



LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Monday 7 November 2011

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Professor David Price (Chair)
Dr Paul Ayris
Dr Caroline Essex
Professor Mike Ewing
Ms Caroline Hibbs
Professor Richard North
Professor Philip Schofield
Dr Andrew Wills

In attendance:

Mr Gary Hawes (Secretary)

Apologies for absence were received from Dr Mike Cope, Mr Luke Durrigan, Dr Kenth Gustafsson, Mr Rex Knight, Dr Hilary Richards and Professor Michael Worton.

Key to abbreviations

BIS Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
CMWG Content Management Working Group
EMC Estates Management Committee
FLC Faculty Library Committee
FTE Full-time equivalent
KPA Key Performance Area
LC Library Committee
MAPS Mathematical and Physical Sciences
RNID Royal National Institute for Deaf People
SHL Senate House Library
SSEES School of Slavonic and East European Languages

1 CONSTITUTION AND 2011-12 MEMBERSHIP; TERMS OF REFERENCE

Received:

- 1.1 The constitution and 2011-12 membership and terms of reference of the Committee at LC 1 -1 (11-12).

Reported:

- 1.2 Following the change in the designation and responsibilities of the UCL Vice-Provosts, it had been agreed that the Vice-Provost (Research) would serve as Chair of LC with effect from 2011-12.
- 1.3 Whereas the intention would be for LC to focus more on overarching strategic issues affecting library provision at UCL, particularly in the context of the student experience and the new Library estate developments, working groups would be established to examine various tactical aspects relating to content management, estates development and the roll-out of open access across UCL (see Minute 12 below).
- 1.4 In order to allow it to receive reports from the working groups, it was proposed that LC should meet at least three times each year towards the end of each term (see Minute 15 below).
- 1.5 It was explained that the slot on LC for 'A member of the academic staff, nominated by the Chair' (which was currently vacant) had traditionally been filled by a representative of SSEES in recognition of the fact that the SSEES Library was large and had particular needs. In light of this, it was agreed that the Secretary would propose an amendment to the LC constitution for approval by the Chair of LC outside of the meeting.

Action:
Gary
Hawes

2 MINUTES OF 31 MAY 2011 MEETING

Approved:

- 2.1 The Minutes of the previous meeting of LC, held on 31 May 2011.

3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(see also Minutes 4-7 & 9 below)

Reported:

- 3.1 *Minute 16.7*– with reference to the need to incorporate a mechanism for ensuring student input into the Implementation Plan for the latest version of the Library Strategy, the Director of UCL Library Services reported that an email had been sent to all undergraduate and postgraduate students, including a link to the Library Strategy and Implementation Plan as well as to a short video, with an invitation for them to submit comments. The Director of UCL Library Services would also be holding termly meetings with the UCL Union Welfare Officer, which would provide a further opportunity for student input.

4 LONG-TERM RETENTION AND RELEGATION OF PAPER-BASED LIBRARY MATERIALS

[LC Min. 13, 31.05.11]

Received:

- 4.1 A report at LC 1-2 (11-12) introduced by the Director of UCL Library Services.

Reported:

- 4.2 Since the previous meeting of LC, an exemplar list of borrowable items held in the Wickfield Store that were of interest to the MAPS Faculty had been produced and made available on the LC sharepoint¹. The list, which comprised 4,840 entries, gave an indication of items that had not been borrowed at all in the last ten years. For the remainder of 2011, UCL Library Services staff would work with academic colleagues in the MAPS Faculty to analyse the list and identify findings with a view to seeing whether this approach would be scalable across the rest of UCL.
- 4.3 The Director of UCL Library Services had not yet received much in the way of feedback from academic staff members of LC on relegation criteria that might be applied to books and/or periodicals within their specific subject areas; however, he had within the last week received comments from SSEES.
- 4.4 During the summer of 2011, a group of UCL Library Services staff had undertaken visits to other Russell Group university libraries to see how they had tackled the issue of the long-term retention and relegation of paper-based material. Possible solutions that UCL Library Services might look to that had been employed by other universities included the building of an offsite storage facility (Oxford) and the extension of the Library's collection management policy to include a single framework categorising all collections (including digital) based on their relative strengths and allocating priorities to them for development, preservation and relegation (Leeds).
- 4.5 It was proposed that the strategic issues discussed at LC 1-2 (11-12) should form the framework for discussions on relegation and storage, to be undertaken by the Working Group on Content Management (see Minute 12 below) which would submit regular reports to LC.

