair proposed that a discussion around a potential decrease in the fee level should take place after the working group reports so that NHSF's current and projected activity level, expenditure budget and capacity could be taken into account. It was noted that clarity around benefits to members and impact on society (and policy) are important elements of decisions on the value of membership. It was agreed that the discussion on fee levels should be taken later on the agenda.</p>	
4.4	<p>Draft budget 2018-19 Paper circulated in advance: <i>4c_DRAFT NHSF_Budget2018-19</i> <i>Note that this item was discussed at the meeting after items 5-8.</i></p>	

4.4.1	It was noted that expenditure for the current and previous year had been budgeted at a level greater than income, and this had been planned as agreed funding of activities from previous years' underspend. The draft budget for 2018-19 also shows expenditure on activities as greater than projected income. Trustees agreed that, whilst this could be accommodated for the 2018-19 financial year, it is not a sustainable situation and there is a need to consider projected income, and each item of expenditure together with its benefit to society and members.	
4.4.2	The Board reviewed income and expenditure and agreed not to include potential new members in budgeted income. The Board agreed several reductions in expenditure. Action: CP to update draft 2018-19 budget and recirculate to trustees	CP
4.4.3	Trustees discussed the benefits of a tiered membership structure, (for example related to size or financial turnover) and the potential positive impact on increasing the number of smaller organisations as members. A tiered membership structure in which larger organisations effectively subsidised smaller organisations was regarded as potentially attractive in terms of social good, inclusiveness and wider public benefit. The Chair reminded trustees that previous conversations around tiered levels of membership had included concern that members would 'trade down' to cheaper membership categories. It was noted that a structure with tiers defined by size/financial turnover (for example) would not offer a trade-down option as the benefits would be the same for all.	
4.4.4	Trustees discussed the potential for increased activity by member organisations to offset the costs of activities. There were mixed thoughts on the benefits and attractiveness to member organisations of this.	
4.4.5	Trustees agreed that changes to the subscription structure would need careful modelling. The modelling should focus on how organisations will engage with NHSF. Options such as a 'taster' category (e.g. £500) were proposed as a mechanism for encouraging people to engage with NHSF and experience its work.	
4.4.6	It was agreed that the 2018-19 fee level should be held at £3000. It was agreed that annual fees could be pro-rated for organisations joining part way through a year. It was agreed that a membership consultation should be run during 2018-19 around future membership structure, tiers and expectations.	
4.5	Financial policies Paper circulated in advance: <i>4d_FinancialPolicies_Review 2018 02 03</i>	
4.5.1	The annual review of NHSF financial policies has been completed by CD and CP, and presented to the Executive Group at its meeting of 2 February 2018. The Executive Group's comments have been incorporated into the version of the Financial Policies 2018-19 circulated for this trustee meeting. The policies include the reserves policy for 2018-19.	
4.5.2	The updated financial policies were unanimously agreed by the Board of Trustees. Action: CP to upload updated policies to OneDrive	CP
5.	Working group report - Policy	
5.1	Paper circulated in advance: <i>5a_PolicyGroupMeetingNotes 2018 02 05</i> Heritage sector deal work	

