



Library Committee

Tuesday 16 November 2021, 2:00pm
Web conferencing meeting via MS Teams

Minutes

Present Members:

Professor Vivek Mudera (Chair); Dr Paul Ayriss; Professor Simon Banks; Dr Tom Carlson; Dr Richard Freeman; Dr Liza Griffin; Dr Charles Inskip; Ms Viktoria Makai; Mr Ben Meunier; Mr Martin Moyle; Dr Rachel Rees; Dr John Sabapathy; Professor Gareth Williams.

Apologies:

Professor Diane Koenker; Mr Andy Smith; Dr Harriet Shannon.

In attendance

Ms Catherine Sharp [for minutes 5.1 – 5.2]
Mr Thomas Turner (Finance and Business Affairs)

Officer:

Ms Freya Markwell

Part I: Preliminary Business

1. Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership (1-01)

- 1.1. LC welcomed the following new members to their first meeting of the committee: Ms Viktoria Makai, Postgraduate Officer (UCL Students' Union), Dr Tom Carlson, nominated representative from the Faculty of Medical Sciences and Professor Gareth Williams, nominated representative from the Faculty of Life Sciences. It was noted that this was the first LC meeting to be chaired by Professor Vivek Mudera, as the nominee of Professor David Price, Vice-Provost (Research, Innovation and Global Engagement).
- 1.2. LC noted at this first meeting of the session its terms of reference, constitution and membership for 2021-22 and approved the following amendments to its Terms of Reference and constitution:
 - a. An update to the Terms of Reference to reflect the change in title from Director of UCL Library Services to Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science).

- b. An update to the constitution to state 'Finance Director, Central and Professional Services or nominee' to allow for the Finance Director to select a nominee to take their place as member on Library Committee.

2. Minutes of the last meeting (1-02)

- 2.1. LC approved the minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 2021 subject to the following amendment being made:
 - a. 31.2.b. The Faculty representative from Engineering Sciences reported that, in his role as Chair of the Desktop Applications Group (DAG), he had led a process by which requests for UCL Desktop applications were prioritised and deduplicated; he suggested that there might be some analogies with the work that the library would be doing to prioritise textbooks and offered to share his experience. The Director of Services (UCL Library Services) would follow up with colleagues to let them know.

3. Matters Arising

- 3.1. Arising from minute 29.2.e, it was noted that a meeting had taken place to review and address any issues in relation to digital resources at the Bartlett ready for 2021-22; outcomes of this meeting had included the addition of more detailed information into student handbooks.
- 3.2. Arising from minute 31.2.b, it was noted that, since the previous meeting of LC held on 2 June 2021, Professor John Mitchell had taken over as Chair of DAG. The Director of Services (UCL Library Services) would advise relevant colleagues who would be undertaking the prioritisation of textbooks, in case they would find it helpful to draw on the experiences of DAG in the prioritisation and deduplication of UCL Desktop applications.
- 3.3. Arising from minute 34.2, the following points were raised:
 - a. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) provided an update on a recent meeting which had taken place with the new Senate House Librarian, Catriona Cannon, to discuss possible future collaborations with Senate House. In particular, the new Senate House Librarian had been supportive of the proposed creation of a National Institute for the Humanities in Senate House incorporating rare and special collections from Senate House and other federal libraries. It was proposed that this Institute could be run in partnership between Senate House, UCL, SOAS and other federal institutions who would like to take part. UCL Library Services and Senate House had previously run a survey in 2016 to canvass the interest of federal institutions in this joint initiative and this survey would be re-run to ascertain if this interest remained. The Chair noted this was a particularly exciting initiative with national significance and suggested that this should be revisited at future LC meetings, possibly as a standing item.