Discussion:

- 4.6 The following points were noted during discussion:
- 4.6.1 One of the criteria that should be used by Library Services should be to prioritise the retention of paper-based materials that were not already available in any other format with a view to considering the case for dispensing with paper-based materials that were held electronically. However, there would need to be discussions with publishers' preservation services in the first instance to ensure that those items that were available in electronic format would be made available in perpetuity.

¹ This was accessible to members of LC, at <https://sharepoint.adm.ucl.ac.uk/sites/lcs/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx>.

- 4.6.2 One further option might be to consider discussing with Oxford the possibility of implementing a shared-services arrangement in respect of its offsite storage facility in Swindon.
- 4.6.3 The relegation criteria would need to take account of the fact that for some discipline areas, such as the Arts and Humanities, there would continue to be a preference for access to paper-based materials over electronic versions.
- 4.6.4 Some members of LC noted that they were waiting for draft relegation criteria to be produced by UCL Library Services so that these could be discussed within the fora of FLC meetings. It was noted that this would be taken forward by the CMWG (see Minute 12 below).

Action:
Dr Paul
Ayris/
CMWG

5 MASTERPLAN DEVELOPMENTS

[LC Min. 14, 31.05.11]

Received:

- 5.1 A report at LC 1-3 (11-12) introduced by the Director of UCL Library Services.

Reported:

- 5.2 The UCL Estates Masterplan, which would create a consolidated library service in the Wilkins Building, had been formally signed off by UCL Council in July 2011, and a number of priority projects involving UCL Library Services had already started.
- 5.3 UCL Library Services had established an Estates Working Group to inform the implementation of the Masterplan (see Minute 12 below). The Working Group had already held a number of meetings and would in due course report back to LC and EMC with recommendations on the library presence in the forthcoming Cruciform Hub.
- 5.4 The Working Group had already undertaken an options appraisal for development of the Cruciform Hub, which had favoured the option of co-locating the Ear Institute Library/RNID Library/Eastman Dental Institute Library collections with relevant Cruciform research collections on one site (location not yet identified) and developing the Cruciform into an Information Commons-type student hub. A separate questionnaire would shortly be issued to assess staff and student feedback on the proposals.
- 5.5 The report at LC 1-3 (11-12) had flagged three strategic questions relating to the development of the Cruciform Hub, which LC members were invited to consider and to take back to their respective faculties/departments for further discussion: i) How much of the open access collection could be moved elsewhere to free up space for more Hub-type activities; ii) How important was project/group study space compared to quiet study space; iii) Would it be acceptable to relax Library Regulations on eating and drinking, and to introduce a self-service kitchen into the new Hub space?

Discussion:

- 5.6 The following points were noted during discussion:

- 5.6.1 As well as catering for teaching and learning, the Hub space would also need to cater for the needs of staff and students who would be utilising the Hub space for research purposes.
- 5.6.2 Further guidance would be needed from UCL for the architects on the question of how much of the open access collection in the Cruciform Library would be able to be moved elsewhere to free up space for more Hub-type activities. This activity would, by definition, encompass the activity outlined in Minute 4 above.
- 5.6.3 The importance of project/group study space relative to quiet study space was different for different disciplines, so it would be important for individual faculties to advise on this issue.
- 5.6.4 While some members of LC expressed unease at the idea of the possible provision of a self-service kitchen in the Hub space, especially if this would permit library users to bring food and drink into proximity with books and other library materials and risk causing damage to these and disturbance to other library users, some members noted the convenience of the British Library's approach to this issue, where café facilities were available in the building, but not immediately in the collection and study spaces.

