

## Collections Advisory Group

**Minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2022 at 2pm via Microsoft Teams [CAG03]**

**CAG Members Present:** Baroness Young of Hornsey (Chair)  
 Lord Faulkner of Worcester (LF)  
 Malavika Anderson (MA)  
 Hannah Obee (HO)

**Apologies:** Gagan Mohindra MP  
 Alayo Akinkugbe  
 Molly Bretton  
 Cat Manson  
 Gilane Tawadros

**In attendance:** [REDACTED] Heritage Collections [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] Parliamentary Archives, [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED], Parliamentary Archives, [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] (secretary)

### Acronyms

CAG	Collections Advisory Group		
CWG	Collections Working Group		
HSG	Heritage Strategy Group		

<b>Meeting Opened at 2pm</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Item 1: Minutes of previous meeting and outstanding actions</u></b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2022 were agreed.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Item 2: Introduction to the Collections Working Group and Priority themes and activities</u></b></p> <p>[REDACTED] presented a paper providing an introduction to the Collections Working Group and the high-level priority work areas that the group has identified as its focus.</p> <p>MA asked about the prioritisation of the three themes identified in the paper, suggesting that it may not be necessary for these to be presented hierarchically. [REDACTED] agreed and removed the words “in order of priority” from paragraph 7 of the paper.</p> <p>On the theme of interpretation (including language and terminology), HO raised the work of Lisa Kennedy on Bath in developing guidance on addressing language in archive collections. <b>HO will forward the Bath example of guidance on language [completed 13/6/22]</b>. There was some discussion of looking toward the United States for examples of how to address language and interpretation,</p>	<b>HO</b>

with it being noted that the US and UK experiences share some similarities but also exist in very different contexts.

[REDACTED] explained that the discussion of the sensitive objects policy had made clear that, going forward, work will need to be underpinned by research through partnership strategies, which will include consideration of terminology used in cataloguing. [REDACTED] noted, in the context of the 1981 display, the importance of managing expectations within these partnerships. There was some discussion of the importance of engaging not only with academics but also with the audiences that we are trying to reach. MA suggested adding a column to the table in Appendix I (“activities underway”) indicating who is responsible for undertaking the engagement necessary to establish frameworks with partners. She also suggested identifying a dedicated person or team who can carry on these relationships.

[REDACTED] noted that the Participation team has done a considerable amount of work on audience development, but this has been done through the prism of engaging audiences in the democratic process, and that we need to move toward a more holistic approach to audience development. HO noted her experience of establishing a programming group at Harewood bringing together collections, engagement and learning. It was suggested that a “core” offer, complemented by (for example) seasonal school group programmes, makes messaging to the public much clearer. It was also stressed that any approach should be as simple and effective as possible, and not create new complications in terms of ascertaining who is responsible for what.

There was discussion of the exhibitions and displays group which has representation from some of the collections. It was noted that this is currently more of a forum for sharing information than a strategic programming group. It was also suggested that an Engagement Officer role could be created, sitting across all relevant groups (including the exhibitions group and the public engagement group). The Chair suggested that the Peers in Schools scheme could form part of the picture.

[REDACTED] said that we would benefit from a bicameral interpretation policy or framework. She asked if there were any examples of interpretation frameworks that could inform this work, even if only for benchmarking purposes. MA noted that she had been involved with an interpretation and engagement framework, as the two mirror one another. The Chair said that it would be helpful to illustrate the parameters of the issues we are considering, for example by following a particular case study from beginning to end, or getting a sense of internal discussions around interpreting particular texts.

HO said that a framework can be complemented by an action plan setting out smaller pragmatic steps. She also stressed the importance of consultation with end users.