- b. On the subject of Senate House, the Postgraduate Officer (UCL Students' Union) raised feedback received from postgraduate students about the lack of locker space and access to drinking water on the third floor. The Director of Operations (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) explained that the Senate House facilities fell under the remit of University of London (UoL) as opposed to UCL's own Estates team and this presented an additional challenge in implementing the requested improvements; he had flagged these requests again with UCL Estates who were following up with their UoL counterparts. With regards to the request for lockers, there was also a question of funding to be taken into account. The Chair offered to write to Estates to summarise and formally follow up on any collective Estates related issues on behalf of LC; it was agreed that this would be helpful. The Director of Operations (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) would provide an update at the next LC meeting on any progress on these requests.

(Action: Director of Operations (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science))
(Action: Chair of Library Committee)

Part II: Strategic Items for Discussion

4. Report from the Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) (1-03)

- 4.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) introduced the report on Library activity and developments in the areas of the UCL Library Services Strategy 2019-22 since the last meeting of LC. The following key points were highlighted:
 - a. Work was ongoing to define the new position of the UCL libraries following the reorganisation of the offices of the Provost, Vice-Provosts and Pro-Vice-Provosts. It was anticipated that the remit of the newly-named Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) would be expanded to include collaboration between collections across UCL, including smaller collections held in academic departments and museums as well as within the libraries, with a focus on the richness of UCL's collections as a unified entity. Public engagement activity (currently held under UCL Culture) was also expected to move across. Formal consultation was still needed on some of these proposals but it was anticipated that this new positioning would be officially approved by early December 2021.
 - b. Results for the 2021 Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) had been received in June; these results highlighted the tremendous impact caused by the physical closure of libraries and restrictions on services because of the pandemic, however the Library's decision to move to a 'digital first' position for education had clearly been popular with students.

- c. The 2021 National Student Survey (NSS) results had been received in July. These included an overall approval rating of 79.6% which, whilst lower than in the previous year, was higher than the sector average, and was deemed a positive result given the restrictions of lockdown. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) praised Library colleagues for the fantastic work they had achieved in such difficult circumstances.
- d. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science), the Director of Operations (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science), and the Director of Services (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) had been invited by the new Rector at SOAS to undertake some consultancy for the SOAS library; they had been able to suggest some ways in which SOAS could offer service improvements within a smaller budget as well as some possible ideas for collaboration on which they were awaiting feedback from SOAS.
- e. As UCL emerged from the Covid-19 pandemic and transitioned from remote working to a 'new normal', the Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) invited LC members to consider what further lessons had been learned which should be taken forward into the new UCL and Library strategies.

4.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

- a. The Chair thanked the Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) and colleagues for the fantastic amount of work which had been undertaken during the pandemic as reflected in the student feedback. These thanks were echoed by LC members who highlighted in particular the valuable input of Library staff sitting on Faculty-level committees, the effective management of budget and issuing of funds where needed, the efforts of security staff who had enabled the libraries to open and the work of Library staff in making resources available to researchers and students.
- b. The Postgraduate Officer (UCL Students' Union) fed back that students had particularly appreciated the Scan and Send service and being able to access resources online, as well as the Click and Collect Service and being able to drop off books with Security during the times the libraries were closed during lockdown. The Chair suggested that the Postgraduate Officer (UCL Students' Union) might write a letter to Library staff to formally pass on students' appreciation.
- c. Given the shift towards a more blended approach in teaching and learning, it was suggested that spaces would need to be made available on campus for students to partake in online lectures, to facilitate the moving between online and face-to-face learning in quick succession.
- d. The Director of Operations (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) reported that the UCL Sustainable Physical and Digital Places for Education (SPiDER) working group was continuing to actively consider research and educational spaces, including looking at hybrid spaces as