6 LIBRARY SERVICES STRATEGY 2011-14: PROGRESS REPORT [LC Min. 16, 31.05.11]

Received:

- 6.1 A report at LC 1-4 (11-12) introduced by the Director of UCL Library Services.

Reported:

- 6.2 The five KPAs that featured in the Library Strategy and that would serve as the focus for the Library's strategic goals and actions for the next five years were all (with the exception of healthcare support) explicitly reflected in the UCL Council White Paper 2011-21, which outlined a vision and strategy for UCL for the next ten years. Similarly, many of the goals and key strategic aims set out in the White Paper were explicitly linked to library activity.
- 6.3 The report at LC 1-4 (11-12) invited LC to consider the strategic question of what the Library would need to do to embed the new readinglists@ucl service, for digitised core readings, into UCL. The report also invited LC members' views on other UCL-produced journals (in addition to the Laws-published *Journal of Bentham Studies*) that could be migrated to the new UCL Discovery platform that had recently been launched.

Discussion:

- 6.4 The following points were noted during discussion:
 - 6.4.1 It would be important for Library Services to consider a communication strategy for embedding the new readinglists@ucl service, which would include incentives for staff to use the service, such as the incorporation of electronic book extracts and a Moodle platform interface to facilitate the task of compiling

reading lists. It was suggested that Library Services colleagues might use Faculty Head of Department meetings as an opportunity for publicising the new service.

- 6.4.2 One of the tasks of the UCL Publications Board (see Minute 12 below) would be to consider whether there were other UCL-produced journals that could be migrated to the new UCL Discovery platform. The Board was also currently looking at ways of using the UCL Discovery platform so that it would serve as a platform for overlaid journals, and a print-on-demand service plug-in was also currently being scoped.
- 6.4.3 A further area that the UCL Publications Board was currently giving consideration to was the infrastructure that would be required to enable UCL to publish its own conference proceedings. To this end, the Director of UCL Library Services was currently working with two publishers to model a UCL-led e-publishing service.

7 RESEARCH LIBRARIES UK: AFFORDABLE SUBSCRIPTION PRICE INITIATIVE

[LC Min. 17, 31.05.11]

Received:

- 7.1 An oral report by the Director of UCL Library Services.

Reported:

- 7.2 JISC Collections had agreed a new, favourable five-year e-only deal with Elsevier in September 2011, which would ensure some security for university research libraries against unreasonable inflationary rises in journal subscriptions costs, at least in the medium term. As part of the deal, Elsevier had agreed to commit to a modest series of inflationary year-on-year increases in subscription prices, – with a break clause after year 3. A similarly favourable deal had also been negotiated with Wiley Blackwell. However, negotiations were still continuing with the American Chemical Society.
- 7.3 The Chair of LC noted that there had been some discussion with Elsevier over the prospect of securing a national licence deal for the UK as a whole. To this end, BIS had set up an independent working group – to be chaired by Dame Janet Finch – to examine how UK-funded research findings could be made more readily accessible to other researchers, policy makers and the general public. Such an arrangement would prove particularly favourable to UK research university libraries, which were currently being forced to pay disproportionately more for this access.

Discussion:

- 7.4 The following points were noted during discussion:
- 7.4.1 Some members of LC noted that the plight of university research libraries over above-the-rate-of-inflation journal subscription price rises enforced by publishers had not been served very well in recent years by the lack of coordinated action between those undertaking the negotiations on behalf of university research libraries and academic staff at grass-roots level, some of

whom were themselves members of the editorial boards of publishing companies.

- 7.4.2 It would be interesting to see what effect the introduction of a number of new, free open-access science journals would have on submission rates to established journals such as *Nature* and *Science*. One such journal would be *E-Life*, funded jointly by the Wellcome Trust and two other international research funders.

8 SENATE HOUSE LIBRARIES STRATEGY 2011-13

Received:

- 8.1 The above document, introduced by the Director of UCL Library Services.