**The CAG endorses and validates the CWG’s identification of priorities. The words “in order of priority” are removed from paragraph 7.**

**The CAG considers that a cross-cutting audience development group is needed to take collective decisions on future audiences.**

**[REDACTED] to feed back the CAG’s position on audience development.**

[REDACTED]  
All

<p><b>All CAG members to share any relevant case studies to help with benchmarking under the three identified priority areas.</b></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Item 3: Update on sensitive objects policy</u></b></p> <p>The Chair, LF and [REDACTED] provided an update on discussions around the sensitive objects policy, following the last CAG meeting and a subsequent meeting of the Lord Speaker’s Advisory Panel.</p> <p>[REDACTED] had fed back to [REDACTED], and there was a recognition that the principle of addressing sensitive materials is a cross-cutting content piece (not restricted to the Parliamentary Art Collection). The Chair noted that this is a huge breakthrough.</p> <p>[REDACTED] explained that the HSG has been given the go-ahead to develop a paper setting out high-level principles for how both Houses can consider their holdings in the context of corporate risk. She said that the governance route for this paper will be challenging as it will need to pass through various other committees, the Executive/Management Boards of both House administrations, and ultimately the two Commissions.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Item 4: Reflections following May discussion of 1981 paper</u></b></p> <p>[REDACTED] provided an update on reflections within the Archives following the CAG’s discussion of the paper on the 1981 display. There had not yet been a detailed discussion of the 1981 display specifically, but there has been thinking about how to take steps toward having a more strategic approach to displays and exhibitions that would mean projects like the 1981 did not seem controversial.</p> <p>[REDACTED] explained that [REDACTED] (Parliamentary Archives) has been working with ParliREACH (the Workplace Equality Network for race, ethnicity and cultural heritage) on a project to mark South Asian Heritage Month (18 July to 17 August). This year, South Asian Heritage Month will mark the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of India and Pakistan’s independence, as well as the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the expulsion of South Asians from Uganda. The Archives will support ParliREACH in delivering displays in Portcullis House and the Royal Gallery.</p> <p>[REDACTED] will share the <b>South Asian Heritage Month draft project brief with CAG [completed 7/6/22]</b>. MA also flagged the “Freedom and Fragmentation” exhibition which had been held at Cambridge University to mark the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of partition and independence.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Item 5: Update on CAG communications</u></b></p> <p>[REDACTED] provided an update following discussions with communications colleagues. It had been agreed to focus on internal communications (developing awareness and understanding of CAG within the two Houses) this side of the summer recess, with external communications being looked at from September. It was stressed that the CAG is a forward-looking group and there will be value in proactively championing this. [REDACTED] also noted that [REDACTED] had offered ongoing assistance to CAG.</p>	

<p>There was some discussion of how to promote the work of the CAG internally. It was suggested that testimonials about particular objects could be spotlighted, for example in the House Magazine.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Item 6: AOB</u></b></p> <p>The possibility of the July meeting being relocated to Millbank House was discussed. [REDACTED] <b>to look into relocating July meeting [completed 8/6/22]</b>.</p> <p>[REDACTED] provided an update on discussions with internal colleagues to set up tours of the Line of Route and Education Centre for CAG members.</p> <p>[REDACTED] raised the Heritage Strategy that is in development. [REDACTED] <b>to bring the Heritage Strategy to CAG for information once endorsed.</b></p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
<p><b><u>Meeting Closed at 3.20pm</u></b></p>	

**Summary of Decisions agreed:**

The draft minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2022 were agreed.

The CAG endorses and validates the CWG’s identification of priorities. The words “in order of priority” are removed from paragraph 7.

The CAG considers that a cross-cutting audience development group is needed to take collective decisions on future audiences.

**Summary of Actions agreed:**

<p>HO will forward the Bath example of guidance on language [completed 13/6/22].</p>	<p>HO</p>
<p>[REDACTED] to feed back the CAG’s position on audience development.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>
<p>All CAG members to share any relevant case studies to help with benchmarking under the three identified priority areas.</p>	<p>All</p>
<p>[REDACTED] will share the South Asian Heritage Month draft project brief with CAG [completed 7/6/22].</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>
<p>[REDACTED] to look into relocating July meeting [completed 8/6/22].</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>
<p>[REDACTED] to bring the Heritage Strategy to CAG for information once endorsed.</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>