- well as the implications of online lectures. Some of these ideas were being trialled in the Student Centre on a small scale. The Director of Operations (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) would provide a further progress update to the next meeting of LC in spring 2022.
- e. Informal feedback had been received from within departments that blended delivery was currently considered to be more feasible to implement in the short-term than hybrid with the spaces currently available. It was noted that the Director of Digital Education was leading a project with enablers looking at learning spaces in light of the move to hybrid and blended learning, with a survey of UCL students and focus groups to be launched in a few weeks' time which would further inform strategy for UCL learning spaces.
 - f. It was noted that the results of the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) had included a result of 89% on the question of appropriate access to online library resources. This score fell within the Russell Group upper quartile boundary which was highlighted as testament to the hard work undertaken by UCL Library staff to enable such good access to online resources. Whilst the score on the question of access to physical resources had fallen, this had not dropped as much as might have been expected given the challenges resulting from the lockdown.
 - g. A question was raised regarding the possibility of access rights for UCL students at the SOAS library; it was suggested that this would be particularly valuable for students within Laws, Arts and Humanities, and Social and Historical Sciences (SLASH) which had notable overlap with SOAS; the Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) agreed to follow up on this with SOAS.
 - h. It was noted that services such as Scan and Send and Click and Collect had been useful not only during the pandemic, but could also be beneficial in the longer term, particularly for researchers and students with mobility issues for whom travelling into campus was more challenging.
 - i. There was feedback that UCL's Scan and Send facility had not initially been as fully-resourced as that offered by some other institutions; this was noted to be a valuable service for which additional resourcing would be welcomed.
 - j. It was suggested that, as opposed to seeing the pandemic as an acceleration towards a 'digital-first' approach, this should instead be taken as an encouragement to use digital resources to allow for greater access to UCL's collections, whilst also retaining the library environment and physical resources where these were the most appropriate option.

(Action: Director of Operations (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science))
(Action: Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science))

5. UKRI Open Access Policy (1-04)

- 5.1. The Head of Open Access Services (UCL Library Services) delivered a presentation on the new UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Open Access policy: key requirements and UCL implementation. The following key points were highlighted:
- a. Under the new UKRI Open Access policy, which applied to articles and conference papers funded by the UK Research Councils or Innovate UK and submitted from 1 April 2022, embargoes on open access would no longer be permitted. The Research Excellence Framework (REF) open access policy remained unchanged however and embargoes were still permitted within the REF policy.
 - b. The new UKRI Open Access policy would apply to monographs, book chapters and edited collections published on or after 1 January 2024 that acknowledged funding from the UK Research Councils or Innovate UK.
 - c. UCL's Open Access team was not in a position to offer legal advice; however it was noted that the UKRI guidance supplied so far did not cover all situations which an author may find themselves in. The new policy represented a difficult area about which UCL was talking very closely with Wellcome and cOAlition S as well as with UKRI.
 - d. For UKRI-funded papers submitted from April 2022, authors would be advised to include the relevant statement on the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence within their submissions, covering letters and funding acknowledgements. Authors would also be advised to check the relevant webpages and publishing agreements to make sure they were clear on which journals were fully open access and in UCL's transformative agreements. It was expected that UKRI would put in place a tool to allow authors to check whether a journal was compliant and how to publish there.
 - e. UCL's Open Access webpages were in the process of being updated, pending clarification on some queries raised with UKRI.
- 5.2. A number of points were raised by LC during discussion as follows:
- a. Communication of this new policy would be key; the Chair suggested Faculty executives would be a good first point of contact to arrange for communications to be cascaded within departments.
 - b. The question of charity funding was raised; it was noted that the approach taken by charities would be likely to vary, but for smaller charities in particular there may be challenges in covering the costs of Open Access.
 - c. It was noted that, if and when a similar Open Access policy were to be introduced for REF, this would pose a big question in terms of funding.

6. Open Science and Scholarship (1-05)

- 6.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) introduced the paper, which looked at the performance of the UCL Office for

Open Science and Scholarship, analysing its organisation and highlighting achievements during the review period. The following points were highlighted:

- a. UCL Press continued to go from strength to strength, having reached over 5 million downloads of 215 monograph titles, downloaded in 245 countries and territories across the world.
- b. The next challenge would be to develop an Open Access E-Textbook platform in collaboration with colleagues within departments; the Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) invited input from LC members on what the UCL Press could do to encourage UCL academics to produce content for this platform, to replace the purchasing of commercial E-Textbooks.