Reported:

- 8.2 As part of its strategy for the next three years, SHL was remodelling itself as a library whose purpose, aims and strategic priorities would be geared towards supporting research. In fact, the new strategy document contained virtually nothing on what level of support would be maintained for teaching and learning.
- 8.3 In light of developments, UCL would be obliged at some point within the next few years to review the level of subscription costs (currently £500k per year) that it paid to the SHL to grant universal access for its staff and students, particularly in the light of the developments to UCL's Library estate that were envisaged as a consequence of the UCL Masterplan, which would be aimed at increasing the amount of study space available to students across UCL.

Discussion:

- 8.4 The following points were noted during discussion:
- 8.4.1 It would be desirable to obtain a breakdown of UCL's current subscription payments to the SHL with a view to working out the costs of granting access to the SHL per student FTE. These metrics would also be useful as a basis for comparison purposes and as a management tool for determining the level of desire for access to the SHL among UCL students.
- 8.4.2 Some LC members noted that students in some UCL faculties (eg Laws) tended to engage more with the libraries of the institutes of the School of Advanced Study than with the SHL itself, and that they would not want the situation with regard to the SHL to impact on this. The Director of UCL Library Services noted, however, that it was his understanding that UCL's subscription with SHL did not cover access to the institute libraries, although he would check on this for colleagues.

RESOLVED:

- 8.5 **That LC receive at its next scheduled meeting a breakdown of UCL's current subscription payments to the SHL with a view to working out the costs of granting access to the SHL per student FTE.**

Action:
Caroline
Hibbs

9 ARRANGEMENTS FOR SPRING TERM 'OPEN TOWN' MEETING 2012

Discussion:

- 9.1 It was agreed that arrangements for the Library 'Open Town' meeting should be repeated during the Spring Term 2012, and that this should supplement the Spring Term meeting of LC instead of substituting for it. It was further agreed that the 'Open Town' meeting should be scheduled for later in the afternoon and followed by a modest reception for those in attendance.

Action:
Gary Hawes

10 RECORDS MANAGEMENT POLICY

Approved:

- 10.1 The Records Management Policy at LC 1-5 (11-12).

11 LIBRARY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

Approved:

- 11.1 The Library Committee Annual Report 2010-11 at LC 1-6 (11-12), for forwarding to the next scheduled meetings of Academic Board and Council for formal approval.

12 WORKING GROUPS REPORTING TO LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Noted:

- 12.1 At LC 1-7 (11-12), details of the following newly established working groups that would be reporting to LC in accordance with clause 4 of its terms of reference: Content Management Working Group; Estates Working Group; UCL Publications Board.

13 UCL LIBRARY SERVICES PROJECTS

Noted:

- 13.1 At LC 1-8 (11-12), a report on i) bids currently submitted to and awaiting decision on funding from UCL and non-UCL sources and ii) projects currently funded from UCL and non-UCL sources.

14 MINUTES OF FACULTY LIBRARY COMMITTEES

Noted:

- 14.1 Since LC's previous meeting, the LC officers had received the Minutes of the following FLCs: Mathematical and Physical Sciences (8/12/10, 15/3/11).

15 DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

Noted:

15.1 The next meeting of LC was scheduled as follows:

Tuesday 14 June 2012, 2.30pm
Ground Floor meeting room, 2 Taviton Street

15.2 The LC Secretary would also be canvassing dates with LC members in due course with a view to arranging a Spring Term meeting of LC (see Minute 9.1 above).

Discussion:

15.3 It was agreed that it would be helpful for the LC Secretary to publicise a rolling schedule of dates for LC meetings in future, to ensure that members were informed in advance of the dates of at least the next three meetings of LC.

Action:
Gary
Hawes

GARY HAWES
Senior Academic Support Officer
Academic Support
Registry and Academic Services
[telephone 020 7679 8592, UCL extension 28592, email: g.hawes@ucl.ac.uk]
18 January 2012