5.1.1	MC reported on work by the policy group to draft a 'Heritage Science and Infrastructure' contribution to heritage sector deal work that is being coordinated by the Heritage 2020 initiative. Little feedback has been received on this work to date.	
5.1.2	There is a sense that a 'heritage' sector deal may not be likely; but there could be an argument for making a separate case for heritage science in which links to science and technology are made more clearly. Another option is to feed heritage into other sector deals.	
5.1.3	Trustees were asked whether to wait for further feedback following the next Heritage 2020 meeting in March, or whether to approach BEIS directly about a heritage science sector deal. It was noted that even though a direct approach to BEIS might not succeed it would still raise the profile of heritage science.	
5.1.4	It was agreed that MC should inform The Heritage Alliance/Heritage 2020 that NHSF wishes to pursue work on a sector deal for heritage science and will continue to work through a 'heritage sector deal' if this is continued by Heritage 2020. If the current 'heritage sector deal' work is not continued, NHSF will approach BEIS directly. Action: MC to contact Lizzie Glithero-West about heritage sector deal work.	MC
5.2	Project to collect socio-economic evidence	
5.2.1	MC observed that the work to produce the 'heritage science and infrastructure' paper for the heritage sector deal approach involved considerable time sourcing case studies. This work is often repeated each time we need to make the case for the socio-economic value of heritage science. This had been discussed by the policy group which agreed that it would be useful to run a project to create a base of socio-economic information that could be used for multiple applications.	
5.2.2	Possible approaches to this work were discussed by the Board – for example, pooling knowledge of evidence that already exists and asking a researcher to turn it into a format that can be useful in a policy context; or showing a researcher what already exists and asking them to identify further evidence. REF impact case studies could be used as a resource.	
5.2.3	The Board agreed that the work would be valuable and agreed a ceiling budget of £1000-3000. Action: MC and policy group to define a brief, including number of days.	MC, policy gp
5.3	Forum policy responses	
5.3.1	The Board discussed whether there is the need for a mechanism to 'opt out' of responses to consultations/statements etc. if there is a situation in which a member does not agree with the overall position of the Forum.	
5.3.2	The Board agreed that there is not a need for a specific mechanism but that the policy group and Chair should take a cautious approach and circulate draft responses to all trustees as necessary. Trustees should be able to sign-off on behalf of their organisation.	
6.	Working group report - Resources	
	Paper circulated in advance: <i>6a_ResourcesGroupMeetingNotes 2018 02 07</i> <i>6b_Training in Heritage Science co-sponsored by NHSF and UCM</i>	

<p>6.1</p> <p>6.1.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.2.1</p> <p>6.2.2</p> <p>6.2.3</p>	<p>Resources group meeting</p> <p>GC reported on the most recent meeting of the Resources Group (held 7 February). The 'Careers in Heritage Science' survey to students and alumni has gone live and will remain open until the end of March. Telephone interviews with training providers are being requested, in line with the list agreed by the Resources group.</p> <p>Co-sponsored training in heritage science</p> <p>The Board discussed the proposal for a co-sponsored training day (with University of Cambridge Museums) in which NHSF contributes £500 and receives 5 places to allocate. The activity would help with outreach, raise the profile of NHSF amongst practitioners, and contribute to the objective of helping practitioners to have better access to heritage science. It would could also help address under-use of the Kit-Catalogue and inform whether there is an appetite for future grants to support analysis/testing.</p> <p>There was debate over whether NHSF should support activities that benefit individuals, when it acts a group of organisations. It was felt that if NHSF enters into the activity, it should seek to raise its profile with the organisation from which the individual comes. This should be achieved through branding, brochures to participants, blogs from supported attendees and a shared evaluation form to all attendees (so that NHSF can demonstrate its impact across a range of organisations).</p> <p>The Board agreed to support a pilot event with a contribution of £500. Action: PR to take forward</p>	<p>PR</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Working group report - Partnerships</p>	
<p>7.1</p>	<p>It was reported that the third partnership event with Wikimedia UK has not yet taken place. Action: DB and CP to take forward.</p>	<p>DB, CP</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Translational research scoping study</p>	
<p>8.1</p> <p>8.2</p> <p>8.3</p>	<p>Paper circulated in advance: <i>8_Improving the Disseminating and Translation of Heritage Science Research</i></p> <p>AMcC introduced the paper on behalf of Nancy Bell. The Board discussed two possible approaches to the translation activities: 1- Look at the wider science field and translate what is relevant to heritage scientists 2 – Look at heritage science research and translate for use by practitioners. The Board agreed that whilst the former is interesting, the focus of this paper is on the latter.</p> <p>The Board noted the value of the work as identifying why a piece of research is relevant (without telling people what to do) and placing the paper amongst a larger relevant body of work. It was noted that the paper focuses on conservation science and any pilot should be expanded to encompass the whole of heritage science including archaeological science.</p> <p>The Board agreed that it would be useful to take forward the pilot activity proposed in the paper but questioned who would do the work and how it should be resourced. It was agreed that a pilot would need a statistically valid sample to act as proof of concept.</p>	