6.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

- a. It was suggested that the publishing of educational work within UCL Press could provide a valuable opportunity for academic colleagues - particularly those early in their careers - to gain experience and build career development; however careful thought would need to be given to the balancing of workloads given the already increasing pressures on research time arising from teaching responsibilities and REF.
- b. There was a comment raised regarding the volume of resources available on Moodle which in many cases acted effectively as an E-Textbook for the class. It was noted that the question here would be on how to make these resources more globally available as opposed to just available to students on that particular course, as was currently the case for materials on Moodle.
- c. The Postgraduate Officer (UCL Students' Union) fed back that many students would be keen for their MA dissertations to be published and queried whether there might be opportunities to do so via the UCL Press. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) confirmed that MA dissertations could already be uploaded via UCL Discovery which was an Open Access platform. In line with common practice for publishing boards, dissertations were not currently publishable via UCL Press, however the Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) agreed to look into the UCL Press editorial board review process to establish if there was any scope for considering MA dissertations with a rewrite.
- d. A comment was raised about the importance of reviewing editorial gaps and ensuring that new E-Textbooks targeted replacements to fill these gaps. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) stated that he would be happy to look at this.
- e. It was suggested that consideration should be given to opening up the option of publishing for UCL Press to UCL staff more generally as opposed to academic staff only, as there may be professional services staff who would be able to contribute. Additionally, a query was raised as to whether it could be appropriate to allow for multiple authors including staff from other HEIs as well as UCL. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library,

Culture, Collections & Open Science) agreed to look into both these questions.

(Action: Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science))

7. National Negotiations over Science Direct Deal with Elsevier (verbal update)

7.1. Exempt from publication, see confidential minutes.

8. Collection Strategy Framework and Collection Management Policy Update (1-06)

8.1. The Director of Services (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) introduced the paper, which presented an updated Library Services Collection Management Policy for the approval of LC. The following key points were highlighted:

- a. The review of the Library Services Collection Management Policy had begun in 2017, with the obvious drivers being the move to digital and the emergence of systems, tools and services which had brought increasing insight into UCL's own collections and where these sat in terms of national and international importance. Following a consultation process which had been delayed due to Covid-19, the final updated policy draft was now presented to LC for their consideration and approval; appended papers included the Collections Framework, Donations Policy and a record of consultation undertaken on the updated Collection Management Policy.
- b. The updated policy highlighted a commitment to a digital-first approach within UCL's collections. Reasons for this approach included greater accessibility, quicker and more streamlined purchasing processes, the ability to deliver resources in massive volume and the taking of strain off UCL's physical estate.
- c. It was emphasised that digital-first was not the same as digital-only. Where digital copies were either not available or would not constitute a suitable substitute for academic reasons, print copies would still be purchased. It was noted that clause 2.10 of the updated policy had been sharpened up following the consultation to clarify that the policy did not constitute a 'digital at all costs' approach.
- d. The updated policy reflected a more systematic approach to retention of physical resources; criteria used to determine whether an item was to be retained would include considerations such as currency, usage, digital availability and the availability of accessible copies of material elsewhere. A commitment had been added to the policy to confirm that safeguards would be in place to ensure that material which was uniquely held by UCL, or very scarcely-held nationally, would be retained.

- 8.2. The following points were raised in discussion:
- a. A question was raised as to how Library Services would evaluate the success of this new strategy given that the policy would have consequences not just for the Library itself but also for staff and students using the collections. The Director of Services (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) confirmed that this success would be evaluated using a mixture of quantitative metrics such as timeliness of purchasing, number of downloads and qualitative data such as feedback from staff and students.
 - b. There was a comment raised regarding the implications of an increasing reliance on digital licences making UCL effectively a renter of the materials within its collections. The Director of Services (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) confirmed that the concept of being a renter was well-understood. In the main, it applied to journals, for which post-cancellation access arrangements are usually in place. For books, most non-textbook items were purchased outright. The Director of Services (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) explained that UCL would look for contractual assurances of long-term digital access before purchase; however an element of trust had to be placed in third parties.
 - c. There was a question raised as to whether clause 2.10 of the updated policy was sufficiently clear in relation to the balance between print copies and digital, and in signalling that where there was sufficient academic justification, physical copies may be obtained. It was agreed that the wording within the policy would be kept as was, but that a clearer process should be developed to enable requesters to make an academic case for physical copies over digital; the Director of Services (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) would take this forward.