8.4	The Board discussed the potential to carry out the work in partnership with a research council, leading to a future requirement for the translation of research into practice becoming a requirement of funding.	
8.5	It was noted that the timing of the proposal is good, with UKRI launching on 1 st April 2018 and requiring collaboration between research councils.	
8.6	A Knowledge Transfer Fellowship, funded by a research council, and working with ADS could offer a model for the pilot. Action: All to think about ways of running the pilot in a way that will achieve goals and minimise risk. Action: AMcC to provide feedback to NB.	All AMcC
9.	Communications and engagement	
	Paper circulated in advance: <i>9_NHSF_CommsActivities_2018_v1</i>	
9.1	The grid of potential communications activity for 2018-19 that had been requested at the last Board meeting was discussed.	
9.2	It was confirmed that trustees can have access to copies of the prospectus for use at conferences, events and for other promotion.	
9.3	It was agreed that NHSF should continue to produce an annual prospectus but should move to a 'print on demand' model.	
10.	Risk register	
	Paper circulated in advance: <i>10_NHSF Risk Register 2018 01 22</i>	
10.1	The Board reviewed risks in which 'action required' and considered residual risks following mitigation actions.	
10.2	Risk 2.1 – It was agreed that there is a need to keep monitoring the action to get more non-trustees involved in working groups.	
10.3	Risk 2.3 – This is not a current risk but could become one in the future so there is a need to ensure that CP is engaged in the recruitment of the new Chair. It was noted that, in the past, this had been managed by discussing the short list of potential candidates with CP.	
10.4	Risk 1.4 – The action to open a second bank account is outstanding, though current balance is below the level of protection provided by the FCS.	
10.5	Risk 2.5 – No new action required. Action: CP update risk register	CP
10.6	Risk 4.3 – Progress to be monitored through the Executive Group. AMcC offered to act as Data Controller. [CD left the meeting at 16.45]	
11.	Succession planning	

	<p>Paper circulated in advance: <i>11_ChairSuccession</i></p>	
11.1	<p>AMcC introduced the paper on Chair succession planning, noting that he will have completed three years in office at the next AGM and NHSF should therefore begin the process of identifying what it requires from its next Chair.</p>	
11.2	<p>Challenges were identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recruiting new members - identifying other sources of funding - the changes surrounding the new structure for the research councils - the Industrial Strategy <p>For the last two, it will be difficult for the niche area of heritage science to make its voice heard.</p>	
11.3	<p>AMcC reflected on his own experience in the role and offered the opinion that ‘time’ and ‘influence’ are the most important requirements, and that good personal connections are essential for the latter.</p>	
11.4	<p>Trustees discussed types of relevant background, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a good grounding in science - a good grounding in science communication - strong heritage credentials 	
11.5	<p>Trustees were invited to suggest possible names. Ben Cowell, Steve Trow and Alice Roberts were mentioned.</p>	
11.6	<p>Trustees were encouraged to think about why the role would be attractive to potential candidates, with the suggestion that this is not a high profile public role.</p>	
11.7	<p>Trustees discussed what they would like the next Chair to achieve, and agreed the need for a high profile advocate for heritage science with influence in policy circles and government.</p> <p>Action: All to consider names and make suggestions by 9 April.</p>	All
12.	AOB	
12.1	<p>It was noted that the proposed date for the September board meeting clashes with the IIC conference. The Board of trustees agreed to change the date from 13 September to 18 September 2018.</p> <p>Action: CP to follow up with PR to rearrange room booking</p>	CP

Dates of next meetings:

22 May 2018, 13.30-16.30 – Castlerosse Room, National Trust, 20 Grosvenor Gardens, London

18 September 2018, 13.30-16.30 – Fitzwilliam Museums Cambridge

6 December 2018, 13.30-16.30 – venue tbc (NB timings may change to accommodate AGM and any associated event).

-End-