- 8.3. LC approved the updated Library Services Collection Management Policy.

(Action: Director of Services (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science))

9. Launch of the new UCL Research Institute for Collections (verbal update)

- 9.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) provided a verbal update on the new UCL Research Institute for Collections which had been launched a few weeks previously. The following key points were highlighted:
- a. One benefit of bringing all collections within UCL together under the banner of Research, Innovation and Global Engagement (RIGE) had been that this enabled more collaborative working across UCL's libraries, museums and academic departments with collections than in the past. Collections had become increasingly reliant on funding from bodies such as UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), and one of the barriers for UCL in obtaining

this funding in the past had been its non-unified approach to collection management; the new Research Institute for Collections would aim to deliver this unified approach acting as a central point of advocacy and collaborative ventures within UCL.

- b. A new website for the UCL Research Institute for Collections would be launched shortly.
- c. Funding of £0.5m had already been secured by Professor Adam Gibson to renew digital imaging equipment across UCL which would form part of an ongoing initiative to maintain quality digital materials.
- d. The Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science) would provide a further update on the UCL Research Institute for Collections at the next LC meeting.

9.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

- a. The Chair provided congratulations on the launch of the new UCL Research Institute for Collections which he noted was a significant achievement.

(Action: Pro-Vice-Provost (Library, Culture, Collections & Open Science))

Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information

10. UCL Library Committee Annual Report 2020-21 (1-07)

10.1. LC approved the UCL Library Committee Annual Report 2020-21 (1-07).

11. Project bidding in UCL Library Services (1-08)

11.1. LC received the termly summary report on the Library's progress on project bidding applications.

12. Reports from Library Working Groups (1-09)

12.1. Since the last meeting, LC had received the following minutes of Working Groups that report to LC:

- a. Press and Publications Board – 17 March 2021;
- b. Press and Publications Board – 17 May 2021;
- c. Bibliometrics Working Group – 24 May 2021;
- d. Open Science and Scholarship Committee – 17 June 2021;
- e. Open Science and Scholarship Committee – 6 October 2021; (unconfirmed);
- f. Bibliometrics Working Group – 26 October 2021 (unconfirmed).

13. Reports from Faculty Library Committees (1-10)

- 13.1. Since the last meeting, LC had received the following minutes of Faculty-level or Faculty Library Committees (FLCs) that report to LC:
- a. School of Slavonic and East European Studies Library Committee – 3 February 2021;
 - b. Mathematical and Physical Sciences Faculty Library Committee – 24 March 2021;
 - c. Faculty of Laws Library Committee - 26 March 2021;
 - d. Arts & Humanities and Social & Historical Sciences Joint Faculty Library Committee – 12 May 2021 (unconfirmed);
 - e. School of Slavonic and East European Studies Library Committee – 5 May 2021.

14. Date of the next meeting

- 14.1. The next meeting of LC was scheduled to take place at 10.00am on Wednesday 2 March 2022.

15. Any Other Business

- 15.1. There was discussion about a recent issue which had arisen at the Institute of Education (IOE), where wheelchair users and people unable to evacuate by stairs were not currently permitted to access levels 3 and 5 of the IOE library, following an assessment that the disabled fire exits were not fit for purpose. LC members acknowledged that the safety of library users was paramount, however there was concern about the quoted timescale of six months or more for the necessary works to be completed; it was suggested that this was an unacceptably long time given the urgency of the situation and the importance of accessibility. LC members also raised the wider issue of all UCL library sites needing to be made fully accessible, which was not currently the case. The Chair agreed to follow up with Estates to flag the concerns raised by LC on these matters.

(Action: Chair of Library Committee)

Freya Markwell, Library Committee Secretary
November 2021